A Scientific Perspective on the 2006 U.S. Army Field Manual 2-22.3

Susan E. Brandon

SyncScience LLC

Steven M. Kleinman

U.S. Air Force (Ret.)

Joeanna C. Arthur

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Steven Kleinman at compass2100@me.com.

The statements of fact, opinion, and analysis in the paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. Government.

Abstract

Army Field Manual 2-22.3, issued by the U.S. Army in 2006, provides doctrinal guidance governing the collection of human intelligence. Chapter 8 of the Manual describes the interrogation techniques and approaches that currently are approved for use on "an individual in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States Government, or detained within a facility owned, operated, or controlled by a department or agency of the United States, in any armed conflict." The interrogation techniques and approaches described by this Manual have never been empirically evaluated or validated. Some of the approaches are consistent with current psychological science, and some are not. The individual techniques and approaches are briefly reviewed here, and recommendations are made for the revisions to the Manual, which are due within the next year.

Keywords: interrogation, interview, Army Field Manual 2-22.3

The Role and Influence of the Army Field Manual on Interrogation Doctrine and Practice

The Army Field Manual 2-22.3, 'Human Intelligence Collector Operations' (hereafter referred to as the AFM), was issued in 2006 by U.S. Army Headquarters. This version of the AFM incorporates the guidelines, methods, and processes previously contained in earlier field manuals that specifically addressed interrogation operations.[1] As described in the preface, the purpose of the AFM is to provide "…doctrinal guidance, techniques, and procedures governing the employment of human intelligence (HUMINT) collection and analytical assets in support of the commander's intelligence needs" (AFM, p. vi).

The AFM sets forth a definitive process for interrogation operations which involves a sequence of actions and activities that include, in order: (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) Approach, (3) Questioning, (4) Termination, and (5) Report. Essential to this review (given the diversity in definitions), the AFM defines an interrogation as "the systematic process of using approved interrogation approaches to question a captured or detained person to obtain reliable information to satisfy intelligence requirements, consistent with applicable law and policy" [2] (AFM, 5-50, p. 5-13). Interrogation techniques are described in detail in AFM Chapter 8.

The *2005 Detainee Treatment Act* mandated that the only interrogation approaches and techniques authorized for use with any detainee, regardless of status or characterization, are those authorized and listed in the AFM. Moreover, President Obama signed *Executive Order 13491* in 2009, which stated, "Effective immediately, an individual in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States Government, or detained within a facility owned, operated, or controlled by a department or agency of the United States, in any armed conflict, *shall not be subjected* [emphasis added] to any interrogation technique or approach, or any treatment related to interrogation, that *is not authorized* [emphasis added] by and listed in Army Field Manual 2–22.3 (Manual)." (Executive Order 13491). The *2016 Congressional National Defense Authorization Act* (NDAA) further stated that "An individual who is (i) in the custody or under the effective control of an officer, employee, or other agent of the United States Government; or (ii) detained within a facility owned, operated, or controlled by a department or agency of the United States, in any armed conflict" (NDAA Sec. 1045 (a)(2)(B)) "shall not be subjected to any interrogation technique or approach, or any

[1] The AFM, which as noted has been established as an overarching framework for the conduct of interrogation operations in the course of current and future operations, contains an array of principles and strategies that are fundamentally unchanged from those described in the original version of the field manual on interrogation produced shortly after the end of World War II. This important point will be explored in greater detail in a later section.
[2] The AFM specifically cites the following: U.S. law, the law of war, relevant international law, relevant directives including DOD Directive 3115.09, 'DoD Intelligence Interrogations, Detainee Debriefings, and Tactical Questioning;' DOD Directive 2310.1E, 'The Department of Defense Detainee Program;' DOD instructions; and military execute orders including FRAGOs (fragmentary orders)" (1-32, p. 1-14).

treatment related to interrogation, that is not authorized by and listed in the Army Field Manual 2-22.3" (NDAA Sec. 1045 (a)(2)(A)). It should be noted, however, that the 2016 NDAA exempted agencies other than the DOD from these restrictions, stating "The limitations in this subsection shall not apply to officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, or other Federal law enforcement entities" (NDAA Sec. 1045(a)(5)).

Given the AFM's status as the overarching standard for interrogation, the efficacy and effectiveness of the strategies and methods set forth in the Manual are critical. Congress recognized this when passing the *McCain-Feinstein Amendment* to the 2016 NDAA, which included specific instructions that "not sooner than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense…shall complete a thorough review of Army Field Manual 2-22.3, and revise Army Field Manual 2-22.3, as necessary to ensure that Army Field Manual 2-22.3 complies with the legal obligations of the United States and the practices for interrogation described therein do not involve the use or threat of force" (NDAA, Sec. 1045 (a)(6)(A)(i)). That review process (which is now less than one year hence) provides opportunities for comments and input based on the robust and rapidly expanding psychological and social science literature relevant to interrogation methods. Such review is the primary focus of this article.[3]

The Foundation of the Army Field Manual: Approach Strategies

The AFM describes 18 approach techniques (commonly referred to as "approaches") that are authorized for employment with any "detainee regardless of status or characterization, including EPWs (Enemy Prisoners of War)" (AFM, 8-18, p. 8-6)), and one (*Separation*) that is restricted. The approach techniques are as follows:

1. *Direct Approach:* "In using the direct approach, the HUMINT collector asks direct questions" (AFM 8-19, p. 8-6).
2. *Incentive Approach:* "The incentive approach is trading something that the source wants for information" (AFM, 8-21, p. 8-7).
3. *Emotional Love Approach:* "The HUMINT collector focuses on the anxiety felt by the source about the circumstances in which he finds himself, his isolation from those he loves, and his feelings of helplessness. The HUMINT collector directs the love the source feels toward the appropriate object: family, homeland, or comrades. If the HUMINT collector can show the source what the source himself can do to alter or improve his situation or the situation of the object of his emotion, the approach has a chance of success" (AFM 8-29, p. 8-9).

[3] It should be noted that since publication, the AFM has been available online (www.us.army.mil). The 2016 NDAA further mandated that the AFM remain available to the public (NDAA Sec. 1045 (a)(6)(A)(ii)).

4. *Emotional Hate Approach:* "The emotional hate approach focuses on any genuine hate, or possibly a desire for revenge, the source may feel. The HUMINT collector must clearly identify the object of the source's hate and, if necessary, build on those feelings so the emotion overrides the source's rational side" (AFM 8-31, p. 8-10).
5. *Emotional Fear-Up* Approach: "In the fear-up approach, the HUMINT collector identifies a preexisting fear or creates a fear within the source. He then links the elimination or reduction of the fear to cooperation on the part of the source" (AFM 8-35, p. 8-10).
6. *Emotional Fear-Down* Approach: "In the fear-down approach the HUMINT collector mitigates existing fear in exchange for cooperation on the part of the source" (AFM8-40, p. 8-11).
7. *Emotional-Pride and Ego-Up Approach:* "In this technique, the source is flattered into providing certain information in order to gain credit and build his ego" (AFM 8-42, p. 8-12).
8. *Emotional-Pride and Ego-Down Approach:* "The emotional-pride and ego-down approach is based on attacking the source's ego or self-image. The source, in defending his ego, reveals information to justify or rationalize his actions" (AFM, 8-45, p. 8-13).
9. *Emotional-Futility:* "In the emotional-futility approach, the HUMINT collector convinces the source that resistance to questioning is futile. This engenders a feeling of hopelessness and helplessness on the part of the source…the HUMINT collector gives the source a 'way out' of the helpless situation" (AFM 8-49, p. 8-13-14).
10. *We Know All:* "In the 'we know all' approach technique, the HUMINT collector subtly convinces the source that his questioning of the source is perfunctory because any information that the source has is already known" (AFM, 8-53, p. 8-14).
11. *File and Dossier:* "a variation of the 'we know all' approach" (AFM 8-55, p. 8-15).
12. *Establish Your Identity:* "In using this approach, the HUMINT collector insists the detained source has been correctly identified as an infamous individual wanted by higher authorities on serious charges, and he is not the person he purports to be. In an effort to clear himself of this allegation, the source makes a genuine and detailed effort to establish or substantiate his true identity" (AFM 8-58, p. 8-15-16).
13. *Repetition:* "In one variation of this approach, the HUMINT collector…repeats the question and answer several times. He does this with each succeeding question until the source becomes so thoroughly bored with the procedure, he answers questions fully and candidly to satisfy the HUMINT collector and gain relief from the monotony of this method" (AFM 8-59, p. 8-16).
14. *Rapid Fire:* "In employing this technique, the HUMINT collectors ask a series of questions in such a manner that the source does not have time to answer a question completely before the next one is asked. This confuses the source, and he will tend to contradict himself as he has little time to formulate his answers. The HUMINT collectors then confront the source with the inconsistencies causing further contradictions" (AFM 8-61, p. 8-16).
15. *Silent:* "When employing this technique, the HUMINT collector says nothing to the source, but looks him squarely in the eye, preferably with a slight smile on his face. It is important

not to look away from the source but force him to break eye contact first. The source may become nervous, begin to shift in his chair, cross and re-cross his legs, and look away. He may ask questions, but the HUMINT collector should not answer until he is ready to break the silence. The source may blurt out questions such as, 'Come on now, what do you want with me?' (AFM 8-62, pp. 8-16-17).

16. *Change of Scenery:* "The change-of-scenery approach may be used in any type of MSO [Military Source Operation] to remove the source from an intimidating atmosphere such as an 'interrogation' room type of setting and to place him in a setting where he feels more comfortable speaking" (AFM 8-63, p. 8-17).
17. *Mutt and Jeff:* "The goal of this technique is to make the source identify with one of the interrogators and thereby establish rapport and cooperation…Using this technique requires two experienced HUMINT collectors who are convincing actors. The two HUMINT collectors will display opposing personalities and attitudes toward the source" (AFM 8-65, p. 8-17); this approach requires approval by "the first O-6 [colonel] in the interrogator's chain of command" (AFM 8-68, p. 8-18).
18. *False Flag:* "The goal of this technique is to convince the detainee that individuals from a country other than the United States are interrogating him, and trick the detainee into cooperating with US forces" (AFM 8-69, p. 8-18)); this approach requires approval from the first O-6 as well as with "the legal representative and the 2X (counterintelligence and human intelligence staff element)" (AFM 8-70, p. 8-18).
19. *Separation*: "The purpose of separation is to deny the detainee the opportunity to communicate with other detainees in order to keep him from learning counter-resistance techniques or gathering new information to support a cover story, decreasing the detainee's resistance to interrogation" (AFM M-26, p. M-8).

There are several caveats that govern the employment of the *Separation* technique. Foremost among these is the prohibition against its use with persons covered by the *Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War*. In addition, it may only be used at Combatant Command (COCOM) approved locations and only in combination with authorized interrogation approaches. This technique may be employed only in situations "when there is a good basis to believe that the detainee is likely to possess important intelligence and the interrogation approach techniques provided in Chapter 8 are insufficient" (AFM M-5, p. M-2).

The AFM is unambiguous that the techniques and approaches described therein are the only authorized techniques and approaches for use against any detainee, and that the Geneva Conventions be fully and completely observed such that "no person…regardless of nationality or physical location, shall be subject to torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment" (AFM, p. viii).

Origins and Application in the Field

Where did these techniques and approaches come from? While the precise origins of the strategies and methods set forth in the AFM remain unclear,[4] the formal doctrine as set forth in Army FMs can be traced back more than a generation. The current AFM supersedes and expands upon previous versions (Field AFM 34-52 [1987], reissued in 1992]), which, in turn, superseded FM 30-15 (1969, revised and reissued in 1978 and 1982). AFM 34-52 sets forth a direct, yet arguably inconsistent instruction for the interrogator to "establish and maintain control, establish and develop rapport, make smooth transitions, appear sincere, be convincing, and recognize the breaking point" (AFM 34-52, p. 3-5). The primary strategies for achieving these ends — and especially to reach the aforementioned "breaking point" — are found in Appendix H of FM 35-42, which lists *Direct Approach*, *Incentive Approach*, *Emotional Approaches* (*Emotional Love*, *Fear Up (Mild)*, *Decreased Fear Down*, *Pride and Ego*, and *Futility*). Also offered are the *We Know All*, *Mutt and Jeff*, *Rapid Fire*, and *Silence*. The previous version (FM 30-15), published in 1969, offers a similar list of techniques. In order, these were: *Direct Approach*, *File and Dossier*, *We Know All*, *Futility*, *Rapid Fire*, and *Harassment*[5], *Repetition*, *Mutt and Jeff*, *Pride and Ego*, *Silent*, *Change of Scene*, *Establish Your Identity*, and *Emotional*. To our knowledge, the origin of these techniques and approaches remains unclear, although it has been asserted that "seventeen or so authorized techniques in the Army manuals are believed to have been developed in the period immediately following World War II" (Fein, 2006, p. xiii). What is clear is that the current practices are not empirically validated and have remained largely unchanged for over five decades.

The 2006 AFM asserts that the "direct approach was effective 90 percent of the time. In Vietnam and in Operations URGENT FURY (Grenada, 1983), JUST CAUSE (Panama, 1989), and DESERT STORM (Kuwait and Iraq, 1991), the direct approach was 95 percent effective" (AFM 8-20, p. 8-6). Despite the appearance of this apparently definitive assessment, the AFM offers no references for these statistics. To our knowledge, there is only one set of data on the use of AFM techniques and approaches in military interrogations. This is a collection of observations of more than 950 detainee interrogations at long-term detention facilities in Iraq and Afghanistan by U.S. military and civilian interrogators between 2009 and 2010 (Trent, Burchfield, Meissner & Brandon, 2018). These data showed that the *Direct Approach* was used in over 95% of the interrogations observed, *Incentive* in approximately 70% of those observed, and *Emotional Love* ('love of family') in approximately 35% of those observed (Trent et al., 2018). Apart from *Fear Down*, which was recorded in approximately 20% of the interrogations observed, the remaining

[4] Anecdotes regarding archival records suggest that the approach strategies are the product of after action reports and formal reviews that draw upon "lessons learned" during both World War II and the Korean War.

[5] As described in this version of the AFM, "harassment may take many forms; for example, the Subject may be called for interrogation at any time of the day or night, questioned for a few minutes and then released only to be recalled shortly thereafter. This treatment continues until he talks, and he finally decides to cooperate with the interrogator" (AFM 30-10, p. 2-6)

techniques were recorded in less than 10%, and eight approaches (*File and Dossier, Establish Your Identity, Repetition, Rapid Fire, Silence, Change of Scenery, Mutt & Jeff*, and *False Flag*) were virtually never observed.[6] (Data on *Separation* were unavailable.) The approaches are, of course, not mutually exclusive; as noted, the AFM directs that the interrogation start with the *Direct Approach* and include other approaches as needed.[7] These findings do suggest that with the exception of *Incentive*, employing other approaches was not the norm. To our knowledge, this is a singular study and we have no estimate of its representativeness of interrogations before, after or even during that period. Leins, Zimmerman and Zabecki (2017) describe 10 presumably consecutive interrogations conducted by the U.S. military in Afghanistan in 2011. These descriptions are based on DOD video records that were analyzed for interrogator, interpreter and detainee behaviors.[8] The ten sessions occurred approximately mid-way through a much longer series of interrogations with a detainee who had been determined to have significant intelligence. However, the interactions were not coded in terms of the use of AFM approaches or techniques.

Comparing and Contrasting Science with Conventional Practice

Efficacy

We acknowledge that an empirical analysis of the AFM 19 techniques and approaches alone, and each in conjunction with each other, would result in an exponentially large number of experimental studies.[9] We know of two instances where clusters of AFM techniques and approaches have been assessed. In one, an interrogation script that used 'negative emotional approaches' (*Fear-Up*, *Futility*, and *Pride and Ego-Down*) was compared with one that used 'positive emotional approaches' (*Fear-Down* and *Pride and Ego-Up*) and with a *Direct Approach* script that used no emotional techniques (Evans, Houston, Meissner, Ross, Labianca, Woestehoff, & Kleinman, 2014). The experimental paradigm had a high degree of realism[10], as it was one where undergraduate students had knowledge of another student apparently cheating on a test; this paradigm was designed to model the high-stake, high consequences, and psychological factors relevant to a real-world interrogation as complicity with such a violation of student code of conduct has significant negative consequences within an academic setting. The

[6] It must be emphasized that these data refer exclusively to the frequency of use parameter. No similar data are available that explore the relative effectiveness of the individual approach strategies.
[7] The fact that the AFM requires an interrogator to begin with a Direct Approach may have contributed to the unsupported premise that it was effective 90 percent of the time since, by policy, it was employed as an approach in 100 percent of all interrogations conducted.
[8] The videos were translated and transcribed by cleared personnel. All personally identifiable information was removed prior to the transcripts being made available to the research team. The DoD determined that this research project was not human subjects research under DoD Instruction 3216.02, Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards in DoD-Supported Research and 32 C.F.R. Part 219.
[9] At the same time, given that so many of the interrogations conducted by the U.S. Government have been (and are) informed by the AFM, the fact that no large-scale experimental studies have ever been conducted to confirm or dispute the efficacy of the approaches is deeply worrisome and potentially damaging to national security.
[10] An oft-referenced drawback of experimental/laboratory-setting studies is the lack of environmental realism.

positive and the negative emotional scripts elicited both more general and specific information about the cheating event than the direct questioning approach; however, neither interrogation script had an impact on whether guilty participants admitted to their cheating. The positive emotional script reduced anxiety and increased feelings of fostering[11] compared to the negative emotional script. A more recent experimental study using the same paradigm (Duke, Wood, Magee, & Escobar, 2018) tested two sequences of AFM approaches: the *Direct Approach* followed by *Change of Scenery*, *Emotional Fear-Down* and then *Emotional Love* (referred to as "Love of Family"), or the *Direct Approach* followed by *We Know All* and then *Futility.* The paradigm was similar to Evans et al. (2014) with minor modifications: each session began with some rapport building and direct questioning (including follow-up and clarifying questions), intended to determine the subject's degree of cooperation.[12] Following this *Direct Approach*, the interrogator used *Change of Scenery*, followed by *Emotional Fear Down* and *Emotional Love*. This condition was compared to another condition where each session again began with some rapport building and direct questioning, followed by *We Know All* and *Futility*. Measures included assessments of the subject's self-reported sense of rapport with the interrogator, amount of information provided about the scenario, amount of information about the cheating (provided only by guilty subjects), and individual scores on both the NEO Five-Factor Inventory 3[13] (McCrae & Costa, 2010) and the Stress-Arousal Checklist (Mackay, Cox, Burrows, & Lazzarini, 1978). Scenario-relevant information increased with each additional approach when *Direct* was followed by *We Know All* and then by *Futility;* however, in the comparison condition, such information increased only when *Direct* was followed by *Fear-Down* and *Love of Family*; *Change of Scenery* provoked no increase in information. Admissions relevant to the cheating increased threefold when the *Direct Approach* was followed by *We Know All* and *Futility*; such information was marginally increased by *Change of Scenery* and unaffected by the subsequent *Fear-Down* and *Love of Family*. Participants in the sequence that included *We Know All* provided twice as many admissions as those in the sequence that included *Change of Scenery*. (It should be noted that the *We Know All* approach included the interrogator providing three of the available nine items of information relevant to the cheating event.) Thirty-four guilty participants provided false information, which was increased in both conditions following the *Direct Approach*. Participants who scored higher on Extraversion were less likely to provide admission details; this was independent of interrogation sequence. The strong impact of the *We Know All* approach, which manipulates the participants' sense of what damaging evidence or information the interrogator has, is consistent with previous data showing that perception of the evidence corresponds strongly with admissions of guilty knowledge (Moston& Engelberg, 1992;

[11] The term 'fostering' was adapted from the negotiation literature (e.g., Cutcher-Gershenfeld, McKersie, & Walton, 1995) to convey an interrogative atmosphere that facilitates kindness, cooperation, and respect.

[12] The psychological realism of this paradigm was evidenced by the fact that the participation of two study subjects was terminated due to behavioral displays of distress resulting from the accusation of cheating and subsequent interrogation.

[13] The NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI 3) provides a concise and systematic assessment of emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles.

Gudjonsson & Petursson, 1991). It also is consistent with other laboratory data showing that a 'we know all' tactic used in conjunction with other components of the *Scharff Technique* (Granhag, Montecinos, & Oleszkiewicz, 2013; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Kleinman, 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Montecinos, 2014) not only elicits more information than the direct approach, but leads to the participant believing that he said less than he did.

Consistency with Current Psychological Science

Previously, we offered a review of the AFM in terms of the extent to which each of the techniques and approaches, as well as other guidance offered in Chapter 8, was consistent with current psychological theories, data and principles (Brandon, Bhatt, Justice & Kleinman, 2010). There we claimed that three approaches were consistent with current psychological findings and principles, one was moderately consistent, three were moderately inconsistent and ten were contradicted. Of course, it can be argued that any of the techniques and approaches could be useful in some context, depending on the specific venue, participants, and objectives involved in a given circumstance. To be of most value, however, the AFM should focus primarily on those techniques and approaches that will be consistently useful in — and adaptable to — the widest array of operational contexts. We argue the methods that are most consistent with psychological principles are also most likely to be broadly and reliably useful.

Here we claim again that some of the AFM approaches are inconsistent with current science. For example, whereas the AFM states that "almost all HUMINT collection begins with the direct approach," and that the interrogator should "continue to use direct questions as long as the source is answering the questions in a truthful manner" (AFM 8-19, p. 8-6), research has shown that eliciting the subject's version of an event using open-ended questions such as "tell me everything about the event" or "describe the planning that preceded the event" and use of interview protocols such as the Cognitive Interview both facilitate disclosure, enhance recall, and improve credibility assessment (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992; Geiselman, 2012; Griffiths & Milne, 2006; Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, 2010; Powell, Fisher, & Wright, 2005; St-Yves & Meissner, 2014). Engendering a feeling of helpless and futility (*Emotional-Futility*) or attacking the source's ego or self-image (*Emotional-Pride and Ego-Down*) are inconsistent with data showing that encouraging a sense of autonomy increased elicitation of useful information in interrogations of U.K. terrorist suspects (Alison, Alison, Noone, Elntib & Christiansen, 2013); in this respect, *Emotional-Pride and Ego-Up* is singularly consistent with research. Several of the AFM approaches are incentive-based (although only #2, *Incentive*, is labeled as such): in *Emotional-Love*, the collector makes clear "what the source himself can do to *alter or improve his situation or the situation of the object of his emotion*" (AFM 8-29, p. 8-9, italics added); *Emotional Fear-Up*, where the collector "links the *elimination or reduction of the fear* to cooperation on the part of the source (AFM 8-35, p. 8-10, italics added), and *Emotional-Fear Down* ("In the fear-down approach the HUMINT collector mitigates existing fear *in exchange for cooperation on the part of the source*" (AFM8-40, p. 8-11), italics added). In the sense that these approaches each

provide some manner of incentive for cooperation, they are likely to be effective. A caveat to their effectiveness is that use of *Emotional Fear-Up* is not predicated by the interrogator instantiating or encouraging fear (in order to then reduce it).

Several techniques and approaches are specifically inconsistent with the notion that useful information is most likely to be provided by a source that not only has some sense of autonomy but is thinking (and remembering) clearly: *Emotional Hate* depends on "emotion overrid(ing) the source's rational side" (AFM 8-31, p. 8-10); *Repetition*, which appears to rely on frustration and boredom, and *Rapid Fire*, which depends on "confus(ing) the source" (AFM 8-61, p. 8-16). Several of the approaches create an aversive or punishing context in order to prompt the source to do something to stop it: *Emotional-Pride and Ego-Down, Emotional-Futility, Establish Your Identity, Repetition, Rapid Fire, Silent,* and *Separation*. *We Know All* and *File and Dossier* bear some similarity to the *Scharff Technique*, (e.g., Granhag, Montecinos, & Oleszkiewicz, 2013; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Montecinos, 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Kleinman, 2014), although it should be noted that the Scharff Technique incorporates five interactive strategic principles of which "we know all" (referred to as "the illusion of knowing" in the Scharff model) is but one (see below), and this operates within a strategy built upon a foundation of affability and rapport-building. *Change of Scenery*, if the change is towards a less austere environment, is consistent with recent experimental data showing a greater willingness to engage on the part of subjects in a mock interrogation study when the subjects were 'interrogated' in a larger room filled with 'open' objects (e.g., an open drawer, open file, a picture of an open window) (Dawson, Hartwig, & Brimbal, 2015; Dawson, Hartwig, Brimbal, & Denisenkov, 2017). *Mutt and Jeff* might be expected to be effective to the extent that it relies on contrast, a robust psychological phenomenon (e.g., Cialdini, 2001): in this instance, the difference between an apparently threatening or hostile interrogator (Mutt) and a seemingly reasonable and amicable interrogator makes the latter appear even more attractive.

The AFM *Separation* technique has special conditions attached. It is authorized exclusively for use in interrogation operations (AFM M-24, p. M-8) and may only be employed "by exception" (i.e., to meet "unique and critical operational requirements") and when senior level authorization has been obtained. It is identified as a "restricted interrogation technique" (AFM M-6, p. M-2) to be used specifically for denying "the detainee the opportunity to communicate with other detainees to keep him from learning counter-resistance techniques or gathering new information to support a cover story, decreasing the detainee's resistance to interrogation" (AFM, M-1, p. M-1). Moreover, it is intended for situations where it may be necessary "(t)o safeguard US and coalition forces" and "(t)o protect US interests." As noted, unlike other approach strategies contained in the AFM, *Separation* is prohibited for individuals covered by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, and can be used only at COCOM-approved locations.

The AFM justifiably provides multiple cautions on the use of Separation (for example, it "requires special approval, judicious execution, special control measures, and rigorous oversight . . .[and] shall be conducted humanely in accordance with applicable law and policy…Planning must consider the possible cumulative effect of using multiple techniques and take into account the age, sex, and health of detainees, as appropriate" (AFM M-5-6, M-24, p. M-2, M-8]). Despite the many caveats, *Separation* is listed as an interrogation approach along with those enumerated above and may be used in conjunction with other approach strategies. The AFM specifically cites *Futility*, *Incentive*, and *Fear-Up as* approaches that can be paired with *Separation*.

According to the AFM, *Separation* is not designed to be sensory deprivation ("Separation does not constitute sensory deprivation, which is prohibited," AFM M-26, p. M-8).[14] It is reasonable to assume that a detainee who is being interrogated under conditions of *Separation* will interact not only with the interrogator but also with supporting personnel. However, extended isolation in a cell with contact limited to a few individuals (e.g., guards and medical personnel) and perhaps extended and intensive interaction only with the interrogator, risks educing compliance (rather than cooperation) on the part of the subject, especially if the frequency of contact is used as an Incentive strategy. Social isolation has been shown to influence physiological functioning, diminish sleep quality, and increase morbidity and mortality, with a high degree of inter-individual variability in terms of the conditions and duration of social isolation that are impactful (e.g., Hawkley & Cacioppo, 2010; Cacioppo, Hawkley, Norman, & Berntson, 2011; Segrin, 1999). Hinkle (1961), who led some of the earliest U.S. Government-sponsored research into the effects of isolation in the interrogation and captivity context, emphasized the point that even though some people are able to endure isolation for extended periods, this does not alter the fact that isolation (along with sleep deprivation and fatigue) can significantly undermine brain function.

Is it just a matter of labels?

It frequently has been asserted that several or even all the techniques and approaches in the AFM are the same as those identified in the psychological literature and that the only difference is terminology. For example, the claim has been made that *We Know All* and *File and Dossier* and are the same as the Scharff Technique. In fact, these are examples where a significant amount of similarity exists. A comparative analysis between the AFM approaches and

[14] We find this assertion to be of concern as Appendix M of the AFM, which specifically sets forth guidance for the employment of separation, suggests that 'goggles or blindfolds and earmuffs may be utilized as a field expedient method to generate the perception of separation (AFM M-27, p. M-8), which can create conditions consistent with sensory deprivation. In addition, the AFM stipulates separation 'must not preclude the detainee getting four hours of continuous sleep every 24 hours (AFM M-30, p. M-10). This limited amount of sleep over time has been shown to generate potentially significant physical and/or psychological disturbances. Moreover, the AFM does not require that this four-hour window of sleep be provided on a regular schedule and therefore could be manipulated in a fashion that can have deleterious psychological and physiological effects.

the Scharff Technique, however, illustrates important differences beyond that briefly mentioned above.

In the *We Know All* approach, the HUMINT collector subtly convinces the source that his questioning of the source is perfunctory because any information that the source has is already known. The interrogator must first become thoroughly familiar with available data concerning the source and the current situation, and initially asks questions based on these known data:

> 8-54. When the source hesitates, refuses to answer, or provides an incorrect or incomplete reply, the HUMINT collector provides the detailed answer himself. The HUMINT collector may even complete a source's answer, as if he is bored and 'just going through the motions.' When the source begins to give accurate and complete information, the HUMINT collector interjects pertinent questions. Questions to which answers are already known are also asked periodically to test the source's truthfulness and to maintain the deception that the information is already known. There are some inherent problems with the use of the 'we know all' approach. The HUMINT collector is required to prepare everything in detail, which is time consuming. He must commit much of the information to memory, as working from notes may show the limits of the information actually known. It is also only usable when sufficient prior information exists to convince the source that 'we know all.' (AFM 8-53, p. 8-13).

The *File and Dossier* approach is a variation of the *We Know All* approach. The interrogator prepares a dossier containing all available information concerning the source or his organization. The information is carefully arranged within a file (or other relevant prop) to give the illusion that it contains more data than is actually there:

> 8-56. The HUMINT collector proceeds as in the 'we know all approach'... As the source becomes convinced that all the information that he knows is contained within the dossier, the HUMINT collector proceeds to topics on which he has little or no information. In doing so, he still refers to the appropriate section of the dossier and may even nod his head knowingly or tell the source that the information the source is providing still matches what is in the dossier.
>
> 8-57. This technique has several limitations and drawbacks. The preparation time in developing the dossier is extensive. The success of this technique is largely dependent on the naiveté of the source, volume of data on the subject, and skill of the HUMINT collector convincing the source that the dossier is more complete than it actually is" (AFM, pp. 8-14-15).

In the course of codifying what came to be known as the Scharff Technique, a team of researchers at Gothenborg University (Granhag, Oleszkiewicz, Strömwall, & Kleinman, 2015; May & Granhag, 2016; May, Granhag, & Oleszkiewicz, 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Montecinos, 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Kleinman, 2014) began by systematically examining anecdotes told about Hanns Joachim Scharff (1907–1992), a member of the German Luftwaffe during World War II, and archival material drawn from official Luftwaffe files. Although not formally trained as an interrogator, Scharff interrogated more than 500 American and British fighter pilots and won acclaim for his mastery primarily because his subjects reported having 'friendly conversations' rather than interrogations, wherein apparently little information—from the perspective of the Allied prisoner-of-war— was exchanged (Toliver, 1978). Scharff was widely recognized as one of the most successful interrogators at the Luftwaffe Intelligence and Evaluation Center (Kleinman, 2006; Scharff, 1950).

The research team determined that *perspective taking,* the cognitive capacity to consider the world from another person's viewpoint, was fundamental to the methods that Scharff employed. To effectively collect intelligence information from American POWs, Scharff would have had to first gain an understanding of the strategies the POWs would likely employ to resist disclosing valuable information (Granhag, 2010). Scharff identified three basic counter-interrogation strategies the prisoners adopted to resist providing information to their captors: (1) do not talk very much, (2) determine what information the interrogator wants and then not give it to him, and (3) do not feel compelled to hold back information that the interrogator appears to already know (Granhag, 2010).

Analyzing various sources about Scharff's methods, the research team identified and tested four techniques that appeared fundamental to his success: (1) be friendly and conversational rather than threatening or coercive; (2) ask few questions and instead offer detailed narratives; (3) use the narratives to reflect back information that the interrogator already has or can reasonably speculate about, leading the subject to assume that the interrogator knows a lot already, and (4) collect new information not by asking direct questions but by using both implicit and explicit confirmation and/or disconfirmation.

A series of studies were conducted using an experimental scenario where study participants received general and specific information items about a (mock) terrorist group's plans to bomb a shopping mall. Of these, some percentage was known by the interviewer. For the purposes of the experiment, the subject was motivated to strike a balance when interviewed between providing too little and too much information. The Scharff Technique was contrasted with the efficacy of an 'open-ended' interview strategy and a 'direct questions' interview strategy. Each interview was analyzed to determine how much information was revealed by the subject during the interview, as well as how much information the subject thought he had provided. Comparison of the Scharff Technique with the 'direct questions' approach demonstrated that more information was revealed using the Scharff Technique with both resistant and non-resistant interviewees, and with interviewees that either possessed a lot of

information or a little (Granhag, Oleszkiewicz, Strömwall, & Kleinman, 2015; May, Granhag, & Oleszkiewicz, 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Montecinos, 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Kleinman, 2014). In addition, the Scharff Technique consistently resulted in subjects thinking they had revealed less information than they did, and believing the interviewer knew more information than they did (which gave the interviewer some strategic advantage). In contrast, the use of the 'direct questions' approach resulted in subjects believing they had revealed more information than they did and believing the interviewer to have less information than he did.

While superficially the Scharff Technique might seem relatively similar to both the *We Know All* and the *File and Dossier* approaches in the AFM, the critical differences are several and fundamental. First, the preconditions for the Scharff Technique are clearly identified (that is, when perspective taking would lead to the same conclusions as Scharff's regarding the source's counter-interrogation strategies). Second, the Scharff Technique has been tested in rigorous laboratory conditions, where a comparison could be made with the direct questions approach. Third, this strategy does not require the interrogator "to prepare everything in detail, which is time consuming…(nor)… commit much of the information to memory" (AFM, 8-53, p. 8-13), nor does it require preparation of a file. Instead, a simple sequence of tactics is provided to implement the Technique. Fourth, it does not require that the source become "convinced that all the information that he knows is contained within the dossier" (AFM 8-56, p. 8-15), a feat that may be difficult to accomplish. Last, and perhaps most importantly, it depends on the interrogator being friendly and conversational rather than threatening or coercive.

Greater disparity between the AFM and psychological science is found in descriptions of rapport — which has been found in numerous experimental and field studies to increase the amount of information provided by sources or informants, increase trust, and produce cooperation (Collins, Lincoln, & Frank, 2002; Fisher & Geiselman, 1992; Fisher, Milne, & Bull, 2011; Goodman, Delhunty, Martschuk, & Dhami, 2014; Geiselman, Fisher et al., 1984; Roberts, & Higham, 2002; Vallano & Schreiber Compo, 2011). Rapport has been universally recognized as the "heart of the interview" (St.-Yves, 2009, p. 104) in intelligence and law enforcement communities both nationally (e.g., Geiselman et al., 1984) and internationally (e.g., Clarke & Milne, 2001; Goodman-Delahunty, Martschuk, & Dhami, 2014; Gudjonsson, 2003; Kebbell, Milne, & Wagstaff, 1999). Rapport is recognized as important in the AFM but descriptions are too brief to be either meaningfully descriptive or adaptable to operational requirements. The treatment of rapport in the AFM is fairly characterized by the following passages: 1) It is "a condition established by the HUMINT collector that is characterized by source confidence in the HUMINT collector and a willingness to cooperate with him" (AFM 8-7, p. 8-3); 2) "Rapport does not necessarily mean a friendly relationship, although that may be the case. It means an establishment of a relationship in which the HUMINT collector presents a realistic persona designed to evoke cooperation from the source" (AFM 8-9, p. 8-4); and 3) "The HUMINT collector must control his temper at all times. He must not show distaste, disgust, or unease at anything the source says" (AFM 8-15, p. 8-5). Rapport may be developed by asking nonpertinent

questions[15] if a source is showing signs of fear (AFM 8-41, p. 8-10) and may be "based on shared interests" (AFM 8-88, p.8-22). Assertions are made about what might threaten rapport between the interrogator and the source, such as the participation of an analyst or a technical expert ("The HUMINT collector can lose rapport and control") (AFM 9-31, p. 9-11). Such descriptions provide an impoverished understanding of rapport and very little instruction on how to build and maintain it.

In a highly innovative adaptation of therapeutic strategies to interrogations, Alison, Alison, Noone, Elntib, & Christiansen (2013) used the principles and strategies of *Motivational Interviewing* to describe rapport-based interrogation techniques as they occurred in video-recorded interviews of UK terrorism suspects.[16] A key underlying assumption of Motivational Interviewing is the *autonomy* of the client (Miller & Rollnick, 2002). Autonomy has been found to be associated with intrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999), persistence (Moller, Deci, & Ryan, 2006), and goal attainment (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998). In contrast, deprivation of autonomy needs has a variety of detrimental consequences, such as apathy and alienation (Deci & Ryan, 2002). The Motivational Interviewing-based therapist provides support to the client's agency (ability to change) through expressions of empathy, developing discrepancies between what the client is doing at present and his core values, rolling with resistance, and supporting self-efficacy (Miller & Rollnick,1991).

Pointing out that both Motivational Interviewing-based therapy and police interviewing seek to "establish an empathetic, respectful, and nonjudgmental atmosphere ... and to maintain a flexible but goal directed strategy throughout the interaction" (Alison et al., 2013, p. 412), the U.K. research team analyzed 418 audio and video recordings (288 hours of footage) of police interviews with 29 suspects who subsequently were convicted of terrorism-related offenses. A coding manual was developed to assess the quality of interpersonal interactions between interviewers and suspects as well as the amount of useful intelligence and evidence generated (yield was measured in terms of capability to commit the offense; opportunity; motive; and details about people locations, actions and times related to the offense). Rapport-building skills were scored in terms of reflective listening, rapport and resistance, providing summaries, developing discrepancies, and five scales related to Motivational Interviewing: acceptance, empathy, and interpersonal competence composed of adaptation and evocation, and autonomy. These constructs were defined in terms of specific behaviors, thus providing a way to assess the degree of rapport present in the interviews.

Structural equation modeling of the relationship of instances of the above-referenced behaviors and information yield showed a strong effect of Motivational Interviewing techniques

[15] Nonpertinent questions are those that seek seemingly unimportant or irrelevant information from the subject (i.e., they will not be construed by the subject as being focused on intelligence or sensitive personal details). Key to nonpertinent questions is that they should not engender concern or resistance by the subject.
[16] These terrorism suspects were described by government security officials as linked to al Qaeda, inspired by al Qaeda, or members of right-wing violent extremist organizations.

to increase yield, both as a direct effect and as an indirect effect via cooperation by increasing adaptive interviewer tactics and decreasing maladaptive interviewer tactics (Alison et al., 2013). The same pattern of outcomes – that rapport leads to cooperation, which leads to information -- has been found via structural modeling of interrogation processes in other contexts, such as rapport-based, information-gathering-focused interviews conducted by the U.S. Air Force Office of Strategic Information (Russano, Meissner, Atkinson, & Dianiska, 2017).

What is Missing from the AFM?

There are multiple highly effective interview methods that cannot be found in the AFM. Details on how to develop and maintain rapport is one example. It also is concerning that a search of the AFM for the word "memory" finds nine instances, and only one of these is with reference to the source's memory (surely to be a concern in an interrogation): in a description of map tracking, the AFM asserts that "The source is led through his memory in a logical manner" (AFM 9-37, p. 9-13). A search for the term "remember" finds 13 instances, only two of which refer to the source: In the description of the Approach Phase, the HUMINT collector is told that the source will tend to "Fail to apply or remember lessons they may have been taught regarding security if confronted with a disorganized or strange situation (AFM 8-6, p. 8-2) and with respect to Repeat Questions, "The repeat question also needs to be separated in time from the original question so that the source cannot easily remember what he said" (AFM 9-9,p. 9-3). The latter is concerning also because recent research has shown that, contrary to common investigative practice (e.g., Strömwall, Granhag, & Hartwig, 2004), the beliefs of police, attorneys and judges (e.g., Brewer & Hupfeld, 2004; Vrij, Akehurst, & Knight, 2006) and even some U.S. federal instructions on witness credibility (Fisher, Vrij, & Leins, 2013), consistency across multiple statements regarding the same issue is not a reliable indicator of truthfulness, and inconsistency across multiple statements is not a reliable indicator of deception (Granhag, Giolla, Sooniste, Strömwall, & Liu-Jonsson, 2016; Granhag, & Strömwall, 2002; for a review, see Vredeveldt, van Koppen, & Granhag, 2014).

However, the larger issue here is that interrogation methods developed on the basis of understanding processes of memory, cognition, social dynamics and communication are not part of the AFM. Examples include the Cognitive Interview (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992) and various modifications of the Cognitive Interview for particular subjects (e.g., Geiselman, 2012; Morgan, Rabinowitz, Hilts, Weller, & Coric, 2013). The Cognitive Interview is a method of interviewing victims, witnesses and suspects that increases the amount of information elicited with little or no loss of accuracy. It is based on scientific principles of social dynamics, memory and interpersonal communication (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). Although originally developed for interviews of victims and witnesses, the method since then has been shown to be effective for suspects as well (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010; Fisher, Geiselman & Amador, 1989; Fisher &

Perez, 2007). Reviews can be found in Fisher & Schreiber (2007), Fisher, Ross, & Cahill (2010), Holliday, Brainerd, Reyna, & Humphries (2009), and for meta-analyses, see Köhnken, Milne, Memon, & Bull (1999) and Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, (2010). The studies described in these reviews reflect both controlled laboratory experiments and field studies with victims and witnesses of real-world crime (e.g., Colomb, Ginet, Wright, Demarchi, & Sadler, 2013; Fisher, Geiselman, & Amador, 1989; George & Clifford, 1996). The Cognitive Interview protocol can be shortened by omitting some of the more time-consuming tactics, such as multiple and varied retrieval mnemonics, apparently with little loss of information yield (Dando, Wilcock, & Milne, 2009; Davis, McMahon, & Greenwood, 2004; Fisher, 2010; Morgan, Rabinowtz, Hilts, Weller & Coric, 2013). The modified cognitive interview (MCI) has been shown to be effective not only for eliciting information but also for discerning cues to deception even when conducted via an interpreter (Morgan, Rabinowitz, Christian, & Hazlett, 2009).

Science-Based Methods That Should Be Included in the AFM

There are other science-based techniques that should be seriously considered for inclusion in the AFM: active listening skills (Royce, 2005; Wells, Taylor & Giebels, 2013; Wells, 2014); *Strategic Use of Evidence* (Granhag & Hartwig, 2008, 2015), which can be extended to using intelligence in intelligence interrogations in such a manner that more information is elicited about either past activities (Hartwig, Granhag, & Strömwall, & Vrij, 2005) or future plans (Clemens, Granhag, & Strömwall), while also providing cues to deception; *Controlled Cognitive Engagement* (Omerod & Dando, 2015), a method of questioning particularly applicable to screening and brief interactions; and a collection of questioning strategies that have been shown to provide cues to both deceit and truthfulness, including asking unanticipated questions (Hartwig, Granhag, & Strömwall, 2007; Leins, Fisher, & Vrij, 2012; Vrij, Leal, Granhag, Mann, Fisher, Hillman, & Sperry, 2009); imposing cognitive load (Vrij, 2008; Vrij, Granhag, Mann, & Leal, 2011; Vrij, Mann, Fisher, Leal, Milne, & Bull, 2008); collective interviewing (interviewing subjects in pairs has been shown to provide unique cues to the validity of their stories [Vrij, Jundi, Hope, Hillman, Gahr, Leal, Marmelink, Mann, Vernham & Granhag, 2012; Jundi, Vrij, Mann, Hope, Hillman, Warmelink, & Gahr, 2013]); the Devil's Advocate (Leal, Vrij, Mann, & Fisher, 2010), asking for checkable facts (Nahari, Vrij, & Fisher, 2014a, 2014b), and using a *Model Statement* (Leal, Vrij, Warmelink, Vernham, & Fisher, 2015). There is a robust and emerging scientific literature on detecting deception about future intentions (Vrij, Granhag, Mann, & Leal, 2011; Clemens, Granhag, & Strömwall, 2011) and posing questions about intentions (and planning or process, as opposed to outcome) as a strategy to detect deception (Vrij, Leal, Mann, & Granhag, 2011; Sooniste, Granhag, Knieps, & Vrij, 2013) (for reviews, see Vrij, 2014, 2015; Vrij & Fisher 2016; Vrij, Hope, & Fisher, 2014; Vrij & Granhag, 2012; Vrij, Granhag, Mann, & Leal, 2011; Vrij, Granhag, & Porter, 2010; Vrij, Leal, Mann, Vernham, & Brankaert, 2015).

Finally, there are several instances where the AFM charts a potentially useful course, only to have it fall short by assuming abilities that are unlikely to be present within the target audience. For example, the manual asserts:

> "A HUMINT collector can best adapt himself to the source's personality and control of the source's reactions when he understands basic behavioral factors, traits, attitudes, drives, motivations, and inhibitions. He must not only understand basic behavioral principles but also know how these principles are manifested in the area and culture in which he is operating" (AFM, 1-30, p. 1-13).

Considering the demographic represented by most young military personnel entering the service and basic interrogation training, it is difficult to imagine that the average AFM-trained interrogator will grasp a meaningful understanding of the behavioral factors enumerated in this passage.[17] Cross-cultural and social awareness is undoubtedly an essential factor in the effectiveness of interrogation approaches. Yet, the AFM presents these cross-cultural competencies as though they can be easily attained. It is practically impossible to teach the 'local narrative' or underlying socio-behavioral principle of every region. Instead, it may be more useful for interrogators to adopt epistemic humility. Moreover, the basic behavioral principles referenced here are not tied to the interrogation techniques or approaches. This is of vital importance given that providing even a rudimentary understanding of why a particular technique or approach should be effective would increase the interrogator's ability to apply the technique or approach to a particular circumstance; flexibility and adaptability have been shown (Alison et al., 2013) and claimed (Bull & Cherryman, 1996, Russano, Kleinman, & Meissner, 2016; Russano et al., 2014) to be of fundamental importance to being a good interrogator.

Toward an Evidence-Based Interrogation Model

In the U.S., the gold standard for evaluation of evidence (e.g., for the Food and Drug Administration's evaluation of human and veterinary drugs, biologic products, and medical devices) are randomized, double-blind placebo control studies. Randomly assigning the intervention eliminates the influence of unknown or immeasurable confounding variables (such as individual differences or co-interventions) that may otherwise lead to biased estimates of treatment effects. The participants, investigators and study staff are all blind to whether an individual participant is in the experimental group or the placebo control group. The advantage over an observational study is that the investigators can claim a causal relationship between treatment and outcome. (Implicit in this design is that different treatments are appropriate for

[17] According to the official U.S. Army website for careers (https://www.goarmy.com/careers-and-jobs.html), there are no specific education requirements to enter the Human Intelligence Collector (Military Occupational Specialty Code 35M) career field beyond a high school diploma or General Education Diploma and the ability to achieve a satisfactory score on the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery.

different ailments, that there are clear outcome measures, and that there is some standardization to the methods of diagnosis.) Drugs are approved if they can be shown in a number of such trials to be superior to a placebo designed to be indistinguishable from the active medication, the rationale being that the specific ingredients of the medication are responsible for their efficacy rather than patient hopes and expectations, as well as of the doctor-patient relationship (Wampold & Bhati, 2004). The origins of this design are in 1950s scientific literature, but it was not until 1980 that such designs were required by the FDA for drug approval (Shapiro & Shapiro, 1997). Important to such evaluation was the advent of meta-analysis methods (Smith & Glass, 1977) that allowed for the computation of effect sizes.

In 1956, it was suggested that the same process be in place to evaluate psychotherapies (Rosenthal & Frank, 1956). However, psychology faced a problem with placebo control groups: the psychologist must be aware of the treatment being delivered to follow the protocol; therefore, the placebo cannot be indistinguishable from the active treatment (Wampold & Bhati, 2004). In 1995, Division 12 (Clinical Psychology) of the American Psychological Association (APA) modified criteria for Empirically Supported Treatments (ESTs) from the requirement that they use the randomized, double-blinded placebo control design to be demonstrations of *efficacy* in experiments that used good experimental designs and compared the intervention with another treatment (Task Force, 1995). Description of the treatment had to be presented in a manual format with a series of prescribed goals and techniques to be used during each session or phase of treatment (Task Force, 1995). In 1995, Division 12 identified 25 psychological interventions as ESTs; by 1998, the list had grown to 71 (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001). ESTs continue to be the gold standard for psychotherapy research in the U.S. and have been adopted by the National Institute of Mental Health.

In an effort to confirm attending to multiple sources of research evidence and to affirm that good psychological practice based on evidence is also based on clinical expertise and patient values, the 2005 APA Presidential Initiative on Evidence-Based Practice in Psychology proposed that clinician experience and voice of the client be given a greater role in determining effective treatments. Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) was defined as "the integration of the best available research with clinical expertise in the context of patient characteristics, culture, and preferences" (APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice, 2006, p. 273). Evidence-based meant applying the best available research evidence in the selection and application of treatments and integrating that with clinical expertise (Sackett, Rosenberg, Gray, Haynes & Richardson, 1996). A psychologist using an evidence-based approach engages in a "process of systematically finding, appraising and using contemporaneous research findings as the basis for clinical decisions" (Rosenberg & Donald, 1995, p. 1122). Evidence-based practice integrates the best external evidence with the individual practitioner's expertise. Patient values are included in the decision-making, including "consideration of the role of ethnicity, race, culture, language,

gender, sexual orientation, religion, age, and disability status and the issue of treatment acceptability and consumer choice" (Levant & Sperry, 2016, p. 16).

Translating Research into Practice

But how do demonstrations of efficacy via ESTs translate to the field? ESTs are studies in which considerable control has been exercised by the researcher over sample selection (usually relying on recruits), delivery of the intervention, and over the conditions under which the intervention occurred. *Effectiveness studies* refer to studies in which a previously demonstrated efficacious intervention is examined in a more heterogeneous sample in a real-world setting and/or is provided by real-world practitioners rather than researchers (Hoagwood, Hibbs, Brent, & Jensen, 1995; Hunsley & Lee, 2007). Differences between ESTs and effectiveness studies are substantive, including sample and the selection, set and setting of treatment. There were objections that the 1995 Task Force criteria were in fact too lenient because they focused solely on the efficacy rather than effectiveness (Elliott, 1998; Hoagwood, et al., 1995), but subsequent reviews of ESTs showed that many interventions were in fact effective in clinical settings with diverse clients (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001).

In an effort to share the growing list of ESTs with practitioners and the general public, Division 12 of APA maintains a website (http://www.div12.org/) that describes various treatments, the level of research support, key references, clinical resources and training opportunities. This is similar in some respects to "what works" clearinghouses, described in a "Memorandum to the Heads of Departments and Agencies" (Office of Management and Budget, 2013) as "repositories that synthesize evaluation findings in ways that make research useful to decision-makers, researchers, and practitioners" (Office of Management and Budget, 2013). Examples are "what works" clearinghouses in the Department of Justice, the Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices, and the Department of Labor's Clearinghouse of Labor Evaluation and Research.

It is instructive to imagine how an Empirically Supported Treatment model – or perhaps more appropriately, an Evidence-Based Practice model – might work for the practice of interrogation, although we admit this is an exercise demanding some imagination. The AFM provides no references to scientific research. The most widely-used law enforcement interrogation training program in the U.S., that of John E. Reid & Associates Inc. (Starr, 2013), references only one study, from the University of Tennessee, where a pre-test, post-test examination of participants of the Reid training course found that "there was a significant improvement for all groups trained" but no other data are provided (http://www.reid.com/faq/) (see also Gallini, 2010). The Reid website points to the publication of the first edition of *Criminal Interrogation and Confessions* as the basis of the Reid Technique (Inbau & Reid, 1962). However, science has played a greater role in other parts of criminal justice investigative

processes, including eyewitness testimony (e.g., Loftus & Palmer, 1974) and identification (e.g., Wells, Lindsay, & Ferguson, 1979), the accuracy of police officers when they serve as eye witnesses (e.g., Reisberg, Simons & Fournier, 2016) and the role of interrogation methods in false confessions (Kassin, 1997; Kassin, Appleby, & Torkildson-Perillo, 2010). There is some, but less frequent, discussion of the importance of science to interrogation methods (e.g., Brandon, 2014; Brandon, Wells & Seale, 2017; Hartwig, Meissner, & Semel, 2014; Meissner, Kelly & Woestehoff, 2015; Narchet, Russano, Kleinman, & Meissner, 2016; Wells & Brandon, 2018).

A minimal prerequisite to an Evidence-Based Practice of interrogation is some consensus that interrogation methods can be improved by scientific research. As noted, medicine (Sackett, Strauss, Richardson, Rosenberg, & Haynes, 2000) and psychotherapy (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001) have struggled to evolve from anecdotal claims to use of evidence-based approaches. Weisz, Donenberg, Han & Weiss (1995) quote an "experienced psychotherapist," as saying,

> "Over more than 22 years of clinical practice, I've become increasingly disaffected about the value of psychotherapy outcome research for the practice of psychotherapy . . . I suspect the outcome research tells us something; I'm just not sure what" (Raw, 1993, pp. 75-76).

Weisz et al. (1995) go on to provide a list of obstacles to "lab-clinic collaboration" that we have heard echoed in some communities of interrogation practitioners; these include the "belief that psychotherapy is art, not science," the "belief that frank scrutiny is harmful to the discipline [of clinical psychotherapy]," the "belief that current clinical practice works well, but in ways that outcome research cannot measure," the belief that outcome research is too narrowly focused and manualized, which is not relevant to the complexity seen in clinics, "devotion to conceptually appealing, personal theoretical orientations," an "undersupply of clinicians from training programs who are well-versed in the use of empirically supported methods," and "lack of proven treatment for some problems" (pp. 697-699). One might easily substitute the practice of interrogation for clinical psychotherapy and reflect the views of many interrogators. The remedy Weisz et al. (1995) offer is a lab-clinic collaboration that is bidirectional: application of science-based methods should enhance practice, and the experience of using science-based methods in clinical practice will highlight important moderating variables and pose new and theoretically interesting research questions (see also Clarke, 1995).

To date, there is one systematic review of interrogation methods that meets the 1995 APA Task Force requirements for establishing 'Empirically Supported Treatments,' a Campbell Systematic review (Cochrane, 1972) published in 2012 (Meissner, Redlich, Bhatt, & Brandon, 2012; see Meissner, Redlich, Michael, Evans, Camilletti, Bhatt, & Brandon, 2014). The authors conducted two, separate meta-analyses, the first focused on observational or quasi-experimental field studies that assessed the association between accusatorial vs information-gathering interrogation methods and elicitation of a true or false confession statement, and a second that

focused on experimental, laboratory-based studies with the same outcome measures, in which ground truth was known. Five studies were located that were eligible for the field study meta-analysis, and 12 studies for the experimental study meta-analysis. Results showed that both accusatorial and information-gathering methods were similarly associated with confession statements in the field studies, whereas the information-gathering method increased the likelihood of true confessions while also decreasing the likelihood of false confessions in the experimental studies. To be germane to revisions of the AFM, similarly analyses are needed where the dependent measures include quantity and quality of information gain, rather than confession statements.

The Challenges of Studying Effectiveness

Effectiveness studies of science-based interrogation methods are almost non-existent, but have been emerging more recently, situated in law enforcement contexts (e.g., Ormerod & Dando, 2015; Kelly, Dawson, & Hartwig, 2015; Russano, Meissner, Atkinson, & Dianiska, 2017; Vredeveldt, Tredoux, Nortje, Kempen, Puljević & Labuschagne, 2014). There are no effectiveness studies on interrogations in military intelligence settings, primarily because researcher access to such contexts is limited and the U.S. Department of Defense prohibits research on detainees, including observational studies (see DoD Instruction 3216.02, Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards, issued in 2011). Effectiveness studies also are limited by the fact that descriptions of science-based interrogation methods are not 'manualized.' Finally, empirical studies of interrogations that occur across a series of days, weeks or months with individuals who have been otherwise isolated are nonexistent (and would be prohibited under regulations that protect human subjects of research).

One challenge to understanding the applicability of laboratory studies of interrogation to interrogations occurring in the field is the stark difference in outcomes measures used in the two domains. It is notable that in the instances where science has had some impact on real world law enforcement interrogation practices and procedures, outcome measures are roughly comparable in the experimental research and the field (e.g., number of accurate identifications; number of true or false admissions or confessions). The correspondence between laboratory and field outcome measures is less for military or intelligence interrogations. Current experimental studies of interrogation methods include measures of number of overall details as well as critical details (e.g., Evans et al., 2014; Mann, Vrij, Shaw, Leal, Ewens, Hillman, Granhag & Fisher, 2012), measures of "forthcomingness" (e.g., Dawson, Hartwig, & Brimbal, 2015) and perceptions of how much information was provided (e.g., Granhag, Montecinos, & Oleszkiewicz, 2013). In the field, the outcome measure is an intelligence report, and the extent to which a report contains new, critical or verified information is difficult to quantify.

A second challenge is that the scientific literature relevant to interrogations currently lacks theorizing — so that disparate tactics that have demonstrated efficacy individually and

could arguably contribute to an effective interrogation are presented in isolation (e.g., Alison et al., 2013; Fisher & Geiselman, 2010; Granhag & Hartwig, 2015; Granhag, Montecinos, & Oleszkiewicz, 2013).

Conclusion

To work towards Evidence-Based Practice in interrogations, researchers and practitioners need access to a substantive database of experimentally validated interrogation methods that have been shown to be both efficacious and effective (the latter requiring effectiveness studies). These would need to be cross-culturally validated – an especially daunting requirement, given the difficulties of conducting interrogation research in diverse populations (including those outside the U.S.). In fact, there is a robust research literature on interrogation methods in law enforcement settings (e.g., Bull, 2014; Bull & Soukara, 2010; Bull, Valentine, & Williamson, 2009; Granhag, Vrij & Verschuere, 2015; Gudjonsson, 2003; Lassiter & Meissner, 2010; Milne & Bull, 1999; Oxburgh, Myklebust, Grant & Milne, 2016; St-Yves, 2014; Vrij, 2008), although almost all of the experimental work has been conducted either in the U.S. or the U.K. Techniques to elicit reliable information with substantive empirical support include the cognitive interview (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010; Geiselman, 2012), the Strategic Use of Evidence (Granhag & Hartwig, 2015), the Scharff Technique (Granhag, Montecinos, & Oleszkiewicz, 2013), and cognition-based lie detection methods (Vrij & Fisher, 2016; Vrij, 2008). Increasingly, the focus of this work has been not just on obtaining confessions but also on gathering intelligence (e.g., Fisher & Geiselman, 2010; Granhag & Hartwig, 2015; Granhag, Montecinos, & Oleszkiewicz, 2013; Meissner, Kelly, & Woestehoff, 2015).

The premises of evidence-based practice movements are that (i) patient care can be enhanced by acquisition and use of up-to-date empirical knowledge, although (ii) it is difficult for clinicians to keep up with such knowledge while they practice full-time. However, (iii) if they do not, their knowledge and clinical performance will deteriorate over time and consequently, (iv) clinicians need summaries or evidence provided by expert reviews and instructions on how to access this information during their routine practice (Chambless & Ollendick, 2001). If one is willing to assume that interrogation methods should be science-based, it is difficult to argue against the general usefulness of these notions for interrogations. What is appealing—yet too often unappreciated—about the evidence-based approach is that it values the practitioner's expertise and experience. While we would argue that much of the AFM is outdated and the Manual itself should undergo an extensive revision informed by the relevant — and considerable — research carried out over the past decades, we also argue that such updates are best accomplished via a robust and continuous partnership of practitioners and scientists until such time as an evidence-based model of interrogation can be instantiated. Perhaps the distance between the experimental research and implementation could be shortened by something like the Veteran's Administration Quality Enhancement Research Initiative, which places a high priority

on implementation research (HSR&D Research Brief, 2004). Toward that end, the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group (HIG), an interagency entity established under the Obama Administration in 2009,[18] supports research on interrogation and had begun to publically disseminate both research summaries and "evidence reports" on a website created in collaboration with FBI and Iowa State University. This platform might point practitioners and trainers to science-based practices, and scientists to research gaps (FBI This Week 2016). These are, in our view, much-needed steps in the right direction.

[18] For a detailed overview of the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group—to include the nature of its unique research program and the evolution of its research-to-practice training effort—see Chapter 11, *The High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group (HIG): Inception, Evolution, and Impact.*

References

Alison, L. J., Alison, E., Noone, G., Elntib, S. & Christiansen P. (2013). Why tough tactics fail and rapport gets results: Observing Rapport-Based Interpersonal Techniques (ORBIT) to generate useful information from terrorists. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 19,* 411-431. doi.org/10.1037/a0034564

APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice. (2006). Evidence based practice in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *61*, 271–285. doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271

Army Field Manual 34-52 (1987). *Intelligence Interrogation*. Headquarters, Department of the Army.

Army Field Manual 2-22.3 (2006). *Human Intelligence Collector Operations*. Headquarters, Department of the Army.

Brandon, S. E. (2014). Towards a science of interrogation. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28,* 945-946. http://dx. doi: 10.1002/acp.3090

Brandon, S. E., Bhatt, S., Justice, B. P., & Kleinman, S. M. (2010). Army Field Manual 2-22.3 interrogation methods: A science-based review. Unpublished manuscript.

Brandon, S. E., Wells, S., & Seale, C. (2018). Science-based interviewing: Information elicitation. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *15*(2), 133-148. https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1496

Brewer, N., & Hupfeld, R. M. (2004). Effects of testimonial inconsistencies and witness group identity on mock-juror judgments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 493–513. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02558.x

Bull, R. (2014). *Investigative interviewing*. New York NY: Springer-Science+Media Business.

Bull, R., & Cherryman, J. (1995). *Helping to identify skills gaps in specialist investigative interviewing.* London: Home Office. London: Home Office Police Department.

Bull, R., & Soukara, S. (2010). Four studies of what really happens in police interviews. In G. Lassiter, & C. A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations* (pp. 81-95). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Bull, R., Valentine, T., & Williamson, T. (2009). *Handbook of psychology of investigative interviewing*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cacioppo. J. T., Hawkley, L. C., Norman, G. J., & Berntson, G. G. (2011). Social isolation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1231,* 17-22. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2011.06028.x

Chambless, D. L., & Ollendick, T. H. (2001). Empirically supported psychological interventions: Controversies and evidence. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 685-716. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.685

Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice* (3rd Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Clarke, G. N. (1995). Improving the transition from basic efficacy research to effectiveness studies: Methodological issues and procedures. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63,* 718-725. doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.63.5.718

Clarke, C., & Milne, R. (2001). National evaluation of the PEACE investigative interviewing course (Report No. PRAS/149). Police Research Award Scheme.

Clemens, F., Granhag, P. A., & Strömwall, L. A. (2011). Eliciting cues to false intent: A new application of strategic interviewing. *Law and Human Behavior, 35,* 512-522. http://dx/ doi:10.1007/s10979-010-9258-9

Cochrane, A. L. (1972). *Effectiveness and efficiency: Random reflections on health services*. London, England: Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust.

Collins, R., Lincoln, R., & Frank, M. G. (2002). The effect of rapport in forensic interviewing. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *9*, 69-78. https://doi.org/10.1375/pplt.2002.9.1.69

Colomb, C., Ginet, M., Wright, D., Demarchi, S., & Sadler, C. (2013). Back to the real: Efficacy and perception of a modified cognitive interview in the field. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 27,* 574-583. doi: 10.1002/acp.2942

Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. E., McKersie, R. B., & Walton, R. E. (1995). Path-ways to change: Case studies of strategic negotiations. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Dando, C., Wilcock, R., Milne, R., & Henry, L. (2009). A modified cognitive interview procedure for frontline police investigators. *Applied Cognitive Psychology: The Official Journal of the Society for Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *23*(5), 698-716. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1501

Davis, M R., McMahon, M., & Greenwood, K. M. (2005). The efficacy of mnemonic components of the cognitive interview: Towards a shortened variant for time-critical investigations. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19,* 75-93. http://dx.doi: 10.1002/acp.1048

Dawson, E., Hartwig, M., & Brimbal, L. (2015). Interviewing to elicit information: Using priming to promote disclosure. *Law and Human Behavior, 39*, 443-450. doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000136

Dawson, E., Hartwig, M., Brimbal, L., & Denisenkov, P. (2017). A room with a view: Setting influences information disclosure in investigative interviews. *Law and Human Behavior*, *41*, 333. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000244

Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 125,* 627-668. doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.6.627

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (Eds.) (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research*. Rochester NY: University of Rochester Press.

DoD Instruction 3216.02 (2011). Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards. Nov. 8, 2011. Accessed at http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/321602p.pdf

Duke, M. C., Wood, J. M., Magee, J., & Escobar, H. (2018). The effectiveness of army field manual interrogation approaches for educing information and building rapport. *Law and Human Behavior*, *42*, 442-457. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000299

Elliott, R. E. (1998). Editor's introduction: A guide to the empirically supported treatments controversy. *Psychotherapy Research, 8,* 115-125.

Evans, J. R., Houston, K. A., Meissner, C. A., Ross, A. B., Labianca, J. R., Woestehoff, S. A., & Kleinman, S. M. (2014). An empirical evaluation of intelligence-gathering interrogation techniques from the United States Army Field Manual. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28,* 867–875. http://dx.doi: 10.1002/acp.3065

Executive Order No. 13491, Ensuring Lawful Interrogations, 3 C.F.R. 199 (2009).\

Fein, R. (2006). Introduction. In *Educing information: Interrogation: Science and Art. Intelligence Science Board Phase 1 Report* (pp. 1–6). Washington DC: National Intelligence College Press.

FBI This Week, January 28, 2016, https://www.fbi.gov/audio-repository/news-podcasts-thisweek-high-value-detainee-interrogation-group.mp3/view

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory-Enhancing Techniques in Investigative Interviewing: The Cognitive Interview.* Springfield IL: C.C. Thomas.

Fisher, R.P., & Geiselman, R.E. (2010). The cognitive interview method of conducting police interviews: eliciting extensive information and promoting therapeutic jurisprudence. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry 33,* 321-28. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2010.09.004

Fisher, R. P., Geiselman, E., & Amador, M. (1989). Field test of the cognitive interview: Enhancing the recollection of the actual victims and witnesses of crime. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 72-727. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.5.722

Fisher, R. P., Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2011). Interviewing cooperative witnesses. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(1), 16-19. http://cdp.sagepub.com/content/20/1/16

Fisher R. P., & Perez, V. (2007). Memory-enhancing techniques for interviewing crime suspects. In S. Christianson (Ed.) *Offenders' memories of violent crimes* (pp. 329–350). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons.

Fisher, R. P., Ross, S. J., & Cahill, B. S. (2010). Interviewing witnesses and victims. In P. A. Granhag (Ed.), *Forensic psychology in context: Nordic and international approaches* (pp. 56-74). Portland: Willan Publishing.

Fisher, R. P., & Schreiber, N. (2007). Interviewing protocols to improve eyewitness memory. In M. Toglia, J. Rred, D. Ross, & R. Lindsay (Eds.), *The handbook of eyewitness psychology: Volume one. Memory for events* (pp. 58-80). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

Fisher, R. P., Vrij, A., & Leins, D. A. (2013). Does testimonial inconsistency indicate memory inaccuracy and deception? Beliefs, empirical research, and theory. In B. S. Cooper et al. (Eds.), *Applied issues in investigative interviewing, eyewitness memory, and credibility assessment.* doi: 10.1007/978-1-4614-5547-9_7

Gallini, B. R. (2010). Police "science" in the interrogation room: Seventy years of pseudo-psychological interrogation methods to obtain inadmissible confessions. *Hastings Law Journal, 61,* 529-580.

Geiselman, R. E. (2012). The cognitive interview for suspects. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 30,* 1-16.

George, R. C., & Clifford, B. R. (1996). The cognitive interview – Does it work? In S. Lloyd-Bostock, & G. Davies (Eds.), *Psychology, law and criminal justice: International developments in research and practice* (pp. 146-154). Oxford: de Gruyter.

Goodman-Delahunty, J., Martschuk, N., & Dhami, M. K. (2014). Interviewing high value detainees: Securing cooperation and disclosures. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *28*, 883-897. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3087

Granhag, P. A. (November 18-19, 2010). *The Strategic use of Evidence (SUE) technique: A scientific perspective.* High Value Detainee Interrogation Group (HIG). HIG Research Symposium: Interrogation in the European Union, Washington, DC.

Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2008). A new theoretical perspective on deception detection: On the psychology of instrumental mind-reading. *Psychology, Crime & Law*,14, 189-200. doi.org/10.1080/10683160701645181

Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2015). The Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE) technique: A conceptual overview. In P. A. Granhag, A. Vrij, & B. Verschuere (Eds.), *Deception detection: Current challenges and cognitive* approaches (pp. 231-251). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Granhag, P. A., Giolla, E. M., Sooniste, T., Strömwall, L. & Liu-Jonsson, M. (2016). Discriminating between statements of true and false intent: The impact of repeated interviews and strategic questioning. *Journal of Applied Security Research, 11,* 1-17.

Granhag, P. A., Montecinos, S. C., & Oleszkiewicz, S. (2013). Eliciting intelligence from sources: The first scientific test of the Scharff technique. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *20,* 96-113. doi:10.1111/lcrp.12015

Granhag, P. A., Oleszkiewicz, S., Strömwall, L. A., & Kleinman, S. M. (2015). Eliciting intelligence with the Scharff Technique: Interviewing more and less cooperative and capable sources. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 21,* 100-110. doi.org/10.1037/law0000030

Granhag, P. A., & Strömwall, L. A. (2002). Repeated interrogations: verbal and non-verbal cues to deception. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 16,* 243-257. doi: 10.1002/acp.784

Granhag, P. A., Vrij, A., & B. Verschuere, B. (2015). Detecting deception: Current challenges and cognitive approaches. Wiley-Blackwell: Chichester, West Sussex.

Griffiths, A., & Milne, R. (2006). Will it all end in tiers? Police interviews with suspects in Britain. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research and regulation* (pp. 167–189). Collompton Dover: Willan.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of Interrogations and confessions: A handbook*. Chichster: Wiley.

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Petursson, H. (1991). Custodial interrogation: Why do suspects confess and how does it relate to their crime, attitude and personality? *Personality and Individual Differences, 12,* 295-306. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(91)90116-S

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A. (2007). Guilty and innocent suspects' strategies during police interrogations. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 13,* 213-227. doi.org/10.1080/10683160600750264

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Vrij, A. (2005). Detecting deception via strategic disclosure of evidence. *Law and Human Behavior, 29,* 469-484. doi: 10.1007/s10979-006-9053-9

Hartwig, M., Meissner, C. A., & Semel, M. D. (2014). Human intelligence interviewing and interrogation: Assessing the challenges of developing an ethical, evidence-based approach. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing* (pp. 209-228). New York NY: Springer-

Science+Media Business

Hawkley, L. C. & Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness matters: A theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 40,* 218-227. doi: 0.1007/s12160-010-9210-8

Hinkle, L. E. Jr. (1961). The physiological state of the interrogation subject as it affects brain function. In A. D. Biderman & H. Zimmer (Eds.), *The manipulation of human behavior* (pp. 1-50). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York.

Hoagwood, K., Hibbs, E., Brent, D., & Jensen, P. (1995). Introduction to the special section: efficacy and effectiveness in studies of child and adolescent psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology, 8,* 126-140. doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.63.5.683

Holliday, R. E., Brainerd, C. J., Reyna, V. F., & Humphries, J. E. (2009). The cognitive interview: Research and practice across the lifespan. In R. Bull, T. Valentine, & T. Williamson (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of investigative interviewing: Current developments and future directions* (pp. 137-160). Oxford: Wiley.

HSR&D Research Brief (2004). VA targets implementation of evidence-based findings into practice. Vol. 2. VA Office of Research and Development, Health Services Research and Development Service, Washington DC.

Hunsley, J., & Lee, C. M. (2007). Research-informed benchmarks for psychological treatments: Efficacy studies, effectiveness studies, and beyond. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 38,* 21-33. https://dx.doi:10.1037/0735-7028.38.1.21

Inbau, R., & Reid, J. (1962). *Criminal interrogations and confessions*. Burlington MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

Jundi, S., Vrij, A., Mann, S., Hope, L., Hillman, J., Warmelink, L., & Gahr, E. (2013). Who should I look at? Eye contact during collective interviewing as a cue to deceit. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 19*, 661-671. doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2013.793332

Kassin, S. M. (1997). The Psychology of Confession Evidence. *American Psychologist, 52*, 221-223. doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.3.221

Kassin, S. M., Appleby, S. C., & Torkildson–Perillo, J. T. (2010). Interviewing suspects: Practice, science and future directions. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 15*, 39–55. doi: 10.1348/135532509X449361

Kebbell, M. R., Milne, R., & Wagstaff, G. F. (1999). The cognitive interview: A survey of its forensic effectiveness. *Psychology, crime and law*, *5*(1-2), 101-115. https://doi.org/10.1080/10683169908414996

Kleinman, S. (2006). KUBARK Counterintelligence interrogation review: Observations of an

interrogator. Lessons learned and avenues for further research. In N. D. I. College (Ed.), *Educing Information* (pp. 95-140).

Knowles & J. A. Linn (Eds.), *Resistance and persuasion* (pp. 175-192). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Köhnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999). The cognitive interview: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Crime and Law, 5,* 3-27. doi.org/10.1080/10683169908414991

Lassiter, G. D., & Meissner, C. A. (2010). *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Leal, S., Vrij, A., Mann, S., & Fisher, R. P. (2010). Detecting true and false opinions: The Devil's Advocate approach as a lie detection aid. *Acta Psychologica, 134,* 323-329. doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.03.005

Leal, S., Vrij, A., Warmelink, L., Vernham, Z., & Fisher, R. (2015). You can't hide your telephone lies: Providing a model statement as an aid to detect deception in insurance telephone calls. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 20,* 129-146. doi: 10.1111/lcrp.12017

Leins, D. A., Fisher, R. P., & Vrij, A. (2012). Drawing on liars' lack of cognitive flexibility: Detecting deception through varying report modes. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 26,* 601-607. doi: 10.1002/acp.2837

Leins, D. A., Zimmerman, L. A., & Zabecki, J. M. (2017). An exploration of interpreter performance in intelligence gathering interviews. *International Investigative Research and Practice, 8,* 44-58. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315792794

Levant, R. F., Sperry, H. A., (2016). Components of evidence-based practice in psychology. In N. Zane, G. Bernal, & F. T. Leon (Eds.), Evidence-based psychological practice with ethnic minorities: Culturally informed research and clinical strategies (pp. 15-29). Washington DC: American Psychological Association. doi.org/10.1037/14940-002

Loftus, E. F., & Palmer, J. C. (1974). Reconstruction of auto-mobile destruction: An example of the interaction between language and memory. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 13,* 585-589. doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(74)80011-3

Mackay, C. J., Cox, T., Burrows, G. C., & Lazzarini, A. J. (1978). An inventory for the measurement of self-reported stress and arousal. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 17,* 283-284. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8260.1978.tb00280.x

Mann, S., Vrij, A., Shaw, D., Leal, S., Ewens, S., Hillman, J., Granhag, P. A., & Fisher, R. P. (2012). Two heads are better than one? How to effectively use two interviewers to elicit cues to deception. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *18,* 324–340. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8333.2012.02055.x

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2010). *NEO Inventories for the NEO Five-Factor Inventory-3 (NEO-FFI-3).* Lutz, FL: PAR.

May, L., & Granhag, P. (2016). Techniques for eliciting human intelligence: Examining possible order effects of the Scharff tactics. *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law*, 275-287. doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2015.1054410

May, L., Granhag, P. A., & Oleszkiewicz, S. (2014). Eliciting intelligence using the Scharff-technique: Closing in on the confirmation/disconfirmation-tactic. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 11,* 136-150. doi: 10.1002/jip.1412

Meissner, C. A., Kelly, C. E., & Woestehoff, S. A. (2015). Improving the effectiveness of suspect interrogations. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 10.11461/annurev-lawsocsci-120814-121657

Meissner, C., Redlich, A., Bhatt, S. & Brandon, S. E. (2012). Interview and interrogation methods and their effects on investigative outcomes. *Campbell Systematic Reviews,* 8.

Meissner, C. A., Redlich, A. D., Michael, S. W., Evans, J. R., Camilletti, C. R., Bhatt, S., & Brandon, S. (2014). Accusatorial and information-gathering interrogation methods and their effects on true and false confessions: A meta-analysis review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology,* doi:10.1007/ s11292-014-9207.6

Memon, A., Meissner, C. A., & Fraser, J. (2010). The cognitive interview: A meta-analytic review and study space analysis of the past 25 years. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 16,* 340-372. doi.org/10.1037/a0020518

Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (1991). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behavior*. New York: Guilford Press.

Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people for change* (2nd Ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Milne, R., & Bull, R. (1999). *Investigative interviewing: Psychology and practice*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Moller, A. C., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2006). Choice and ego depletion: The moderating role of autonomy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32,* 1024-1036. doi.org/10.1177/0146167206288008

Morgan III, C. A., Rabinowitz, Y., Christian, J., & & Hazlett, G. A. (2007). Detecting deception in Vietnamese: Efficacy of forensic statement analysis when interviewing via an interpreter. *Journal of Intelligence Research and Development*, January.

Morgan, III, C. A., Rabinowitz, Y. G., Hilts, D., Weller, C., & Coric, V. (2013). Efficacy of

modified cognitive interviewing, compared to human judgments in detecting deception related to bio–threat activities. *Journal of Strategic Security, 6,* 100-119.

Moston, S., & Engelberg, T. (1993). Police questioning techniques in tape-recorded interviews with criminal suspects. *Policing and Society, 6*, 61–75. doi.org/10.1080/10439463.1993.9964670

Nahari, G., Vrij, A., & Fisher, R. P. (2014a). Exploiting liars' verbal strategies by examining unverifiable details. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 19,* 227–239. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8333.2012.02069.x

Nahari, G., Vrij, A., & Fisher, R. P. (2014b). The verifiability approach: Countermeasures facilitate its ability to discriminate between truths and lies. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28*, 122–128..doi: 10.1002/acp.2974

Narchet, F. M., Russano, M. B., Kleinman, S. M., & Meissner, C. A. (2016). A (nearly) 360 ° perspective of the interrogation process: Communicating with high-value tagets. In G. Oxburgh, T. Myklebust, T. Grant & R. Milne (Eds.), *Communication in investigative and legal contexts: Integrated approaches from forensic psychology, linguistics and law enforcement* (pp. 159-178). Chichester UK: John Wiley & Sons.

NDAA (2016). National Defense Authorization Act, Section 1045(a)(6)(A)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, 42 U.S.C. § 2000dd-2(a)(6)(A)(1)(2015).

Office of Management and Budget (2013). Memorandum for Heads of Departments M-17-06 Nov. 8, 2016. Accessed at https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/memoranda/2017/m-17-06.pdf

Oleszkiewicz, S., Granhag, P. A., & Kleinman, S. M. (2014). On eliciting intelligence from human sources: Contextualizing the Scharff-technique. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28,* 898-907. doi: 10.1002/acp.3073

Oleszkiewicz, S., Granhag, P. A., & Montecinos, S. C. (2014). The Scharff-Technique: Eliciting intelligence from human sources. *Law and Human Behavior, 38,* 478-489. doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000085

Ormerod, T. C., & Dando, C. J. (2015). Finding a needle in a haystack: Toward a psychologically informed method for aviation security screening. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144,* 76–84. doi.org/10.1037/xge0000030

Oxburgh, G., Myklebust, T., Grant, T., & Milne, R. (2016). *Communication in investigative and legal contexts: Integrated approaches from forensic psychology, linguistics and law enforcement*. Chichester UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Powell, M. B., Fisher, R. P., & Wright, R. (2005). Investigative interviewing. In N. Brewer & K. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology and law: An empirical perspective* (pp. 11-42). New York: The

Guilford Press.

Raw, S. D. (1993, March). Does psychotherapy research teach us anything about psychotherapy? *The Behavior Therapist*, pp. 75-76.

Reisberg, D., Simons, D. J., & Fournier, L. R. (2016). Introduction to the forum on when and whether psychological research is ready for use in the justice system. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 5,* 233-236. doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2016.07.009

Rosenberg, W., & Donald, A. (1995). Evidence-based medicine: An approach to clinical problem solving. *British Medical Journal, 310,* 1122-1126.

Rosenthal, D., & Frank, J. D. (1956). Psychotherapy and the placebo effect. *Psychological Bulletin, 53,* 294–302. doi.org/10.1037/h0044068

Royce, T. (2005). The negotiator and the bomber: Analyzing the critical role of active listening in crisis negotiation. *Negotiation Journal, 21*, 5–27. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2005.00045.x

Russano, M. B., Meissner, C. A., Atkinson, D., & Dianiska, R. E. (2017, March). Training science-based methods of interrogation with Air Force Office of Special Investigations. Paper presented at the American Psychology-Law Society Conference, Seattle, WA.

Russano, M. B., Narchet, F. M., Kleinman, S. M., & Meissner, C. A. (2014). Structured interviews of experienced HUMINT interrogators. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *28*(6), 847-859. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3069

Sackett, D. L., Haynes, R. B., & Tugwell, P. (1985). *Clinical epidemiology: A basic science for clinical medicine*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Sackett, D. L., Rosenberg, W. M. C., Gray, J. A., Gray, M., Haynes, R. B., & Richardson, W. S. (1996). Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *Psychotherapy Research, 7,* 21-43. doi.org/10.1136/bmj.312.7023.71

Sackett, D. L, Strauss S. E., Richardson, W. S., Rosenberg, W., & Haynes, R.B. (2000). *Evidence based medicine: How to practice and teach EBM.* Second Edition. London, England: Churchill, Livingston.

Scharff, H. J. "Without Torture," *Argosy Magazine*, May 1950.

Segrin, C. (1999). Social skills, stressful events, and the development of psychosocial problems. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology, 18*, 14-34. doi:10.1521/jscp.1999.18.1.14

Shapiro, A. K., & Shapiro, E. S. (1997). *The powerful placebo: From ancient priest to modern medicine*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). Not all personal goals are personal: Comparing autonomous and controlled reasons for goals as predictors of effort and attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24,* 546-557. doi.org/10.1177/0146167298245010

Smith, M. L., & Glass, G. V. (1977). Meta-analysis of psychotherapy outcome studies. *American Psychologist, 32*, 752-760.

Sooniste, T., Granhag, P. A., Knieps, M., & Vrij, A. (2013). True and false intentions: Asking about the past to detect lies about the future. *Psychology, Crime, and Law, 19,* 673–685. doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2013.793333

St-Yves, M. (2014), *Investigative interviewing: The essentials*. Toronto CA: Thomson Reuters Ltd.

St-Yves, M., & Meissner, C. A. (2014). Interviewing suspects. In M. St-Yves (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: The essentials* (pp. 145-190). Toronto CA: Thomson Reuters Ltd.

Starr, D. (2013). The interview: Do police interrogation techniques produce false confessions? *The New Yorker*, December 9.

Strömwall, L. A., Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2004). Practitioners' beliefs about deception. In P. A. Granhag, & L. A. Strömwall (Eds.), *Deception detection in forensic contexts* (pp. 229–250). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Task Force on Promotion and Dissemination of Psychological Procedures (1995). Training in and dissemination of empirically validated treatments: Report and recommendations. *The Clinical Psychologist, 48*, 3-23.

Toliver, R. F. (1978). *The interrogator: The story of Hanns Scharff, Luftwaffe's master interrogator*. Fallbrook CA: Aero Publishers.

Trent, S.., Burchfield, C., Meissner, C. A., & Brandon, S. E. (2018). A field study of U.S. military interrogations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Unpublished manuscript.

Vallano, J. P., & Schreiber Compo, N. S. (2011). A comfortable witness is a good witness: Rapport-building and susceptibility to misinformation in an investigative mock-crime interview. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *25*, 960-970. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1789

Vredeveldt, A., van Koppen, P. J., & Granhag, P. A. (2014). The inconsistent suspect: A systematic review of different types of consistency in truth tellers and liars. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative Interviewing* (pp. 183-207). New York: Springer.

Vredeveldt, A., Tredoux, C. G., Nortje, A., Kempen, K., Puljević & Labuschagne, G. N. (2014). A field evaluation of the eye-closure interview with witnesses of serious crimes. *Law and Human Behavior, 39,* 189-197. doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000113

Vrij, A. (2008). *Detecting lies and deceit: Pitfalls and opportunities* (2nd Ed.). Chichester, U.K.: John Wiley and Sons.

Vrij, A. (2014). Interviewing to detect deception. *European Psychologist, 19,* 184-194. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040/a000201

Vrij, A. (2015). Verbal lie detection tools: Statement Validity Analysis, Reality Monitoring and Scientific Content Analysis. In P. A. Granhag, A. Vrij, & B. Verschuere (Eds.), *Detecting deception: Current challenges and cognitive approaches* (pp. 3-36). Wiley Blackwell: Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.

Vrij, A., Akehurst, L., & Knight, S. (2006). Police officers', social workers', teachers' and the general public's beliefs about deception in children, adolescents and adults. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 11,* 297-312. doi: 10.1348/135532505X60816

Vrij, A., & Fisher, F. P. (2016). Which lie detection tools are ready for use in the criminal justice system? *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 5,* 302-307. doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2016.06.014

Vrij, A., & Granhag, P. A. (2012). Eliciting cues to deception: What matters are the questions asked. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 1,* 110-117. doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2012.02.004

Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2011). Lying about flying: The first experiment to detect false intent. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 17,* 611–620. doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2013.793333

Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2011). Outsmarting the liars: Toward a cognitive lie detection approach. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20, 28-32. doi.org/10.1177/0963721410391245

Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., & Porter, S. B. (2010). Pitfalls and opportunities in nonverbal and verbal lie detection. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 11,* 89-121. doi.org/10.1177/1529100610390861

Vrij, A., Hope, L., & Fisher, R. P. (2014). Eliciting reliable information in investigative interviews. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1,* 129 -136. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732214548592

Vrij, A., Jundi, S., Hope, L., Hillman, J., Gahr, E., Leal, S., Marmelink, L., Mann, S., Vernham, Z., & Granhag, P. A. (2012). Collective interviewing of suspects. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 1,* 41-44. http://dx. doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2011.12.002

Vrij, A., Leal, S., Granhag, P., Mann, S., Fisher, R., Hillman, J., & Sperry, K. (2009). Outsmarting the liars: The benefit of asking unanticipated questions. *Law and Human Behavior, 33, 15*9–166. doi:10.1007/s10979-008-9143-y

Vrij, A., Leal, S., Mann, S. A., & Granhag, P. A. (2011). A comparison between lying about intentions and past activities: Verbal cues and detection accuracy. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28,* 212-218. doi:10.1002/acp.1665

Vrij, A., Leal, S., Mann, S., Vernham, Z., & Brankaert, F. (2015). Translating theory into practice: Evaluating a cognitive lie detection training workshop. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 4, 110-120. doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2015.02.002

Vrij, A., Mann, S., Fisher, R., Leal, S., Milne, B., & Bull, R. (2008). Increasing cognitive load to facilitate lie detection: The benefit of recalling an event in reverse order. *Law and Human Behavior, 32,* 253–265. doi:10.1007/s10979-007-9103-y

Wampold, B. E. (1997). Methodological problems in identifying efficacious psychotherapies. *Psychotherapy Research, 7,* 21–43. doi.org/10.1080/10503309712331331853

Wampold, B. E., & Bhati, K. S. (2004). Attending to the omissions: A historical examination of evidence-based practice movements. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 35,* 563-570. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.35.6.563

Weisz, J. R., Donenberg, G. R., Han, S. S., & Weiss, B. (1995). Bridging the gap between laboratory and clinic in child and adolescent psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *63*, 688-701.

Wells, S., (2014). Negotiating in a Terrorist Environment. In J. Pearce, (Ed.), *Terrorism Case Studies* (pp. 144- 167). Wiley: Oxford.

Wells, S. & Brandon, S. E. (in press). Interviewing in criminal and intelligence-gathering contexts: Applying science. C. Logan (Ed.), *Special Issue of International Journal of Forensic Mental Health Services.*

Wells, G. L., Lindsay, R. C., & Ferguson, T. J. (1979). Accuracy, confidence, and juror perceptions in eyewitness identification. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64,* 440-448. doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.64.4.440

Wells, S., Taylor P., & Giebels, E. (2013). Crisis Negotiation: From Suicide to Terrorism Intervention (pp.473-498). In M. Olekalns & W. Adair (Eds.), *Handbook of Negotiation Research*. Elgar, Edwards Publishing. Melbourne AU.