

## THE PROBLEM OF IDENTIFYING SUSPICIOUS AND FALSE NEWS IN A PSYCHOLOGIST-EXPERT INTERVIEW

Mahmudova Hulkar Tilabovna

Associate professor of the department of professional skills, Supreme School of Judges under the Supreme Judicial Council of the Republic of Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8086779>

**Abstract.** *This article discusses the scientific concepts aimed at the use of special knowledge by an expert-psychologist in the process of forensic psychological examination to identify suspicious and false messages. In addition, the rules of competent preparation for the organization of interview conditions with the examinees of the expert-psychologist, the processes that should be paid attention to during the interview are highlighted.*

**Keywords:** *expert-psychologist, conversation, false news, skepticism.*

It is known that forensic psychology uses general psychological methods designed to determine the psychological factors, laws and mechanisms of human behavior and relationships, which are naturally regulated by legal norms. The methods used during forensic psychological examination are: observation, interview and survey, summarization and analysis of case materials and independent descriptions, structural and structural-genetic analysis methods, biographical method, psychodiagnostic method, experiment, case study method [1].

Conversation - an important source of knowledge of psychological phenomena. In the interview with the examinees, emphasis is placed on internal experiences related to the characteristics of the legally significant situation. The following requirements are set for an interview in psychology:

- goal orientation;
- planning;
- selection;
- individuality of approach;
- psychological ethics.

In order for the interview to be effective, it is necessary to take into account the age, gender, education and life experience of the subject. It is necessary to prepare questions in advance that can express the necessary information for verification [2].

The basis of the interview is to communicate with the person under investigation with the help of indirect questions that form common personal-important aspects, which makes the interview more effective. However, it should be taken into account that one cannot hope to get reliable information based on the interview. Using this method, it is possible to compare and analyze the testee's statements, taking into account other methods of psychology (for example, profiling). Only a comparative analysis allows for a full assessment of the examinee's testimony.

Expert interview is one of the central methods of forensic psychological examination. The purpose of conducting it is to obtain information that is important for the questions put to the expert about the subject's subjective world and the situation under investigation. The results of the interview are also important for the evaluation of the data obtained in the process of psychodiagnostic research, for the formation of general expert conclusions. Therefore, the problem of identifying lies and dubious statements of the person being examined is of great importance for

the expert psychologist when there is a discrepancy between the information given by the person being examined about a criminally important event or a part of it and what he actually knows, thinks or feels.

At the same time, even though it does not correspond to reality, the information about which the person being examined is mistaken about its authenticity is also doubtful. False messages are always the result of a deliberate attempt to deceive the interlocutor.

Fake news can take different forms of speech, such as hiding real facts (circumstances), denying them, reporting fabricated facts, and various combinations of these forms. In this case, hiding the phenomenon under investigation, denying one or another of its circumstances (i.e., passive lying) is less likely to be exposed than active, "creative" change of reality by telling fictitious information. The use of real-life facts, typical life situations, and careful preparation and practice of a false message make it difficult to detect false reporting [3].

In the scientific literature (A.R. Ratinov, Yu.P. Adamov, M.M. Kochenov, V.V. Romanov, O.D. Sitkovskaya, etc.), a number of signs are given that allow identifying messages that may be false. These include:

- the fact that the story about the extreme situation that is important for the person is smooth and conflict-free;

- there is a difference in the initial and subsequent statements (testimonies) of the person examined in the examination, an increase in the "remembered" details (number);

- changes his shows many times (even if he gives convincing explanations for this).

The presence of the following situations in an expert interview may also indicate the presence of hidden situations, fantasy, and independence in speech:

- existence of a conflict between the information given by the person under investigation and the information in the case file;

- emotional "slowness" and schematicity of messages: in this case, the person being examined rarely uses personal and emotional words in relation to the event he is describing;

- there are expressions in his speech that show that he behaves like an external observer (such as "they usually do this", "they say this", "it is necessary to act this way"), the person being examined often relies on (refers to) the opinion of others;

- on his own initiative (even if no one asks him) tells positive information about himself, actively demonstrates his socially useful or society-approved position ("fighter for justice", "critic of shortcomings in society", etc.);

- the messages are the same (in the same mold, stereotyped), "fixed" and are repeated using the same words and phrases, the events are described in the same sequence;

- refuses to answer the questions posed by the expert (switches to another topic, ignores the question, answers only part of the question);

- in the expert examination, the person being investigated shows that he does not know the facts that he should be familiar with (does not know the situation at the scene of the incident, some actions of the participants of the investigated situation, cannot perform certain actions, etc.);

- in his messages (speech words) there are words, phrases and terms that are not characteristic of his usual speech (they stand out among other descriptions of work situations);

- expresses the secondary details of the incident too clearly, and the main aspects superficially;

- there are cases of "obstructing communication": conflicting judgments, use of incomplete sentences, inconsistency in the statement, often changing the topics of the story, showing (showing) misunderstanding of the expert's words;

- thinks for a long time when answering questions about the important details of the situation, emotional reaction, but in other matters, on his own initiative, he tells a story (talks);

- repeats the same information willingly (with satisfaction), without external motivation;

- literally applies evaluative judgments (opinions) used by other persons (expressed in case materials);

- says that he has forgotten the time that passed after the incident, the circumstances that he cannot forget due to his age, mnemonic, professional characteristics;

- answers the expert's questions inadequately (too emotionally, sometimes even aggressively);

- the expert does not recognize any information he said during the interview (this may indicate that he accidentally said it during the interview);

- when interpreting the actions of the participants of the event, it is based on the information that it is clear that he did not know about the event in question at the time of its occurrence.

Psychologist-expert should evaluate all these factors together, taking into account the motivation and individual psychological characteristics of the person being examined.

External influences can also cause the subject to make significant (large) unexpected errors in the description of the situation, that is, to give dubious messages. Social memory is characterized by the mixing of information from different sources over time, as a result of which it is much more difficult for a person to distinguish the original information from the newly formed one.

"Significant changes in the programs can be caused by the subsequent discussion of the events, social opinion, rumors, criminal sensationalism, media reports" [4].

Therefore, the quality of the story of the person being examined largely depends on the time interval that separates perception from reproduction, repetition of remembered information, and the number of repetitions. There are the following forms of changes in memories:

1) generalization or "exaggeration" of the event, which in the original version was in a clear, widespread, detailed form;

2) clarification and detailing of something in a more general, narrower form;

3) replacement of one content with another content of equal value in terms of meaning, generality and detail;

4) moving or moving some parts of the real event;

5) unification of things that are separate from each other and separation of things (events) that are actually interrelated;

6) additions that are not in the original version;

7) violation of the meaning of the original as a whole, including some of its parts [5].

It should be noted that the results of the expert interview are greatly influenced by the characteristics of its conduct by the psychologist. The main mistake of the beginning experts, which leads to the violation of the information obtained about the criminal event as a whole or some of its parts, is the lack of an interview plan. As a result, the psychologist cannot gather complete information on questions important for forming a conclusion; on the contrary, it "automatically" adheres to the scheme created for the conversation, that is, in an inflexible way, which leads to the fact that unconsidered directions of the development of topics, new facts that

do not correspond to the working hypothesis are not taken into account; uses overly complex (or overly simple) questions that do not correspond to the level of understanding, speech characteristics of the person being examined, and therefore leads to inadequate answers, etc.

In order to minimize distortions in the story of the person being examined, the psychologist should follow the following rules during the interview:

- give clear and understandable instructions to the person being examined, several times if necessary (according to his vocabulary);

- organization of communication space without distractions and incentives (people, sounds, etc.) (this is especially important when working with children);

- to give the initiative in the interview to the person being examined. If it is not necessary, not to divide his free story, to determine all possible and necessary deviations and details according to the opinion of the person being told;

- asking questions on topics whose answers are known to the psychologist from the case materials (the answers to them allow to assess the general position (attitude) of the person being examined towards the expert: generally reliable or generally unreliable);

- at first, to clarify in general the events of the past life of the subject of the examination, then to clarify in more detail the events that occurred immediately before the situation being examined, and then to clarify in detail the events of the situation being studied (such an approach is to have "base points" for the conversation about the situation, as well as the subject of the examination) allows to study the characteristics of personal communication);

- distinguish the main stages of development of the situation together with the person being examined; try to post memories in chronological order;

- use of elements of stimulating situations (photographs, drawing schemes, etc.). Conditions for recalling events can also be restored;

- introduce various modifications to the conversation, such as drawing pictures, game situations, role-playing games, use of scales (if they fit into the conversational system);

- achieving clarifications (for example, if the person being examined uses general evaluative adjectives, it is necessary to clarify and detail them; when using concepts representing distance, time, strength of smell, etc., it is necessary to determine how the person being examined understands their content, if possible, it is necessary to ask to demonstrate this in reality, etc. .);

- to clarify the meaning of words and phrases with emotional color in the speech of the person being examined;

- offering several possible alternatives (showing an example) in cases where the person being examined has difficulty expressing his/her situation and feelings;

- use of the technique of repeating the words of the person being examined to check that the messages of the person being examined are clearly understood;

- making a conclusion about the content (if it is necessary to systematize what the person being examined has stated, if the topic has been discussed in a chaotic manner for a long time);

- to refrain from expressing one's beliefs, opinions, and evaluation;

- predicting the state of fatigue of the person being examined (sensing fatigue); managing his attention;

- use more open questions, express questions according to the level of understanding and speech characteristics of the person being examined. Questions should be clear in meaning, simple in structure;

- not to use indicative questions, i.e. questions with an open or hidden answer, cautiously use questions formulated in such a way that the person being examined only has to confirm what has been said;

- complete recording of all the words and non-verbal (non-verbal) behavior of the person being examined, significant changes. It would be appropriate to record the words of the expert. It is necessary to find out its meaning as soon as possible after the conversation.

Thus, the use of techniques (methods) that allow us to find out suspicious and false messages, to identify them, to organize the most optimal interview conditions, requires the expert-psychologist to have qualified training and extensive experience in conducting examinations. Our experience shows that the use of professional communication training by an expert psychologist in education helps in better acquisition of necessary knowledge, learning, skills, and the formation of a conscious professional position.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Engalychev V.F., Makhmudova H.T. Modern types and directions of development of forensic psychological expertise. - T., Ministry of Internal Affairs Academy of the Republic of Uzbekistan. 2020. - 288 p.
2. Makhmudova H.T. Fundamentals of forensic psychological expertise. - T., Ministry of Internal Affairs Academy of the Republic of Uzbekistan. 2019. - 319 p.
3. Vatslavik P., Bivin J., Jackson D. Pragmatics of human communications. - M., 2000. - S. 90-91.
4. Enikeev M. I. Encyclopedia. Legal psychology. - M., 2001. - S. 62.
5. Smirnov A. A. Problems of the psychology of memory. - M., 1966. - S. 158.
6. Makhmudova, K. (2023). THE ROLE OF THE PSYCHOLOGIST IN COMPLEX FORENSIC PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PSYCHIATRIC EXPERTISE. *Science and innovation*, 2(B2), 100-106.
7. Tilabovna, M. K. (2021). Actual problems in the expert competence of a psychologist in civil proceedings of the Republic of Uzbekistan (on the example of psychological and psychiatric examinations). *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(3), 1379-1384.
8. Makhmudova, K. (2023). SIGNIFICANCE OF JUDICIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL EXAMINATION OF DEALABILITY IN UZBEKISTAN. *Science and innovation*, 2(C1), 13-16.
9. Tilabovna, M. K. (2021). Current opportunities of forensic-psychological expertise in solving the question of will. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(5), 881-887.