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Definitions:

Forensic Interviewing: Interviews conducted in the investigation of a crime.

Truth: A statement or answer given in accordance with one’s experience, facts, reality.

Deception: The act or practice of deceiving; a verbal statement, a gesture, or something written in an attempt to deceive.

Nonverbal Behavior: Behavior that is gestural; behavior being other than verbal communication.

Unwitting Verbal Cues: Verbal statements made by a suspect that can be assessed for truth or deception without the suspect’s knowledge.

Statement Analysis: The assessment of a written or verbal statement via Scientific Content Analysis, Criteria Based Content Analysis or any other means, in an attempt to determine its veracity.

Lie Detection: Any interview or instrumental method that attempts to detect deception of a statement or answer.

Truth Verification: Any interview or instrumental method that attempts to verify the truthfulness of a statement or answer.
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Afrikaans summary

Hierdie navorsing het die geldigheid van die “Forensic Assessment Interview Technique (FAINT)” ondersoek. FAINT is ‘n spesifieke onderhoudsvoeringsproses wat algemeen aanvaar en gebruik word. Die FAINT- proses is ‘n integrasie van die werke wat die navorser onderneem en geïntegreer het met navoring van John Reid, Richard Arthur en Avinaom Sapir. Die FAINT- tegniek behels die evaluasie van nie-verbale gedrag, projekterende analise van onwetende verbale wenke en verklaring analiese. Die fundamentele hipotese van FAINT is dat eerlike en oneerlike verdagtes bewysbaar verskil in hul nie-verbale, verbale en geskrewe kommunikasie wanneer gevra word om te regeageer op ‘n gekonstrueerde formaat van onderhoudsvrae.

FAINT handhaaf dat hierdie verskille waarnembaar is, en gekwantifiseer kan word. Dit stel verder die Forensisiese onderhoudsvoerders in staat om akkurate gevolgtrekkings van ‘n verdagte se betrokkenheid by ‘n misdaad te kan maak. Hierdie navorsing werk onderskryf die geldigheid van die tegniek, soos gemeet deur ‘n tradisionele ongeweegde drie-punt skaal en ‘n geweegde puntetelsel (‘n punt wat nagevors word in hierdie stuk) wat vergelykenderwys gebruik word vir die bepaling van waarheid of onwaarhied (valsheid). Die ondersoek het die resultate van albei puntetelsels weergegee, sowel as die vergelyking tussen die bogenoemde puntetelsels en die tradisionele gebruikte “Behavioral Assessment Interview” wat John Reid ontwikkel het.

English summary
This research paper has examined the validity of the Forensic Assessment Interview Technique (FAINT). FAINT is a specific interview process – accepted and in current use - integrating the works of this researcher with the works of John Reid, Richard Arther, and Avinoam Sapir. The FAINT technique involves the evaluation of nonverbal behavior, projective analysis of unwitting verbal cues, and statement analysis. The fundamental hypothesis of FAINT is that truthful and deceptive criminal suspects differ demonstrably in their nonverbal, verbal and written communication, when asked to respond to a structured format of interview questions.

FAINT maintains that these differences are observable and can be quantified to allow forensic interviewers to make accurate determinations of a suspect's involvement in a crime. This research has examined the validity of the technique as measured by a traditional, unweighted 3 point scale and a weighted scoring system (an issue being researched in this paper) comparatively used for determining truth or deception. This dissertation reports the results of both scoring systems, as well as a comparison between them and the historically used Behavioral Analysis Interview (BAI) that was developed by John E. Reid.