James Allan Matte[*]
Matte Polygraph Service, Inc.
Williamsville, New York
USA

Effect of Habituation to Least Threatening Zone Questions on the Most Threatening Zone Comparison Questions in Psychophysiological Veracity Examinations

During the past 39 years of conducting psychophysiological veracity (PV) examinations, this author observed a phenomenon wherein the responsivity of the confirmed deceptive and truthful examinees remained constant and often increased with each chart collected on the relevant questions if deceptive or the control questions if truthful.

This author suspected that the reason for this occurrence was due to the truthful examinee's habituation to the relevant questions and the deceptive examinee's habituation to the control questions, as a result of their psychological set being focused on the tests questions having the greatest threat to their security.

---

[*] JamesAllanMatte@mattepolygraph.com

This empirical observation was based on charts collected from the administration of the Quadri-Track Zone Comparison Technique, a single-issue test that clearly separates the relevant questions (Red Zone) dealing with a single-issue from the control questions (Green Zone) embracing earlier-in-life experiences with the use of non-current exclusive control questions that employ time bars that enable the "Either-Or" rule. In essence, the examinee is presented with two threats, the red zone questions and the green zone questions from which he/she must choose which of those two threats offer the greatest threat to his/her well-being, thus creating a double-bind effect (Bateson, et al, 1956), and this is determined and discovered from the physiological data collected from the examinee during the presentation of those two threats.

This empirical observation prompted this author to review and examine the raw data acquired in a field study (Matte-Reuss, 1989) comprising 122 confirmed real-life cases that used the Quadri-Track Zone Comparison Technique where the scores for each chart collected were recorded and reported.

There were 62 confirmed Deception Indicated (DI) cases, 53 confirmed No Deception Indicated (NDI), and 7 Inconclusives.

Results

Of the 62 confirmed DI cases, 39 cases (62.9%) had an average greater score for charts succeeding the first chart (Chart #1), and 4 cases (6.4%) had average equal scores for charts succeeding the first chart. There were 10 cases (16.1%) where a fourth chart was collected. Five of those cases (50%) had greater scores than the first chart collected. Raw data available in Appendix A.

The scores for each chart collected were tallied and divided by the number of cases to obtain the average score for charts number 1 thru 4. The results are as follows:

Deception Indicated	CHART #1	CHART #2	CHART #3	CHART #4
Total Score:	-516 (n.62)	-617 (n.62)	-387 (n.42)	-83 (n.9)
Average Score:	-8.32	-9.95	-9.21	-9.22

Of the 53 confirmed NDI cases, 23 cases (43.3%) had an average greater score for charts succeeding the first chart, and 7 cases (13.2%) had average equal

scores for charts succeeding the first chart. There were three cases (5.6%) where a fourth chart was collected. Two of those cases (66.6%) had greater scores than the first chart collected and one of those cases (33.3%) had scores equal to the first chart collected.

No Deception Indicated	CHART #1	CHART #2	CHART #3	CHART #4
Total Score:	+355 (n.53)	+301 (n.53)	+80 (n.10)	+26 (n.3)
Average Score:	+6.6	+5.6	+8.0	+8.6

Discussion

The data for deceptive cases clearly indicate a lack of habituation to the relevant test questions throughout the collection of the four charts. Indeed the scores from charts 2 through 4 are higher than chart 1 indicating increased responsivity to the relevant questions, which may be due to habituation to the control questions.

The data for the truthful cases indicate a slight score decrease in Chart #2 (+5.6) versus Chart #1 (+6.6), but this is followed by Chart #3 with +8.0 and Chart #4 with +8.6 indicating an overall increase in responsivity to the control questions versus the relevant questions. It is recognized that the number of charts available in Charts #3 and #4 for NDI were small, and additional field research needs to be conducted. It must be noted that this data was collected from a true single-issue zone comparison technique where, unlike multiple-issue tests, the examinee is confronted with only two distinctly separate threats which permits one threat to dampen the other thus creating a double-bind effect that can result in eventual habituation to the least threatening questions.

The implications from this data are that polygraphists should be receptive to the collection of additional charts beyond the customary three-charts when confronted with an inconclusive result, especially when using a single-issue polygraph technique that employs an increasing score threshold with each chart collected rather than a fixed score threshold that does not increase with each chart collected. The data further supports the Quadri-Track Zone Comparison Technique's increasing score threshold, which multiplies its initial scoring threshold with the collection of each subsequent chart, clearly showing that its increasing score threshold does not contribute to inconclusive results. Published field studies by Matte-Reuss 1989; Mangan, et al 2008; Shurany, et

al 2009, comprising a total of 319 subjects reported a combined inconclusive rate of only 2.2 percent.

Notes

[1] The term "control" question has been replaced with the term "comparison" to conform to the scientific literature. Nevertheless, in this study the term "control" is still used to avoid duplication of the term comparison in succession which could cause confusion, such as comparison of the comparison versus relevant questions.
[2] The "Either-Or" Rule is unique to the Backster ZCT and the Quadri-Track ZCT. Research by Meiron, et al 2008 showed that the "Either-Or) rule was an essential element of the Backster ZCT and its high accuracy. For a full explanation of the "Either-Or" Rule, see Matte, 1996; Mangan, et al 2008; and Shurany, et al 2009.
[3] Double-bind: A situation in which a person must choose between equally unsatisfactory alternatives; a punishing and inescapable dilemma. American Heritage Dictionary.
[4] The Quadri-Track ZCT employs the following increasing score threshold: Chart 1, -5 DI, +3 NDI; Chart 2, -10 DI, +6 NDI; Chart 3, -15 DI, +9 NDI; Chart 4, -20 DI, +12 NDI. A minimum of 2 charts must be collected in order to render a decision of Truth or Deception. Scores below the indicated threshold fall into the inconclusive category.

Appendix

Page No.   1
06/17/89

TABLE 4   POLYGRAPH GRANDSCORE WITH
ZONE 4 LISTED BY RANK SCORES

NUM	CASE	CONF	CONC	C13	C23	C33	C43	GS23
43	M11	DI	DI	-9	-17	-19		-45
87	M53	DI	DI	-1	-17	-9	-18	-45
118	M70A	DI	DI	-15	-13	-5	-11	-44
7	L7A2	DI	DI	-18	-11	-9		-38
57	M23	DI	DI	-10	-14	-13		-37
47	M13B	DI	DI	-11	-11	-14		-36
1	A1A	DI	DI	-10	-12	-13		-35
112	M67A	DI	DI	-8	-15	-12		-35
60	M26	DI	DI	-8	-10	-5	-11	-34
114	M68A	DI	DI	-13	-7	-14		-34
75	M41	DI	DI	-10	-11	-12		-33
14	A12A	DI	DI	-3	-17	-12		-32
93	M56	DI	DI	-12	-11	-9		-32
15	A13A	DI	DI	-17	-14			-31
92	M55B	DI	DI	-9	-3	-12	-7	-31
107	M64A	DI	DI	-13	-11	-7		-31
72	M38	DI	DI	-5	-3	-10	-12	-30
89	M54B	DI	DI	-9	-12	-9		-30
98	M59A	DI	DI	-10	-1	-19		-30
113	M67B	DI	DI	-9	-8	-13		-30
119	M70B	DI	DI	-9	-9	-12		-30
61	M27	DI	DI	-4	-9	0	-16	-29
34	M2	DI	DI	-12	-13	-2	-1	-28
111	M66	DI	DI	-12	-7	-9		-28
91	M55A	DI	DI	-9	-11	-5	-2	-27
95	M57B	DI	DI	-15	-12			-27
40	M8	DI	DI	-15	-11			-26
77	M43	DI	DI	-4	-11	-11		-26
121	M71B	DI	DI	-9	-17			-26
46	M13A	DI	DI	-6	-10	-9		-25
110	M65B	DI	DI	-10	-8	-7		-25
41	M9	DI	DI	-12	-12			-24
115	M68B	DI	DI	-2	-9	-13		-24
32	A26B	DI	DI	-12	-11			-23
103	M62A	DI	DI	-10	-13			-23
106	M63B	DI	DI	-9	-14			-23
117	M69B	DI	DI	-7	-6	-10		-23
122	M71C	DI	DI	-16	-7			-23
73	M39	DI	DI	-11	-11			-22
88	M54A	DI	DI	0	-12	-10		-22
99	M59B	DI	DI	-9	-13			-22
100	M60	DI	DI	-4	-8	-10		-22
30	A25	DI	DI	-6	-15			-21
104	M62B	DI	DI	-9	-12			-21
105	M63A	DI	DI	-11	-10			-21
120	M71A	DI	DI	-3	-12	-6		-21
31	A26A	DI	DI	-10	-9	-1		-20
33	M1	DI	DI	-1	-4	-10	-5	-20
90	M54C	DI	DI	-9	-11			-20
94	M57A	DI	DI	-7	-6	-7		-20

Page No. 2
06/17/89

TABLE 4   POLYGRAPH GRANDSCO
ZONE 4 LISTED BY RANK SC

NUM	CASE	CONF	CONC	C13	C23	C33	C43	GS23
101	M61A	DI	DI.	2	-10	-11		-19
109	M65A	DI	DI	-6	-7	-6		-19
11	A10B	DI	DI	-3	-15			-18
16	A14A	DI	DI	-8	-6	-4		-18
20	A17	DI	DI	-8	-10			-18
108	M64B	DI	DI	-7	-11			-18
5	A5A2	DI	DI	-8	2	-9		-15
8	L8A3	NDI	INC	-8	-4	0	-3	-15
10	A10A	DI	DI	-4	1	-12		-15
28	A23B	DI	DI	-4	-4	-7		-15
42	M10	DI	DI	-7	-8			-15
96	M58A	DI	DI	-5	-8			-13
102	M61B	DI	DI	-5	-8			-13
13	A11B	DI	INC	-7	2	-5		-10
97	M58B	NDI	INC	3	-3			0
116	M69A	DI	INC	5	-2	-1		2
74	M40	NDI	INC	-4	3	4		3
86	M52	NDI	INC	3	2			5
9	A9A	NDI	INC	3	-1	4		6
18	A15B	NDI	NDI	-1	9			8
25	A21B	NDI	NDI	6	2			8
29	A24	NDI	NDI	7	1			8
35	M3	NDI	NDI	4	4			8
36	M4	NDI	NDI	4	4			8
39	M7	NDI	NDI	4	4			8
49	M15	NDI	NDI	6	2			8
50	M16	NDI	NDI	0	8			8
53	M19	NDI	NDI	3	5			8
55	M21	NDI	NDI	6	2			8
71	M37	NDI	NDI	-2	10			8
84	M50	NDI	NDI	8	0			8
59	M25	NDI	NDI	12	-3			9
82	M48	NDI	NDI	2	7			9
4	A4A1	NDI	NDI	8	3			11
12	A11A	NDI	NDI	5	6			11
63	M29	NDI	NDI	8	3			11
66	M32	NDI	NDI	11	0			11
83	M49	NDI	NDI	8	3			11
52	M18	NDI	NDI	7	5			12
79	M45	NDI	NDI	2	-5	15		12
80	M46	NDI	NDI	6	6			12
2	A2A1	NDI	NDI	4	4	5		13
3	A3A2	NDI	NDI	10	3			13
22	A19	NDI	NDI	0	7	6		13
48	M14	NDI	NDI	3	0	5	5	13
81	M47	NDI	NDI	8	7			13
38	M6	NDI	NDI	10	4			14
64	M30	NDI	NDI	1	13			14
69	M35	NDI	NDI	7	7			14
70	M36	NDI	NDI	9	5			14

```
Page No.      3
06/17/89
                    TABLE 4   POLYGRAPH GRANDSCORE WITH
                      ZONE 4 LISTED BY RANK SCORES

NUM CASE CONF CONC C13 C23 C33 C43 GS23


 78 M44  NDI  NDI    7   7               14
 51 M17  NDI  NDI    7   8               15
 76 M42  NDI  NDI    2  13               15
 54 M20  NDI  NDI    7   9               16
 85 M51  NDI  NDI    8   8               16
 27 A23A NDI  NDI    6  11               17
 44 M12A NDI  NDI   -2   7  12           17
 45 M12B NDI  NDI    7  10               17
 19 A16  NDI  NDI   14   4               18
 23 A20  NDI  NDI   12   6               18
 67 M33  NDI  NDI    5  13               18
 17 A15A NDI  NDI    9  10               19
 26 A22  NDI  NDI   13   6               19
 58 M24  NDI  NDI   12   8               20
 68 M34  NDI  NDI    9  12               21
  6 L6A1 NDI  NDI    8  -1   5  11       23
 21 A18  NDI  NDI    8   8   7           23
 24 A21A NDI  NDI    1  13  10           24
 37 M5   NDI  NDI   10   0   4  10       24
 56 M22  NDI  NDI   11   3  11           25
 65 M31  NDI  NDI   18  10               28
 62 M28  NDI  NDI   20  10               30
*** Total ***
                    *** *** *** -60 -847
```

References

Bateson G., Jackson D.D., Haley J., Weak-Land J. (1956), Toward a theory of schizophrenia, Behavioral Science, 1: 251–254.

Mangan D.J., Armitage T.E., Adams G.C. (2008), A field study on the validity of the Quadri-Track Zone Comparison Technique, Physiology & Behavior, 95 (1–2): 17–23.

Matte J.A. (1996), Forensic Psychophysiology Using the Polygraph: Scientific Truth Verification – Lie Detection, Williamsville, New York: J.A.M. Publications.

Matte J.A. (2010), A field study of the Backster Zone Comparison Technique's Either-Or rule and scoring system versus two other scoring systems when relevant question elicits strong response, European Polygraph, 4 (2–12), 53–70.

Matte J.A., Reuss R.E. (1989), Validation study on the polygraph Quadri-Zone Comparison Technique, Research Dissertation Abstract, LD 01452: 1502, Proquest Information and Learning (Formerly known as University Microfilm International).

Meiron E., Kapohl D., Ashkenazi T. (2008), An assessment of the Backster "Either-Or" rule in polygraph scoring, Polygraph, 37 (4): 240–249.

Shurany T., Stein E., Brand E. (2009), A field study on the validity of the Quadri-Track Zone Comparison Technique, European Polygraph, 1 (1–7): 5–23.