From Ancient Oracles to Modern Techniques: The Evolution of Deception Detection and the Benefits of Investigative Interviewing
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Abstract

Throughout history, different methods and instrumental designs have been used to identify and obtain the truth. Some of the methods described in this work are based on myths that have remained over time, but due to this legacy are unlikely to be applied, such as the Osiris judgment. In this study, we analyzed the characteristics of these methods, such as the period in which they were used, their scientific validation, and their passive or active approach according to the literature. Some approaches have established the theoretical foundations for the development of more precise technologies that are currently used, such as the Bisha Bedouin Court System (ordeal by fire), which is based on arousal theory (response). This work also includes innovative
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applications such as the use of interview techniques to detect deception, which stands out for their wide spectrum of use in different contexts. Finally, we mention elements of investigative interview models and highlight the benefits of using verbal approaches to detect deception.
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**Background**

Over time, different techniques and technologies have been used to detect deception, from the undercover Salem witch trials in Massachusetts (Ford, 2006) to the use of the brain fingerprint identification system in the XXI century (Wolpe et al., 2005) or Functional Magnetic Resonance (Kozel et al., 2005). This work, in addition to informing the reader about the various techniques used to detect deception, offers a classification of each technique, according to its type, application viability context, and degree of certainty. Not all the techniques presented in this text can be used in all scenarios; therefore, in our experience, the interview is the best way to assess deception in most situations. The main objective of the interview is to acquire information and assess its credibility. We will focus on the techniques that stand out for their operability and scientific support, such as information-gathering interviews, also known as ethical interviews or investigative interview techniques. Amongst the most notable is the Cognitive Interview (CI), which allows the use of cognitive approaches to detect deceit (Vrij et al., 2017), as well as the Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE) (Hartwig, 2005). We leave aside techniques not validated by the scientific community or those that are considered third-degree interrogation methodologies, consisting of emotional, physical, and cognitive coercive tactics (Leo, 2004).

**History and evolution of deception detection**

**Ancient history**

For many centuries, knowledge has equaled power. The employment of trustworthy information has served to win battles and money, as well as create religious, economic, and cultural empires. In a current context, the importance of using relevant and trustworthy information increases exponentially when talking about legal matters, it is crucial for the success of a product, service, or judgment about an act or person.

For thousands of years, attempts have been made to define the reliability of information from human sources. One of the oldest records addressing this type of cred
ability assessment practice can be seen in the myth of the trial of Osiris, 3500 B.C.E. (Assmann, 1989), in which Anubis, the grave keeper, removes the heart of a deceased person and places it on a scale to counterbalance a feather: the symbol of truth. From this, a jury of 42 judges questions the spirit of the deceased regarding the sins committed in life, the truth is determined from the weight of the heart in the postmortem trial.

A very creative way to detect deception was used in India (500 B.C.E.). In the sacred ass/donkey test, suspects were told that the animal would bray when a guilty subject grabbed its tail. Before the test, the investigator covered the animal's tail with soot. Due to the belief in the animal's supernatural powers, when the guilty suspect was sent alone into the chamber with the guilt-detecting ass, he passed by without grasping its tail, while the innocent subject grasped the tail as instructed, thus covering his hand with soot. The guilty subject, therefore, came from the chamber with clean hands (Keeler, 1938). In this example, the donkey, imbued with sacredness, acts as a supposed agent of a just world order, reinforcing the idea that the guilty will be exposed and punished, thus maintaining the illusion of a just world. The ritual plays on the suspect's fear and his own belief in a just world system (Lerner & Lerner, 1980).

The Odyssey, written in 800 B.C.E. by Homer (Vidal-Naquet, 2000), records the first use of social engineering to manipulate and deceive people. “The cyclops Polyphemus traps Odysseus and his men in a cave behind an enormous rock. Only the Cyclops is strong enough to move the rock, so Odysseus cannot escape. Instead, Odysseus hatches a plan. While the Cyclops is out with his sheep, Odysseus sharpens a piece of wood into a stake and hardens it in the fire. Then, he gives the Cyclops wine to get him drunk, and he tells the Cyclops that his name is “Nobody.” When the Cyclops falls asleep, Odysseus blinds him with the hardened stake. Polyphemus’ screams summon the other Cyclopes, but when he screams “Nobody’s killing me!” they go away again” (Schein, 1970).

Physical behavior has also been considered important throughout the history of credibility assessment. For example, in Egyptian culture in 900 B.C.E., signs of stress from lying down were perceived as playing with hair, facial paleness, evasive behavior, and rubbing the big toe on the floor (Hocking et al., 1979; Trovillo, 1939). The same characteristics were observed in the sacred Hindu Yajurveda, written around 1000 B.C.E (Chand, 1980, p. 54).
The year 970 B.C.E., witnessed the trial of King Salomon (Francisco, 1953). To discover the truth in the dispute between two women who declared themselves to be the authentic mother of a child, the king decided that the best way to confirm it would be to suggest taking the child's life. After asking each woman for her opinion, one replied that it was fine to do so, however, the other, with tears in her eyes, cried out “Let her keep it!” (Giovanazzi & Linares, 2007). These words allowed the king to identify the true mother by probing instincts, observing emotional authenticity, and offering a forced choice that allowed the women’s responses to be compared and contrasted. Salomon trial could be explained through the Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura & Walters, 1977), which emphasizes observational learning and social modelling. It could be argued that Salomon used his understanding of typical maternal behavior to identify the real mother, based on how most mothers would react in this heightened situation.

Middle Ages

The trial of Pontius Pilate occurred between 30–33 Common Era (C.E). During the trial, Pilate asked Jesus, ‘So you are a king, are you not?’. Jesus replied, ‘You say that I am a king. For this reason, I was born and came into the world, to bear witness to the truth. Everyone who belongs to the truth listens to my voice.’ When Pilate asked, ‘What is truth?’, Jesus did not answer. After this, he returned to the Jews and informed them that he found no guilt in Jesus (Agamben, 2015). During the trial, the crowd posed the question of who was to be crucified, Jesus or Barabbas. This exemplifies a trial conducted without physical evidence, which carries the risk of personal bias or crowd pressure in high-stakes situations. Such factors can lead to a subjective interpretation of the truth or social conformity (Mallinson & Hatemi, 2018). In this case, the crowd’s decision resulted in the acceptance of a falsehood as the answer.

One way of assessing credibility, carried out by the Rajmahal tribes in North Bengal, was to put a burning iron on the accused’s tongue nine times and, if burn injuries occurred, they were considered guilty (Segrave, 2003; Trovillo, 1939). Nowadays, Bedouin tribes (North Africa, Arabian Peninsula, Egypt, Israel, Iraq, Syria, and Jordan) still practice the hot iron lie detector applied to the tongue (Adrian, 2014; Houck, 2018).
In China, suspects were instructed to chew rice and spit it out a few minutes later; those who spit out dry rice, that is, rice without saliva, were considered guilty (Grubin & Madsen, 2005; Sullivan, 2001; Trovillo, 1939).

In the year 49 C.E., a Roman tale recounts the story of Empress Agrippina, who ordered the assassination of Lollii Paulina, her perceived rival for the imperial throne. Soldiers were sent to kill Lollii Paulina and were instructed to return with her head to confirm her death. However, the delay in returning Lollii Paulina’s head resulted in the decomposition of tissues, rendering her face unidentifiable. Undeterred, Agrippina identified Lollii Paulina’s head by examining her teeth, as she was known to have distinctive dental characteristics (Bowers, 2010). This exemplifies the comparison of the oldest records of a testimony (soldiers) with evidence, as in the Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE) technique, used to uncover false information during interviews in modern times.

Another mythical example is the Bocca della Verità mask (Underwood, 1995), one of the most famous attractions in Rome, situated on a wall inside the Cosmedin church in Santa María since the beginning of the 17th century. Legend says that it was used to obtain confessions from adulterers during medieval times (476 C.E.), i.e., the “mouth of truth” bit those who lied. A similar example is described in the work “Das Gottesurteil” (The Judgement of God) (Hepworth & Rahde, 1964), in which the subjects were obligated to put their hands into the mouth of a stone lion, in which lay a venomous serpent that only bit those who were guilty, and they died shortly after.

During the Inquisition and the witch trials (1478–1808 C.E.), the credibility test for identifying those who practiced witchcraft in Great Britain was mediated by signs, marks, or scars that appeared on the body. Once the suspects were identified, their hands and feet were tied and they were thrown into a lake or river. The final decision of guilt or innocence was determined by whether they “floated” or not. Those who were considered innocent sank and drowned during the trial, while the survivors were believed to be witches (Kramer & Sprenger, 1971).

In Mexico, the last Aztec Emperor Cuauhtémoc ruled Tenochtitlan from 1520 to 1521. During the battle for Tenochtitlan, Hernan Cortes questioned him about the hidden treasure of Moctezuma; Cuauhtémoc responded that it was just a myth. Cortes did not believe him; thus, he dipped his hands and feet in oil and set them on fire to discover the truth (foot roasting). Only then did the emperor
confess that the treasure had been thrown into the lagoon. This is an example of coerced confession (Kassin & Wrightsman, 1981; Rajagopalan, 2018).

In the 1850s, French forensic pathologist Augusto Ambrosio Tardieu stated that to distinguish truth or lie in allegations related to sexual abuse, the number of details in the statements should be observed. In 1886, Dr. Jerome Walker indicated that “the way in which children tell their stories, in their own words and expressions,” was indicative of the authenticity of sexual abuse cases (Lamers-Winkelman, 2000). Both examples reveal one of the first attempts to detect deception through verbal approaches.

Other practices, such as instructions to identify poisoners by their conduct, claimed: “A poisoner can be identified. They do not answer questions or give evasive answers, they speak without meaning, rub the big toe on the ground and shake, their face loses color, they play with their hair, and they try to leave the building by all means...” (Wise, 1860).

Cesare Lombroso (1895) thought that psychophysiological measurement could be recorded with some type of instrumentation. This led to the creation of the polygraph in 1921 by John A. Larson (Synnott et al., 2015).

More recently, the use of “science” has become present, in the early 1900’s, the so-called “truth serum” was used. It was believed that a combination of barbiturates administered to a suspect would cause him to provide true and accurate information about his actions (Piper, 1993). This technique was used by Sidney Gottlieb (”Mad scientist”) in 1953 to get confessions and control the mind (Thomas, 2008).

In 1915, William Marston developed the ‘systolic blood pressure deception test,’ apparently stimulated by his wife’s observation that her blood pressure increased when she became angry or excited (Lamb, 2001). For this reason, some investigators look at an interviewee’s neck to try to observe and identify a “jumping vein”, which is considered a lie detection clue (Hartley & Karinch, 2012; Morrison et al., 2007). Marston also gained fame under the pseudonym Charles Moulton as the creator of comic strip hero Wonder Woman, whose ‘magic lasso’ forced everyone caught by it, to tell the truth (Berlatsky, 2015; Grubin & Madsen, 2005). In 1923, he attempted to submit the results of his lie detector test as evidence in the case of James Frye, a 19-year-old man who had been accused of robbery and murder (United States v. Frye, 1924). Marston administered the lie on Frye test and concluded that he was telling the truth, although Frye was convicted. On appeal, the initial decision was upheld and the court decided that Marston's lie detector test had not
gained sufficient acceptance within the scientific community to be considered scientif-
ic evidence. Ironically, Frye was later exonerated and set free, suggesting that Marston may have been right all along (Office of Technology Assessment, 1983).

The ‘Frye standard,’ as it was known, became the test for the admissibility of scientific evidence in the US and remained a significant barrier to the inclusion of polygraph evidence in American courtrooms for the next 70 years. However, the Frye standard was eventually displaced in 1993 in the US Supreme Court’s decision in Daubert v. Merrell Dow (Farrel, 1993).

In the 1970s, the UK government attempted to limit the immigration of fiancées from the Indian subcontinent. This was based on the unfounded assumption that these women were using a legal loophole in marriage to migrate. A credibility test was then used to determine whether the women had been previously married, as their word alone was not considered sufficient. The examination conducted was a ‘virginity test,’ which is considered invasive and unscientific (Smith & Marmo, 2011). Female immigrants were frequently subjected to an examination that falsely claimed to determine whether they were virgins or not (Parekh & Datta, 2024). Passing this test was a prerequisite for women to enter the UK and get married. Similar tests are currently used in India, but they are intended to determine whether a woman has been raped or not (Bagcchi, 2017).

In World War II, the Scharff technique began to be used (1939–1949). Hanns Joachim Scharff created a framework with four main tactics (Granhag, 2010): 1) the friendly approach, 2) not pressing for information, 3) the illusion of knowing everything, and 4) the confirmation/disconfirmation tactic (May & Granhag, 2016; Oleszkiewicz et al., 2014). This approach allowed investigators to decrease the frequency of lies by establishing the facts through the disclosure of information.

In 1942, the Reid Interview & Interrogation was developed (Inbau, 1942) to replace “third-degree” interrogation methods (methods that inflict physical or mental suffering on a person to obtain information about a crime) (Keedy, 1936; Leo, 2004; Ortman, 2016). Reid’s technique assesses credibility through a Behavior Analysis Interview (BAI). This technique, according to Masip et al. (2011), is based on common sense beliefs to identify guilt or innocence.

In the same decade, the Brain Fingerprint (BF) was developed. The BF detects concealed information stored in the brain by measuring brainwaves (P300) and identifying cognitive information processing with an encephalogram (Farwell, 1992, 1994, 1995a, 1995b, Farwell & Donchin, 1991). The Polygraph Concealed Infor-
Information Test (CIT) technique uses physiological responses to assess whether someone can differentiate crime details from irrelevant control information (Lykken, 1959).

Years later in Mexico (1996), through the attorney general offices of the Mexican Republic, the Federal Government used a psychic named “La Paca” to discover information about a murderer (Olmos, 2012), similar to the psychic (Troy Griffin) used by the FBI to solve cases in 2010 (NY post, 2016). This pseudo-investigation technique “allows investigators to uncover concealed information and validate that acquired by other means”.

Another promising technique that has been studied in the twentieth century is Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (FMRI). The existence of a prefrontal-parietal-subcortical circuit has been demonstrated to be activated when deceivers produce simulated memory impairment. Brain activation Patterns in feigned memory would provide specific markers for the detection of deception. FMRI serves to investigate the precise nature of brain activation during feigned memory impairment, in particular, to determine whether it is distinguishable from normal recall (Lee et al., 2002).

In the state of Oaxaca, Mexico, in the region of Tehuantepec, there is still a ritual to show if a woman is pure and chaste, since her word is not considered enough. She is submitted to a “rapture”, agreed upon by the families concerned, in which the man makes his future spouse show evidence of her virginity to society. He does this by publicly displaying a blood-stained sheet, which is presumed to show the loss of her virginity and purity (Vázquez, 2017).

Contemporary Techniques to Detect Deception

Throughout history, various methods have been employed to determine whether a person is lying or telling the truth. Previous examples have attempted to identify cues that distinguish deception from truthfulness. Many of these methods were based on the arousal theory to detect deception (De Turck & Miller, 1985). For instance, centuries ago, poisoners were identified by observing their behavior during questioning and looking for suspicious behavior. A guilty verdict was based on physiological manifestations derived from adrenergic responses, which influence human behavior, physiology, emotions, and the biochemistry of the body (Rinaman, 2011).
Today, technological advances have allowed investigators to indirectly observe physiological responses, such as with the polygraph. Also, evidence-based interview techniques have been developed that allow the application of verbal approaches to detect deception. In this regard, approaches to detecting deception can be classified into three categories: 1) psychophysiological technology-based techniques, 2) psychophysiological interview and interrogation techniques, and 3) investigative interviewing verbal approaches.

All of these categories involve the use of a stimulus, such as questions, to elicit physiological, nonverbal, or verbal responses. These responses may include an increase in heart rate, a change in posture, or the provision of specific details. The categories can be applied in a variety of settings, including formal or informal interviews, or through the use of technology, such as an oculomotor detection test (ODT), or voice stress analysis (VSA). The first two categories are referred to as arousal approaches. These methods aim to measure physiological changes associated with lying. The principle underlying this approach is that deception often triggers increased arousal in the nervous system, leading to detectable bodily responses (Ambach & Gamer, 2018; Handler & Honts, 2007; Vrij & Fisher, 2016; Vrij & Granhag, 2006).

Arousal approaches
Psychophysiological technology-based techniques, psychophysiological interviews, and interrogation techniques

These approaches are known as arousal-based lie detection tools because they rely on physiological reactions as indicators of deception (Vrij & Fisher, 2016). These indicators can originate in various organs and manifest as signs, which can be observed directly or indirectly (i.e., pupil dilation) (Langham et al., 1971), or symptoms, which are subjective experiences (i.e., emotional intensity or time distortion) (Brosnihan, 2023). Some signs can be observed through simple means, such as blushing, while others require the use of technology; for example, reactions in heart rate, skin color, intestinal movements, salivary gland excretions, pupil movements, smooth and striated muscle contractions, pituitary gland hormone release, etc. Each organ will react differently, releasing hormones or glycogen and increasing or decreasing activity.

These changes can affect verbal, nonverbal, or cognitive behavior, modifying or influencing thoughts, emotions, and cognition such as attention, perception, and
memory. For instance, the secretion of stress hormones (such as amylase and cortisol) in response to a genuine or imaginary threat (such as physical aggression or inquiries about homicide) alters both thoughts and behavior (Engert et al., 2014). Arousal approaches are related to Cannon’s theory of emotions (the fight or flight response) (Handler & Honts, 2007), which was used for many years to explain the polygraph or BAI hypothesis (Vrij & Fisher, 2016). Currently, the polygraph test is based on the scientific analytic theory, which states that “polygraph testing does not depend on the false hypothesis that responses are driven by fear, or any other emotion, or any psychological process” (Nelson, 2016). Scientific analytic theory provides an opportunity for polygraph testing to develop protocols that comply with Daubert criteria. The Daubert criteria, also known as the Daubert Standard, are a set of factors used by courts in the US to determine the admissibility of scientific evidence and expert testimony. The Daubert criteria, named after the landmark legal case Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993) (Farrel, 1993), have a significant impact on how scientific evidence is handled in court.

Some arousal-based techniques do not meet the Daubert criteria and therefore cannot be used as evidence in US criminal courts (confirmatory test) but can be used in operational settings (presumptive test), for example, to profile passengers within an airport through Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT) (Lord, 2010).

Verbal Approaches

Investigative Interviewing Verbal Approaches (IIVA)

IIVA refers to scientifically based methods used to determine whether someone is lying or telling the truth through verbal cues to deception. These methods include the 1) Verifiability approach (Harvey et al., 2018), 2) Cognitive Credibility Assessment (e.g., imposing cognitive load, techniques designed to encourage interviewees to say more, and ask unexpected questions), and 3) The Strategic Use of Evidence.

Investigative Interviews Verbal Approaches are preferred over accusatory or behavior analysis styles because arousal approaches reveal fewer verbal cues to deceit (Vrij et al., 2007).
## Table 1. Arousal, verbal, third-degree, and brainwave approaches assessing credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period: 1) Ancient history, 2) Middle Ages, 3) Modern history</th>
<th>Approaches, techniques &amp; myths (legends) of Credibility Assessment</th>
<th>1) Verbal, 2) arousal response, or nonverbal behavior, 3) third-degree-based Lie Detection, and 4) electroencephalographic (EEG) brain responses (brainwaves)</th>
<th>Controlled (interview room, laboratory) or uncontrolled environment (airport, customs, street)</th>
<th>Requires technical equipment or technicians</th>
<th>Has scientific publications listed in SCOPUS or JCR</th>
<th>Investigative interviewing techniques include active and passive approaches to detect deception (Vrij et al., 2014). An investigative interviewing technique typically consists of phases, operating rules, and a specific structure. This box only applies to non-technological techniques</th>
<th>Currently used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient history</td>
<td>Judgment of Osiris</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test of Sacred ass/donkey</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>No longer used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odysses and the Cyclops Polyphemus: Odysse</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egyptian papyrus, signs of stress from lying</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>No longer used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgement of King Salomon</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>No longer used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindi Sacred Writing Yajurveda</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>No longer used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ages (suffering and torture)</td>
<td>Hot red iron test, Rajmahal tribes</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Uncontrolled environment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>It is no longer used by the Rajmahal tribes, but it is for the Bedouin tribes. For more information, refer to the following sources: (Adrian, 2014; Houck, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China rice test</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>No data is available on this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agrippina legend</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legend of the Bocca della Verità Mask</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth/Technique</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Third-degree</td>
<td>Detailed</td>
<td>Deception</td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Judgement of God&quot; myth</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisition period</td>
<td>Third-degree</td>
<td>Some of them yes, e.g., the chair of the Inquisition (Donnelly &amp; Diehl, 2008)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>Yes (torture). Refer to Ginbar (2020) for information on torture in modern times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced confession of Cuauhtémoc (Foot roasting)</td>
<td>Third-degree</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>Yes (torture). Refer to Wang (2020) for information on foot roasting in modern times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern history</td>
<td>Currently, it is understood that it belongs to the verbal approach</td>
<td>This information is unknown</td>
<td>At the time he made the statement, the number of details provided in the testimony was not considered a verbal cue of deception. Nowadays, the number of details in a testimony is considered a verbal cue of deception (Amado et al., 2016)</td>
<td>This information is not available</td>
<td>Not currently used, however, it may be a precursor of the Verifiability approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Walker, &quot;the way in which children tell their story, their own words and expressions&quot;</td>
<td>Currently, it is understood that it belongs to the verbal approach</td>
<td>This information is unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>This information is unknown</td>
<td>Not currently used, however, it may be a precursor to the linguistic analysis of true and deceptive statements. For more information, refer to the following sources: Hauch et al., 2015; Thompson &amp; Hartwig, 2023; Williams et al., 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Type of Behavior</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Evasive Responses</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How to identify a poisoner | Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior | Controlled environment | Yes | No | No | It can be inferred that a passive approach was adopted. 
Not currently used, however, evasive responses are still employed to detect deception. For further information, please refer to Masip et al. (2018) |
| Polygraph | Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior | Controlled environment | Yes (Honts et al., 2021) | No | No | Does not apply because it is not a per se interview or interrogation technique. 
Yes (Adrian, 2014; Houck, 2018) |
| Hot red iron test, Bedouin tribes | Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior | Uncontrolled environment | No | No | No | Passive. 
Yes (Adrian, 2014; Houck, 2018) |
| The truth serum | Third-degree lie detection using drugs | Controlled environment | Yes | No | No | Does not apply. 
Does not apply | Yes (Lokaneeta, 2020) |
| Scharf technique | Verbal approach | Both | No | Yes (Lake, 2021; Oleszkiewicz et al., 2017) | Active | Yes, for human intelligence gathering (Granhag, 2023) |
| Behavior analysis interview (BAI). The BAI is part of the Reid technique | Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior | Controlled environment | No | No | No | Passive | Yes |
| Brain fingerprint | Electroencephalographic (EEG) brain responses (Farwell, 2012) | Controlled environment | Yes | Yes | No | Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique. 
Yes (Budaházi & Fantoly, 2019) |
<p>| Functional magnetic resonance imaging | This technique is not applicable in our classification. It displays images of brain activity associated with lying by measuring changes in blood oxygenation levels in different areas of the brain (Shapiro, 2015) | Controlled environment | Yes | Yes (Yu et al., 2019) | Passive | Yes (research only) (Langleben et al., 2016) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Type</th>
<th>Approach/Environment</th>
<th>Controlled Environment</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Does Not Apply Reason</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginity test (local custom of Tehuantepec, Oaxaca)</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Controlled environment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>(Vázquez, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Content Analysis (Scan)</td>
<td>Verbal approach</td>
<td>Controlled environment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(Bogaard et al, 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro expressions</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>(Matsumoto &amp; Hwang, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphopsychology</td>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>(Crăciun, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Based Content Analysis (CBCA)</td>
<td>Verbal Approach</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Amado et al., 2016)</td>
<td>(Oberlader et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality Monitoring (RM)</td>
<td>Verbal Approach</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Gancedo et al., 2021; Vrij, 2018)</td>
<td>(Logue et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening of Passengers by Observation Techniques (SPOT)</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(Vrij &amp; Fisher, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergology “gesture reading” in France &amp; Quebec</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Does not apply because it is not an interview or interrogation technique</td>
<td>(Delmas et al. 2016; Denault et al., 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE)</td>
<td>Verbal Approach</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Clemens et al. 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shift-of-Strategy (SoS) approach, an extension of the SUE</td>
<td>Verbal Approach</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(Luke &amp; Granhag, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAnS (Six Channel Analysis System)</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>(Mazziotta, 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oculomotor detection test (ODT)</td>
<td>Arousal response, or nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (Kircher, 2018; klein Selle et al, 2023)</td>
<td>(Cook et al. 2012; Pasquali et al. 2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparative evolution

Table 1 presents techniques for detecting deception during an investigation. These include the behavior analysis interview, which uses behavioral and nonverbal arousal cues to identify deception such as crossing legs during questioning. It also includes techniques based on leakage theory, such as micro expressions (Ekman, 2009), which reveal contradictions between emotions and nonverbal behavior indicating ‘deceit’ or discomfort. Furthermore, techniques are shown that do not necessarily detect deception such as Brain Fingerprinting (BF), which uses an electro-
encephalogram to search for the P300 memory wave and possibly detect concealed information (Farwell, 2012).

The evolution of detecting deceit

Currently, there are various techniques available to evaluate credibility. Techniques that evaluate credibility during the interview process stand out, such as the Strategic Use of Evidence. When assessing credibility, it is important to consider techniques that rely on verbal signals rather than non-verbal cues. Arousal-based lie detection can lead to misinterpretation of deception cues, which could lead to false confessions and wrongful convictions if psychophysiological interview and interrogation techniques are employed (Vrij et al., 2010; Vrij et al., 2015). Cases of wrongful convictions have been reported in various countries, including the United Kingdom’s Birmingham Six case and the United States’ NY Central Park Jogger case (Kassin, 2006). In both instances, the determination of the suspect’s guilt was based on external evidence, such as eyewitness reports, or the interviewer’s judgments during the interview (Kassin, 2004, 2005). The credibility of suspects is often influenced by the training that officers have received to interrogate and interpret their behavior. The use of psychophysiological interview and interrogation techniques presents various challenges, including legality, validity, and operability. For deception detection techniques to be considered useful, they must address the following questions in response to these ideas:

- Can it be used in a wide range of investigation contexts? For example, is its application legal in the public and private sectors?
- Is it useful for investigating all types of crime?
- In the private sector, is it affordable?
- Is the cost of training affordable?
- Does the investigator need special knowledge to be trained in the technique?
- Is the technique validated by the scientific community?
- Is it easy to apply?
- How much time does the investigator need to get results?
- Can it be applied to victims, witnesses, and suspects?
- Can it be applied anywhere, or does it need to be applied in a special room to conduct interviews and observe non-verbal behavior?
- Is the credibility assessment carried out during or after the process?
To respond to the previous questions, Investigative Interviews have been designed to be applied in a wide variety of contexts. In contrast to an Ocular-motor deception test, informed consent is not necessary for the application of this technique. Additionally, this technique is non-intrusive, unlike the use of contrast medium in FMRI, and is legal and ethical in all countries. It can be applied in corporate and public service investigations, as well as for all types of crimes. The training cost is affordable and no specialized prior knowledge is required for learning and application. Investigative interviewing is a validated technique endorsed by the scientific community. It can be applied to witnesses, suspects, and victims, and offers numerous benefits.

**Investigative Interview**

An investigative interview is a purposeful conversation conducted to elicit information from a person, such as a witness, victim, or suspect during an investigation. The purpose, scope, and content of investigative interviews conducted by investigators can vary greatly. The objective of an investigative interview is to obtain reliable information and assess credibility through verbal approaches to deception detection while reducing the occurrence of false confessions resulting from an accusatory style of questioning. To achieve this, it is important to avoid techniques such as the prisoner’s dilemma (Norris & Redlich, 2014).

**Verbal Approaches to Deception Detection**

Verbal approaches are useful in investigative interviews. Credibility should not be evaluated based on non-verbal behaviors or attitudes, as scientific evidence has shown that the nonverbal cues associated with deception are weak and unreliable. To enhance the interview accuracy, investigators should focus on improving verbal cues. This can be achieved through the application of the Cognitive Credibility Assessment, Verifiability Approach, and Strategic Use of Evidence.

**Cognitive Credibility Assessment**

The cognitive credibility assessment (CCA) comprises three elements: (1) imposing a cognitive load, (2) asking unexpected questions, and (3) encouraging interviewees to say more.
Imposing a cognitive load

Stating the truth requires less cognitive effort than lying. Investigators can exploit this by introducing a secondary task, such as asking the suspect to remember a number, during the interview. This additional cognitive load disproportionately affects lie-tellers, who are already struggling to maintain their deception. According to Debey et al. (2012), individuals who lie experience a noticeable impairment in their storytelling abilities.

Asking unexpected questions

During interviews, individuals who are not truthful can prepare for anticipated questions and rehearse their answers. To counter this, investigators should ask both anticipated and unanticipated questions. This approach can reveal a key difference between truth-tellers and lie-tellers. Truth-tellers handle both types of questions with relative ease while lie-tellers struggle with unanticipated questions, leading to a noticeable decline in the quality of their responses (Lancaster et al., 2013).

Encouraging interviewees to say more

During interviews, individuals may not always reveal all information due to uncertainty about the investigator’s expectations. To address this, a Model Statement (Pérez-Campos Mayoral et al., 2023) can be used as a benchmark for the desired level of detail. It is important to note that the use of a Model Statement should be disclosed to all interviewees. This can encourage both truthful and deceptive individuals to provide more information. The quality of information provided by truth-tellers is crucially different from that of lie-tellers. Truthful stories tend to be more nuanced and include realistic complications that enhance plausibility (Vrij et al., 2017). In contrast, lie-tellers often provide fewer details, resulting in less complex and less believable stories.

Verifiability Approach

The Verifiability Approach (VA) focuses on the challenge that lie-tellers face. They aim to appear convincing by providing enough details, but they also try to avoid including details that can be easily checked and disproven. Consequently, lie-tellers tend to offer fewer verifiable details compared to truth-tellers (Vrij et al., 2016).
Verifiable details include activities carried out with or seen by named individuals, events recorded on cameras or photos, and actions that leave digital or physical traces (such as phone records or receipts) (Nahari et al., 2014).

When an Information Protocol (Harvey et al., 2017) is used, that explicitly requests verifiable details, the difference between lie-tellers and truth-tellers becomes more pronounced. Lie-tellers struggle to invent verifiable details, while truth-tellers readily provide them. The VA analyses the presence and ratio of verifiable details within a person’s statement to aid in deception detection.

**Strategic Use of Evidence**

Investigators can use evidence strategically to distinguish between truthful and deceptive individuals. Truthful individuals are usually forthcoming in their free recall, while deceptive individuals may omit key details such as their whereabouts or deny involvement when directly questioned (Granhag & Hartwig, 2008). Presenting evidence to a suspect can further amplify these differences. When discovered, dishonest individuals may alter their story or provide complicated explanations to fit the evidence. When the suspect’s statements agree with the evidence in the investigator’s possession, it is determined that there is consistency between the statement and the evidence. When the evidence in the investigator’s possession contradicts the suspect’s statements, it is called inconsistency between the statement and evidence (Hartwig et al., 2006; Hartwig et al., 2014). The SUE technique is an empirically validated investigative interview technique that adheres to science-based methodologies. It has a structured operational methodology that requires the investigator to understand tactical questioning techniques and the strategic use of evidence. SUE is one of the few techniques allowed for use in the criminal justice system nowadays (Vrij & Fisher, 2016).

Therefore, contemporary investigators can benefit greatly from training in verbal approaches to detecting deception and investigative interviewing techniques. These methods have several advantages. For instance, according to the New Zealand Police (2012), the use of investigative interviews can improve the completeness, accuracy, and reliability of police information acquisition, increase conviction rates within the criminal justice system, and identify innocent individuals to prevent wrongful convictions.

The benefits of applying verbal approaches to detect deception within investigative interviewing include:
• Encourage investigators to use science-based investigation techniques.
• Encourage investigators to continue their additional education/training.
• Encourage investigators to develop ethical questioning styles and avoid inquisitive questioning, which decreases interviewees’ self-esteem and can produce false confessions.
• Encourage investigators to actively listen to the interviewee.
• Encourage interviewees to say more (model statement). The interviewer can then be able to apply the Verifiable approach or the Strategic Use of Evidence technique once the interviewee commits to their narrative or uses unanticipated questioning.
• Encourage investigators to develop rapport, avoiding psychological or physical defenses and therefore helping the interviewee to say more.
• Encourage investigators to do proper planning for the entire investigation process, including identifying the best time to show evidence.
• Avoid the so-called Othello error, which is when the interviewer fails to consider that a truthful and stressed person may appear to be lying (Kleinberg et al. 2019).

Closing comments

Throughout human history, one of the primary goals has been to distinguish between truth and lies. There has been a marked tendency to identify lies through nonverbal language or behavior assessment, as seen in the poisoner’s exemplified instructions. However, current evidence suggests that nonverbal language evaluation lacks scientific support. At the same time, science-based interview techniques, such as the CI, or SUE, are being developed and seem to be more appropriate for information gathering and assessing credibility in legal and forensic contexts.
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