AN INTERVIEW PROTOCOL OF EXPERIENCED HUMAN INTELLIGENCE COLLECTORS AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AGENTS: IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Charles H. Leps and R. Edward Geiselman, Ph.D.

Twenty-three experienced military human intelligence collectors and counterintelligence agents participated in a structured survey interview designed to qualify their perspectives about their professional practice, explore the prospect of integrating with the scientific community, and identify tangible gains from an idealized interface. The results revealed some misunderstandings about the applicability of academic psychological research in support of their intelligence collection mission, but once clarified the participants expressed enthusiasm for future collaboration and continued dialogue. All participants were confident in their abilities, especially those with more years on the job. Mythology was evident in the training pipeline, but valid organically generated principles for conducting effective "adversarial interactions" also were described, especially from the more experienced practitioners. There was little support for the use of force or severe interrogation techniques as methodologies for use in gathering reliable information. Instead, the participants expressed a preference for culturally sensitive, rapport-based techniques, as well as further research in support of those approaches.

Expansion of the U.S. intelligence community since the inception of the modern era of conflict with terrorist and asymmetrical adversaries has revealed a shortfall of empirical data available to affect improvement in the acquisition of information and the detection of deception (1). By comparison, a substantial literature exists with applicability to law enforcement and the criminal justice system, generated primarily from within the cognitive sciences (2). In particular, the literature pertaining to the detection of deception exists primarily in the context of law enforcement interviews and interrogations (3). It is only recently that social scientists have begun to review the research literature pertaining to deception within the criminal context and reascribe the applicable findings to the domain of intelligence gathering by entities other than law enforcement (1). These efforts to export the research

in support of law enforcement functions to practitioners working within the intelligence community have revealed a fundamental difference between the two domains, namely the requirement for confession. Confession has little or no relevance for obtaining information during the course of a typical adversarial, intelligence-gathering interaction (1). Accordingly, work toward generating academically valid data for the practitioner community must extend beyond re-working information originally conceived as applicable from a law enforcement perspective.

Contributing to the slow pace of any cross-pollination is the challenge of establishing a dialogue between the intelligence-gathering practitioner and the academic researcher. Because the world of the intelligence collector is made necessarily opaque by virtue of security concerns, progress has been limited throughout recent efforts toward integration. The present study was designed to promote an ongoing dialogue between the academic-research community and practitioner community toward rectifying misunderstandings, with a shared interest in determining the accuracy of the information acquired during adversarial interactions. We set out to obtain a sample of experienced practitioners from the military intelligence community for detailed interviews based on a structured survey requiring narrative responses obtained during direct interaction with the administering author. The specific aims were to qualify the perspectives of the practitioners about their professional practice, to explore the prospect of integrating with the scientific community, and to identify tangible gains that might be garnered through an idealized interface. The present survey represents an initial step toward developing a rapport for future joint projects. The results confirmed that there is a requirement as well as an interest in an integration of efforts. Future collaboration will undoubtedly serve both communities well.

Throughout this article we use the term "adversarial interaction" to define any interaction where all participants are physically present and the goal of one or more of the involved persons is the acquisition of information that the opposing party is unwilling to provide. Our intent for introducing the term adversarial interaction is to better encapsulate the investigation of a broader palate of applicable contexts in the field. Previously used terminology, such as interrogation, creates a focus that is too narrow for addressing the

varieties of interpersonal interactions that exist with the goal of collecting human intelligence.

METHOD

Participants

Twenty-three U.S. human intelligence collectors and counterintelligence agents served as the participants for this study. The participants were selected through formal requests by way of personal lines of communication, as well as through informal agreements with individuals serving in posts with which the authors have professional knowledge. None of the participants were provided compensation for their involvement, and none were required to contribute to this research against their personal wills.

The authors selected participants based on perceived effectiveness, as measured through the quantitative metrics of the U.S. intelligence infrastructure, their collective reputation with colleagues and peers, and their longevity and experience within the U.S. intelligence community. It is the assessment of the authors that the sample of participants for this study is representative of some of the more competent and accomplished human intelligence collectors and counterintelligence agents currently working within the intelligence field.

As a component of the various agreements made between U.S. intelligence offices, the authors, and the participants, it would be imprudent to further define the specific scope of experience of the participants. However, for contextual purposes, the average age of the participants at the point of initial professional practice was 24.8 and the average number of years' experience in the intelligence community was 15.6.

Questioning Protocol

The questioning protocol covered 13 metrics with a focus on the methodology employed by each participant in the conduct of their professional duties (see Appendix A). The questions were designed to elicit responses significant to the current study of interviewing and interrogation techniques within the cognitive sciences. All interviews were conducted by the first author (CHL), who has training in human intelligence and counterintelligence interviewing and interrogation. The duration of the interviews was between

90 and 120 minutes. All interviews began with a period of rapport building, which was critical given the sensitivity of individual subjects to both personal and professional information security. Following initial rapport building, CHL provided a brief explanation of the objectives of the study. After securing a final consent for participation, participants had an opportunity to ask questions prior to the start of the questioning protocol outlined in Appendix A. None of the 23 participants expressed initial protest based on the overview of intent. Moreover, participants received clear instruction to terminate the interview if at any point they assessed the material under discussion to be of a sensitive or classified nature. None of the 23 participants terminated the interview or expressed any concerns regarding the security or classification of the topics discussed.

Throughout the process of executing the questioning protocol, CHL maintained a rapport with the participants, and asked expansive follow-up questions where appropriate. CHL did not move to subsequent questions until all reasonable facets of a given question had been satisfied. When CHL terminated the interviews at the conclusion of the questioning protocol, the majority of participants expressed strong interest in knowing about future developments or studies by the authors. These requests for follow-up contact are consistent with a positive interest toward future interviews about their expertise and for providing input, as opposed to distrust or derogatory impressions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Experience

In the present sample, the variables (a) years on the job, (b) age, and (c) estimated number of adversarial interactions were not significantly intercorrelated, suggesting a wide spectrum of experience. The number of years on the job ranged from 1 to 33 years with an average of 15.5 years. The age of the participants at the time of the interviews ranged from 18 to 51 years with an average of 25 years. The self-report values for the total number of adversarial interactions varied from 60 to 5000, with an average of 1120 interactions. The average number of total exchanges matches closely with an estimated 100 interactions for every year of professional experience. However, the outlying self-report numbers are likely indicative of a failure to quan-

tify accurately the total number of interactions over the course of a given career. Although the definition of an adversarial interaction was explained to each participant in the same manner, with amplification in cases where the interviewer observed confusion, a lack of clarity remained in some instances as participants likely included relatively brief exchanges as interactions while others may have underestimated their career totals. Nevertheless, we retained this self-report measure in the data matrix as one index of perceived experience with adversarial interactions.

Self-Assessment

With few exceptions, the self-assessment rating variables were significantly inter-correlated in the positive direction (average $\underline{r} = +.48$, $\underline{p} < .05$). All of the average ratings were above 3 on the 5-point rating scale. The participants were most confident in their abilities to garner truthful and accurate information with an extended timeline for interaction (4.26) whereas they were least confident with a limited timeline (3.41). Thus, the time available for the interaction with the adversarial subject emerged as a salient factor. Of the three experience-related variables, only years on the job was uniformly related to the self-assessment measures (average $r = +0.63$, $\underline{p} < .05$). Neither age nor estimated number of adversarial interactions was significantly related to the self-assessment measures ($\underline{r} = +0.04$ and $\underline{r} = +0.27$, respectively). Thus, those with an extended career were more confident in their abilities.

Strategies for Detecting Deception

When asked which techniques the participant employs in order to assess deception versus truthfulness, three fourths of the respondents referenced an approach that incorporates a combination of non-verbal and verbal indicators, a strategy that we will call a standard-global methodology. With a standard-global methodology, the practitioner is attentive to several factors simultaneously. Those mentioned were: posture (open or closed), apparent nervousness and discomfort, speed and ease with which questions are answered, movement of the eyes, articulation of limbs while speaking, and cadence and tone of speech. Some participants also included commentary about the development of baseline metrics to be compared with the adversary's responses to poignant questions at subsequent points in a given interaction.

Fundamental to the concept of a standard-global approach, over half of these participants included a conceptualization of neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) within the context of their recitation. However, in contrast with the doctrinal definition of NLP, the practitioners interviewed in this study did not describe NLP as attempting to track eye movements in relation to memory recall and narrative manifestation (4). Instead, they described a broader concept meant to encapsulate the locus of points involved in the observation of non-verbal indicators. Exploration of this discrepancy following the full interview protocol suggested that the confusion was likely a result of the manner in which the concept of NLP is introduced to practitioners within the training pipeline. All participants who referenced NLP described a cursory presentation of the concept during one or several professional schools, always delivered by an individual without an academic background in the cognitive sciences.

Beyond the conceptualization of a standard global approach, and the reference to NLP, the only additional response with continuity across multiple participants was narrative inconsistency. Four of the respondents stated that an inconsistent narrative was either a primary or secondary tool in assessing the deception of an adversary. Other unique responses included (a) question length, as compared to answer length (longer responses are seen as more likely to indicate deceit, "selling the story"), and (b) speed and cadence of speech when answering questions (high speed and chopped cadence are more likely to indicate deceit). The assessment of adversary deception as being characterized by longer narratives with greater detail is potentially inconsistent with previous experiments dealing with the length and level of detail of deceptive interaction. The general finding from academic research as well as from realistic experiments with SERE personnel suggests that deception is most often given in shorter narratives with lesser detail (3, 5, 6). This discrepant finding may be a result of cultural differences on the part of the adversaries. It is also possible that with an information-gathering interaction, adversaries are more likely to choose to "talk their way out" of the situation.

One third of the participants emphasized the importance of conducting background research whenever possible prior to the interview in order to ensure sufficient technical and cultural baseline information (planning and preparation). One participant noted the ease with which an adversary can

manipulate an interaction when the practitioner lacks sufficient technical, cultural, or biographic background information.

When asked specifically about the techniques utilized by the adversary in order to subvert the effectiveness of the practitioner, over half of the participants referred to a definitive refusal to speak openly about the issue in question. The defensive strategy of not speaking to the practitioner ranged from feigning ignorance, the employment of a resistance technique such as counting prior to giving a response, or a total refusal to respond to any questions or stimuli. However, with only one exception, each of the participants stated that an adversary's refusal to speak could be countered successfully with a rapport-based approach. One quarter of the participants described a defensive strategy whereby the adversary raised some version of a culturally significant offense in the hope that the practitioner would perceive the manufactured offense as sufficiently severe to redirect the course of the interaction. Also mentioned was the strategic feigning of severe illness and the utilization of the linguist as a foil. Finally, one participant pointed to the effectiveness of an adversary who, without actively pursuing a defensive strategy, deflects the effectiveness of the interviewer by proclaiming the morality of the actions in question; the adversary defuses the effectiveness of the practitioner's techniques by removing the cornerstone of moral wrongdoing.

Perspective on the Academic Discipline and Applicability

All participants professed a positive or qualified positive overall opinion about the potential role of the cognitive sciences in support of practitioners within the intelligence community. However, beyond the generalized, positive responses to this question and follow-up questions, it was evident that over half of the participants had a general lack of understanding about the applicability of the cognitive sciences to their job functions. Two of the participants were unaware that any research was ongoing in pursuit of improving practitioner effectiveness, while another three participants seemed unable to differentiate consistently between clinical and research psychology throughout the duration of the questioning protocol. The latter ideation appeared to stem from the clinical inundation currently indicative of the mental health crisis throughout the Department of Defense (7). These participants appeared to believe that psychologists only address mental health issues, and that those issues are addressed only through therapy. We believe that the lack

of differentiation between clinical and research psychology may be partly responsible for many of the difficulties often encountered in liaison and coordination between the academic and practitioner communities.

Among the unique responses from the participants were the following: Concern about the experience level and perspective of researchers involved in any future studies or experiments (specifically a lack of experience as practitioners), reticence about the security of publishing findings that might allow a hostile force to garner useful insight into developing techniques, and an overall ambivalence with respect to the notion that academic research could positively affect the training systems for practitioners. The latter concern related to the perceived archaic and change-averse nature of the training pipeline and curriculum.

Training and Research

Over half of the participants reported acquiring the majority of their professional aptitude from either informal interaction with colleagues, personal adolescent experiences, or some civilian education. All but one participant evaluated their professional training experiences as insufficient for assessing another individual within the context of an adversarial interaction. No participant indicated a full satisfaction with their level of competence as developed through the training opportunities afforded them over the course of their career. Nevertheless, as noted above, those participants with an extended career were more confident in their abilities.

An interest in additional training intersected with a discussion about directions for future research, as most participants conflated research with specific training for practitioners. To that end, one third of the participants cited a strong interest in acquiring a basic education in psychology where that training would have implications for their job function. Access to case studies from a psychological perspective was mentioned by one-fourth of the participants. The most frequently cited shortfall in the current knowledge base was the cultural component of adversarial interactions. Cultural components within the context of research and training were mentioned by half of the participants. In fact, the significance of the cultural component to adversarial interaction was noted during at least one component of the questioning

protocol by every participant, effectively making culture the most prevalent topic during the course of the participant interviews.

Formative Experiences

The protocol question seeking detail about a formative professional experience generated a range of compelling anecdotes, of which very few shared commonalities in theme or effect for the practitioner. The majority of participants reported a formative experience with positive connotation, while one third cited an anecdote resulting in negative reinforcement for the practitioner. These stories related to personal failures in approaching adversaries, or the observation of peers who were unable to perform as a result of the moral implications of the deception required in assessing the adversary. When the anecdote related to a failure as the result of a previously instructed technique or approach, the effect on the practitioner was a recalibration for all future interactions, ostensibly causing the individual to retain an appreciation for the complexity and uncertainty of adversarial interactions following the point of failure.

One third of the positive formative experiences revolved around the significance of rapport building, although the context of the stories varied widely. Collectively, the impact of the experience on the practitioner was consistently profound and left some impression of astonishment that in spite of the myriad motivations for an adversary to remain uncooperative, rapport had in fact caused the individual to provide sensitive and accurate information to U.S. intelligence. Likewise, as noted above, the participants found greater success and they were more confident in their abilities with an extended timeline for the adversarial interaction, during which time they could develop rapport with the adversary.

In summarizing a significant formative event one subject pointed to an adversary encountered in a custodial context, who professed an inability to understand the events of 9/11 as a catalyst for U.S. involvement in Central Asia. The participant acknowledged that initially it was difficult to interpret the behavior of the adversary as other than deceptive. However, diligent follow-on interactions with the individual revealed that the inability to appreciate the impetus for U.S. involvement was legitimate and a direct result of a lack of context for the existence of a building sufficiently large to accommo-

date destruction by an aircraft as had been described by the practitioner. What the practitioner initially assessed as deception or a resistance tactic came to be understood as a deep disparity in experience with the world. The participant explained that the incident permanently changed that perspective from which he approached any given adversarial interaction, regardless of initial impressions.

Another compelling anecdote was a generalized account of negative rapport development. Following several weeks of slow but deliberate rapport development with an adversary, the practitioner had reached a status quo that included sharing specially prepared meals while involved in the interactions. However, it became increasingly clear to the practitioner that the adversary viewed the positive rapport as an opportunity to manipulate the interest of the practitioner in constructing a relationship. The practitioner noted the emerging behavior and during a subsequent interaction orchestrated a sudden emotional outburst that culminated in angrily and dramatically revoking the gifted meal. Although the gifted meal was in addition to meals already afforded the detainee such that no sustenance was denied, the effect on the adversary was as planned, and in subsequent interactions the manipulation behavior ceased. The practitioner noted that the technique, or a similar variation thereof, has been successful in numerous interactions since the initial utilization.

A third formative experience involved a scenario in which the practitioner was determined to conduct an extensive review of recordings of recent adversarial interactions with a level of scrutiny beyond that which was doctrinally required. Based on this self-generated exercise, the practitioner came to realize that many of the ongoing techniques and procedures had produced an insincere façade of empathy and consideration while dealing with adversaries that appeared ludicrous in review. The techniques most frequently utilized by the practitioner at the time of the review were emotionally grounded approaches that required empathy, often to include the development of personal backstories—such as a family life—in order to relate to a detainee. The subject concluded that empathy and common experience need not be fabricated, but that emotional connectivity to adversaries is achievable through relative honesty. The practitioner re-approached all subsequent interactions more directly, eschewing the development of insincere dialogues aimed at

specific modes of rapport. This participant went on to describe a significantly increased success rate following the epiphany, which is consistent with other indications from this survey that the emergence of interview concepts with experience served to reduce cognitive load for the interviewer toward increasing productivity (8).

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Rapport Versus Force

Every participant at some point in the interview addressed the popular dichotomy between obtaining information through rapport-based approaches and obtaining information through aggressive and coercive means. Unlike in a law enforcement context, where force and heavy coercion has been shown to generate false confessions (9), the acquisition of intelligence information might be seen as less prone to this type of error. Nevertheless, with the exception of two participants, the practitioners were adamant about their experience and professional perspective relating to the uselessness of force-based techniques. Even the two participants who seemingly inferred a potential utility of force were at other times strong proponents of developing rapport. We found no participant with an open affinity toward the use of any heavily coercive approach. It is important for this discussion to note that they did not reject force on moral grounds, rather, force was perceived as ineffective based on consideration of their experiences and the significance of rapport-based successes. The practitioners in this sample clearly articulated a difference between gaining compliance versus gaining co-operation from adversaries (see also, 10).

Although our study does not offer sufficient grounds to dismiss the possibility of latent retributive intent (11), none of the narratives from the practitioners revealed mal-intent for the adversaries that guided their interview practices. To the contrary, the practitioners consistently used their respective ability to behave sympathetically to the most culpable of adversaries as an indicator of superior professional competence.

Cognitive Strategies

The more experienced practitioners in the present sample were able to outline a foundation of cognitive principles that they had generated organi-

cally during the course of their extensive professional practice. Although the ideas were often vague, and sometimes coupled with less empirically valuable concepts, the foundation of the strategies was consistently valid in terms of existing research. An example of the valid strategies mentioned by the practitioners is the utilization of tools such as reverse narratives and sketching (3). Problematically, the explication of cognitive strategies for use in their professional practice emerged only from the practitioners with many years of experience. It is instructive to note that the participants in this study were selected to include particularly well-accomplished and respected practitioners. Thus, the measured and empirical self-assessment necessary in order to distill valid techniques may not be evident in the broader population of practitioners. Even in the present sub-sample of the more imminently qualified practitioners, the amount of time required to reach effectiveness through valid self-generated methodology is extremely inefficient and appears to be derived from nebulous sources outside the training pipeline. Furthermore, the realization of the efficacy of the most advanced principles coincides with the twilight of the practitioners' professional careers, making the development of the techniques ineffectual for use in the broader community through extended mentorship. Finally, the practitioners who had developed cognitively valid strategies were unable to cite a specific source for the tool, or the information leading to the development of the tool. In sum, it would appear that few if any of the established cognitive tools for effective interviewing were obtained through the training pipeline.

Cross-Cultural Considerations

Of the few universally recurrent topics to emerge over the course of the questioning protocol, one of the most pervasive was that of culture and the challenges of cross-cultural interaction in the gathering of intelligence. For example, the complexities of assessing deceit, a far more sophisticated and demanding proposition than simply maintaining positive rapport, has been found to be at odds with cultural variations (12), particularly with adversaries having lower cross-cultural literacy.

A particularly tangible illustration of cultural differentiation was offered by a participant who described his interactions with an adversary in a non-custodial environment that required the mention of the adversary's recently deceased daughter. Although the practitioner appreciated that there were no-

table cultural differences in discussing such a tragedy, his efforts at crafting an appropriate strategy were ultimately unsuccessful, and the maintenance of rapport suffered while likewise causing the acquisition of information to falter. The practitioner stated that he had received extensive cultural training within the parameters of the applicable organizational requirements, but that the background afforded by the training pipeline was insufficient for handling the complexities of this scenario. The practitioner discovered that responding to the situation from a western perspective, with a high level of remorse and empathy, was inconsistent with the existing cultural mores that dictated a detached acceptance of childhood fatalities and a lesser value ascribed to female lives. Although these cultural differences were well known to the practitioner at the time of the interaction, the participant assessed that the extrapolation of an appropriate response through the synthesis of cultural disparity requires a level of cross-cultural literacy beyond that which is typically available in the training pipeline.

Participant Enthusiasm and Frustrations

As a result of the lack of familiarity by the majority of practitioners with the process of conducting research in the cognitive sciences, it often required considerable time and reiteration to clarify the applicability of academic research to the task of intelligence gathering. At such a point as the practitioner was able to create the necessary mental connections, a notable and enduring enthusiasm, not previously apparent in the interview, emerged concerning the promise for significant progress in the field. We observed such an epiphany effect in every interview.

We are encouraged by the strong interest ultimately expressed by all of the participants for ongoing engagement and collaboration with academia. However, the path to collaboration and the subsequent development of effective information for use by the practitioner community faces at least two significant barriers. First, the participants universally stated that if it were not for the practitioner background of CHL, responses to the interview questions would likely have been significantly different, insinuating an unwillingness to speak openly with an individual from outside the intelligence community. Second, the practitioners also expressed apathetic sentiments toward the changeability of the training pipeline.

CONCLUSIONS

Severe Methods

It would be presumptuous to cite data gathered from this survey to support a claim that severe methods of garnering information during adversarial interactions are universally non-productive. However, the consistent reiteration of the value of rapport-based strategies by the participants adds to the significant literature pointing away from the effectiveness of harsh and heavily coercive techniques (1, 10, 13).

Mythology in the Training Pipeline

Several practitioners in this study gave anecdotal evidence suggesting that they based their professional practice, at least in part, on unreliable psychological principles, the source of which is likely the training pipeline. The proliferation of myth-based principles masquerading as valid psychologically grounded strategies has a detrimental effect both on the effectiveness of the practitioner and on the interface with the academic community. The use and promotion of these techniques, most notably neuro-linguistic programming (NLP), among practitioners inculcates the use of unproductive strategies (4). Perhaps more troubling, practitioners who eventually discern the uselessness of the strategies can be justified in branding any subsequent information from an academic sphere as similarly erroneous.

Duration of Professional Practice Required to Obtain Competence

Based on our assessment of the organically derived cognitive principles generated by the practitioners in the twilight of their careers, it is our tentative conclusion that the duration of professional practice required to obtain competence is longer than should be the case. It may be unreasonable to suggest that the total amount of time required to reach professional competence can be shortened dramatically, but access to the more reliable principles of investigative interviewing from the academic-research community would be a significant path forward. This outlook is supported by recent findings from meta-analyses showing that intuitive notions about deception are more accurate than explicit knowledge and that lie detection is more readily improved by increasing behavioral differences between liars and truth tellers than by informing lie-catchers of valid cues to deception (14). Summary interview

protocols for increasing the observable differences between liars and truth tellers are currently available from the academic-research community, such as the cognitive interview for suspects (CIS) (3). The reliable strategies that comprise such protocols could prove valuable to the community of intelligence collectors and counterintelligence agents. Moreover, a variant of the basic CI protocol already has been shown to lead to deception-detection accuracy rates above 80% in ecologically valid settings involving U.S. Army personnel (6).

Culture

Despite the complex implications for experimental methodology, researchers must proactively confront the issue of cross-cultural communication that so deeply affects the practitioner community. The ideal solution would be the utilization of personnel with cultural and linguistic commonalities to their adversaries, but this is not generally feasible. It is of little use to the community for which the research is intended to develop principles, strategies, or tools that do not contend with the fundamental factors of a cross-cultural application. While the participants commented that cross-cultural communication is hugely important to the effectiveness and success of an adversarial interaction, they also commented that it is the component of professional practice on which the least amount of training occurs within the present system. Likewise, the cultural component of adversarial interaction is conspicuously absent from the academic literature, although the subject is sometimes mentioned as potentially significant (1). One notable exception is the important ongoing work of Morgan and colleagues (15, 16).

For clarity, we note that cross-cultural communication efficacy and components of cultural literacy have been addressed successfully within a military context (17), but rarely within the context of adversarial interactions and deception detection in support of the gathering of intelligence. To clarify, consider a negotiation between parties without cultural barriers. In a negotiation between individuals belonging to the same culture, successfully discerning specific features of deceit within the interaction is not necessarily a requirement for success. Many interactions are predicated on accepted deceptions. That is, successful cross-cultural communication for planning and negotiation purposes need not include an exploration of adversarial interaction. Conversely, the intelligence collector—unlike the negotiator—is uniquely

concerned with not only rapport, but the deceit that follows the development of rapport. It is the conditions preceding the deception as well as the cross-cultural aspects *during* the deception that the participants in this study referenced as requiring additional study.

Practitioners as Resources for Methodology and Theory

Historically, the lack of dialogue between the practitioner and academic communities has presented some significant challenges, but the emerging dialogue presents some promising opportunities. One is to improve the effectiveness of the practitioners' performance through exposure to valid principles generated from empirical research. Another is for researchers to garner valuable information for subsequent empirical testing from the practitioners. Responses during the present survey reflect that the more experienced practitioners were able to develop effective and valuable techniques without exposure to research. The identified techniques were viewed as valid by the users, and some are in fact supported by academic research data, but they are of limited utility given the time frame required to achieve the experience that precedes the concepts. Therefore, a more synergistic relationship between the practitioner and the academic has the potential to enhance productivity and efficiency for both communities. Specifically, the observations reported by the present participants that deceptive adversaries tend to provide longer narratives rather than shorter ones, which is opposite what typically is reported in the deception detection literature, represents one clear example of how structured surveys can lead to important questions for study in future collaborative efforts.

An approach to the practitioner community in which there is a more equitable, symbiotic exchange of ideas would most certainly serve to improve the overall relationship for a future interface. Based on the narrative responses from the present sample of experienced practitioners, an interaction that delegitimizes the perspectives of practitioners through ivory tower implications seems likely to be unsuccessful or lead to the generation of inaccurate data. We suggest that the ongoing dialogue maintain a collaborative tone and avoid the implication of ignorance that may have shaped derogatory perceptions of researchers by many in the practitioner community.

AUTHORS' NOTE

The views of the authors offered in this manuscript are strictly those of the authors and do not represent any official views of the Department of Defense, nor does this manuscript represent any Department of Defense official existing or future policy or strategy.

REFERENCES

1. Evans JR, Meissner CA, Brandon SE, Russano MB, Kleinman SM: Criminal versus HUMINT interrogations: the importance of psychological science in improving interrogative practice. Journal of Psychiatry and Law 2010; 38:215-249
2. Bull R, Valentine T, Williamson T: Handbook of Psychology of Investigative Interviewing: Current Developments and Future Directions. New York, John Wiley and Sons, 2009
3. Geiselman RE: The Cognitive Interview for Suspects (CIS). American Journal of Forensic Psychology 2012; 30:3:5-21
4. Mann S, Vrij A, Nasholm E, Warmelink L, Leal S, Forrester D: The direction of deception: neuro-linguistic programming as a lie detection tool. Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology 2012; 27:160-166
5. Colwell K, Hiscock-Anisman C, Memon A, Woods D, Michlik PM: Strategies of impression management among deceivers and truth-tellers: how liars attempt to convince. American Journal of Forensic Psychology 2006; 24:253-260
6. Morgan AM, Colwell LH, Hazlett GA: Efficacy of forensic statement analysis in distinguishing truthful from deceptive eyewitness accounts of highly stressful events. Journal of Forensic Sciences 2011; 56:1227-1234.
7. Wong EC, Schell TL, Jaycox LH, Marshall GN, Tanielian T, Miles JN: Mental health treatment experiences of U.S. service members previously deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. Psychiatric Services 2013; 64:3:277-279.
8. Vrij A, Granhag PA, Mann S, Leal S: Outsmarting the liars: towards a cognitive lie detection approach. Current Directions in Psychological Science 2011; 20:28-32
9. Kassin SM, Leo RA, Meissner CA, Richman KD, Colwell LH, Leach A, La Fon, D: Police interviewing and interrogation: a self-report survey of police practices and beliefs. Law and Human Behavior 2007; 31:381-400
10. Soufan AH: The Black Banners: The Inside Story of 9/11 and the War Against Al-Qaeda. W.W. Norton, New York, 2011
11. Carlsmith KM, Sood AM: The fine line between interrogation and retribution. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 2009; 45:1:191-196
12. Castillo PA, Mallard D: Preventing cross-cultural bias in deception judgments: the role of expectancies about nonverbal behavior. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 2012; 43:6:967-978

13. Abbe A, Brandon SE: The role of rapport in investigative interviewing: a review. Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling 2012; 10:1386-1398
14. Bond CF, Hartwig M: Why do lie-catchers fail? A lens model meta-analysis of human lie judgments. Psychological Bulletin 2011; 137:643-659
15. Morgan AM, Mishara A, Christian J, Hazlett G: Detecting deception through automated analysis of translated speech: credibility assessments of Arabic speaking interviewees. Journal of Intelligence Community Research and Development, August 2008; 1-32
16. Morgan AM, Rabinowitz Y, Christian J, Hazlett G: Detecting deception in Vietnamese: efficacy of forensic statement analysis when interviewing via an interpreter. Journal of Intelligence Community Research and Development, January 2009; 1-22
17. Sands RRG: Language of culture in the Department of Defense: synergizing complimentary instruction and building LREC competency. Small Wars Journal, March 8, 2013

APPENDIX

Structured Interview Protocol

1) Number of years the participant has worked in the field.

How long have you been working in your current field?

2) Age of initial professional practice.

At what age did you initially begin to train in your current profession?

3) Approximate number of total adversarial interactions by the participant.

How many adversarial interactions would you estimate you have had over the course of your career in the present field?

4) Identify scope of adversarial interactions as conducted by participant within a professional context.

What are the circumstances, in terms of stress, oversight, and operational context, of the majority of adversarial interactions in which you have been engaged?

5) Self-assessment of skill and success rate within the context of adversarial interactions.

a. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your overall skills as a practitioner in your field?

b. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your skills as a practitioner in garnering truthful and accurate information during the conduct of adversarial interaction?

c. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your skills as a practitioner in detecting deception?

d. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your skills as a practitioner in garnering truthful and accurate information within a limited period of time?

e. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your skills as a practitioner in garnering truthful and accurate information under extremely stressful circumstances?

f. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your skills as a practitioner in garnering truthful and accurate information within a low stress environment?

g. How would you rate, on the stated scale, your skills as a practitioner in garnering truthful and accurate information when provided with an extended timeline for interaction?

6) Description and exploration of foci within the context of participant's adversarial interactions.

a. When engaged in an adversarial interaction, what specific cues/techniques do you focus on in order to ensure the successful extraction of information?

b. In particular, of the techniques cited as useful within your professional practice, what technique(s) do you find to be the most consistently effective?

7) Techniques observed/assessed as employed by adversaries in resisting or otherwise manipulating the intended trajectory of the interaction.

a. When engaged in an adversarial interaction, what techniques do you observe as employed by the other participant(s) in the service of disrupting your success?

b. In particular, of the techniques most frequently observed as employed by adversaries, what technique(s) do you assess as most effective in disrupting your success?

8) Perspective of the participant on the field of psychology and potential impact within the community of practitioners.

What positive affect might the development of the field of psychology have on the overall effectiveness of your field?

9) Psychological principles of deception detection, memory, and cognition in which the participant has had training.

What training have you received with potential direct impact on your skill in the conduct of adversarial interaction?

10) The use of skills/techniques the participant believes would make the conduct of adversarial interaction more successful.

a. What skills or techniques, based on your knowledge of available resources, would have the greatest impact on your future success?

b. What do you feel is lacking in the training you have received for the conduct of adversarial interactions?

11) Single memorable or formative experience with adversarial interaction.

Describe a particularly memorable or formative adversarial interaction, and what specifically made the experience so significant?

12) Any additional components of perceived significance to the participant.

What additional components of your work do you assess as significant to the topics under discussion during the course of this interview?

13) Potential focus of academic study in the field.

If you were in charge of allocating funding for research in support of your job functions, what issue would you most like to see studied by researchers?

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Charles H. Leps is a veteran of the United States Marine Corps, for whom he functioned as an intelligence collector, and retains a reserve affiliation with the Department of Defense. During the conduct of this research, he was a student at the University of California, Los Angeles and a member of the lab directed by Professor Geiselman. Currently, he is a graduate student and researcher at the John Jay School of Criminal Justice in New York.

R. Edward Geiselman, Ph.D. is a Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Los Angeles, Franz Hall, 405 Hilgard Ave, Los Angeles, California 90095-1563. He has been with UCLA for 35 years and currently teaches classes for law enforcement on investigative interviewing. Please send correspondence for either author to geiselma@psych.ucla.edu.