Unbalanced Implementation of Cognitive Interviewing Across Law Enforcement

Shane McNeil

University of North Dakota

PSYC 593: Readings in Psychology

Dr. Richard Wise

11 December 2020
Abstract

It has been approximately 36 years since the initial development of the cognitive interviewing technique for conducting witness interviews. In that time, federal law enforcement has adopted the technique and numerous studies have repeatedly shown the value of using cognitive interviewing to increase the quantity and value of witness recall. While cognitive interviewing, like any other scientifically devised technique, has limitations, each of these limitations can be mitigated limiting any negative impact that may reduce law enforcement’s choice to implement it. Even after decades of research, demonstrated real-world value in federal investigations, and similar implementations in other nation’s police forces, with few exceptions local US law enforcement still has not implemented cognitive interviewing. Would additional training and improved leadership bring local law enforcement into balance with the federal system?
In August 2000, a US Air Force female technical training school student was attacked in the home of one of her assigned Air Force instructors. While an initial rape test was conducted at the hospital in 2000, due to the stigma surrounding sexual assault in the military the victim first reported the crime on March 12, 2014 to the 82nd Training Wing Staff Judge Advocate at Sheppard Air Force Base. The nearly 14 years that passed since the assault led to a breadth of memory issues in the victim and a “he said, she said” situation for investigators. However, due to the cognitive interview training of the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) investigators, the victim was able to provide a sketch of the attacker’s residence – a place she never should have been as a trainee – which led to charges and a conviction in the cold case (Amann & AFOSI Public Affairs, 2017).

Prior to the 1980s, nearly all law enforcement interviewing techniques consisted primarily of asking a list of set questions such as “How tall was he? How much did he weigh? Did he have a weapon?” Questions may have even been specifically leading to gain an answer desired for the investigation such as “He was wearing a red shirt, wasn't he?” (Geiselman & Fisher, 2014) As of 2014, numerous federal agencies including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Transportation Safety Board, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and the Defense Intelligence Agency have adopted cognitive interview techniques for conducting witness and suspect interviews (R. E. Geiselman & Fisher, 2014). However, after 36 years, and numerous studies showing the effectiveness of cognitive interviewing, law enforcement outside of the federal system are still using the same techniques to conduct witness interviews they used almost half a century ago (Schreiber Compo et al., 2012). So, if an abundance of evidence shows cognitive interviewing works, why after all these years are local police still not using it in their interviews?
How Are Police Interviewing Witnesses?

If local law enforcement agencies are not using cognitive interviewing techniques, how are they conducting their witness interviews? One study involving two Florida police departments evaluated the questioning techniques used by experienced detectives who had each conducted at least 10 witness/victim interviews (Schreiber Compo et al., 2012). According to the Schreiber Compo et al. (2012) study, of the questions asked by the detectives, only 11% were open-ended narrative and the most common types of question were yes/no (59%) followed by closed-ended questions (26%). In other words, 85% of questions asked of the witnesses gave them little to no opportunity to expound upon the answer or generate new leads for the investigation. The most common negative behaviors were suggestive/leading questions (5.87 times per witness interview) and interrupting the witness (5.67 times per witness interview) and 44% of interviews contained negative rapport building such as intimidating or insulting the witness (Schreiber Compo et al., 2012). Schreiber Compo et al. (2012) concluded that the police officers they studied “followed neither generally recommended interviewing principles (e.g. open-ended questions and building rapport) nor more specific best evidence witness interviewing recommendations” (Ronald P Fisher & Geiselman, 1992; Schreiber Compo et al., 2012, p. 368; Technical Working Group for Eyewitness Evidence, 1999).

Continuing the examination of police interviewing techniques, an earlier study by Kassin et al., (2007) assessed 631 police officers’ self-reported interrogation beliefs and practices, including detection of deception and frequency of use for 16 various interview techniques. It should be noted that this study evaluates interrogation rather than specifically interviewing; however, as most police officers are not trained in witness interview techniques (Hirn Mueller et al., 2015, p. 296) they are likely to fall back on what training they do have (Cleary & Warner, 2016) which is commonly interrogation. The most common techniques the officers believed they used were physical isolation, identification of contradictions in multiple accounts, establishing rapport, confrontation of suspects with evidence of
their guilt, and appealing to self-interests. Several of these tactics are components of the Reid Technique – the “most popular and frequently used police interview technique” (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011, p. 33).

The Reid Technique is an interrogation technique rather than an interview technique; however, as previously stated, most police officers are not trained in witness interview techniques and are likely to fall back on their limited training in interrogation for interviews. This technique is reported to be widely known throughout law enforcement and, according to John E. Reid & Associates Inc. who teach the technique, more than half a million investigators have been trained in this technique since its development in 1974 (John E. Reid & Associates Inc., n.d.). Even with the controversy surrounding the Reid Technique, explained in the next paragraph, many departments continue to train their officers in the use of this technique (Ohio Attorney General, 2020; Oklahoma Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training, 2020).

So, if the Reid Technique is the most common, does that mean it is the most effective? While some in law enforcement who use the technique would agree, study after study shows the technique is actually likely to generate false confessions and can result in wrongful convictions (Kassin et al., 2010; Moore & Fitzsimmons, 2011; Spierer, 2018). According to a review of the technique by the Connecticut Office of Legislative Research (Orlando, 2014), the Reid Technique begins with determining that an individual is likely to have committed a crime through factual analysis and then to begin interrogation through “positive confrontation” – a technique in which the investigator starts the interrogation by accusing the individual of committing the crime. In using the Reid Technique, once an investigator has personally decided that the individual is guilty, they will use “isolation, positive confrontation, the interruption of denials, the presentation of false evidence, minimization,” (Meissner & Kassin, 2004, p. 87) and other techniques that are strongly associated with behavioral confirmation bias to coerce a confession. In conducting an interview using this technique, an investigator may have no knowledge that
they are potentially extracting a false confession or generating false or misleading memories (Clarke & Milne, 2001, High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group, 2016; Meissner & Kassin, 2004). Interestingly, even John E. Reid & Associates Inc. who developed and train the Reid Technique recommend that officers conducting witness interviews “consider using cognitive interviewing techniques” (John E. Reid & Associates Inc, 2011).

All of this is not meant to imply that police officers are choosing not to use the best possible techniques in conducting interviews. In fact, many of the above studies examining actual interviews do not align with the self-reported behaviors of law enforcement officers, and even in the Kassin et al. (2007) study, the officers believed they were using the most effective techniques. Hirn Mueller et al. (2015) identified that law enforcement officers can recognize good interviewing techniques when they see them and report frequently using these techniques in interviews; however, another study found that officers’ reports of what they believe they are doing fail to align with the actual observed behaviors during interviews (Clarke & Milne, 2001). In other words, police officers at the local level believe they are using the most effective interview techniques, so what could be causing these officers to use ineffective techniques when the federal system uses techniques that are scientifically supported?

**Potential Explanations for the Imbalance**

**Lack of Training?**

Could the imbalance in implementation of cognitive interviewing be due to the difference in training between local and federal law enforcement? While for decades police interview training was a mystery to anyone who had not been through the police academies, multiple studies in the last 10 years have provided new insights into local law enforcement training. These studies have produced varied results but do show some commonalities. Amongst the studies, the Reid Technique appears to be the primary method although the percentage of active law enforcement investigators currently trained in
Reid is difficult to verify. The three studies looking at Reid Technique training (Cleary & Warner, 2016; Kassin et al., 2007; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009) report quite different training rates of 11%, 29%, and 55.9% respectively. Other less common interview training techniques identified in Cleary & Warner’s 2016 study include Britain’s PEACE (Planning and Preparation, Engage and Explain, Account, Closure, Evaluation) Model, which will be examined later, as well as military and intelligence interrogation techniques, otherwise known as Human Intelligence or “HUMINT.” Of the officers who have received formal interview training, each of these later models accounted for only 8.2% and 5.9% respectively (Cleary & Warner, 2016), although some of the officers trained in HUMINT may have received that training outside of their individual departments such as through prior military training, as it is a means of intelligence collection rather than a traditional law enforcement technique. As for cognitive interview training, while more common than the British PEACE method or the intelligence community’s HUMINT techniques, only 14.6% of state and local law enforcement officers reported receiving cognitive interviewing-type training (Hirn Mueller et al., 2015).

While it is difficult to compare the state and local training to the federal training because no studies have directly examined federal law enforcement training, there is evidence that the federal system has incorporated cognitive interviewing into much of its curriculum, based on published federal training programs and reports. For instance, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) has six training programs specifically incorporating cognitive interviewing, including Introduction to Criminal Investigation Training Program and Advanced Interviewing for Law Enforcement Investigators (Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, 2020b). In addition, the previously mentioned AFOSI trains their agents exclusively to conduct cognitive interviews as a part of their Sex Crimes Investigations Training Program (United States Air Force, 2015). Other federal agencies that have developed their own internal cognitive interview training programs include the National Transportation Safety Board, Customs and Border Patrol, and the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (Bourke & Van Hasselt, 2018, p. 457). So
while there may not be published academic research into federal implementation of cognitive interviewing, if the evidence shows that federal agents are trained in the technique and federal leadership dictates its use that it is more likely than not that criminal investigators in the federal system are utilizing cognitive interviewing techniques, although it should be noted it is possible they may be using the techniques improperly as there is no research to validate.

If state and local law enforcement is not using cognitive interviewing because of a lack of training, can their training regimen be corrected through education or directives from the federal government? In 1999, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) published guidelines outlining interviewing techniques that aligned with the cognitive interview process (Hirn Mueller et al., 2015, p. 296). NIJ’s published guidelines were followed with a training manual disseminated to local law enforcement organizations across the United States; however, in many cases the guidelines did not make it into actual police training. As of 2015, 91% of law enforcement officers who attended their applicable police academy after 1999 received only informal “on the job” training to conduct interviews (Cleary & Warner, 2016). Furthermore, of the 220 supervisory and mid-career state and local police officers interviewed by Cleary & Warner (2016) while attending the FBI National Academy, only 2.3% reported a mandate by their department to follow NIJ interviewing guidelines. It appears that even after being made aware of recommended changes, police departments are reticent to update the manner in which they train, or do not train, their officers to conduct interviews.

A Leadership Failure?

As previously mentioned, only 2.3% of police officers reported a mandate to follow the published NIJ interviewing guidelines (Hirn Mueller et al., 2015, p. 296). Could this mean that the reason local law enforcement has failed to implement cognitive interviewing in witness interviewing is that their leadership has not instructed them to do so? Are there any examples of positive police leadership
that resulted in the implementation of positive police reforms in interviewing which other departments could follow?

Implementing cognitive interviewing could be considered a police reform, much like many of the other reforms that have been initiated in the past few years following numerous policing missteps that have captured national attention. In the past, successful reforms have been driven by strong and committed leaders such as the successful efforts in Pittsburg and Los Angeles to increase police accountability while lessening instances of excessive force (Chanin, 2014). After the federal government mandated reforms be made, the reforms were championed by the Chiefs of Police and city governments. While officers on the street have broad discretion, several studies have shown that leaders, especially first-line supervisors, who place a high priority on implementation of reform are the “most influential voices of accountability” (Chanin, 2014, p. 40; Fernandez & Rainey, 2011; Kelling & Bratton, 1993; Santos, 2013). If, instead of 2.3% of departments mandating cognitive interviewing, if there were a true effort by police leaders at the departmental level and below to implement NIJ guidelines, perhaps there would be reform.

Avoidance of Limitations?

Like anything in psychology or law enforcement, cognitive interviewing has its limitations and situations in which the techniques may not work effectively. Have these limitations created a scenario in which it is too difficult for law enforcement to effectively implement cognitive interviewing or does the situation simply require training on how and when to implement the technique for maximum effectiveness? To answer, let us review what some of the limitations are.

In 1989, Ronald P. Fisher et al. conducted a field test of their new technique to determine its effectiveness in real world situations. While their test was effective at showing the benefits of cognitive interviewing, with trained detectives eliciting 63% more information over traditional interview
techniques, they did identify a few limitations in the initial technique. These limitations are: (1) the effectiveness may vary between different types of crimes; (2) the technique can only be used with cooperative witnesses; (3) the technique could potentially take longer than traditional witness interview techniques, although this was not observed in their study; and (4) the technique “requires considerable mental concentration on the part of the interviewer” (Ronald P. Fisher et al., 1989). While these limitations could be the reason that the technique is not more commonly used among local law enforcement, they could also apply to any witness interviewing technique and therefore may not be actual limitations of cognitive interviewing. For instance, it is true that the effectiveness could vary between different crimes; however, Fisher et al. meant this to say that the technique is most effective in the case of crimes where most of the evidence is derived from eyewitness reports such as robbery or battery (Ronald P. Fisher et al., 1989). If there is no eyewitness to the crime, then enhancing the memory of eyewitnesses would have no benefit. Furthermore, while the technique may only work with cooperative witnesses, studies show that effective rapport such as that encouraged through cognitive interviewing could shift a witness to become more cooperative (Collins et al., 2002; Hershkowitz et al., 2013). As for the time and preparation required, each of those items is subjective and therefore difficult to quantify as one investigator may spend significantly more or less time preparing for their interviews than another. However, researchers have recognized that time may be a concern in real-world law enforcement scenarios and have developed and effectively tested multiple shortened versions of the cognitive interview, including one specifically designed for by patrol officers in time-limited situations (Geiselman & Fisher, 2014).

Another studied limitation of the cognitive interview is that it does not decrease the impact of the social desirability bias - a type of response bias in which the interviewee tends to answer questions in a manner that will be viewed favorably by others (Krumpal, 2011). In other words, the witness to a crime may alter their recounting of the events to align with what they believe either the interviewer or
society would want them to have observed. This is not a unique limitation of cognitive interviewing, however, and a meta-analysis of studies on this effect indicates that accuracy in cognitive interviewing is almost identical to standard interviews (Köhnken et al., 1999). This bias may be stronger in children and could explain why there have been some observed limitations related to the use of cognitive interview with children (Memon et al., 1997). Although the original cognitive interview has been modified over the years to account for effects based on age, the results can vary with some studies indicating modified cognitive interviews with pre-adolescent children can increase the amount of correct information recalled but may also increase the rates of confabulation (McCauley & Fisher, 1995; Memon et al., 1997). Again though, the confabulation rates observed by McCauley & Fisher (1995) were similar to those in standard interviews. While an interviewer should be aware of these possibilities, the evidence does not necessarily indicate that limitations based on social desirability bias or confabulation are any more significant with cognitive interviewing that with the interview techniques police have traditionally used.

Another previously identified potential limitation that likely has limited impact is possibility that the cognitive interview is ineffective for persons diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder (Maras & Bowler, 2010). There is some evidence that there is a relationship between autism spectrum disorder and offending behavior (Hayes, 2016) indicating a potentially increased likelihood of law enforcement coming in contact with individuals on the spectrum. Follow-up research on this topic has indicated that any limitation caused by an Autism Spectrum Disorder diagnosis can be “ameliorated in large part by taking these witnesses physically back to the scene of the crime for the [cognitive interview] rather than having them mentally reconstruct the context at a different location as is typically the case” (Maras & Bowler, 2012). In other words, once again an identified limitation of the cognitive interview can be mitigated through simple preparation and the potential expenditure of additional time.
Possibly more than any other, one limitation to cognitive interviewing that does have the potential to create a significant concern for law enforcement is the prospect of an impact on the witness’ ability to accurately identify a face in comparison to a standard police interview. In many cases, a witness identification is the key component to identifying, charging, and convicting a suspect in a crime, and may also be the key factor impacting wrongful incarceration, with 75% of the first 183 DNA exonerations in the United States stemming from mistaken witness identification (Schuster, 2007). The importance of a correct and properly executed witness identification cannot be understated. To that end, in 1999, Finger & Pezdek conducted a study to determine the impact of verbal descriptions on face identification accuracy. Finger & Pezdek (1999) first examined the effect of the cognitive interview on face recognition accuracy and showed a potential for lessened accuracy of facial identification following a cognitive interview versus following a standard interview. The standard interview was followed by 73% correct facial identification while the cognitive interview was followed by 47% correct facial identifications. They then repeated the experiment but added in a one-hour break between the interview and the facial identification, resulting in a near-reversal of the previous results with 69% correct identification following the standard interview but 85% correct following the cognitive interview. Finger & Pezdek (1999) went on to demonstrate that describing a face impairs the subsequent ability to accurately identify the face. However, by adding in a gap, later identified as potentially as small as 24 minutes, that impairment could be eliminated. Like other possible limitations of the cognitive interview, simply understanding the research and utilizing the technique correctly can mitigate or eliminate the potential negatives – although with the potential expenditure of additional time.

So, could the limitations of cognitive interviewing be the reasoning behind local police forces’ failure to implement cognitive interviewing techniques? Of all cognitive interviewing’s potential weaknesses, the greatest is probably the fact that it does require special training and potentially even a willingness to listen and understand a witness at more than a nominal level. In a local law enforcement
culture that focuses 35% of its training on use of weapons and force versus about 8% on how to conduct an investigation or 18% on an actual understanding of the law (Reaves, 2016), it will almost certainly be difficult to convey the message that training on interviewing is important. This is one limitation that may be difficult to overcome – perhaps though, showing how it has been done before might be the answer.

**Examination of Implemented Cognitive Interview Reform**

A good example of a successful implementation of cognitive interviewing at the local level is the PEACE system in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom, the PEACE model incorporates the enhanced cognitive interview for witness and victim interviewing while using the conversation management method for suspect interrogations (Clarke & Milne, 2001).

How does this technique compare for leadership and training? According to the official evaluation of the PEACE model by Clarke & Milne (2001), the model was first introduced to policing in the United Kingdom by the Home Office in 1993 and by 1998 over 70% of police in England and Wales had already been trained in and begun implementing the new system. In addition to just making the recommendation for the training like the NIJ did in the U.S., 49% of United Kingdom police departments had a “supervision of interviewing policy” in place within the first 5 years (Clarke & Milne, 2001). The 2001 study by Clarke & Milne, which was funded by the British Home Office, is one of the most comprehensive evaluations of police interviewing and interrogation reform available and shows the United Kingdom’s commitment to implementing real change.

While the PEACE system has not been a perfectly implemented plan, the evaluation in 2001 took place only 8 years after its initiation and there were noticeable improvements, as well as aspects that still needed to be enhanced. While the overall tone of the evaluation was negative, expressing that the PEACE model had not been fully implemented as quickly as hoped, when compared with American models of similar implementation discussed above, the results are surprisingly positive. So much so that
the PEACE model has expanded outside the United Kingdom, with New Zealand and Norway implementing the technique and even the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture has encouraged the use of the PEACE model as a worldwide protocol for police interviewing (Rhodes, 2016).

As for the potential impact of limitations, one primary concern for the PEACE model that mirrors the concerns in the United States is the amount of time the technique takes over the standard interview. In examining a standard interview, one study showed the average length of interview including the statement writing stage was 50 minutes with the minimum being 8 minutes and maximum 131 minutes (Schollum & New Zealand Police, 2005). Clarke and Milne’s 2001 study found that the average PEACE interview took 23 minutes, so while much of the time during a standard interview is not actually spent interviewing the witness (Schollum & New Zealand Police, 2005) the end result is that the PEACE interview does not actually require any more time than the standard interview. As both PEACE and the cognitive interview utilize the same methodology, this research would indicate that while US law enforcement may be concerned about not having the time to implement the technique, once again the science does not align with their concerns.

Continued Research

Additional research into the current views of local police departments on cognitive interviewing techniques would provide valuable insight into the reasoning behind the imbalance. While we can develop theories based on previous studies and assessments of training, the direct opinions of active law enforcement officers on the technique and their reasoning behind using or not using cognitive interviewing would be essential to developing a way forward for increasing the technique’s usage amongst local law enforcement. Based on previous research, however, the new study would need to account for the potential of local law enforcement to inaccurately assess their behavior, as observed in the previously mentioned Clarke & Milne (2001) study which showed officers’ reports of what they
believe they are doing fail to align with the actual observed behaviors during interviews. This could be accounted for either through observations of live or recorded interviews or possibly through the inclusion of questions designed to test the officer’s knowledge of cognitive interviewing implementation.

Any assessed imbalance between federal and local law enforcement in the implementation of cognitive interviewing is also an assumption based on the training provided to federal agents as well as a handful of reports indicating that federal agencies have implemented the technique. To validate this assumption, one would need to conduct the same research within federal agencies as has been conducted on local police departments. While they may have been trained in the technique, are federal criminal investigators actually using cognitive interviewing when conducting witness interviews? Do federal agents also fall into the trap of believing they are performing in a certain way when in reality they actually fall back on the same techniques used by local law enforcement? Does federal leadership enforce and mandate the implementation of cognitive interviewing and verify their agents are performing as expected? As observed in the British study of the PEACE technique, training alone cannot suffice for ensuring correct actions in interviewing – agency leadership has to ensure follow through. The only way to be sure about any of the previous assumptions would be to replicate the studies by Hirn Mueller et al. (2015) and Schreiber Compo et al. (2012) using a federal law enforcement sample.

**Correcting the Imbalance**

Given the stated assumption that assessments of federal implementation are correct, what steps can be taken to correct the imbalance? To begin, training is almost certainly the key to improving accurate and effective implementation of cognitive interviewing in local police departments. In any professional field, continuing education following initial schooling and hiring has become the norm. However, continuing education may not always be a priority at the local level, where law enforcement
officers may be considered to be “trained” upon graduation of the regional police academy. So, if the officer is considered trained upon graduating, are they being effectively trained for things like interviewing? The average law enforcement training, local and federal, in the United States is 21 weeks long (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2016b; Reaves, 2016). Comparing this to the German law enforcement training standard of 3 years (Bundeskriminalamt, 2020) already makes the U.S. model seem low. The true difference in the U.S. between local and federal, however, appears to come after initial training. For instance, one assessment of the annual cost of a police officer in Chicago includes everything from salary and benefits to the cost of the individuals supervising the officer; however, the cost breakdown does not account for money needed to continue formal training of the officer on an annual basis (Chicago 43rd Ward Office, 2015). On the other hand, once the FBI Agent graduates their academy they are expected to return regularly to Quantico “for specialized training and refresher courses throughout their careers” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2016b). Furthermore, local law enforcement supervision can vary greatly, potentially leading an officer to degrade following their academy as they are effectively negatively retrained by their supervisory officers (Bloom & Labovich, 2020; Reaves, 2016).

Effective training is the key to effective law enforcement. For cognitive interviewing to be implement at the local level, officers must be trained in, and given the opportunity to become comfortable in implementing, cognitive interview techniques such as mnemonics. A 2016 study by MacDonald et al. examining the difference between trained and untrained law enforcement officers conducting witness interviews found that “the evidence is clear that a commitment to a quality interviewing training initiative is required if organizations are intent on improving their interviewing and investigative abilities.” While continuing education training may not be in the budget for many local law enforcement organizations, there are ways around this. For instance, the previously discussed federal training through either FLETC or the FBI National Academy is frequently also opened up to local
departments, allowing police officers to receive additional training at the expense of the federal government (Federal Bureau of Investigations, 2016a; Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, 2020a).

Following training, law enforcement officers must receive a clear message from their leadership that cognitive interviewing works, that their concerns about it will be addressed if they are unsure of its benefits, and that it is the expectation of their organization that they implement effective cognitive interviewing techniques in the conduct of their witness interviews. While 14.6% of state and local law enforcement officers reported receiving cognitive interviewing-type training (Hirn Mueller et al., 2015, p. 302) only 2.3% reported a mandate to follow the federal guidelines that encouraged departments to use these techniques (p. 296). We have already demonstrated that leadership is the key to implementing change in law enforcement. To correct the imbalance in the systems, in addition to ensuring their officers are trained, local law enforcement agencies must set clear expectations for their officers and ensure those expectations are met through supervision, observation, and follow-on training if necessary.

Summary

Decades of research, both purely academic as well as field observations, have shown that cognitive interviewing techniques work and are an effective means of conducting a witness interview to obtain the maximum amount of information available to solve the crime. There are limitations to the technique; however, given appropriate training and an understanding of how to adapt the procedure to various witness demographics, nearly all of these limitations can be overcome. Moving forward more research is needed to identify the best way to encourage local law enforcement to adopt cognitive interviewing but it is clear with existing knowledge that the keys to making the process work are in-depth training and effective leadership. It is possible to balance the implementation and get local and
federal law enforcement on the same page when it comes to witness interviewing, but it will take a concerted effort and an open mind to move the process forward.
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