Eliciting Reliable Information in Investigative Interviews

Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences
2014, Vol. 1(1) 129–136

DOI: 10.1177/2372732214548592
bbs.sagepub.com
SAGE

Aldert Vrij[1], Lorraine Hope[1], and Ronald P. Fisher[2]

Abstract

Interviews are an important part of investigations, as the information obtained from interviewees generates leads and evidence. However, for several psychological reasons, even cooperative victims and witnesses do not spontaneously report all the information they know, and their accounts may incorporate errors. Furthermore, suspects often deliberately withhold information or may attempt to mislead the interviewer. First, known psychological factors promote complete and accurate reports by cooperative witnesses and victims. Such factors relate to the social dynamics between the witness and interviewer (e.g., developing rapport), the interviewee's and the interviewer's cognitive processes, and communication between the witness and interviewer. Empirical research examines interviewing techniques that incorporate these interviewing principles. Second, some suspects may be reluctant to volunteer information. Typically, two interview styles encourage suspects to talk: An information-gathering style seeks to establish rapport with interviewees and uses open-ended exploratory questions to elicit information and establish guilt. An accusatorial style uses closed-ended confirmatory questions to elicit confessions. The former approach performs better at eliciting accurate information and true confessions. In any interview, the ability to detect truth from deceit is important. Many lie detection techniques are based on listening to speech or observing behavior, but only some discriminate between truth and deceit.

Keywords

investigative interviewing, lie detection, cognitive interview, NICHD, interviewing suspects

Tweet

Effective investigative interviews use rapport, prevent overload, gather information, avoid accusing, and observe cognitive load.

Key Points

- Complete, accurate reports by cooperative witnesses depend on social dynamics of the interview (e.g., developing rapport) and both parties' cognitive limits (e.g., avoiding overload).
- Reluctant suspects often respond better to an information-gathering style, more than an accusatory style.
- Lie detection techniques often work no better than chance, but new ones are promising.

Introduction

Interviews are critical to investigations. Information obtained from witnesses, victims, and suspects in the course of investigative interviews not only provide important leads in an investigation but may also generate evidence for subsequent legal proceedings. Professionally conducted interviews use techniques based on psychological science. This advances investigations by eliciting high-quality, reliable information from interviewees. Poorly conducted interviews run a serious risk of eliciting unreliable information, decreasing the amount of information elicited, destroying the credibility of the interviewee, and contaminating the investigative process. Worse still, poor interviewing practice can lead to miscarriages of justice (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004). Using validated psychological principles elicits reliable information, based on key research adapting these principles for application.

The main goal of an investigative interviewer should be to elicit a complete and accurate account from the interviewee. However, such accounts do not usually emerge spontaneously and are also vulnerable to suggestion and error. Established psychological factors promote detailed, accurate reporting by cooperative interviewees. Capitalizing on these factors, researchers have developed interview techniques to address the challenges of eliciting a complete, accurate

[1]University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK
[2]Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA

Corresponding Author:
Aldert Vrij, Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth, King Henry Building, King Henry 1 Street, Portsmouth PO1 2DY, Hants, UK.
Email: aldert.vrij@port.ac.uk

account from interviewees. The first part of this article reviews the relevant research, highlighting the impact of psychological science on investigative interviewing practice.

Suspects may be resistant to talk during interviews. Two dominant styles of interviewing have been developed to encourage interviewees to talk: An information-gathering style seeks to establish rapport with interviewees and uses open-ended, exploratory questions to elicit information and establish guilt. An accusatorial style uses closed-ended confirmatory questions to elicit confessions. We will evaluate how much these interview styles elicit reliable information and true confessions.

In any interview, an important task for the interviewer is to establish whether the interviewee has been truthful. In the final section, we discuss lie detection techniques that are based on listening to speech or observing behavior, and we evaluate their ability to distinguish between truth and deceit.

This article focuses on investigative interviewing in forensic or security settings. However, the underlying psychological principles of high-quality investigative interviewing are also relevant to other types of interview practice (e.g., accident investigations). As such, the current article can inform a wide audience of practitioners and policy makers concerned with interpersonal communication in formal settings or the impact of psychological science on professional practice.

Interviewing Cooperative Adults, Witnesses, and Victims

Effectively interviewing cooperative witnesses and victims demands considerable skill; however, training is often limited (Fisher & Schreiber, 2007). As a result, many investigative interviews are conducted poorly. Consider a typical American police witness/victim interview, which often begins with a standard open-ended question (e.g., "What happened?") but quickly evolves into a barrage of closed questions focused on each element of the crime (e.g., "How tall was the robber?"), and ends with an obligatory, "Is there anything else?" (Fisher & Schreiber, 2007). Such interviews are problematic. Failing to establish rapport, interrupting interviewees, asking primarily closed questions, asking leading and suggestive questions (e.g., "Was he wearing a blue shirt?"), and providing inadequate retrieval support—all hamper interviewees' ability to provide an accurate and complete account. Several psychological factors influence the interview, and techniques based on psychological science can improve the quality of investigative interviews.

A Psychological Approach to Interviewing

Interviewing entails the interviewer and interviewee interacting closely with each other; hence the success of the interview hinges on mutual trust and cooperation. Furthermore, the interviewer must engineer the social dynamics of the interview so that the interviewee sees his or her role as an information generator rather than merely as a question answerer (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992).

Developing rapport. Rapport has been described as the "heart of the interview" (St. Yves, 2009, p. 104). Rapport is the most critical element of investigative interviewing, according to a U.S. Intelligence Science Board report on gathering information, and the most effective way to obtain accurate information from interviews, according to the FBI (Driskell, Blickensderfer, & Salas, 2013).

Rapport consists of mutual attention, positivity, and coordination (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1990). *Mutual attention* is the degree of involvement that both interviewers and interviewees experience, signaled by directly facing, nodding, and verbal back-channel responses ("uh huh," "okay," "yes"; Abbe & Brandon, 2012). *Positivity* refers to friendliness and caring, but also to liking (warmth) and respecting competence (Abbe & Brandon, 2012). *Coordination* refers to how much the people's behavior in the interview is synchronized (showing complementarity, mimicry, accommodation, or convergence; Abbe & Brandon, 2012).

Rapport has benefits for eliciting interviewees' accounts of experienced events. For example, good rapport is associated with reporting more complete and accurate accounts (Collins, Lincoln, & Frank, 2002; Vallano & Schreiber Compo, 2011). However, it is unclear how the rapport advantage occurs. The effects of rapport could be motivational (the interviewee tries harder) or could assist memory retrieval more directly. For example, enhanced coordination may minimize disruption by the interviewer, allowing the witness to actively generate a narrative (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992).

Effectively establishing rapport uses both verbal and nonverbal techniques. Successful nonverbal techniques include having a relaxed posture (Collins et al., 2002) and mimicking the interviewee (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999). Verbal rapport-building techniques include asking questions to show general interest and disclosing personal information from the interviewer (Bedi, Davis, & Williams, 2005).

Promoting detailed accounts. Interviews are most effective when interviewees provide richly detailed narratives. However, interviewees often mistakenly believe that that their task is to answer the interviewer's questions. Interviewers therefore should disabuse witnesses of this incorrect belief and explain that witnesses should provide extensive, detailed information, and not wait passively for the interviewer to ask questions. This can be accomplished by interviewers explicitly informing interviewees of their expected role or by exposing interviewees to a detailed account of an unrelated event, so that the interviewee understands the expected amount detail and type of detail (Leal, Vrij, Warmelink, Vernham, & Fisher, in press). Interviewers can also assist interviewees to generate detailed narratives by (a) asking

mainly open-ended questions and (b) not interrupting interviewees during their narratives (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992).

Promoting accuracy. Individuals retrieving and reporting information from memory face competing demands about their report. On one hand, they need to provide as much information as possible, whereas on the other hand, they need to avoid providing incorrect information. Such competing demands require effective meta-cognition (i.e., thinking about one's own report; Koriat & Goldsmith, 1996). Interviewers can promote accuracy by warning interviewees against guessing and also encouraging them to say "don't know" or "not sure" when appropriate. Interviewers should also avoid excessive questioning—which may be perceived as pressure to respond. For example, they should avoid repeating a question (which suggests that the interviewee's initial response was unsatisfactory) and asking the interviewee about details they have not previously mentioned in their free report (which avoids suggestively leading the witness with respect to information they have not reported).

Properly conducted interviews should also be sensitive to both the interviewee's and the interviewer's cognitive processes. Specifically, the interview should (a) facilitate the interviewee's search through memory and (b) not overload either the interviewee's or the interviewer's limited capacity to process information.

Context reinstatement. According to the "encoding-specificity principle" (Tulving & Thomson, 1973), a match between the original context (when experiences were encoded) and the recall context facilitates memory. For example, divers who learned items underwater recalled better when tested under water than on dry land (Godden & Baddeley, 1975). Mental reinstatement of context draws on this principle by promoting the mental re-visiting of the encoding context (i.e., thinking back to the original event and psychologically re-experiencing physical, mental, and sensory aspects of that event). Mentally re-instating context in this way typically promotes the recall of additional accurate information, particularly effective following a long delay (Fisher, Falkner, Trevisan, & McCauley, 2000).

Multiple and varied retrieval. Attempting to remember an event in detail on multiple occasions typically leads to new-found recollections not reported earlier (Roediger & Payne, 1982; Roediger, Payne, Gillespie, & Lean, 1982). Several attempts to remember an event using different memory strategies, such as remembering the event in reverse order (from end to beginning) or taking a different mental perspective during recall (recalling the event from a different viewpoint) can also facilitate access to additional memories beyond an initial attempt to remember (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992).

Limited capacity. Both interviewees and interviewers have only limited capacity to process information (Kahneman, 1973, 2011), so it is critical not to overload either the interviewee or the interviewer. One general strategy is for the interviewer to avoid asking too many questions, as extensive questioning (a) redirects the interviewee's attention outwardly, toward the interviewer, rather than inwardly, to the source of his or her memory, and (b) forces the interviewer to think about the next series of questions rather than to listen to the interviewee's response. In general, asking fewer questions—but instead, encouraging witnesses to generate information rather than to answer questions—allows interviewees and interviewers both to use their cognitive resources more efficiently.

Communication. Interviewees have to remember what they experienced, but they also must communicate those recollections to the interviewer, which is not always an easy task (e.g., how does one describe the odor of ammonia?). Interviewers communicate mainly through the verbal medium, but some objects and events are better described nonverbally (Leibowitz, Guzy, Peterson, & Blake, 1993). Interviewers can encourage interviewees to use nonverbal methods to express their knowledge. For example, interviewees may be able to describe the layout of a location better through drawing a sketch than through describing it verbally (Dando, Wilcock, & Milne, 2009). Similarly, using a timeline enhances communicating the temporal order of action (Hope, Mullis, & Gabbert, 2013).

Eliciting Complete, Accurate Accounts: Interview Techniques Informed by Psychology

Many of the psychological principles just outlined have guided successful investigative interviewing techniques. Two techniques have had the most significant international impact on investigative interviewing practice: the Cognitive Interview (CI) and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) interviewing protocol.

The Cognitive Interview

The CI is a face-to-face interview format that incorporates the principles of social dynamics, cognition, and communication already noted (for a more complete description of the CI, its theoretical underpinnings, and the derived interviewing techniques, see Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). Currently, approximately 100 laboratory and 3 field studies (actual criminal investigations) have shown the CI to elicit considerably more information than a standard investigative interview, while maintaining accuracy (see the meta-analysis by Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, 2010). The CI is robust and effective for a variety of investigative tasks (e.g., recalling crimes, accidents, health-related experiences, earlier decisions), interviewees (e.g., young children, young adults,

older adults, cognitive challenged), and nationalities (e.g., the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany; for a review, see Fisher, 2010).

The NICHD

Because of their age and dependency, children are particularly vulnerable in forensic interviews. Over the past 30 years, a central investigative concern has been how to elicit testimony from children in a way that enhances the accuracy of their account, preserves the reliability and integrity of their testimony, and protects the credibility of the child as a witness. Better understanding of how memory works, identifying developmental vulnerabilities and capabilities, and appreciating how to facilitate children's reporting—particularly of sensitive or abuse-related experiences—led to the NICHD interviewing protocol (Lamb, Hershkowitz, Orbach, & Esplin, 2008).

The NICHD protocol involves three main stages. The initial stage includes establishing rapport, preparing the child by emphasizing the importance of telling the truth, letting the child know he or she can use "I don't know" or "I don't understand" if need be, and making the child aware of what is expected. In this initial stage, children come to understand that they are expected to give detailed answers and become accustomed to the open-ended questions that will be used during the interview. The substantive second stage, concerning details of the incident, starts with open-ended questions, for example, "What happened yesterday?" Closed-ended questions occur only at the end of the interview. The third stage focuses on any previous disclosures about the incident to other people and ensures the child has said everything he or she wanted. The interview ends with discussion of a neutral topic.

Analysis of child sexual abuse case data (Pipe et al., 2012) showed that using the NICHD protocol interview was associated with more guilty pleas and, where cases were tried, more guilty verdicts, than nonprotocol interviews.

Interviewing Suspects

Interviewing suspects is a thorny task. In recent years, the enhanced interrogation methods used in Iraq and Afghanistan have come under scrutiny (Evans, Meissner, Brandon, Russano, & Kleinman, 2010). In a similar vein, accusatory police techniques typically used in the United States, Canada, and many Asian countries (Kassin et al., 2010; Meissner, Redlich, Bhatt, & Brandon, 2012) have provoked controversy and heated debates. Accusatory interrogation methods presume that the suspect is guilty and typically involve three elements (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004): (a) control, by detaining the suspect in a small room and leaving the suspect uncertain of what will happen; (b) confrontation, by informing the suspect of the incriminating evidence and warning about the consequences of denial; and (c) minimization, by offering the suspect face-saving excuses or justifications of the crime, and implying more lenient consequences if he or she confesses (Meissner et al., 2012).

Supporters of accusatory methods argue that such methods are essential to make reluctant suspects talk (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2013). Opponents of accusatory interrogation methods argue that such methods lead to inaccurate information, including false confessions, and wrongful convictions (Kassin et al., 2010). The alternative to an accusatory method is an information-gathering method, which is used in many European countries, Australia, and New Zealand (Meissner et al., 2012). This method focuses on establishing rapport, explaining to suspects the allegation against them, and asking suspects to give their version of events. Under this approach, investigators are encouraged to listen to suspects, who are allowed to explain themselves without interruption. Only after suspects have been given full opportunity to provide information are they presented with inconsistencies, either (a) within their stories or (b) between their stories and evidence known to the investigator but not revealed yet to the suspects. Investigators are encouraged to use open-ended questions and are not allowed to lie to suspects (e.g., presenting false evidence; Meissner et al., 2012; Williamson, 1993).

Over the past 35 years, research has evaluated the relative merits of both approaches in terms of obtaining accurate information and true confessions. Seven police interview studies in the United Kingdom (where information-gathering interview methods are prevalent) found confession/admission rates ranging from 49% to 61% (Vrij, 2003). These rates were similar to the 50% to 55% admission rates found in police studies across the United States, where accusatory methods are prevalent (Slobogin, 2003).

A meta-analysis, the most thorough comparison of information-gathering and accusatory methods to date (Meissner et al., 2012), included 5 field studies (police studies carried out in the United Kingdom [$n = 3$], Canada, and the United States) and 12 laboratory studies (carried out in the United States [$n = 11$] and the United Kingdom). The results favored the information-gathering approach, which elicited significantly more relevant information than accusatorial methods. Moreover, information-gathering approaches significantly increased the likelihood of true confessions and significantly decreased the likelihood of false confessions, compared with accusatory approaches. In sum, the concern of supporters of accusatory interview methods—that without such techniques, suspects will not talk or confess—is not supported by research. However, these conclusions are based on a relatively small number of studies, all concerning police interviews and laboratory studies. More studies, including those examining military and human intelligence interviews, will increase our understanding of the effects of interrogation techniques on suspects.

Meissner et al.'s (2012) meta-analysis revealed one further advantage of information-gathering methods compared

with accusatory methods: The former provide more cues to deceit. The reasons are twofold. Accusation in itself can change a suspect's behavior (e.g., increase anxiety or panic). Such changes take place in both liars and truth-tellers (Ofshe & Leo, 1997), making their behaviors virtually indistinguishable. Second, information gathering leads suspects to communicate more, which increases the chances of verbal cues to deception, as words are the carriers of such cues (Vrij, Mann, Kristen, & Fisher, 2007).

Lie Detection

Laboratory research including almost 25,000 observers has shown that when observers try to determine veracity based on someone's speech or behavior, they achieve only about 54% accuracy, where 50% can be expected by chance alone (Bond & DePaulo, 2006; Levine, 2014). These accuracy rates improve somewhat when the consequences of (not) being believed increase (Vrij & Granhag, 2012) or when real-life police interviews are examined (Mann, Vrij, & Bull, 2004), but even then, accuracy rates do not exceed 65%.

Misconceptions about lie detection exist. Freud's observation that "betrayal oozes out of him at every pore" (Freud, 1959, p. 94) is not underpinned by empirical data. A meta-analysis including 120 studies (almost all laboratory studies) showed that behavioral differences between truth-tellers and liars are weak and unreliable (DePaulo et al., 2003). Popular views that liars look away or fidget (Strömwall, Granhag, & Hartwig, 2004) are not supported by evidence (DePaulo et al., 2003).

Police interview manuals tend to focus more attention on nonverbal behavior than on speech content when assessing credibility (Vrij, Granhag, & Porter, 2010). They justify this by claiming that as much as 70% of a message communicated between persons occurs at a nonverbal level (Vrij, 2014). This claim is taken out of context and, as such, is misleading. It is largely based on Mehrabian's (1971) work on the communication of single spoken words (such as the expression of emotions through single words such as "dear" or "terrible"), and cannot be applied to police interviews or other interviews, where interviewees say considerably more than a single word.

Lie Detection Tools: The Importance of Empirical Testing

Several lie detection tools have been suggested by researchers and practitioners, but not all are supported by empirical evidence. Two nonverbal lie detection tools are frequently used in practice. First, the Behavioral Analysis Interview (BAI) is used in some U.S. police interviews prior to the interrogation phase, to determine whether the interviewee is indeed "the suspect" (Inbau et al., 2013). The BAI relies on nonverbal and (para)linguistic cues that deception research shows to be unreliable (DePaulo et al., 2003). In addition, little research has evaluated the efficiency of BAI. The field research typically cited in defense of the BAI method (Horvath, Jayne, & Buckley, 1994) is problematic, as the actual veracity status of the interviewee (ground truth) was established in only 2 out of 60 cases examined. In other words, it was largely unknown which of the suspects were actually lying and which were telling the truth. As a result, this field study cannot establish the efficacy of the tool for distinguishing liars from truth-tellers.

Ekman's analyses of micro-expressions, popularized in the TV police series *Lie to Me*, is another nonverbal lie detection technique used by practitioners. Ekman has long argued that deceptive emotional information is betrayed (leaked) by "micro-expressions," fleeting but complete facial expressions that are thought to reveal the felt emotion during emotional concealment and are suppressed within 1/5th to 1/25th of a second (Ekman, 1985/2001). This notion has gained increasing traction in the media (Henig, 2006) and scientific community (Schubert, 2006), despite little empirical research. Ekman, for example, has never published data demonstrating that micro-expressions distinguish truth-tellers from liars. Porter and ten Brinke (2008) conducted the first thorough investigation of facial expressions associated with genuine versus deceptive emotions. Micro-expressions hardly ever occurred (in only 14 out of 697 video fragments that were analyzed); both liars and truth-tellers displayed them.

Two verbal lie detection tools are used in practice internationally. The first is criteria-based content analysis (CBCA), a tool designed to determine the credibility of *child* witnesses' testimonies in trials for *sexual offenses* (Steller & Köhnken, 1989). CBCA assessments are accepted as evidence in some North American courts and in criminal courts in several Western European countries (Vrij, 2008). CBCA experts read written transcripts of interviews with children in alleged sexual abuse cases and score for the presence of 19 criteria in these transcripts. Examples of criteria are *unstructured production* (whether the information is not provided in a chronological time sequence), *contextual embeddings* (references to time and space), *descriptions of interactions, reproduction of speech*, and *spontaneous corrections*. More than 50 CBCA studies have been published to date showing around 72% accuracy in distinguishing truths and lies with CBCA (albeit the vast majority of them are laboratory studies with adult participants, not the intended context, making it difficult to assess its accuracy in real-life child sexual abuse cases; Vrij, 2008).

A second frequently used verbal lie detection tool is Scientific Content Analysis (SCAN), developed by a former polygraph examiner in the Israeli police. International users include federal law enforcement (including the FBI), military agencies (including the U.S. Army Military Intelligence), secret services (including the Central Intelligence Agency [CIA]), and other types of investigators (including social workers and lawyers; Nahari, Vrij, & Fisher, 2012). In the SCAN procedure, suspects write down in their own words

their version of events. SCAN experts score the presence of an undefined number of criteria, including some criteria also assessed by CBCA experts.

The word *scientific* is misleading because no theoretical rationale justifies why truth- tellers and liars would differ on the SCAN criteria. Research into SCAN is scarce and not particularly compelling. The only laboratory study to date showed that truth-tellers and liars could not be distinguished from each other above chance level (Nahari et al., 2012). The (field) study referenced by proponents of the SCAN method (Driscoll, 1994) is problematic because ground truth was not established. Moreover, for the CBCA and SCAN criteria that overlap, predictions contradict each other: CBCA experts claim that some of the same criteria are more prevalent in truthful statements, and SCAN experts claim that they are more prevalent in deceptive statements. Research supports the CBCA assumptions (Vrij, 2008).

More recently, two new techniques use a more active approach to detect deceit, the Strategic Use of Evidence (SUE) approach (Granhag & Hartwig, 2008) and the cognitive lie detection approach (Vrij, Granhag, Mann, & Leal, 2011). Both approaches take into account the different mental states of truth-tellers and liars and are based on the principle that investigators can elicit differences between truth-tellers and liars through specific questioning. SUE takes as its starting position that truth-tellers are forthcoming in interviews, whereas liars do not wish to be linked to incriminating evidence and thereby use an "avoid and escape" strategy. The core of the SUE technique is to ask questions related to the evidence without actually mentioning the evidence, "When you were in the shopping mall, did you visit the book store?" (leaving out the CCTV evidence that the person visited the book store). Liars are then more likely than truth-tellers to provide a statement that contradicts the evidence (e.g., denying having been at a certain place at a certain time), according to a meta-analysis of the SUE technique (Hartwig, Granhag, & Luke, 2014).

The cognitive lie detection technique contends that certain instructions can be more difficult to follow for liars than truth-tellers. This technique comprises three key elements. First, in interview settings, lying is more difficult than truth-telling (Christ, Van Essen, Watson, Brubaker, & McDermott, 2009), and investigators can exploit this by making the interview setting more difficult through additional "imposing cognitive load" requests. If lying already requires more cognitive resources than truth-telling, liars will have fewer cognitive resources left over to deal with such additional requests. For example, when interviewees were asked to recall their story in reverse order—a difficult task—lie detection was better than when they recalled their stories in chronological order (Evans, Michael, Meissner, & Brandon, 2013).

The second element of the cognitive lie detection approach encourages interviewees to say more, for example, by using a supportive interviewer or by using a model statement of a detailed response. A supportive interviewer creates a pleasant atmosphere and makes the interviewee feel appreciated. A model statement of a detailed response gives the interviewee a good idea how much detail is required. Such methods result in truth-tellers adding more detail than liars do (Leal et al., in press; Mann et al., 2013). Liars' tendency to add fewer details than truth-tellers may be because they lack the necessary imagination or creativity to add the same amount of detail as truth-tellers, or they may be reluctant to say more out of fear that any additional information will expose possible leads—or their deception—to investigators.

The third element of the cognitive lie detection approach is to ask unexpected questions. Liars prepare themselves for interviews by thinking of answers to possible questions (Hartwig, Granhag, & Strömwall, 2007). The difficulty liars face is that they do not know what questions will be asked. Investigators can exploit this by asking a mixture of questions that liars have expected and questions that they have not expected, but that make perfect sense in the given context, such as spatial questions ("Where did you and your friend sit in the restaurant") and questions about the planning of activities. Typically, truth-tellers and liars provide the same amount of detail when answering expected questions, but liars are less detailed than truth-tellers when answering unexpected questions (Knieps, Granhag, & Vrij, 2013).

A meta-analysis of the cognitive lie detection approach, including 38 studies of which 11 reported accuracy rates, revealed a superior lie detection rate in the cognitive load interviews (72%) compared with the standard interviews (58%; Vrij, 2014).

Conclusion

Currently, most investigative interviews are conducted by practitioners whose guidance comes from hands-on experience, but with minimal formal training. As described here, however, researchers (mainly cognitive and social psychologists) can contribute to the process, either by testing currently held beliefs about methods (some of which may be inaccurate) or by developing new theoretically informed methods of interviewing. We expect that improved methods of interviewing will aid not only legal/criminal investigations, but may also be adapted to many other investigative contexts: debriefing hostages after their ordeals, collecting medical histories from patients, conducting financial audits, eliciting information from witnesses to accidents, and so on. We encourage creative readers to explore this potential.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Abbe, A., & Brandon, S. E. (2012). The role of rapport in investigative interviewing: A review. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *10*, 237-249. doi:10.1002/jip. 1386

Bedi, R. P., Davis, M. D., & Williams, M. (2005). Critical incidents in the formation of the therapeutic alliance from the client's perspective. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *42*, 311-323. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.42.3.311

Bond, C. F., & DePaulo, B. M. (2006). Accuracy of deception judgements. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 214-234.

Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception–behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 893-910. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.6.893

Christ, S. E., Van Essen, D. C., Watson, J. M., Brubaker, L. E., & McDermott, K. B. (2009). The contributions of prefrontal cortex and executive control to deception: Evidence from activation likelihood estimate meta-analyses. *Cerebral Cortex*, *19*, 1557-1566. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhn189

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

Dando, C. J., Wilcock, R., & Milne, R. (2009). The cognitive interview: The efficacy of a modified mental reinstatement of context procedure for frontline police investigators. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *23*, 138-147.

DePaulo, B. M., Lindsay, J. L., Malone, B. E., Muhlenbruck, L., Charlton, K., & Cooper, H. (2003). Cues to deception. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*, 74-118.

Driscoll, L. N. (1994). A validity assessment of written statements from suspects in criminal investigations using the SCAN technique. *Police Studies*, *17*, 77-88.

Driskell, T., Blickensderfer, E. L., & Salas, E. (2013). Is three a crowd? Examining rapport in investigative interviews. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, *17*, 1-13. doi:10.1037/a0029686

Ekman, P. (1985). *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics and marriage*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton. (Reprinted in 1992 and 2001)

Evans, J. R., Meissner, C. A., Brandon, S. E., Russano, M. B., & Kleinman, S. M. (2010). Criminal versus HUMINT interrogations: The importance of psychological science to improving interrogative practice. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, *38*, 215-249.

Evans, J. R., Michael, S. W., Meissner, C. A., & Brandon, S. E. (2013). Validating a new assessment method for deception detection: Introducing a Psychologically Based Credibility Assessment Tool. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *2*, 33-41.

Fisher, R. P. (2010). Interviewing cooperative witnesses. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *15*, 25-38.

Fisher, R. P., Falkner, K. L., Trevisan, M., & McCauley, M. R. (2000). Adapting the cognitive interview to enhance long-term (35 years) recall of physical activities. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 180-189.

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing: The cognitive interview*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Fisher, R. P., & Schreiber, N. (2007). Interviewing protocols to improve eyewitness memory. In M. Toglia, R. Lindsay, D. Ross, & J. Reed (Eds.), *The handbook of eyewitness psychology: Vol. 1. Memory for events* (pp. 53-80). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Freud, S. (1959). *Collected papers*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Godden, D., & Baddeley, A. (1975). Context dependent memory in two natural environments. *British Journal of Psychology*, *66*, 325-331. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.1975.tb01468.x

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.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., & Luke, T. (2014). Strategic use of evidence during investigative interviews: The state of the science. In D. C. Raskin, C. R. Honts, & J. C. Kircher (Eds.), *Credibility assessment: Scientific research and applications* (pp. 1-36). Oxford, UK: Academic Press.

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

Henig, R. M. (2006, February 5). Looking for the lie. *New York Times*. Available from www.nytimes.com

Hope, L., Mullis, R., & Gabbert, F. (2013). Who? What? When? Using a timeline technique to facilitate recall of a complex event. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *2*, 20-24.

Horvath, F., Jayne, B., & Buckley, J. (1994). Differentiation of truthful and deceptive criminal suspects in behavioral analysis interviews. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *39*, 793-807.

Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., Buckley, J. P., & Jayne, B. C. (2013). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (5th ed). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S. A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G. H., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. D. (2010). Police-induced confessions: Risk factors and recommendations. *Law and Human Behavior*, *34*, 3-38. doi:10.1007/s10979-009-9188-6

Kassin, S. M., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2004). The psychology of confessions: A review of the literature and issues. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *5*, 33-67.

Knieps, M., Granhag, P. A., & Vrij, A. (2013). Back to the future: Asking about mental images to discriminate between true and false intentions. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, *147*, 619-640.

Koriat, A., & Goldsmith, M. (1996). Monitoring and control processes in the strategic regulation of memory accuracy. *Psychological Review*, *103*, 490-517.

Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. W. (2008). *Tell me what happened: Structured investigative interviews of child victims and witnesses*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Leal, S., Vrij, A., Warmelink, L., Vernham, Z., & Fisher, R. (in press). 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*.

Leibowitz, H. W., Guzy, L. T., Peterson, E., & Blake, P. T. (1993). Quantitative perceptual estimates: Verbal versus nonverbal retrieval techniques. *Perception*, *22*, 1051-1060.

Levine, T. (2014). Active deception detection. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1*, 122-128.

Mann, S., Vrij, A., & Bull, R. (2004). Detecting true lies: Police officers' ability to detect deceit. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 137-149.

Mann, S., Vrij, A., Shaw, D., Leal, S., Ewans, S., Hillman, J., Granhag, P. A., & Fisher, R. P. (2013). 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

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages* (1st ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Meissner, C. A., Redlich, A. D., Bhatt, S., & Brandon, S. (2012). Interview and interrogation methods and their effects on true and false confessions. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *2012*, Article 13. doi:10.4073/csr.2012.13

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.

Nahari, G., Vrij, A., & Fisher, R. P. (2012). Does the truth come out in the writing? SCAN as a lie detection tool. *Law and Human Behavior*, *36*, 68-76.

Ofshe, R. J., & Leo, R. A. (1997). The decision to confess falsely: Rational choice and irrational action. *Denver University Law Review*, *74*, 979-1112.

Pipe, M. E., Orbach, Y., Lamb, M. E., Abbott, C. B., & Stewart, H. (2012). Do case outcomes change when investigative interviewing practices change? *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, *19*, 179-190. doi:10.1037/a0030312

Porter, S., & ten Brinke, L. (2008). Reading between the lies: Identifying concealed and falsified emotions in universal facial expressions. *Psychological Science*, *19*, 508-514.

Roediger, H. L., & Payne, D. G. (1982). Hypermnesia: The role of repeated testing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, *8*, 66-72.

Roediger, H. L., Payne, D., Gillespie, G. L., & Lean, D. S. (1982). Hypermnesia as determined by level of recall. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *21*, 635-665.

Schubert, S. (2006, October). A look tells all. *Scientific American Mind*. Retrieved from http://www.federaljack.com/ebooks/Consciousness%20Books%20Collection/SciAm%20Mind%2017.5%20-%20Brainstorm.pdf

Slobogin, C. (2003). An empirically based comparison of American and European regulatory approaches to police investigation. In P. J. van Koppen & S. D. Penrod (Eds.), *Adversarial versus inquisitorial justice: Psychological perspectives on criminal justice systems* (pp. 27-54). New York, NY: Plenum.

Steller, M., & Köhnken, G. (1989). Criteria-based content analysis. In D. C. Raskin (Ed.), *Psychological methods in criminal investigation and evidence* (pp. 217-245). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

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.

St. Yves, M. (2009). Police interrogation in Canada: From the quest for confession to the search for the truth. In T. Williamson, B. Milne, & S. P. Savage (Eds.), *International developments in investigative interviewing* (pp. 92-110). Devon, UK: Willan.

Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The nature of rapport and its nonverbal correlates. *Psychological Inquiry*, *1*, 285-293.

Tulving, E., & Thomson, D. M. (1973). Encoding specificity and retrieval processes in episodic memory. *Psychological Review*, *80*, 352-373.

Vallano, J. P., & Schreiber Compo, N. (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. doi:10.1002/acp.1789

Vrij, A. (2003). We will protect your wife and child, but only if you confess: Police interrogations in England and the Netherlands. In P. J. van Koppen & S. D. Penrod (Eds.), *Adversarial versus inquisitorial justice: Psychological perspectives on criminal justice systems* (pp. 55-79). New York, NY: Plenum.

Vrij, A. (2008). *Detecting lies and deceit: Pitfalls and opportunities* (2nd ed.). Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

Vrij, A. (2014, May 13-14). *A cognitive approach to lie detection*. Federal Law Enforcement Training Centre (FLETC) symposium "At the Intersection of Theory and Technique," Brunswick, GA.

Vrij, A. (2014). Myths and opportunities in verbal and nonverbal lie detection. In M. St. Yves (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: The essential* (pp. 225-239). Canada: Carswell.

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

Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2011). Outsmarting the liars: Towards a cognitive lie detection approach. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*, 28-32. doi: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:10.1177/1529100610390861

Vrij, A., Mann, S., Kristen, S., & Fisher, R. P. (2007). Cues to deception and ability to detect lies as a function of police interview styles. *Law and Human Behavior*, *31*, 499-518.

Williamson, T. (1993). From interrogation to investigative interviewing: Strategic trends in police questioning. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *3*, 89-99.