## LAFAYETTE REPORT BUILDER

The Report Builder in the LX software is a powerful yet easy to use tool that allows any examiner to incorporate all the information collected in a PF's Personal History and Series/Exam Information templates, and easily transfer this information into your own personal or departmental report forms.

The PERSONAL HISTORY template, SERIES/EXAM INFORMATION template and REPORT BUILDER features are designed to work together, and each can be easily customized to your own needs.

PERSONAL HISTORY template:

To customize the Personal History template, create a new PF. When the Personal History template is open, type in the required information (fields in red) such as name and date of birth, and click <u>Default Template Operations</u> in the lower left corner of this dialog box.

Personal History - report builder		- • ×
Details Show	Enter the Examinee's Personal Information	
Identification		
Medical History		
PDD Examinations	Name	
Family History	AKA	
Education	SSN/ID	=
Employment	Date of Birth	
Military History	Place of Birth	
Comments	Race	
Riometrics	Sex	
biometrics	Height	
Photo	Weight	
Fingerprint	Eye color	
Signature	Hair	
File Operations	Complexion	
	Build	
Check Spelling	Scars/Tattoos/Marks	
Print	Case #	
Save to PDF Advanced Operations	Misc	
Default Template Operations	Medical History	
berault remplate operations	Rate Health	
	Physicians Care?	
	Heart Problems?	
	High Blood Pressure	
	Lung/Respiratory Problems?	
	Recent Surgery?	
	Medications?	
	Prescribed Meds	<b>•</b> •
		<u>O</u> K <u>C</u> ancel
	<	•

Click EDIT at the DEFAULT TEMPLATE dialog box to make your changes.



The "EDIT DEFAULT TEMPLATE" dialog box is divided into a left and right side, and consists of TABLES and ROWS. The headings colored in blue are identified as TABLES, and fields of information below each TABLE are identified as ROWS. Options for each are on the far left. TABLEs can be added, deleted, renamed, copied and/or pasted. ROWs under a TABLE can be added, deleted, copied and/or pasted. TABLEs can be opened or collapsed (closed) by clicking the -/+ to the immediate left of the TABLE title on the blue bar. A + collapses the TABLE and a – opens the Table so you can view the Rows beneath.

Edit					X				
🕺 Edit t	the Default Template								
Operations	Description	Data	*	🗆 Data					
Add Table	Identification			Description	Name				
Delete Table	Name			Data					
Rename Table	АКА			Data Attributes					
Copy Table	SSN/ID			Unique Identifier	Name				
Paste Table	Date of Birth			Data Type	Tevt				
A 11 D	Place of Birth			Height (# rows)	1				
Add Kow				Read-Only	False				
Copy Row	Race Course			Required	True				
Paste Row	Sex			Strip	Separate Words				
	Height			Exportable	True				
	Weight								
	Eye color								
	Hair								
	Complexion								
	Build								
	Scars/Tattoos/Marks								
	Case #								
	Misc								
	∃ Medical History								
	PDD Examinations								
	± Education		-	🔲 Show database attrib	utes				
					O <u>K</u> <u>C</u> ancel				

On the right side of your screen are descriptions and explanations of each field.

On the right side, under the heading DATA, "DESCRIPTION" is where you will type in a description for this field, and is what will appear in the column on the left when a new PERSONAL HISTORY template or SERIES/EXAM INFORMATION template is opened.

DATA is an optional field that can be left blank.

Under the heading DATA ATTRIBUTES, UNIQUE IDENTIFIER assigns YOUR unique string of alpha/numeric characters and does NOT have to match the Data name. Example: Examinee Name in the DESCRIPTION field could be "Examinee Name", or could be shortened to "ExNme" or any other text that allows YOU to identify that field when incorporating it into the appropriate spot in your report. (When a field is clicked or highlighted, a complete explanation of that cells' requirements will be shown in the blue box at the bottom.)

LX SOFTWARE TYPE is an optional field and can be left blank.

DATA TYPE determines how the text is entered into this field. Options of DATA TYPE are:

- $\circ$   $\;$  Text Allows data to be entered without any restrictions
- Dropdown List Displays a fixed list of strings in a dropdown list
- Edit Dropdown List Displays a fixed list of strings in a dropdown list but also allows the user to enter data into the field
- Number Allows only a number to be entered

- Date Allows a date to be entered
- Yes/No Displays the words 'Yes' and 'No' in a dropdown list.
- Phone Number Allows a phone number to be entered in format '\_\_\_\_\_'.
- Drug Reference Allows you to choose a drug name from the drug reference.
- Current Time The current time will automatically be entered into this field when it is present.
- Custom Allows you to create a custom format to restrict how data is entered. Requires a mask to determine what characters are accepted and a mask literal to determine what the user sees
- Height (# rows) Determines the height of this item. Set it to the number of rows you need to be displayed in order to fit all the text you want to enter into it.
- Read-Only Set to 'True' to prevent the user from entering information in the data field, or set to 'False' to allow the user to enter information.
- Required Set to 'True' to require this item to be entered and warn the user if it is not entered. Set to 'False' to not require this item to be entered. (EX: NAME and DOB are currently REQUIRED (set to TRUE) and (will appear in red), to signify this field must be completed) in the default template. You must complete these two fields, unless you change the data attribute to FALSE.
- STRIP This setting is applied when sensitive information is removed from the PF. Options are:
  - DO NOT STRIP The text from this field is left in the PF.
  - WHOLE VALUE Any match of the entire text from this field will be removed from the PF.
  - SEPARATE WORDS Matches on any of the value's component words will be removed from the PF.

Ideally, each examiner will edit the PERSONAL HISTORY and SERIES/EXAM INFORMATION templates, and add fields for information that are on your report form(s) and delete fields that are of no interest to you.

Once you have customized the two templates by adding TABLES or ROWS and deleting un-necessary TABLES or ROWS, click OK at the bottom of the EDIT DEFAULT TEMPLATE dialog box. You are now ready to incorporate your report forms into the LX software. Your newly customized templates for PERSONAL HISTORY and SERIES/EXAM INFORMATION will be available in the next new PF file you create.

Lafayette does have only one example report template and is called "FinalReport". The majority of examiners are very proprietary about their reports and have put much effort and thought into a good report format. Because of this, most do not want to share their report forms with other examiners. If you have report forms that you would like to share, we will be happy to build a "forms library folder" and include these for others to use. And Pat, yours will be the first I ask for (wink).

## **REPORT BUILDER – Getting Started**

## Click FILE>REPORT>EDIT REPORT TEMPLATE.

Edit Report Template	×
Edit Report Template Edit a final report template	
Select the report format: Microsoft Word	
Edit Can	cel

In this example, we will use Microsoft Word, and Word Perfect and WordPad work equally as well. Select the report format and click the folder icon to browse to the location where your report form is stored, then click EDIT. In this example, I am using the sample report template provided by Lafayette titled FINAL REPORT, but any of your report templates, IF you can browse to them on this computer and IF they are in Word, WordPerfect or WordPad can be used.

Once you select the report file you want to use and click EDIT, both our Report Builder and your report form will open as in the example below.

			Report Builder		
Lafayette Instrumer	Confidential Lafayette Instrument Company Polygraph Examination Report		Select an item and cli placeholder for the ite processor.	Report Builder Insert placeholders into the final report ck on the "Insert" button or double-click the item to a m into the template at the current cursor position v	automatically put a vithin the word
	Personal Information	Phot	t		
Name: « Date of Birth: « Social Security: « Address: «	«Name» «DateOfBirth» Age: «Age» «SSN» Driver's License: «DriversLicenseNumber» «AddressStreet» «AddressApt» «AddressCity» «AddressState» «PostalCode»	«Phot	Hide empty items	12Reese0410 Sue Luttrell	Expand All Collapse All
	Exam Information	Fingerp	Photo		
Exam Location: « Exam Date: « Case #: « Examiner: « Final Call: «	(Series1_\$_Location» (Series1_\$_StartDate» «Series1_\$_StartTime» (CaseNumber» (Examiner Name» (Series2_\$_FinalCall»	«Fingerp	Fingerprint Final Call Summ PF Notes Questions Asket All Questions Relevant Questi	c:\Users\Sue\Documents\n C:\Users\Sue\Documents\n ary ed	My LX My LX Copy to Clipboard
Section 1: Purpose	of Examination		Control Questio	ons	Insert
The main issue under to the pertinent quest	r consideration for the polygraph examination was whether or not the exami ions listed under Section 3 of this report.	nee was tellin	Series 1 All Que	strons	Close
Section 2: Pre-Test	Interview				
On «Series1_\$_Start[ were read, completed Polygraph Co Polygraph Wa	Date», «Name» arrived and voluntarily submitted to a polygraph examinatic d, and voluntarily signed by the examinee: onsent Form aiver Form	on. The follow	ving forms		
During the pre-test int	terview, «Name» read the forms and said he/she understood the forms and	l signed them a	agreeing to		

Now, the fields appearing in the REPORT BUILDER dialog box will be a compilation of all the fields in both EXAMINEE HISTORY and SERIES/EXAM INFORMATION templates that you customized using the EDIT feature as discussed in the beginning of this lesson. You will scroll to the location on your report form for each of the fields, and scroll to that particular field in the Report Builder, and click INSERT from the Report Builder. (Example – for NAME, place your cursor on the report where you want NAME to appear, scroll to NAME in the Report Builder, and click INSERT). The information from that field will be inserted where you placed your cursor on your report form, and will be surrounded with << >>. All the fields, including Start Time and Date, along with Questions Asked and their responses or ALL RELEVANT QUESTIONS can be inserted into your report at your desired location.

Once you have all the fields in your report form completed with the insertion of the data for that field from the Report template, save the report form in the Lafayette software by clicking FILE, then SAVE AS, and browse to the location of your LX software (normally, Documents/My LX Software, double-click to open, and scroll to REPORT TEMPLATES. Click SAVE. You can store all your report forms documents in this folder (DOCUMENTS/MY LX SOFTWARE>REPORT TEMPLATES) for accessibility through LX software.

To populate the report with the information from the PERSONAL HISTORY and SERIES/EXAM INFORMATION templates, with the new PF open, click FILE, REPORT and NEW REPORT. Using the folder icon, you can now BROWSE to any of your report templates and select the one you want to use.

New Report	x
New Report	
Create a final report document	
Edit the final call	
Select the report format:	
Microsoft Word	
Select the final report template:	
C:\Users\Sue\Documents\My LXSoftware\Report Templates\FinalReport.doc	
Specify the name of the final report.	
FinalReport	►
Edit the report template Create Cane	cel

Follow the prompts by choosing the report format (here we used MS Word), select the report template (here we used the Lafayette sample called FINAL REPORT). Click CREATE and all fields of information are taken from the PF's PERSONAL HISTORY and SERES/EXAM INFORMATION templates and are inserted into your report form.

This report will now be included in the PF file, and if the PF copied to another location, the report is copied with it. For each new report format you need, follow these same steps.

If you customize your PERSONAL HISTORY and/or SERIES INFORMATION templates and want to share them with a fellow examiner for use, or transfer them to another computer, create a new PF and when the PERSONAL HISTORY template appears, click EDIT DEFAULT TEMPLATE, then click EXPORT. Browse to your thumb drive destination and click SAVE. At the computer you want to copy this to, do the same thing (create a new PF, at the PERSONAL HISTORY click EDIT DEFAULT TEMPLATE, and click IMPORT. Browse to the thumb drive destination and click OK.)

I hope this is helpful. Please call, email or text me if you need assistance. Perhaps by the next TALEPI seminar Lafayette will have a REPORT TEMPLATES folder full of different report formats from different examiners, for all to choose from and use.

ANOTHER TIP – LX software allows you to take a photo snapshot of your subject while you are video recording and include the snapshot in your report form. To do this, while at the PERSONAL HISTORY template, on the left side, click PHOTO.

Personal History - rb		
Details Show	Enter the Examinee's Personal In	formation
Identification	Identification	*
PDD Examinations	Name	Sue
Family History	АКА	
Education	SSN/ID	
Employment	Date of Birth	=
Military History	Place of Birth	
Comments	Race	
Biometrics	Sex	
Photo	Height	
Fingerprint	Weight	
Signature	Eye color	
File Operations	Hair	
	Complexion	
Check Spelling	Build	
Print	Scars/Tattoos/Marks	
Save to PDF	Case #	
Advanced Operations	Misc	
berault remplate operations	PDD Examinations	
	Prior Polygraph?	
	When?	
	Where?	
	Why?	
	Family History	
	Family Member #1	
	Mother's Name	
	Mother's Age	Ψ
		<u>O</u> K <u>C</u> ancel
	•	III

At the next dialog box, click TAKE PICTURE.



To insert the picture into your report, scroll through the REPORT BUILDER for <<PHOTO>> (with your report open) and place your cursor where you want the photo to appear, then click INSERT from the REPORT BUILDER.

Normally I ask customer to NOT struggle with a feature more than 5 minutes without picking up the phone and calling me. For this, I say 15 minutes. I did NOT read the detailed, professionally and technically written User Manual we include in the software. I just started clicking and playing around with the software to figure out each of the many features. I have every confidence you will do the same, or CALL ME.

And thank you for attending TALEPI! Please remember to always bring your computer and software questions when you come. I am always available to help you anytime with anything, and if I can't figure it out, I can certainly reach someone who can teach us both.

In our latest version 11.3, we include a new feature – ESS REPORT GENERATOR. To use this, open the PF and open a chart. Click SERIES/EXAM>SCORE>SHOW SCORE then SHOW SCORE SHEET. At the bottom of the score sheet, click GENERATE ESS REPORT.

## Lafayette Instrument Company

Empirical Scoring System

Examine         Reese George Anderson           Result         Deception Indicated           pvalue         <.001         Probability this result was produced by a truthful person           Technique         Event Specific (single issue)         Deception Indicated           Dacision rule         Two-stage rules (Senter rules)         Image: Senter rules         Image: Senter rules           12         Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (%)         Image: Senter rules         Senter rules         Senter rules           10         Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (%)         Image: Senter rules				R	aymond Nelson	and Mark Han	dler (2010; 20	12)					
Result     Deception Indicated       p-value     <.001	Examine	e	Reese G	eorge	Anderson	1							
Probability this result was produced by a truthful persoi       Decision rule       Event Specific (single issue)       Decision rule       Westions       Cuestions       R5     Did you put your peris in Kansas James mouth? (N)       R7     Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (N)       R10     Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)       Test Details     Deception Indicated       NSR     Docusion Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores       PF Name     Test Details     Deception Indicated       R7     Deception Indicated       R8     Deception Indicated       R7     Deception Indicated       R7     Deception Indicated       R7     Deception Indicated       R8     Deception Indicated       R8     Deception Indicated       Rest Details     Deception Indicated       Interpretation Sources     NSR       OS     Scores       Series 1, Chart 2       Pipe2     0	Result		Decepti	on Inc	dicated								
Event Specific (single issue)           Questions           Rest Details         Question Scores           Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         Test Details         Question Scores         Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         Test Details         Question Scores         Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         Test Details         Question Scores         Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         Test Details         Deception Indicated           R and 12 Rescubit 0         Cuestion Scores         Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         12 Rescubit 0         Cuestion Indicated           R and 14 10/0212         R7         Deception Indicated           R and a sind andicate that only small proportion (<0.1%) of taitHull         Use of call score of -28 equals or exceeds the cut-score of 4 for deceptive dissifications. The prystedio for doub a similar deceptive test score. These results support the colspan="2">Series 1, Chart 3           PipP2         0         Series 1, Chart 3           PipP2         0         Series	p-value		<.001	Proba	ability this	s result v	vas prod	luced b	y a tri	uthfu	l perse	on	
Questions           R5         Did you put your penis in Kansas James mouth? (N)           R7         Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (N)         Colspan="2">Colspan="2"           Colspan="2"           Interpretation Summary           Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the part total scoped on or-28 equals created that and ysing propriom (<-10.10) of thuth displan boundary (or 2.50). Normative data indicating protocol for test data analysis, the part total scope of a similar decapitive dissifications. The for scapulated at p = <.001, with the equal to or less than the required to a similar decapitive dissification responses to the relevant specific do colspite test scale.         Series 1, Charl 1           Colspan="2"         Colspan="2"         Series 1, Charl 1           Colspan="2"           <th colspan="2</td> <td>Techniqu Decision</td> <td>rule</td> <td>Event Specific ( Two-stage rule:</td> <td>(single issu s (Senter ru</td> <td>ue) ules)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Techniqu Decision	rule	Event Specific ( Two-stage rule:	(single issu s (Senter ru	ue) ules)								
R5       Did you put your peris in Kansas James mouth? (N)         R7       Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (N)         R10       Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)         R10       Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)         PF Name       12Rese0410       Duestion         Series 1       R5       Deception Indicated         R7       Did you put your peris in Kansas James mouth? (N)       NSR       .050         Series 4       1       R5       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Series 5       1       R5       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Rammar       System Administrator       R10       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Rammar       System Administrator       R10       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Series 1, Chart 2       R8       R7       Did deceptive classifications. The series its as than the regione or 1-85 scores       Series 1, Chart 3       ESS Scores         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the protocol for fest data score of -36 requested or produce a similar deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for toreptive classifications and alpha = .05 for toreptive tassifications and alph						Questions							
R7       Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (N)         R10       Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)         R10       Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)         PF Name       12Resold10       Question         Series 1       R5       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Series 4       100       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Series 1, Chart 3       Series 1, Chart 3       Series 1, Chart 3       Series 1, Chart 3         Week of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or test that the required apha boundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only smal propertion (<0.1%) of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or test that the required calculated statistical significance is calculated at a simular propertion (<0.1%) of statistical significance is calculated at analysis, the second or to 0.1% of statistical significance is calculated at analysis, the second or to 0.1% of statistical significance is calculated at analysis. The second is the cut-second or to 0.1% of statistical significance is calculated at analysis. The second or to 0.1% of statistical significance is calculated at analys	R5	Did you put	t your penis in Ka	ansas Jame	es mouth? (N)								
R10       Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)         Test Details       Question Scores       Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores         PF Name       12 Resea0410       Question       Signed Scores       Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores         Series #       1       R5       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Sam Date       410/2012       R7       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Rapert Date       610/2014       R7       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Branniar       System Administrator       R10       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Series #       1       Interpretation Summary       Use Bonferroni corrected alpha       .017       Use Bonferroni corrected alpha       .017         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the grand total score of -28 equals or exceeds the cut-score or -4 for deceptive classifications. The event score score score of 4 for deceptive test scores. These results support the conclusion that them is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant silmulus questions during this examination.       Series 1, Chart 3       PHPP 1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	R7 Did Kansas put her mouth on your penis? (N)												
Test Details         Question Scores         Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         12Resea0410         Question         NSR         .050           Series #         1         R5         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Exam Date         4/10/2012         R7         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Raport Data         6/10/2014         R10         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Brainer         System Administrator         R10         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Brainer         6/10/2014         Interpretation Summary         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the civel of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or less than the required alpha boundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (<0.1%) of truthul persons are expected to produce a similar doceptive test score. These results support the required alpha	R10 Did Kansas give you a blow job? (N)												
Test Details         Question Scores         Decision Alpha (1 tailed) / Cutscores           PF Name         12Ress0410         Question         NSR         .050           Series #         1         P5         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Exam Date         4/10/2014         R7         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Report Data         6/10/2014         R7         Deception Indicated         NSR         .050           Wing the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the civel of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or less than the required alpha toundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (<0.1%) of truthul persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive lest score. These results support the conclusion that here is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant simulus questions during this examination.													
PF Name       12Resea0410       Question       R5       Deception Indicated       NSR       .050         Series #       1       R5       Deception Indicated       SR       .050         Examinar       System Administrator       R10       Deception Indicated       SR       .050         Report Date       610/2014       R17       Deception Indicated       .017       Use Bonferroni corrected alpha       .017         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the relevel of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.01, which is equal to or test sthan the required alpha boundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (<0.1%) of truthul persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant simulus questions during this examination.		Те	st Details		Qu	estion Scores	i i	Decisi	on Alpha	(1 tailed)	/ Cutscor	es	
Series #       1       R5       Deception Indicated       SR       .050         Examba       4/10/2012       R7       Deception Indicated       Series 1       Composition Composition Composition       Bonferroni corrected alpha       .017         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the composition constructed at p = <.001, which is equal to or test that analysis, the composition constructed alpha	PF Name	12R	leese0410		Question			NSR			.050		5
Exam Date       4/10/2012       R7       Deception Indicated         Examiner       System Administrator       R10       Deception Indicated         R10       Deception Indicated       Use Bonferroni correction       TRUE         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the grand total score of -28 equals or exceeds the cut-score of -41 for deceptive classifications. The level of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or less than the required alpha boundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (<0.1%) of furthful protocol or test state analysis, the grans or ane expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant simulus questions during this examination.	Series #	1			R5	Deception In	dicated	SR			.050		4
Examiner       Bystem Administrator       R10       Deception Indicated       Use Bonferroni correction       TRUE         Report Date       6/10/2014       Use Bonferroni correction       TRUE         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the grand total score of -4 for deceptive classifications. The environment is carculated at p < -(001, which is equal to or less than the required alpha boundary (o = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (<0.1%) of truthul persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant stimulus questions during this examination.	Exam Date	e 4/10	V2012		R7	Deception In	dicated	Bonferroni o	orrected a	lpha	.017	1 -	7
Report Date       Interpretation Summary         Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the grand total score of -28 equals or exceeds the cut-score of -4 for deceptive classifications. The level of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or less than the required as a format that nortice mate proportion (<-0.1%) of truthful persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant simulus questions during this examination.       Series 1, Chart 2         Criterion Accuracy         Series 1, Chart 4         PI/P2 -1 1 0 1-1         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications anocuracy is .007 to .093, to .093, with an expected on f	Examiner	Sys	tern Administrator		R10	Deception In	dicated	Use Bonfern	oni correct	tion	TRUE	2	
Interpretation Summary           Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the grand total score of ~28 equals or exceeds the cut-score of ~4 for deceptive classifications. The level of statistical significance is calculated at p = <.001, which is equal to or less than the required paths boundary (p = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (~0.1%) of truthul persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant simulus questions during this examination.         Series 1, Chart 3           Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthul classifications can be expected to produce a talse-positive error rate for which the the 95% confidence interval is from .007 to .093, with an expected confidence interval of .007 to .093 for talse-negative error when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy of validated polygraph to .993.         Series 1, Chart 4           References           Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M. (2011), Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.           Nelson, R. & Hander, M. (2012), Using Normative Reference Data with Disgnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.	Report Da	te 6/10	¥2014		-								
Using the ESS, an evidence-based, normed, and standardized protocol for test data analysis, the grand total score of -28 equals or exceeds the cut-score of -4 for deceptive dassifications. The level of statistical significance is calculated at p = <,001, which is equal to or less than the required alpha boundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only smal proportion (-0.1%) of 1 untituit persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant stimulus questions during this examination. Criterion Accuracy Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthul classifications can be expected to produce a failes-positive error rate for which the 195% confidence interval is from .007 to .033, with an expected confidence interval of .007 to .093 A table errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907 to .993. References Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blaock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oetrich, M. (2011) Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78. Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78. Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78. Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.			In	terpretation	n Summary								_
grant base sourd of use equates or locked and use of the decipined base sharts the required alpha boundary (a = .05). Normative data indicate that only small proportion (=0.1%) of truthful persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant stimulus questions during this examination. <b>Series 1, Chart 2</b> <b>PI/P2</b> <b>0</b> <b>Criterion Accuracy Event-specific examinations</b> with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for failed and the result of .007 to .093 for failed approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907             to .993.               Series 1, Chart 4 <b>References References Series 1, Chart 4 References Series 1, Chart 4 Series 1, Chart 4 References Series 1, Chart 4</b>	Using the	ESS, an ev	idence-based, no	rmed, and s	standardized proto	col for test data	analysis, the		ES	S Scores			
References         Referenc	level of sta	atistical sine	ificance is calcula	ated at n = <	< 001 which is on	ual to or less th	an the required		Serie	s 1, Chart	2		_
persons are expected to produce a similar deceptive test score. These results support the conclusion that there is DECEPTION INDICATED by the physiological responses to the relevant stimulus questions during this examination.           Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthful classifications can be expected to produce a faise-positive error rate for which the the 95% confidence interval is from .007 to .093, with an expected confidence interval of .007 to .093 for faise-negative error science error when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph to references         Series 1, Chart 4           References         References         Image: Chart (Chart (Char	alpha bou	indary (a = .	05). Normative d	ata indicate	that only small pr	oportion (<0.19	6) of truthful	P1/P2	0	1	-1		_
Cardia       -1       -1         Series 1, Chart 3         Series 1, Chart 3         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for         Introl Maccuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for         Introl Maccuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for         Introl Maccuracy         Event-specific examination to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907         Interior Accuracy of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques, Polygraph 48sociation (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques, Polygraph, 40(4), 195-305. [Electronic version; Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.         Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blaock, B., Russall, C.	persons a	re expected	to produce a sim	nilar deceptiv	ve test score. The	se results supp	ort the	EDA	-2	-2	-2		_
Series 1, Chart 3         Series 1, Chart 3         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthul classifications can be expected to produce a failse-pocalitive error rate for which the 195% confidence interval is from .007 to .033, with an expected confidence interval - 1       0         Series 1, Chart 4         PI/P2 - 1       -1         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for faise-negative errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907       0         References         American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques. Polygraph, 404), 195-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.         Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oetrich, M.         (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.         Nelson, R. & Hander, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.	conclusion	n that there	IS DECEPTION I	NDICATED	by the physiologic	al responses to	the relevant	Cardio	-1	-1	-1		_
Series 1, Chart 3         R5 R7 R10         PI/P2 -1 0 -1         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for function accuracy is confidence interval is from .007 to .033, with an expected confidence interval 0 1.007 to .033, with an expected confidence interval 0 1.007 to .033, with an expected confidence interval 0 1.007 to .033, with an expected confidence interval 0 1.007 to .033 for accuracy is .907       EDA -2 -2 -2 -2 Cardio -1 1 -1         Series 1, Chart 4         Criterion Accuracy         (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907         References         American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques. Polygraph, 40(4), 195-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.         Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blakok, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oetrich, M.         (2011). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Emerical Scoring System. Polygraph. 45(3), 61-9.	sumous q	juestions de	ang uns examina										
PI/P2       N       N/V       N/V         Criterion Accuracy         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthful dassifications can be expected to produce a false-positive error rate for which the the 95% pri/p2       -1       -1       0         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthful dassifications can be expected to produce a false-positive error rate for which the the 95% pri/p2       -1       -1       0       EDA       -2       <									Serie	s 1, Charl	3		_
EDA       -2       -2       -2         Cardio       0       -1       -1         Series 1, Chart 4         Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthul classifications of the optical site -positive error rate for which the the 95%       P1/P2       -1       -1       0         (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907       1       -1								P1/P2	-1	0	-1		-
Criterion Accuracy     Series 1, Charl 4       Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for ruthul dassifications can be expected to produce a faise-positive error rate for which the the 95% confidence interval of .007 to .093 for that a assumption of non-independent criterion avaiance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample calculated polygraph 40,40, 195-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.     Image: Cardio Calculated polygraph techniques, Polygraph, 40, 47-78.       Nelson, R., & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Emerical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.     Image: Cardio Calculated polygraph application score applications.								EDA	-2	-2	-2		_
Criterion Accuracy           Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for fruthful classifications can be expected to produce a false-positive error rate for which the 195% profile errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907 to .993.         Series 1, Chart 4           References         EDA         -2								Cardio	0	-1	-1		_
Event-specific examinations with alpha = .05 for deceptive classifications and alpha = .05 for truthul classifications can be expected to produce a false-positive error rate for which the the 95% Pt/P2 - 1 -1 0 EDA -2 -2 -2 -2 Error false-negative errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907 to .993.  References  References  American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques, Polygraph, 40(4), 195-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.  Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oetrich, M. (2011). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.				Criterion A	ocuracy								
truthful dassifications can be expected to produce a false-positive error rate for which the the 95% P1/P2 1 1 0 0 confidence interval is from .007 to .093, with an expected confidence interval of .007 to .093 for false-negative errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent oriterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907 to .993.  References  American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques. Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques. Polygraph Age. Courter Standards-apa-publications. Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M. (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78. Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. Action, 1-09.	Eventishe	cific examin	ations with alpha	= 05 for de	centive classificat	tions and alpha	= .05 for		Serie	s 1, Chart	4		
confidence interval is from .007 to .093, with an expected confidence interval of .007 to .093 for     false-negative errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent orferion variance     (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a norminal sample     space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907     to .993.      References     American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph     techniques. Polygraph .40(4), 196-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from     http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.     Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M.     (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.     Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the     Empirical Scoring System.	truthful da	assifications	can be expected	to produce	a false-positive en	ror rate for white	the the 95%	P1/P2	-1	-1	0		_
false-negative errors when interpreted with an assumption of non-independent criterion variance (calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a nominal sample space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907       -1       1       -1         space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907       -       -       -         References       -       -       -       -       -         American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph techniques. Polygraph .40(4), 195-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.       -       -       -       -         Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oetrich, M.       -       <	confidence	e interval is	from .007 to .093	, with an ex	pected confidence	interval of .00	7 to .093 for	EDA	-2	-2	-2		_
(calculated using binomial approximation to standard normal distribution using a normal sample     space of 100 cases). The 95% confidence interval for unweighted mean decision accuracy is .907     to .993.      References      American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph     techniques. Polygraph, 40(4), 195-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from     http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.  Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oetrich, M.     (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.     Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the     Empirical Scoring System. A630, 61-69.	false-nega	ative errors	when interpreted	with an ass	umption of non-ind	dependent crite	tion variance	Cardio	-1	1	-1		_
References     R	(calculated	d using bind 100 cases)	miai approximatik The 95% confider	on 10 standa noe interval	for unweighted me	tion using a noi ean decision ac	ninal sample						
References     Image: Control of the second se	to .993.	oo casesj.	The Solve Connice		ion or intergritico int	can declaren ac	concy is .sol						_
References         Image: Control of Control													
References         Image: Comparison of										<u> </u>			-
American Polygraph Association (2011). Meta-analytic survey of criterion accuracy of validated polygraph ticchniques. Polygraph. 4(4), 196-305. [Electronic version] Retrieved August 20, 2012, from http://www.polygraph.org/section/research-standards-apa-publications.         Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M.         (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph. 40, 67-78.         Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. 45(3), 61-69.				Refere	nces								_
Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M. (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78. Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. APA Magazine 45(3), 61-69.	American F techniques http://www.	Polygraph As a. Polygraph, Loolvoraph.o	sociation (2011). / . 40(4), 196-305. [E ro/section/research	Meta-analytic Electronic ver h-standards-i	survey of criterion sion] Retrieved Aug ace-oublications.	accuracy of vali just 20, 2012, fro	sated polygraph m						_
Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Bialook, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M. (2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78. Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. APA Magazine. 45(3), 61-69.		1 10 10										_	
(2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.  Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Empirical Scoring System. APA Magazina, 45(3), 61-69.	Nelson, R., Handler, M., Shaw, P., Gougler, M., Blalock, B., Russell, C., Cushman, B. & Oelrich, M.								_				
Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2012). Using Normative Reference Data with Diagnostic Exams and the Emolitical Scoring System. APA Magazine, 45(3), 61-69.	(2011). Using the Empirical Scoring System. Polygraph, 40, 67-78.							_					
	Nelson, R. Empirical S	& Handler, I Scoring Syst	M. (2012). Using N em. APA Magazine	ormative Ref a, 45(3), 61-6	ference Data with D 9.	Nagnostic Exams	and the						
Notices D & Handler M (2010). Employed Section System Laforette Instrument Comment	Notes C	I Handler I	(2010) Emoli	al George C	ation I also alla faci	to uncert Comment	_		R5	R7	R10		
researce, is a remaining as the row of the remaining system. Language meruning Company. Sub-Totals -10 -7 -11	reason, PC	a nancier, i	a. (2010). Empires	a ocuring sy	raistri, carayette Ins	Compare Compare	<b>9</b> .	Sub-Totals	-10	-7	-11   28		_
LXSoftware Version								Grand Total		LXS	oftware Vers	ior: 11	3

The  $p\ value\ can be\ changes\ under\ TOOLS/PREFERENCES/HAND\ SCORE,\ then\ ESS.$ 

Preferences			<u> </u>
Chart	Hand Score		
Thoracic Respiration		м	
Abdominal Respiration	Synchronize scorer types?	Yes	<b>_</b> ^
EDA - Multi-mode	Color-code individual scores?	Yes	
Cardio	Color-code all totals?	Yes	
Aux1	Show plus signs?	Yes	
Line Length	Prompt for score sheet name?	No	-
Line Length	ESS		
Background	Enable ESS Report Generation	Yes	
Answer/Annotation Line	Minimum number of charts	3	
Question Bar	Pneumo 1 sensor name	P1	
Look/Feel Summary	Penumo 2 sensor name	P2	
Chart Comments	EDA sensor name	EDA	
xamination	Cardio sensor name	Cardio	
Pur Dunia a Review	Result type	p-Value	<b>-</b>
Printing During Review	Simple cutscores	Yes	-
Annung During Recording	Inverse odds	No	
Coolbar/Menu	Bayesian conditional	No	
Creen Calibration	Prior probability	0.500	
Caliners	DI/SR alpha	0.050	
Question Editor	NDI/NSR alpha	0.050	
Sneech Synthesis			
Hand Score System Administrator	Chart shading color Select the color used to shade the question being score	ed. A vertical bar is placed on the chart around the question.	
	Edit default score sheet template	Reset to the de	fault ESS settings
		OK Cancel	Help

Sue Luttrell

sue@lafayetteinstrument.com

cell: 571-263-5310

office: 240-568-4047