**PHOTO**

**Examination report**

NAME OF THE EXAMINEE

 Rodolfo Prado Pelayo

**I.- GENERAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date and place of examination:** | Guatemala City, May 21, 2021 |
| **Type of examination:** | Pre-employment |
| **Education:** | Expert Accountant |
| **Age:** | 31 years |
| **Place and Date of birth:** | Guatemala City 24 Jul 1989 |
| **Adress:** | 5ª Av y 18 calle numero 27 zona 1 cd de Guatemala |
| **Phone Numbers:** | 234-50392 and 6343-2432 (Mobile) |

**II.- OBJECTIVE OF THE TEST**

This polygraph examination was carried out at the request of the **company IPTC** with the purpose of determining whether or not **Rodolfo Prado** presents indicators of deception in his answers to the risk topics investigated for his selection process for the position of **systems analyst.**

The polygraph examination was carried out at the request of the **IPTC company** with the purpose of determining whether or not Juan Perez **presents indicators of deception** in his **answers regarding** his **participation in the theft of any of his boss's watches on July 22.**

**III.- CONDITIONS OF THE EXAMINEE AT THE TIME OF THE TEST (suitability)**

At the time of the examination, the examinee indicated that his health is stable, and that he did not have physical, medical or psychological conditions that would prevent him from undergoing the test. He clarified that he had not slept more than two hours the night before the test, however he was able to stay attentive and focused during the test. He said he understood the authorization format for the test and stated that he took the test with his consent, and he authorized the test verbally and in writing.

At the time of the examination, the examinee indicated that during the last three days he has felt sick to his stomach and that for this reason he has had medications in the last two days. He added that this medication makes him feel tired and that at the time of the test he had a headache. However, he said he was willing to continue with the examination since at the time of the test he felt stable. During the test he was tired, on two occasions during the test he fell asleep, however, interpretable records could be obtained within the margins of suitability

 At the time of the examination, the examinee indicated that 8 years ago he was diagnosed with schizophrenic personality disorder caused by his addiction to illegal drugs. He said the doctor monitoring his treatment changed the dose on his medication a week ago and that this has led to anxiety and perceptions of persecution. He said he felt very anxious during the test and showed constant movements in his hands and legs.

(Therefore)

The information presented by the examinee **did not** affect the subject's suitability to undergo the polygraph test.

The information presented by the examinee does not affect the suitability for undergoing the test, however it is within the limits of suitability required for a polygraph test.

The information presented by the examinee affects the suitability of the examinee to undergo the polygraph test , so it is recommended to reschedule the examination once it is considered that the person is in functional conditions for the examination to be carried out.

**IV.- INTERVIEW TOPIC(S) REPORT**

If it is specific evidence, a summary of the subject's version of the facts is made. Details, chronology and complete content of what was reported by the subject and what the examiner asked.

A report is made with order and structure of the information obtained during the pretest.

In case of employment test, risk areas are reported. Example:

**WORK EXPERIENCE**

* He reported that his last job was in the accounting firm "The Washing Machine", where he joined as an accounting assistant in January 2019. He explained that his functions are... And that he receives a monthly salary of ... He clarified that the reason why he wants to change jobs is because…

**RISK AREAS**

**MISUSE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

He reported that in his current employment, on **multiple occasions he has provided confidential information in an unauthorized manner to employees of the companies** served by the firm in which he currently works. As an example, he said that employees of the company "Panadería los cuernitos" have been told details such as dates on which they will receive payment of profits, compensation, payroll or even financial statements of the company. **He clarified that even when he knows that this is not allowed, he does it to have a good relationship with employees since sometimes he himself needs information to carry out his work** and thanks to the fact that he shares this information, these employees also share with him the information he needs. He said this happens to him at least once a week and denied receiving money or items in exchange for this information.

**THEFT AND/OR ILLICIT PROFITS IN JOBS**

When asked about these issues, he said that he has never taken anything from his job in an unauthorized way and that he has not unduly benefited from the resources or functions under his charge within the company.

**CONTACT WITH ILLEGAL DRUGS**

The examinee **admitted** to having consumed drugs (cocaine and marijuana) since the age of fourteen and that he has currently done so during some holidays at the beach (Easter, June and Christmas leave); and the last time he did it was during Easter this year. He also said that he consumed cocaine and smoked marijuana twice a day and the way he gets it is through the friendships he has in his town. The examinee **said**  that during the time he has been at his Job Place he has not done it, and has not tried to do it because he knows that it is forbidden.

**CRIMES AND ILLEGAL BEHAVIOR**

The examinee said that he has never been detained in jail, has never committed crimes and has no criminal record of any kind. He indicated that where he lives is a relatively quiet place and there are no criminals.

On this subject, the examinee showed significant reactions, but did not provide information during the pre-test interview about his involvement in criminal acts.

**At the end of the exam, he was questioned about it and said that the neighborhood where he lives (Comayagua) is full of criminals. He said he was worried because he greets them and hangs with them for "having a peaceful party", and that is what he was thinking about at the time of chart recording, since a year ago one of these persons asked him to keep a car mirror that he had stolen, and that he asked him to deliver it to him the next day. He said he could not refuse to keep that object for fear of retaliation.**

**LINKS TO CRIMINAL GROUPS**

He said that only once, about a year ago, he did buy two cell phones (one for him and one for his wife) from one of his neighbors who has businesses in the downtown area where he lives. He explained that he bought them because they were very cheap and that when his sister told him **that they were most probably stolen, he thought about returning them, although the seller did not accept to refund him for what he had bought and so he still has them.** He clarified that it is the only occasion that he has had contact with people or groups that carry out criminal activities and that outside of this experience he only knows people who commit crimes in the area where he lives but that he only greets them.

**FALSIFICATION OF INFORMATION IN THE JOB APPLICATION**

He mentioned that he did not provide any false information in his documentation to enter this company, and that all the personal and work data he has reported are truthful and can be verified.

**V.- TECHNICAL RESULT**

During the course of the test, questions were designed and asked in two different series. The questions asked, their respective answers and their technical results were as follows:

**SERIES A:**

1. **Have you used any type of illegal drug from one year to date?**

**ANSWER: NO RESULT: Significant reactions / DECEITFUL**

1. **In addition to what you said, have you been linked to people who belong to groups outside the law?**

**ANSWER: NO RESULT: Significant reactions / DECEITFUL**

**SERIES B:**

1. **Did you collaborate with someone to steal your boss's watches?**

**ANSWER: NO RESULT: No Significant Reactions / TRUTHFUL**

1. **Did you help steal the clocks from your boss's room?**

**ANSWER: NO RESULT: No Significant actions / TRUTHFUL**

**VI.- QUALITY OF TEST DATA (GRAPHS)**

The behavior of the examinee during the application of the test with the polygraph (charts) was of attention, and he/she followed-up the instructions that were given and collaborated with the procedure correctly. Regarding the quality of the records, response patterns were observed within the margins of normality.

The behavior of the examinee during the application of the test with the polygraph (charts) was not according to what was requested by the examiner. He constantly presented movements during the test, sometimes fell asleep and in three of the questions he answered with a different answer than the one reviewed during the interview. Although the examiner insisted on multiple occasions, on the need to remain stable, he ignored the instructions. There are atypical traces that DO NOT ALLOW THE PROVISIONING OF A RELIABLE RESULT.

The physiological activity of the examinee obtained during this test, show atypical response patterns in one of the recorded channels (outside the normal parameters) due to the physical condition of the subject. This type of registration did not allow the obtention of scores to provide a reliable result, so a result of NO OPINION is obtained.

The physiological activity of the examinee obtained during this test, show atypical response patterns in one of the recording channels (outside the normal parameters) due to the physical condition of the subject. Even so, recorded information allowed the obtention of scores that allow for a reliable result, so a MARGINAL BUT STILL INTERPRETABLE result was obtained.

The examinee's behavior during the test was one of constant lack of cooperation with the instructions provided. Atypical traces were observed in his data, even though the instructions provided were clear and precise. In the physiological data obtained during this examination, constant alterations were observed that could only be generated by deliberate activity on the part of the subject.

By analyzing the timing, frequency and duration of the traces, the existence of patterns that did not occur randomly was demonstrated, and are an example of deliberate manipulation by the person being examined.

The significance level of intentional distortion reported by the OSS algorithmic rating system indicated a possibility of deliberate test manipulation with a confidence level greater than 99%

Therefore, in the physiological data obtained during this examination, records we observed:

**Normal and interpretable quality charts**

**Non-interpretable charts**

**Marginal but still interpretable charts (within the limits of normality but still interpretable)**

**VII.- CONCLUSION**

**CONCLUSION ESS-M**

For the polygraph test, a scientifically validated technique for multiple-issue/single-issue exploratory/diagnostic cases known as MGQT was used. To analyze the results, we used the Multinomial Empirical Scoring System (ESS-M), a standardized and evidence-based protocol, which determines the posterior probability of deception or truth-telling of the examinee. The results were calculated using a previous probability of .50 which means that the chances of deception or veracity before administering the test were 1 to 1. A credibility interval was calculated with a unilateral alpha of .05. to report meaningful results, demonstrating a confidence level in the outcome of at least 95%.

(FOR SINGLE ISSUE) The categorical test result was parsed from the probabilistic result using two-stage decision rules. Two-stage rules are based on an assumption that the test questions are non-independent of one another.

(FOR MULTIPLE ISSUE) The categorical test result was parsed from the probabilistic result using decision rules for subtotal scores. These rules are based on an assumption that the test questions are independent of one another.

The Grand Total Score of this test it is -3, which equaled or exceeded the required numerical cut-off score of -3 to be classified as TRUTHFUL/NOT TRUTHFUL/DECEITFUL

The lowest score on this test was +2, which exceeded the required numerical cut-off score of +1 to be classified as **TRUTHFUL.**

The lowest score on this test was -**7**, which exceeded the required numerical cut-off score of -**3** to be classified as **NOT TRUTHFUL/DECEITFUL.**

These results are statistically significant with a probability of 95%, meaning that the posterior probabilities after the test exceeded the value of the previous probabilities, or that of the minimum cut-off rate required.

The Bayes factor associated with this rating is 35; so the post-test possibilities of truth/deception are of 12 to 1; which can also be expressed as a probability of deception of 92%; .  **These analytical results support the categorical conclusion that the examinee PRESENTED SIGNIFICANT REACTIONS INDICATIVE OF DECEPTION IN THIS TEST. / DID NOT PRESENT SIGNIFICANT REACTIONS INDICATIVE OF DECEPTION IN THIS TEST.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EXAMINER****Rodolfo Prado****POLYGRAPH EXAMINER** | **QUALITY CONTROL****Raymond Nelson****SUPERVISOR** |