The first two interviews were conducted as practice sessions, and the
participants were told that they should describe their feelings honestly to the
interviewer. The second interview was conducted as a real interview, and
the participants were told that they should try to gain the interviewer's
trust and be as open and honest as possible.

The results of the interviews were analyzed in terms of three
variables: trust, rapport, and honesty. The trust variable was assessed
by asking participants whether they felt that the interviewer could
be trusted. The rapport variable was assessed by asking participants
whether they felt that they had a good relationship with the interviewer.
The honesty variable was assessed by asking participants whether they
had given honest answers to the interview questions.

The data were analyzed using a series of statistical tests, including
ANOVA and chi-square tests. The results showed that there was a
significant difference in the level of trust, rapport, and honesty
between the first and second interviews. Participants felt more
trust, rapport, and honesty in the second interview than in the first
interview.

The findings of this study suggest that practice interviews can
help participants feel more comfortable and confident in real
interview situations. However, further research is needed to
investigate the long-term effects of practice interviews on
participants' interview performance.

Method

Participants were divided into two groups: a control group and an
intervention group. The control group received no special training
before the interview, while the intervention group received a short,
structured, and guided training session on interview techniques.

The intervention group received training in three main areas:

1. Building rapport: Participants were taught how to
build rapport with the interviewer, including
listening actively, maintaining eye contact,
and using appropriate body language.

2. Asking questions: Participants were taught
how to ask effective and open-ended
questions, and how to follow up on
responses.

3. Managing stress: Participants were taught
strategies for managing stress and
anxiety during the interview, including
deep breathing, positive self-talk,
and visualization.

After the training session, both groups were given
an interview situation to practice what they had
learned. The interviews were conducted by
experienced interviewers who were blind to
the participants' group assignment.

The data were collected using a standardized interview
protocol, which included both open-ended and
structured questions. The interviews were
conducted in a quiet, well-lit room, with
adequate seating and refreshments.

Results

The results showed that the intervention group
performed significantly better than the control group
in terms of rapport, trust, and honesty. Participants in
the intervention group felt more comfortable and
confident during the interview, and they were more
likely to build rapport and maintain open dialogue.

Discussion

The findings of this study suggest that guided
training sessions can be effective in improving
participants' interview performance. Future
research should investigate the long-term
effects of such training on participants' interview
performance and their career outcomes.
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TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations of Pleasant and Unpleasant Affect Self-Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interview Condition</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honest Mean S.D.</td>
<td>Deceptive Mean S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Felt 7.58 1.45</td>
<td>1.13  .45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicated 6.93</td>
<td>1.91  1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Felt 1.33 .38</td>
<td>4.44  1.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicated 1.36  .33</td>
<td>2.48  .99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which the lie was about an emotion, it was a mild, not a strong emotion. The second difference is in the motivation of the liars. Our subjects were invited to participate by the dean of the Nursing School and they believed, as we did, that their ability to control their negative emotions while viewing upsetting surgical procedures was important for their later career success. Also, unlike many other experiments on lying, our subjects directly faced the person they were attempting to deceive, and our subjects did not know they were being videotaped until after the experiment was over, decreasing the likelihood that their behavior would be self-conscious.

Our scenario confounds lying and emotion (i.e., being truthful about positive emotion and lying about negative emotion). It provides two samples of behavior which differ in two important ways—the emotion experienced and the veracity of the communication about that emotion. Another limitation in our scenario is that there was no control for the order of the honest and deceptive interviews. The honest interview always came before the deceptive interview, because we found in pilot studies that when the order was reversed the negative impact of the negative films lingered, spilling over into what was intended to be a positive experience in the honest interview. A more detailed description of the scenario was reported by Ekman and Friesen (1974). Ekman, Friesen, O'Sullivan, and Scherer (1980) also provided a more thorough description of the advantages and disadvantages of this paradigm.

Subjects
Fifteen student nurses were recruited via a letter from the Nursing School dean. Two years later another 16 subjects were recruited by the same means, providing a total sample of 31 subjects. The mean age of these women was 20.7, the range was from 19 to 26. After the experiment, all of these subjects reported that it had been helpful in preparing them for their work as nurses, and all of them volunteered when offered an opportunity to go through the experiment a second time.

Behavioral Measures
All of the measurements were made from videotapes or audiotapes. The individuals who scored these behavioral records did not know whether the interviews they scored were honest or deceptive and were unfamiliar with the design or purpose of the experiment.

Face measures. All of the facial behavior shown in the videotaped interviews was measured with the Facial Action Coding System (FACS) (Ekman and Friesen, 1976, 1978). A trained scorer “dissected” each ob-
was tailored to the difference between the honest and deceptive interviews. In the column which reports using both verbal and nonverbal measures, a high score indicates that the subject was more likely to be considered deceptive. Table 2 shows the results of this analysis for the dependent measures.

## Results

Decoy as compared to the honest interview.

The dependent measures were the same as those used in the study of 1972. Although the effects of deception on the interviewers' ratings of the honesty, the interviewers' ratings were the same for the honest and deceptive conditions. The significant difference between the honest and deceptive conditions is that the honest condition had a mean of 6.20, while the deceptive condition had a mean of 6.80. The difference between the two conditions was statistically significant (t = 2.49, p < 0.05). The results for the dependent measures are shown in Table 2.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illusions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaved</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that the honest condition had a higher mean score than the deceptive condition. The differences were significant for both the verbal and nonverbal measures. The results also show that the honest condition had a higher mean score than the deceptive condition for the dependent measures as well.
TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hits and Misses on the Basis of Facial and Pitch Measures</th>
<th>D-Smile</th>
<th>Masking Smile</th>
<th>D-Smile + Masking Sm.</th>
<th>Illustrators</th>
<th>Pitch</th>
<th>Smiling + Pitch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hits</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hits/</td>
<td>72.2**</td>
<td>73.3*</td>
<td>75.0**</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>78.3***</td>
<td>86.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misses</td>
<td>72.2**</td>
<td>73.3*</td>
<td>75.0**</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>78.3***</td>
<td>86.4***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Binomial Tests: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

was in the predicted direction on both measures, or if it was in the predicted direction on one measure and the other measure had not provided a basis for classification. A miss was tallied if the difference between the two interviews was counter to the predicted direction on both measures, or if it was counter on one measure and the other measure had provided no basis for classification. A subject was tallied as unclassified, if unclassified had been the score for both smile measures, or if one measure yielded a hit and the other a miss. In the column labeled smiles and pitch, the same logic was used except here the two scores used were the classification based on both smiling measures and the single pitch measure.

Table 3 shows that the hit rate with illustrators was low, compared to the face or pitch measures. Because illustrators did not yield significantly more hits than misses, we did not combine it with either the smile or the pitch measures. Pitch, compared with the smiling measure, provided an additional basis for classifying when subjects were lying or telling the truth. Eight of the subjects who could not be classified on the basis of the two smiling measures were accurately classified by adding the pitch measure. The facial measures, on the other hand, allowed accurate classification of four of the subjects who did not differ in pitch. In addition, there were seven subjects who were correctly classified on both the smiling and the pitch measures, and another seven subjects for whom the smiling measures and pitch measures yielded contradictory classifications: for three subjects smiling yielded the correct classification, and for four subjects pitch yielded the correct classification.

The optimal combination of measures (yielding the highest hit rate) utilized both pitch and the combined facial measures. All three measures—D-smiles, masking smiles, and pitch—gave high hit rates, and no one measure was better than any other (Chi squares comparing each pair of measures were not significant). Table 3 shows that the combination of all three measures yielded the largest number of hits, and the smallest number of misses, although nearly a third of the subjects could not be classified when both the combined smile and pitch measures were used. Combining the smiling and pitch measures yielded results which were significantly different from the results obtained with either of the smile measures considered alone ($\chi^2 (2, N = 31) = 8.89, p < .05$ compared with D-smiles; $\chi^2 (2, N = 31) = 15.35, p < .001$ compared with masking smiles), but it was not significantly better (although it did discriminate more subjects) than pitch alone or the two smiling measures combined.

Discussion

To our knowledge no prior study of how behavior differs in honest and deceptive interactions has determined the hit rate for each measure and for various combination of measures. Yet this type of subject-by-subject analysis can help to evaluate how well any one behavioral measure or combination of measures can differentiate deceptive from honest behavior as well as in determining whether different behavioral measures are useful in detecting the deception of different people. We hope that other investigators will adopt this type of subject-by-subject analysis, so that it will be possible to compare findings across experiments in regards to which measures allow the identification of lying in the greatest number of subjects.

Duchenne smiles (enjoyment smiles), masking smiles and pitch all yielded high hit rates, although no one measure was better than another. In support of our hypothesis, the hit rate when based on all three measures was very high: 86.4% if the hits are divided by the hits plus misses; 61.2% if the hits are divided by the total sample (misses plus those who could not be classified with these measures). The hit rates found across experimental studies of polygraph lie detection range from 35% to 100%, but the comparison is difficult to make because of major differences in experimental design (see Ekman, 1985, chapter 7, for a review of polygraph studies and a comparison of polygraphic and behavioral clues to deceit). Illustrators did not yield a significant hit rate. We did not utilize any other measures of vocal or verbal behavior in this analysis because measures of hesitations,
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