

WHITE PAPER

SUBJECT: Timeline Detailing the Countermeasures Classification Issue

Bottom Line Up Front: The attached timeline demonstrates current DoD (federal) countermeasure definitions and protocols were developed from research initiated in the 1980s. The researchers (Honts, Raskin, Kircher, and Barland) primarily responsible for our current understanding of CMs were employed at the University of Utah. During the mid-1990s polygraph countermeasures (CMs) within the Federal Government were initially defined, taught and oversight provided at the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute (DoDPI, now named the National Center for Credibility Assessment (NCCA). The review of the literature resulting in this timeline can be summarized in the following::

- 1) In the Federal Government, NCCA personnel compiled existing research and developed CM protocols that are currently employed by the Federal Government.
- 2) NCCA personnel are officially and unofficially considered the Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for defining and identifying polygraph countermeasures in the federal government.
- 3) Since 1983, SMEs within the polygraph community collaborated to develop CM procedures (including CM criteria (sometimes referred to as "C factors"). This sharing involved researchers and polygraph examiners from federal, state, local law enforcement (law enforcement) and IC agencies.

Countermeasure policy for the Department of Defense and by de facto for the Federal Government was initially defined in the Memorandum titled, "Interim Policy for Polygraph Anti-Countermeasure Procedures," dated March 27 2006, signed by Robert W. Rogalski, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security). Mr. Rogalski, in no uncertain terms identified NCCA as the SME for countermeasure determinations within the Department of Defense (attached). This interim document formed the basis for DoD countermeasure guidance as elaborated in DoD guidance (DoDD 5210.48 and DoDI 5210.91) and in the Federal PDD Examiners Handbook (Handbook), which details federal polygraph standards. Since the issuance of the Rogalski memorandum, guidance from OUSD(I) has consistently reaffirmed NCCA as the SMEs for the federal government.

BACKGROUND: Dr. Gordon Barland and Paul M. Menges are (or should be) credited with compiling existing research that established current federal countermeasure procedures. Barland, who was a professor at the University of Utah, and Menges established a relationship between DoDPI and several researchers (Raskin, Honts and Kircher) employed at the University of Utah. This relationship, which continues to this day, allowed Barland and Menges to develop federal CM procedures while the researchers also were able to extensively publish their research in scientific journals. As the research which forms the basis for federal CM protocols was extensively published and presented in both domestic and foreign forums and is readily available on the internet, Dr. Barland and Mr. Menges, as well as informed federal security personnel (OUSD(I), the National Security Agency, Counterintelligence Field Activity, Defense Security Service, etc.) did not and have not considered CMs as classified information. As is documented in the following timeline, from 1995 (US versus Galbreth) to 2005, Dr. Barland, Mr. Menges, Dr. Honts and Dr. Kircher presented numerous lectures involving CM procedures

to audiences both foreign and domestic; Mexico, South America, Israel and Canada (see timeline). While presentations researchers employed at the University of Utah research could present their research at will, the federal government also approved for Dr. Barland makes CM presentations to both foreign and domestic presentations. These presentations were approved by senior DoD CI specialists of the National Security Agency (NSA), DIS, DSS, the Counterintelligence Field Activity.

Discussion: As pointed out on August 10, 2012 by Mr. Mike Porco, OUSD(I) a simple internet search for polygraph countermeasures results in 65,800 sources of information. A more detailed internet inquiry will reveal every countermeasure criteria that comprises federal CM can simply be located in unclassified forums. One only has to attend public lectures and read published articles such as, "Effectiveness of physical countermeasures under high motivation conditions," and, "effects of physical countermeasures on the physiological detection of deception."

The timeline not only demonstrates that CMs are clearly in the public domain but it should also indicate the importance of allowing CMs to be used by the federal LE community has become our national security. Currently, the use of polygraph results has become the most viable tool available for use by federal LE agencies to disallow applicants from being hired into sensitive positions. NSA and CIA have successfully use the polygraph in this manner for years in a classified environment. With the sophistication of CM procedures, the identification of persons employing CMs is also being effectively used for denying persons access to sensitive LE positions. In a recent administrative hearing, NCCA was successful in admitting testimony about the presence of CMs. This testimony will lay the foundation to deny a person access a position that would have given him the "keys to the Kingdom." The federal law enforcement community, unlike the IC does not have the infrastructure to cope with the security requirements to provide such testimony in federal LE administrative hearings.

Summary:

The below timelines support the position of NCCA that the following apply to CMS:

CM detection information from its inception has been researched, developed and implemented in an unclassified environment. CM procedures were not, are not and need not be classified when teaching the detection process.

The expertise to determine what and when credibility assessment procedures, such as countermeasure protocols exists have been with NCCA. This opinion has been consistently reflected in DoD guidance. It should further be noted that since 2000 the federal government has conducted over 1,000,000,000 examinations. Over these years and this vast number of examinations, NCCA has been considered the SME for CMS. In this time and after all of these examinations, not one example can be provided wherein NCCA procedures for the protection of CM protocols has failed.

APPENDIX

Timeline Involving the Development of Countermeasures (CM) as used in the Federal Government

Note only published papers and presentations are contained in this timeline that were authored by personnel who had a direct nexus to NCCA. The relationship between the authors and NCCA were either employment with NCCA (Barland/Honts/Slupski) or they had an extended working relationship (Kircher) with NCCA that involved the development of CM procedures. The Nexus is for each author is provided below.

Entry	Time	
	1983	CM research results published in a public journal. The research is titled, "Detection of deception: Effectiveness of physical countermeasures under high motivation conditions." The paper and presentation, in an unclassified environment, discussed specific types of CMs. Paper presented at the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Pacific Grove, California. Published by Honts, Raskin, & Kircher. Available on the internet.
	1984	CM paper presented in a non-classified setting. The research is titled, "Effects of spontaneous countermeasures on the detection of deception." The presentation and paper discussed specific types of CMs. Paper presented in an unclassified environment at the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Milwaukee, Wisconsin by Honts, Raskin, Kircher & Hodes. Available on the internet.
	1984	CM paper presented in a non-classified setting. The paper is titled, "Countermeasures: The state of the art in 1984." Paper presented by Barland at the annual meeting of the American Polygraph Association (APA), Nashville, Tennessee. NOTE: The APA seminar is attended by private and foreign examiners as well as federal, state and local CI and law enforcement (LE) examiners.
1.	1985	CM research results published in a public journal. The research, titled "Effects of physical countermeasures on the physiological detection of deception" involves a description and discussion of CM criteria and how they may impact the polygraph protocol. Published by Dr.s Honts, Hodes, and Raskin. Available on the internet. Note: CM criteria have been referred to as "C factors." In this time-line they will only be referred to a CM criteria.
	1985	Research published in a public journal and presented in Jerusalem. The research, titled, "Computerized polygraph interpretations and detection of physical countermeasures," involves descriptions and discussions of CM criteria. The presentation was for the International Congress on Techniques for Criminal Investigation, held in Jerusalem. The research was published and presented by Raskin, Kircher, & Honts. Available on the internet.

	1985 Thru 2000	Dr. Gordon Barland assigned to the Research Division, DoDPI. Dr. Barland, an NSA employee, was detailed to DoDPI. He is credited with defining CM criteria for DoD (and the federal government). He assisted in the development of anti-CM protocols based upon collaborations with researchers primarily from his peers at the University of Utah; Honts, Raskin and Kircher at the University of Utah. Note: All collaboration involved research that was unclassified and in the public domain.
	1986	CM paper presented in a non-classified setting. The research and presentation was titled, "Countermeasures and the detection of deception." Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C. Presented by Honts, Raskin, & Kircher. NOTE: This seminar was the largest APA seminars to date and was attended by private and foreign examiners as well as federal, state and local CI and law enforcement (LE) examiners.
	1987	CM paper presented in a non-classified setting. The research is titled, "Countermeasures to the physiological detection of deception. Presented at a colloquium given at the Psychology Department, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Presented by Honts. Available on the internet.
2.	1987	CM research results published in a public journal. The research is titled, "Effects of physical countermeasures and their electromyographic detection during polygraph tests for deception." Involves a description of CM criteria and their impact on aspects of a polygraph protocol. Published by Honts, Raskin, and Kircher. Available on the internet.
	1988	CM paper presented in a non-classified setting at DoDPI. The presentation was titled, "Countermeasures and psychophysiological patterning in the detection of deception." Presented at DoDPI for the instructors. Presented by Dr. Honts. Note: University of Utah and DoDPI/NCCA continue to collaborate in an unclassified environment.
3	1988 Thru 1990	Dr. Charles Honts , employed by DoDPI as a "lead researcher." Dr. Honts, prior and subsequent to his employment with DoDPI, extensively published on the topic of CMs. Much of current NCCA CM criteria are founded on Honts' research. Dr. Honts' has provided lectures, testimony (congressional and judicial) and authored numerous publications in the public domain. Dr. Honts' has presented many CM lectures OCONUS for foreign governments and private organizations. Dr. Barland, Chief, Research Division, DoDPI often cites the work of Dr. Honts. For example in U.S. Galbreth, Dr. Barland repeatedly referenced the work of Dr. Honts in the trial transcripts. Dr. Barland was a peer of Dr. Honts at DoDPI. Barland was employed at the University of Utah with Raskin, Honts and Kircher at the University of Utah).
	1988 Thru 2012	Dr. John C. Kircher, University of Utah , was a contemporary of Barland and Honts. While Kircher was never assigned to NCCA, he continues to be consulted as an SME reference test data analysis and CM criteria (See attachment, DoDPI00-P-0002). He is currently completing a CM project (DoD funded) that is unclassified.
	1989	An Accuracy study completed at DoDPI by Dr.s Barland, Honts & Barger. The non-CM related research was titled, "Studies of the Accuracy of Security Screening Polygraph Examinations." "The project was completed at Fort McClellan, AL. unclassified and available on the internet.

	1990	<p>A pilot study for the U.S. Government. A study funded by the USG and completed at the University of Utah. This study was one of many that involved the development of a computerized polygraph system and physiological measures for detection of deception and countermeasures. The study was completed by Raskin and Kircher reference contract 88-L655300-000.</p> <p>Note:This study was later present OCONUS in an unclassified presentation.</p>
	1990	<p>Paper presented in a non-classified setting for Naval Investigative Service (now NCIS) at DoDPI. The presentation was titled, "Validity of the positive control question test and the effects of countermeasures on the control question test". The class was presents at the NIS Annual Polygraph Seminar held at DoDPI, Fort McClellan, AL. The presenter was Dr. Honts.</p>
	1993	<p>Foreign Polygraph Activity Report was presented as a series of quarterly reports for the CI community in a classified environment starting in the first quarter of FY 1993 and continuing until 2000. Each report consisted of about 20 pages detailing polygraph activities by foreign countries. The report was presented by Dr. Barland.</p>
	1994	<p>CM research results published in a public journal. The research titled, "Mental and physical countermeasures reduce the accuracy of polygraph tests". Involves a discussion of specific CM criteria. Published by Honts, et al. Available on internet.</p>
	1994	<p>CM paper presented in a non-classified setting. The research and presentation was titled," Physical and mental countermeasures can be used to defeat guilty knowledge tests." The paper discussed specific procedures that could be used to defeat a polygraph examination. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Atlanta, GA by Dr. Honts, et al.</p>
	1994	<p>CM research results published in a public journal. The research titled, "Effects of physical and mental countermeasures on the detection of deception." The research involves a discussion of CM criteria and how they may impact the polygraph protocol. Published by Honts, Raskin and Kircher. Available on internet.</p>
	1995	<p>CM paper presented at DoDPI. The results of DoDPI research was presented at DoDPI by Barland. The research titled, "Two Countermeasures and the Numbers Test. (CM-1) was presented to DoDPI instructors at Ft McClellan, AL. The project helped develop current CM criteria.</p>
3	1995	<p>CM Courtroom testimony by DoDPI personnel in a public forum. In US versus Galbreth, Dr. Barland, the Chief, DoDPI Research Division, and Dr. Honts provided testimony in reference to polygraph CM criteria. Additionally, CM protocols were defined in their testimony. As noted Dr. Honts was a previous DoDPI researcher. This set the precedent for CMs being used in federal court. The testimony was provided in an unclassified environment. The testimony is available on the internet.</p>
	1996	<p>CM paper presented at DoDPI. The results of DoDPI research was presented at DoDPI. The research titled, "A Mental Countermeasure and the Numbers Test. (CM-2) was presented to DoDPI. The project assisted in developing current CM criteria. Presented by Dr. Barland.</p>
	1996	<p>CM research results published in a public journal. The research titled, "Mental and physical countermeasures reduce the accuracy of the concealed knowledge test." Involves a discussion of CM criteria and how they impact the polygraph protocol. Published by Honts, Devitt, winbush and Kircher. Available on internet.</p>

1996	CM paper presented in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI CM research was presented at Delta College National Polygraph Workshop. The research titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures (v.2.1) The presentation involved discussions of CM protocols used by DoDPI. CM criteria were discussed. Presented by Dr. Barland. Delta College operates in an unclassified environment.
1997	CM paper presented in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI research was presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Police Polygraphists, Albuquerque, NM. The research titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures (v.2.1) was presented. The presentation involved discussions of CM protocols used by DoDPI. CM criteria were discussed. Presented by Barland.
1997	CM paper presented in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI research was presented at Federal Interagency Seminar at the Maritime Academy, Linthicum, MD. The research titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures (v.2.1) was presented. The presentation involved discussions of CM protocols used By DoDPI. CM criteria were discussed. Presented by Barland. Note: The Federal Interagency Seminar is attended only by federal examiners.
1997	CM research provided to the U.S. Supreme Court in an Amicus Brief. Dr. Honts , in an Amicus Brief for the U.S. Supreme Court in US versus Sheffer discussed current research involving CMs and pointed out studies indicate training in specific countermeasures was effective in producing a substantial number of false negative outcomes. Available on the internet.
1998	CM paper presented in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI CM research was presented at the American Polygraph Association in San Diego, CA. The research titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures (v.2.1)," involved discussions of CM protocols used by DoDPI. CM criteria were discussed. Presented by Barland.
1998	NCCA supports federal LE and CI , state and local LE agencies with reviews of sensitive examinations submitted to NCCA. The examinations are submitted primarily to determine if countermeasures are present. In 1998, three examinations were submitted, in 2000, 40 examinations were completed, in 2011 60 were completed. All but one examination reviewed (for the CIA) have been completed in an unclassified environment.
1999	CM paper presented in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI CM research was presented at the American Polygraph Association in Dallas, TX. The research titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures (v.2.1) involved discussions of CM protocols used by DoDPI. CM criteria were discussed. Presented by Barland.
2000	Classification Guide (DoD 5240.08) was published including polygraph CM for the first time. The guide was written by Dr. Barland and Mr. Menges. CMs are not classified as they were and are considered by NCCA to meet the exception criteria (public domain) of this DoD Guidance.
2001	Support for "First Responders." Mr. Jay Fraude, DSS OGC approved training of state and local LE examiners. This support is provided to develop standardized practices for "First Responders" in order to develop partnerships in support of the Global War on Terrorism.

2002	CM course provided by DoDPI Instructor for federal, state and local LE personnel in Indiana. The course provided CM wherein CM criteria are provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Menges.
2002	CM paper presented in a non-classified environment by DoDPI researcher. The results of DoDPI CM research was presented at the American Polygraph Association in Albuquerque, NM. The presentation titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures." The presentation involved discussions of CM protocols used by DoDPI. CM criteria were discussed. Presented by Dr. Barland.
1992 Thru 1996	Charles Slupski, a DoDPI Instructor from 1992 thru 1996. Upon his retirement from the United States Army Criminal Investigation Command, Slupski began a polygraph school, "American International Institute of Polygraph (AIIP)." The school advertises, "AIIP uses a proven successful and up-to-date curriculum with instructional methods based on federal training and experience gained while teaching at the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute." This school based in Atlanta, GA. The school annually conducts at least three 10 week courses a year for foreign students.
2002	CM courses, based upon NCCA curriculum in South Africa. Beginning in June 2000, Mr. Slupski began providing 10 week polygraph training courses in South Africa. Countermeasure training is a part of the school's curriculum and according to Mr. Slupski (a former DoDPI instructor for four years), his curriculum is "taught as close to DoDPI as possible for both the foreign and domestic courses." The following South African schedule is provided: Professional Polygraph Examiner's Basic Training Program: March 12 - May 18, 2012 (Pretoria) 10 weeks June 18 - August 24, 2012 (Pretoria) 10 weeks October 1 - December 7, 2012 (Cape Town) 10 weeks
2003	CM course provided by Chief, DoDPI Research Division in Mexico City, Mexico. A one week workshop conducted for Mexican government examiners from Central America involving Chart interpretation and Counter-Countermeasures. The examiners were assigned to the National Institute of Forensic Sciences [<i>Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Forenses (INACIPE)</i>]. The course was presented by Barland after being approved by the National Security Agency (July 2003).
2003	CM Course provided by Chief, DoDPI Research Division in Mexico City, Mexico. A one week workshop conducted for Mexican government examiners from Central America involving countermeasures and polygraph techniques. The examiners were assigned to the National Institute of Forensic Sciences [<i>Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Forenses (INACIPE)</i>]. The course was presented by Barland after being approved by the National Security Agency (August 2003).
2003	CM course provided by Chief, DoDPI Research Division for the APA. The course titled, "Countermeasures," addressed CM procedures wherein CM criteria was provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Menges. The four hour class was completed in Reno, NV.
2003	Polygraph testimony used in an administrative hearing. In US Versus Lee, the polygraph results were used by a federal judge to sentence a child molester. This precedent setting agreement was supported and the sentence did not violate Lee's 5 th amendment rights.

2003	An NCCA review of a CM examination. Based upon the NCCA's concurrence with the quality control division of the Drug Enforcement Administration that CMs were employed, the applicant was not hired. The NCCA memorandum which detailed the CMs employed was used in an unclassified environment.
2004	CM Course provided by Chief, DoDPI Research Division. The course titled, "Case studies of successful and nearly successful countermeasures," was presented to the APA in Orlando, FL. The class was presented by Barland. The class described what criteria were successful in defeating a polygraph examination. The class was presented by Barland in an unclassified environment.
2004	Technical Support for State and local LE agencies authorized. In support of the Global War on Terrorism, Mr. Richard Schiff, OGC, CIFA authorized NCCA to support state and local LE with technical support, to include CM case review.
2004	Dr. John C. Kircher Researcher completes his research into CM criteria. In a research project titled, "Human and computer decision making in the PDD," CM criteria were further identified. The research was funded by DoDPI. Dr. Kircher does not maintain a clearance and the project is unclassified. Available on the internet.
2004	Deputy Director DIA authorizes NCCA to support state and local LE. Ms. Elisa Skidsrub, OGC, DIA, coordinates a memorandum to the Deputy Director, DIA allowing for operational (to include CM reviews) and educational (to include CM training for Senior Examiner Courses) support for state and local LE.
2004	CM Course provided by Chief, DoDPI Research Division in Mexico City, Mexico. A one week workshop conducted for Mexican government examiners from Central America involving "advanced Techniques in Security Screening" which includes countermeasures. The examiners were assigned to the National Institute of Forensic Sciences [<i>Centro de Investigacion y Seguridad Nacional (CISEN)</i>]. The course was presented by Barland after being approved by the National Security Agency (August 2004).
2005	National Academy of Science (NAS) points out that CMs can defeat a polygraph Examination. The NAS report opined, "A well supported theory of the test is also essential to provide confidence that the test will work well in the face of efforts examinees may make to produce a false negative result. Spies and terrorists may be strongly motivated to learn countermeasures to polygraph tests and may develop potential countermeasures that have not been studied." Report was unclassified. Available on the internet.
2005	CM course provided by previous DoDPI researcher in China. The course titled, " <i>Polygraph Countermeasures</i> ," which addressed CM procedures wherein CM criteria was provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Honts where he was invited to "lecture at 第二届全国心理测试高级培训班（中国洛阳）Second Chinese National Seminar on Polygraph. Luoyang, China."
2005	Addition of CM Chapter (unclassified) to Federal Polygraph Handbook – The CM chapter detailing federal polygraph CM procedures for the federal government was authorized to be chronicled in the Handbook. The chapter was fully staffed within CIFA and subsequently signed by the Director, CIFA. The Chapter was also staffed with the 26 participating federal agencies. The document staffed was unclassified.

2005	DoDPI coordination of “atypical” physiological tracings. Based upon Dr. Kircher’s research into physiological criteria, Paul Menges discussed, in very great detail, CM criteria in unclassified documents. Dr. Kircher provided specific input to Paul Menges in an unclassified document. Slide show and discussions of criteria available.
2006	CM paper presented by previous Chief, DoDPI Research Division in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI CM research was presented to the Utah Polygraph Association in Park City, UT. The 15 hour course was titled, “Countermeasures: Identification & Verification.” Discussions of CM protocols and CM criteria was completed.
2006	FBI Polygraph Unit requests to initiate a “partnership”. The Chief, FBI polygraph Unit requested NCCA to assist the FBI in co-sponsoring state and local LE polygraph training for those agencies supporting the Joint Terrorism Task Force (JTTF). The request was honored based upon the previous authorization by the Director, CIFA.
2006	Mr. Rogalski ,DUSD(CI & S) defines DoD polygraph CM policy. In signing the “Interim” countermeasures policy document, Mr. Rogalski assigned NCCA the responsibility for properly implementing DoD CM policy. NCCA was clearly designated as DoD SMEs to improve polygraph examiner training. NCCA (QAP) was also specifically designated to provide oversight for the implementation of the policy.
2007	General Clapper signed DoDD 5210.48. The Directive designates the D2X responsible for establishing DoD credibility Assessment standards for education, training, certification, quality assurance, and research.
2007	CM paper presented by Chief, DoDPI Research Division in a non-classified environment. The results of DoDPI CM research was presented to the American Polygraph Association in New Orleans, LA. The 4 hour course was titled, “Countermeasures.” Discussions of CM protocols and CM criteria were completed.
2007	Federal, DoD and NCCA personnel directed to assist Iraqi examiners. Federal examiners deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan were directed to assist (through on-site training & quality control assistance) Iraqi examiners involving different vetting missions. The assistance involved CM and anti-CM procedures. The assistance continued until DoD examiners were no longer deployed in Iraq.
2009	CM course provided by previous DoDPI researcher in Bogota, South America. The course titled, “ <i>Countermeasures in 2009: What We Know and What We Don’t know,</i> ” addressed CM procedures wherein CM criteria was provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Honts where he was invited to “address Asociacion Colombiana de Poligrafistas, Bogota, Colombia.”
2009	CM course provided by previous DoDPI researcher in Atlantic City, NJ. The course titled, “ <i>Countermeasures in 2009: What We Know and What We Don’t know,</i> ” addressed CM procedures wherein CM criteria was provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Honts to the New Jersey Polygraphists.
2009	Gen Clapper USD(I) signed the JTTF memorandum between DoD and the FBI. The DoD established a partnership to support state and local law enforcement agencies through the JTTF.

2010	General Clapper signs DoDI 5210.91 implementing DoDD 510.48. The Instruction details that NCCA will conduct polygraph CM research to identify CM trends and CM signatures. NCCA shall aggressively pursue CM lessons learned and investigate procedures, techniques, and technology to develop anti-CM and counter-CM to improve the effectiveness of polygraph examiner training. NCCA is responsible for establishing polygraph standards,
2010	Mr. Patterson, Deputy Director, DIA signs FBI/DoDPI JTTF Memorandum. The memorandum codified the FBI and NCCA's support for the training of federal, state and local LE. The goal for the FBI was to establish a Polygraph Database and the goal of NCCA was to assist in standardizing the LE polygraph community to assist in the exchange of national security information
2010	General James R. Clapper, USD(I) signed the NCCA Nationalization Memorandum. The memorandum reaffirms that NCCA is the credibility assessment SME for DoD and by de facto the federal government.
2010	CM course provided by previous DoDPI researcher in Ottawa, Ontario. The course titled, " <i>Countermeasures in 2010: What We Know and What We Don't know,</i> " addressed CM procedures wherein CM criteria was provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Honts where he was invited to "address the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Police Polygraphists."
2010	CM course provided by previous DoDPI researcher in Cartagena, Columbia. The course titled, " <i>Countermeasures: What We Know and What We Don't know,</i> " addressed CM procedures wherein CM criteria was provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Honts where he was invited to "address the World Congress of Forensic Sciences and Polygraph (Congreso Mundial de Ciencias Forenses y Poligrafia).
2010	CM course provided by previous DoDPI researcher in Vancouver, Canada. The course titled, "Polygraph Countermeasures Cannot Be Detected From Respiratory Signatures: Government Policy Puts The Innocent At Risk." The paper presented and the lecture addressed respiratory CM procedures wherein CM criteria were provided in an unclassified environment. The class was presented by Honts at the American Psychology Law Society.
2011	OUSD(I) DoD Polygraph Program Compliance Study completed. The study found NCCA "plays a significant role in the collaborative capturing and dissemination of best business practices for the DoD and Federal credibility assessment community, as it is the government's repository and distributor for credibility assessment techniques, research, training, and technological advances.
2011	Russian CM Policy Chapter #5 provided to the Department of Energy (DOE). DOE personnel were provided with a 125 page document describing the CM policy of a Russian government agency. The CM criteria described in the text were similar to those of DoD. Basically only the names of the criteria differed.

Reference: Kircher, J.C., Kristjansson, S.D., and Gardner, M.K. (2004). Human and computer decision-making in the psychophysiological detection of deception, DoDPI00-P-0002, unpublished manuscript.

Interim Policy

5210.48

5210.91

Nationalization memo

Need:

Reference: Kircher, J.C., Kristjansson, S.D., and Gardner, M.K. (2004). Human and computer decision-making in the psychophysiological detection of deception, DoDPI00-P-0002, unpublished manuscript.

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C. & Kircher, J. C. (1994). Effects of physical and mental countermeasures on the detection of deception. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 252-259.

The effects of a physical (pressing the toes to the floor) and a mental (counting backward by sevens) countermeasure on the concealed knowledge test (CKT) were examined in a mock crime experiment with 40 subjects. Some knowledgeable subjects were informed about the nature of the CKT and were trained in the use of a countermeasure, whereas others remained uninformed. All subjects were offered a monetary reward if they could produce a truthful outcome. Subjects were tested using standard field techniques and instrumentation. The physical and, to a lesser extent, the mental countermeasures reduced the accuracy of the CKT. These results clearly demonstrate that the CKT has no special immunity to the effects of countermeasures.

Honts, Mental and physical countermeasures reduce the accuracy of polygraph tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79(2):252-259.

Honts, C. R., Devitt, M., Winbush, M. & Kircher, J. C. (1996). Mental and physical countermeasures reduce the accuracy of the concealed knowledge test. *Psychophysiology*, 33, 84-92. The effects of a physical (pressing the toes to the floor) and a mental (counting backward by sevens) countermeasure on the concealed knowledge test (CKT) were examined in a mock crime experiment with 40 subjects. Some knowledgeable subjects were informed about the nature of the CKT and were trained in the use of a countermeasure, whereas others remained uninformed. All subjects were offered a monetary reward if they could produce a truthful outcome. Subjects were tested using standard field techniques and instrumentation. The physical and, to a lesser extent, the mental countermeasures reduced the accuracy of the CKT. These results clearly demonstrate that the CKT has no special immunity to the effects of countermeasures.

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C., & Kircher, J. C. (1983). Detection of deception: Effectiveness of physical countermeasures under high motivation conditions. *Psychophysiology*, 20, 452.

(Abstract)

Amicus Brief Honts & Perry, Supra note 18 at 373; Charles R. Honts, *Interpreting research on polygraph countermeasures*. 15 J. POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION 204 (1987);

Honts, C. R., & Peterson, C. F. (1997). *Brief of the Committee of Concerned Social Scientists as Amicus Curiae. United States v. Scheffer*, in the Supreme Court of the United States. Available from the author.

Honts, C.R., D.C. Raskin, and J.C. Kircher 1987 Effects of physical countermeasures and their electromyographic detection during polygraph tests for deception. *Journal of Psychophysiology* 1(3):241-247.

CAP DIA Policy

Effects of physical countermeasures on the physiological detection of deception. Published countermeasure (CM) Criteria (now referred to as c factors). Served as a basis for current criteria. Published by Dr.s Honts, C.R., R.L. Hodes, and D.C. Raskin *Journal of Applied Psychology* 70(1):177-187.

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C. & Kircher, J. C. (1994). Effects of physical and mental countermeasures on the detection of deception. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 252-259. A discussion of CM criteria and how they impact the polygraph protocol.

Raskin, D. C., Kircher, J. C., & Honts, C. R. (1985). Computerized polygraph interpretations and detection of physical countermeasures. In *Anti-terrorism; forensic science; psychology and police investigations*, (pp. 179-189). Proceedings of IDENTTA '85, the International Congresson Techniques for Criminal Investigation, Jerusalem: Heiliger.

Raskin, D. C. & Kircher, J. C. (1990). Development of a computerized polygraph system and physiological measures for detection of deception and countermeasures: A pilot study. Report to the U.S. Federal Government (Contract 88-L655300-000). Scientific Assessment Technologies, 1865 Herbert Avenue, Salt Lake City, UT 84108.

KIRCHER & DoD

Kircher, J. C., Packard, R. E., Bernhardt, P. C., & Bell, B. G. (2001). Comparison of skin conductance and skin resistance measures for the detection of deception (Grant No. DoDPI97-P-0016). Final report to the U. S. Department of Defense. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Department of Educational Psychology. Kircher, J. C., Packard, R. E., Bell, B. G. & Bernhardt, P. C. (2001).

Effects of prior demonstrations of polygraph accuracy on outcomes of probable-lie and directed-lie polygraph tests (Grant No. DoDPI97-P-0016). Final report to the U. S. Department of Defense. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Department of Educational Psychology. Lockette, E. & Kircher, J. C., (2003)

Growth curve analysis of polygraph data. (Grant No.

DASW01-03-1-0001). Final report to the U.S. Department of Defense. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, Department of Educational Psychology.

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C. & Kircher, J. C. (1986, August) Countermeasures and the detection of deception. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C.

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C., & Kircher, J. C. (1983, September). Detection of deception: Effectiveness of physical countermeasures under high motivation conditions. Paper presented at the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Pacific Grove, California.

HONTS & GOVERNMENT

Validity of Outside-Issue Questions in the Control Question Test (DoDPI97-P-0012). Co-principal investigator, Susan Amato. Research grant originated with the Department of Defense Polygraph Institute, issued through the Office of Naval Research, 9 March 1998. Award amount \$129,042.50.

Overseas Presentations:

Honts, C. R. (2010, August). *Countermeasures in 2010: What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Police Polygraphists, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Honts, C. R. (2010, October). *Countermeasures; What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at the World Congress of Forensic Sciences and Polygraph (Congreso Mundial de Ciencias Forenses y Poligrafia) Cartagena, Columbia.

Honts, C. R., & Crawford, M. (2010, March). *Polygraph Countermeasures Cannot Be Detected From Respiratory Signatures: Government Policy Puts The Innocent At Risk*. Paper presented at the 2010 meeting of the American Psychology Law Society, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

2009

Honts, C. R. (2009, January). *Research on Countermeasures and the Utah Polygraph Technique*. Invited address at the annual meeting of the National Polygraph Association, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Honts, C. R. (2009, August). *Countermeasures in 2009: What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at the annual meeting of the American Polygraph Association, Nashville, Tennessee.

Honts, C. R. (2009, September). *Countermeasures in 2009: What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at the annual meeting of the New Jersey Polygraphists, Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Honts, C. R., & Raskin, D. C. (2009, November). *Countermeasures in 2009: What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at Asociacion Colombiana de Poligrafistas, Bogota, Colombia.

Honts, C. R. (2010, August). *Countermeasures in 2010: What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Police Polygraphists, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Honts, C. R. (2010, October). *Countermeasures; What We Know and What We Don't Know*. Invited address at the World Congress of Forensic Sciences and Polygraph (Congreso Mundial de Ciencias Forenses y Poligrafia) Cartagena, Columbia.

2005

Honts, C. R. (2005, May). *Polygraph countermeasures*. Invited lecture at 第二届全国心理测试高级培训班（中国洛阳）Second Chinese National Seminar on Polygraph. Luoyang, China.

Honts, C. R., & Raskin, D. C. (2005, May). *The polygraph in employment and national security*. Invited lectures at 第二届全国心理测试高级培训班（中国洛阳）Second Chinese National Seminar on Polygraph. Luoyang, China.

2002

Alloway, W. R., & Honts, C. R. (2002, April). *An information countermeasure has no effect on the validity of the Test for Espionage and Sabotage (TES)*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Park City, Utah.

Honts, C. R. (2002, September). *Countermeasures, can we detect them, the scientific research, and can we neutralize them*. Invited address at the Midwest Polygraph Training Seminar.

Sponsored by the National Polygraph Association, Kansas Polygraph Association, Missouri

Polygraph Association and the Nebraska Polygraph Association, Overland Park, Kansas.

1999

Otter, K. D., Amato, S., & Honts, C. R. (1999, April). *Spontaneous countermeasures during polygraph examinations: An apparent exercise in futility*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association, Fort Collins Colorado.

1994 Honts, C. R., Winbush, M., & Devitt, M. K. (October, 1994). *Physical and mental countermeasures can be used to defeat guilty knowledge tests*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Atlanta, GA.

1990

"Validity of the positive control question test and the effects of countermeasures on the control question test". Naval Investigative Service Annual Polygraph Seminar, Department of Defense Polygraph Institute, Fort McClellan, Alabama. July 16, 1990.

1988 "Countermeasures and psychophysiological patterning in the detection of deception". Department of Defense Polygraph Institute, Fort McClellan, Alabama, March 7, 1988.

1987

Honts, C. R. (February, 1987). *Countermeasures to the physiological detection of deception*. Colloquium given at the Psychology Department, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

1986

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C., & Kircher, J. C. (1986, August). *Countermeasures and the detection of deception*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C.

Countermeasures, the directed lie control question, socialization, and other things." Canadian Association of Police Polygraphists Annual Seminar, Ottawa, Canada, August 21, 1986.

1985

Honts, C. R., (1985, August). *Research on countermeasures and the physiological detection of deception*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

1984

Honts, C. R. (1984, October). *Countermeasures and the physiological detection of deception*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Milwaukee, WI.

Honts, C. R., Raskin, D. C., Kircher, J. C., & Hodes, R. L. (1984, October). *Effects of spontaneous countermeasures on the physiological detection of deception*. Paper

presented at the meeting of the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Milwaukee, WI.

1982

Honts, C. R. & Hodes, R. L. (1982, October). *The effect of simple physical countermeasures on the detection of deception*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Minneapolis, MN.

Honts, C. R. & Hodes, R. L. (1982, October). *The effects of multiple physical countermeasures on the detection of deception*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Psychophysiological Research, Minneapolis, MN.