# Coding Form

DRAFT CODING FORM 7/18/83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code r</th>
<th>____________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Author**

**Year**

**Study ID**

**Outcome NCI.**

**Total number of outcomes in this analysis**

**Typstud1, Type of study:** analog or field

**Typstud2, Type of study:**

1. Analog
2. Field

**Total number of outcomes in this analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject’s NSUBJS</th>
<th>Number of subjects or cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typsubjs</th>
<th>Type of subj pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non-crim. military personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Non-military criminals or suspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Military criminals or suspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Police informants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Prison inmates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Police applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Private employment applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gov’t employees or applicants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Victims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Witnesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Casesrc. Source of cases for judgment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casesrc</th>
<th>Source of cases for judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Polygraph school files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Police files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Military files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pctmale, Purpose**

1. Pre-employment |
2. Crime investigation
POLYGRAPH CHARACTERISTICS

BASERATE, Base rate of guilt
GROUNDME, Method of establishing ground truth
(1) Majority judgment, (2) Unanimous judgment, (3) Confession, (4) Court decision, (5) Mock crime or contrived story, (6) real crime ‘set up’ by experimenter, (7) not verified, (8) not specified

ACCUR, Experimenter’s judgment of accuracy of basis for ground truth (see Barland, 1982)
(1) low, (2) high

QUESDES, Method for designing control questions or pretest interview
(1) Standard for all Ss; (2) CUSTOliZed

TECHNIQU, Type of question technique
(1) ZOC, (2) MGQT, (3) POT, (4) ZOC & MGQT, (5) ZOC & pOT, (6) MGQT & POT, (7) GQT, (8) ZOC & GQT, (9) MGQT & GQT, (10) POT & GQT, (11) GK, (12) RI, (13) RCQT

STIM, Stim test included?
MACHINE, Vachine tYpe
(1) Yes, (2) No
(12) ______________/
(13) __________________

PASTE, Type of contact paste
(1) Sanborn, (2) Beckman, (3) NaCl w/cornstarch
PHYSMEAS, Phys. measure used for results

PHYSME2, Were other phys. measures taken and not used in analysis?
PHYSME3, If ans. to PHYSME2 is yes, why?

CHARTS, Number of charts on which examiners' judgment based

PROCED, Did procedure differ from standard in any way (e.g., Podlesny & Raskin did not review control questions with Ss)

PROCVAR, Way procedure varied

EXAMEQ, Did examiners do own init. ratings (i.e., chart interpretations)
If answer to EXAMEQ is "No," answer following with respect to those who did do init. ratings (Note these are not ultimate judges in field studies)
**PGBLIND, Were raters blind to subj condition?
**KNWRATE, Did raters know rate of guilt?
**RAITEXPF, Raters exp. ranged from (in yrs.)
**RATEXPT, Raters exp. ranged to (in yrs.)

OBJRAT', Was orig. rating objective?

NEXAM, Number if initial examiners

(1) SCR/GSR,
(2) Respiration, (3) 3100d pressure, (4) Heart rate, (5) Cardiovascular unspecifed,
(6) finger pulse volume, (7) some combination
(1) yes, (2) No

(1) results inconclusive, (2) not given

(1) Yes, (2) No

(1) high (specific measurement of phys. variables), (2) medium (score assigned to subjective assessment, (3) low (rating of guilt or innocence based on visual assessment, (4) very low (rating of guilt or innocence based on case files, clinical assessment etc.)
INCZONE, Inconclusive zone (+ or - x)
PGPCTMAL, % of Polygraphers Male
PGEXP, Avg. yrs Poly training and experience
EXAMEXPF, Examiners’ exp. range from (in yrs.)
EXAMEXPT, Examiners’ exp. ranged to
PGTYPE, Type of initial examiner
PGTRN, Place polygraph examiner trained

*JUDGES, Judge characteristics

NJUDGES, Number of judges or evaluators (not initial examiners)
KNOWRATJ, Did judges know base rate of guilt?
*JUDGEXPF, Judges exp. ranged from (in yrs.)
*JUDGEXPT, Judges exp. ranged to (in yrs.)
*JUDGEXP2, Judges exp. ranged to
*JUDGEXP3, Judges exp. ranged from
*AVJUDEXP. Av. judge exp (yrs.)
DESIGN

SAMPLING~ Random selection of Ss or cases?
(1) yes, (2) No

EXCLU, If not randomly selected, % of population not included in sample

BASISSEC, Basis of selection (use variable code listing)

ATTRIT, % attrition from sample

BASISATT, Basis of attrition (use variable code listing)

KNOWRATE, Did init. examiners know rate of guilt?
(1) Yes, (2) No

MOTIV, Were subjects offered inducement to beat machine? (analogue only)
(1) Yes, (2) No

PGBLIND2, Did examiners know Ss were in an exp?
INDEPEND, Was initial polygraph rating blind (independent of examination?)
(1) Yes, (2) No

*OBJRAT2, were "judges" r-tings objective?
(1) high (specific measurement of phys. variables), (2) medium (score assigned to subjective assessment, (3) low (rating of guilt or innocence based on visual assessment, (4) very low

FACTORIA, Factorial effect tested (use variable code listing)

FACTORIB, Was factorial effect 1A significant?
(1) Yes, (2) No

FACTOR2A, Second factorial effect tested?
(1) Yes, (2) No

FACTOR2B, Was factorial effect 2A significant?
(1) Yes, (2) No

FACTOR3A, Third factorial effect tested?
(1) Yes, (2) NO

FACTOR3B, Was factorial effect 3B significant?
(1) Yes, (2) No

FACTOR4A, Fourth factorial effect tested?
(1) Yes, (2) No

FACTOR4B, Was factorial effect 4A significant?
### OUTCOME

#### DETECTION STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GC</th>
<th>GNC</th>
<th>GIN</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>INC</th>
<th>IIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIT, Unit of analysis for **outcome**

1) Persons  
2) Questions,

#### JUDGMENT STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JGC</th>
<th>JGNC</th>
<th>JGIN</th>
<th>JIC</th>
<th>JINC</th>
<th>JIIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER CROSS-VALIDATION STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GC2</th>
<th>GNC2</th>
<th>GIN2</th>
<th>IC2</th>
<th>INC2</th>
<th>IIN2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CONTINUOUS SCORES (Means and signif. tests)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUILTY, Mean for guilty (deceptive) subjects</th>
<th>IN?JO, Mean for innocent (truthful) subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) F, (2) t, (3) , (4)</td>
<td>(1) , (2) F, (3) , (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGTEST, Significance test used</th>
<th>SIGDIFF, Was difference significant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Yes, (2) No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>