

The importance and relevance of special interrogation and human intelligence gathering has gained increased attention since the turn of the century. After 9/11 and the start of the war on terror, human intelligence has become the central tool in the fight against foreign enemies and plots. The gathering of that information is pivotal in the success of any agency hoping to stop attacks, learn more about enemies, and eventually extinguish threatening groups, yet the special interrogation techniques that must be used to reach the goals of intelligence gathering have only recently begun to be studied. Since its spike in relevance after 9/11 and in the decade proceeding, there has been little research on what intelligence interrogation methods are, let alone which are the most efficient for reaching goals in HUMINT (Human Intelligence) gathering. The goals of human intelligence, contrary to what might come to mind from knowledge of criminal interrogations, are to gather as much relevant and correct intelligence as possible, regardless of if the interviewee is guilty or not. As previously stated, it has only been recently studied that certain kinds of interrogation methods produce different kinds of reactions from interviewees and therefore effect the kind and value of intelligence gathered.

What *has* been studied since the spark of attention in the last decade, is the different kinds of interrogation methods that an interrogator can utilize in an interview and under which broad categories these methods fall into. A recent and thorough taxonomy of these methods was published by Kelly, Miller, Redlich, and Kleinman (2013) in which 71 unique methods are sorted into 6 domains: “Rapport and Relationship Building, Context Manipulation, Emotion Provocation, Collaboration, Confrontation/Competition, and Presentation of Evidence” (Kleinmen et al., 2013, p. 165). Each domain houses specific techniques that all relate to the process and relationship between the interrogator and subject. The macro-level of the taxonomy is the general interrogation approaches whether they be broadly and generally accusatorial/confrontational or centered around information gathering, but as those broad approaches make it hard to distinguish the relationships and patterns, connection of the domains with the specific methods helps in finding frequency of usage and efficiency of certain kinds of interrogation techniques. This taxonomy is what the following articles employ as their foundational tool for answering their research question of *What Domains and techniques are found most frequently by interrogators to be most effective?*

The following articles fall in line with the taxonomy’s decision to omit the use of torture as a viable technique and cite President Obama’s 2009 Executive Orders 13491 and 13493,

which established in the US Army Field Manual that all HUMINT interrogation should follow the Geneva Convention, thus eliminating any use of physical harm from viable techniques. The articles also cite the difference in goals and process of HUMINT interrogations and criminal interrogations, in which the latter's goal is to obtain a confession of wrong doing and evidence to convict a guilty party in a trial, while the former's goal is "to obtain reliable information from a source about the past, present, or future, which can be used to improve national security and/or further national interests" regardless of the subject having or admitting guilt (Evans et al., 2014, p. 867).

Redlich, A., Kelly, C., & Miller, J. (2014). The Who, What, and Why of Human Intelligence Gathering: Self-Reported Measures of Interrogation Methods. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28(6), 817-828.

Methods of Research

This article dives deeper into the research on interrogation techniques by being one of the first quantitative research of its kind. Redlich et. al designed an online survey "to examine the frequency of use and perceived effectiveness of interrogation methods for up to 152 military and federal-level interrogators from the USA" (Redlich et al., 2013, p. 817). This is a study whose participants have been rarely if ever researched in this way. The survey takes into account the who—the interrogators characteristics, the what—the situational and subject's characteristics, and the why—the goal of the interrogation. To obtain a diverse and varying-in-experience sample they attempted to recruit participants by "drawing upon contacts from the FBI/High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group (HIG) researchers and (ii) generating new contacts in the interrogation community" (Redlich et al., 2014, p. 819). 51% of the interrogators completed the entire anonymous and voluntary survey, while 61% completed approximately half, yet the sample was 91% male and 92% white. (Redlich et al., 2014).

The survey instrument had 9 sections, covering the six domains and 67 unique techniques where respondents reported on general frequency of usage of certain techniques by the use of a 1 to 5 scale (1= never, 5=always). The techniques were grouped into one of the six domains. "Who" questions included demographics and if those characteristics increased, decreased, or had no effect on the perceived effectiveness of interrogation. "What" questions had 3 vignettes to

determine what techniques would be applied given certain context of detainee's value (high or low), detainee's characteristics/demeanor, and the intended goal—strategic or tactical intelligence (Redlich et al., 2014).

The first vignette was a 27-year-old Pakistani male suspected of financing Al-Qaeda and believed to have intelligence about other sources of their funding. He had not been incredibly cooperative and continued to deny involvement with the group—considered a high value detainee.

The second vignette was a 20-year-old American male who was stopped while returning to the US from traveling to the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region. He is a known poster of sympathies for the Taliban and Al-Qaeda on English radical Islamist websites, and is suspected of training in a terrorist camp. Explosive instructions were found on his person upon being searched, and he remained uncooperative and belligerent—considered a high value detainee.

The third vignette was a low value female, suspected of having tactical intelligence on the location of her two sons who eluded capture during a raid of her home. The two sons were suspected of manufacturing IED's. She was initially supportive of the overthrow of the previous regime, but sectarian violence caused the death of her husband and youngest son, so she has increased hostility toward the US, and was uncooperative and combative with interrogators.

Each respondent was asked to select the interrogation techniques they would employ in the context of these three vignettes—a note was added that the Army Field House Manual protocol of beginning with direct questions had been carried out and unsuccessful (Redlich et al., 2014).

“Why” questions were focused on the perceived efficacy of interrogation methods by intended outcome as respondents considered four goals: gathering intelligence, obtaining a confession or information for later prosecution, obtaining tactical information for quicker decision making, and obtaining strategic information for long-term decision making. They were then asked to rate the effectiveness of each domain from 1 = very ineffective to 5 = very effective for obtaining success within each goal (Redlich et al., 2014).

By finding the mean of the scaled answers, the results showed that 4 out of the 5 most frequently used techniques were all part of the Rapport and Relationship Domain (with means of approximately 4), assessing that generally interrogators are most likely to employ friendly

techniques. While “harsher” techniques were put in the bottom 5 with means of approximately 2. The most frequently used domain on average was the rapport and relationship building domain, following rather far behind was Emotional provocation and in least used was presentation of evidence; these were found by creating “a mean rating of domain usage by summing the individual frequency responses and dividing by the number of items within the domain” (Redlich et al., 2014)

Results of “who” questions were compared by the different “perceptions by interrogator characteristic”, and then “examined whether sample respondents believed certain interrogator attributes to result in more or less successful interrogations” (Redlich et al., 2014, p. 822). There were no significant differences between military or law enforcement, but effects of active v. retired status showed that retired interrogators used rapport and relationship building, context manipulation, and collaboration techniques more frequently. The majority of respondents thought “that the likelihood of a successful interrogation increased with interrogators who are friendly, can adapt to conditions in the interrogation room, are sensitive to culture and religion of the detainee, and are able to demonstrate impartiality and establish control” (Redlich et al., 2014, p. 822).

The results of the “what” questions where the respondents had context with the vignettes showed that for all three vignettes the rapport and relationship building domain was used more than the other domains. Confrontation domain was least likely to be chosen.

- Vignette 1, the Pakistani male: 51% chose rapport and relationship building, followed by 40% Collaboration, and the least chosen domain was 22% Confrontation.
- Vignette 2, the American male: 46% chose rapport and relationship building, and 42% chose presentation of evidence, and the least chosen domain was 29% confrontation.
- Vignette 3, the Iraqi Female: 46% chose rapport and relationship building, followed by 45% for collaboration, and again the least likely chosen domain was confrontation.

No significant differences were found for any of the vignettes when comparing the answers of active v retired respondents (Redlich et al., 2014).

For the intended outcome questions, the respondents showed that the perceived effectiveness for rapport and relationship building for the goal of intelligence gathering was significantly higher than any other domain. The confrontation domain was viewed as more effective for confession/prosecution and tactical interrogations. Rapport and relationship building is, however, “consistently viewed as most effective in comparison to other domains” (Redlich et al., 2014).

Rapport and relationship building techniques were reported to be used most frequently and were perceived as the most effective regardless of interrogation goal or contextual situation, while confrontation techniques were used the least and seen as the least effective (Redlich et al., 2014).

Evans, J., Houston, K., Meissner, C., Ross, A., LaBianca, J., Woestehoff, S., & Kleinman, S. (2014). An Empirical Evaluation of Intelligence-gathering Interrogation Techniques from the United States Army Field Manual. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28(6), 867-875.

Methods of Research

Evans, Houston, Meissner, Ross, LaBianca, Woestehoff, and Kleinman conduct their research on what the most effective interrogation domains of the Kelly et al. (2013) taxonomy, by quantitative method as well. Evans et al., research the effectiveness of the techniques from the United States Army Field Manual by an experimental intelligence gathering paradigm in order to actually test techniques on different “detainees” and evaluate the amount of relevant information each could extract from the subject.

The experiment used undergrads who were told they were recruited to participate in a “Trivia Challenge” in exchange for research credit. 60% of participants were female and 85% were Hispanic with an average age of 19. The factorial design of 3 (interrogation approaches) x 2 (culpability: guilty and innocent) was employed, giving participants random conditions. The interrogation approaches applied in blocks were Direct approach, Negative Emotional Approach, and Positive Emotional Approach. There was a consistency in each approach’s script of interrogation questions and techniques. The participants and a female confederate arrived in the lab to take part in the trivia study assessing college student’s knowledge. Participants were told

to leave all personal belongings in the main lab area, and were placed in a small windowless area. The experimenter then explained that “(i) the study was being conducted across the USA to assess college students' knowledge, (ii) that they would receive 50 cents for each correctly answered question (up to a total of \$10), and (iii) that they should complete the questions together using no other resources” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 869). Students then completed demographic info and were left alone together to complete the task (Evans et al., 2014).

For the culpability manipulation, the innocent participants were in the room as the confederate followed a script in which she attested that her roommate had taken the test, said it was easy, and then proceeded to call her roommate to complain that the questions were harder. The confederate did not cheat, but did break a rule by using the cellphone. The participants then finished the questions and alerted the experimenter when they were done. The guilty condition was set as the confederate followed another script in which she retrieved a paper from her pocket with handwritten questions and answers from her roommate who allegedly provided it. Then she used the cheat sheet to answer 10 of the test questions, noting that the other 10 on the cheat sheet did not correspond with the test. She then called her roommate using her cellphone and received answers to two more questions that the roommate purportedly looked up using google. Lastly, she copied the questions missing from the cheat sheet for another friend who would be completing the study the next week (Evans et al., 2014).

During the interrogation process the participants were told, by use of a script, that there was a suspicion of cheating, that the interrogator had been instructed by the professor in charge of the study to talk to participants separately to determine what happened, and if any cheating had occurred there could be consequences for academic dishonesty.

The direct approach script began with simple questions, while the negative emotional approach script employed fear-up, futility, and pride-and-ego down techniques that created high anxiety and highlighted the interrogator's control over the situation. The positive emotional script employed fear-down and pride-and-ego-up techniques by easing fears to facilitate rapport, and the interrogator also engaged in self-disclosure of a past accusation of cheating. After they were done with the scripts the interrogators asked open ended questions, adding open questions and if participants admitted details, the interrogator added a follow up of asking them to explain more. These questions were made to gain as much information as possible. The participant was then debriefed about what the study was really about and was given surety that they were not in

any trouble. They were given a debriefing questionnaire with 41 items to assess perceptions, answering with a 7-point scale (7=a lot 1=none), focusing on “perceived *pressure* to provide information...the degree of *anxiety* experienced during the interrogation...feelings of *guilt* that occurred during the interrogation...[and] perception of a *fostering* interrogation context” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 871).

For the results, coders determined the amount of relevant information the participants could have reported, and then recorded the amount of information actually reported, scoring the video’s proportion of relevant information. The proportion of relevant information was analyzed by “a 2 (culpability) $\times$ 3 (interrogation approach) between participant’s factorial analysis of variance” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 871). The guilty participants gave a higher proportion of relevant information, and the Direct Approach yielded fewer details than the other two approaches, but there was no difference found between positive and negative emotional approaches. The guilty participants were scored on the admission of 3 pieces of information involving the cheating. They “tested for differences in the proportion of admissions as a function of interrogation approach and found no significant differences between the Direct Approach...the Positive Emotional Approach..., and the Negative Emotional Approach” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 872).

Participants engaged in positive emotional approach answered in their debriefing questionnaire that they had significantly less anxiety and perceived larger fostering compared with those under the negative emotional approach. Guilty participants perceived larger pressure to give information and had larger feelings of guilt than innocent participants. Guilty participants also experienced greater pressure and feelings of guilt in the negative emotional approach and in the positive emotional approach than did innocent participants, but “no differences between innocent and guilty participants were observed in the Direct Approach condition” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 873).

So, the Positive Emotional Approach reduced anxiety and promoted a fostering interrogation environment, while the negative approach did not. The differences between guilty and innocent participants was greater overall arousal in the guilty with the emotional approaches. The whole of their findings showed “that both Positive and Negative Emotional Approaches were more effective in eliciting details, including a key admission when compared with a Direct Approach” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 873), although no differences occurred between the two

emotional approaches. However, the relationship between perceived fostering and information gain was significantly influenced by approach and was the strongest in the Positive Emotional Approach where anxiety was greatly decreased as well. Therefore, they assess that under real and lengthy interrogation sessions the increased anxiety and negative perception of interrogator that comes with Negative Emotional Approach may come at too high of a cost for the benefits, potentially causing problems for cooperation and perception of interrogator/ the government he represents, while the Positive Emotional Approach protects against these problems, and facilitates cooperation without being too 'soft' (Evans et al., 2014).

Analysis

How does method one discover and test facts?

Method one assumes that the Direct Approach, cited in the Army Field Manual as the first step in interrogation, did not work on the subject and a different domain of techniques must now be used. This assumption is bred from the underlying idea that the best way to gather HUMINT is not to ask direct questions, and the most relevant information will not be reached by just overtly do so. The researchers also believe that the certain technique and domain used is the proximate cause of the amount of cooperation or relevant details received, or else the survey would not need to ask the question of which domain is the most effective in gathering HUMINT.

Method one draws upon the perceptions of a pool of highly experienced and technical experts to gain support for which of the domains is more likely to yield cooperation, finding statistical correlation between the experts' perception of effectiveness and the technique/domain type which causes a reaction from the subject. Method one assumes that the expertise of the pool, added to the experience—21+ years on average—will yield valuable data that shows there is a better domain than the direct approach, and that domain is the one utilized and seen as most effective by the experts.

Another assumption of the first method comes with the structuring of the survey. The researchers assumed that one cannot just ask an expert what the best interrogation technique and domain is, but instead that the inclusion of contextual situations and scaled answers are valuable and necessary to gain the most data for viewing statistical correlation to properly answer the question. And along with the added context—the vignette questions—, they also placed value on

the scaled answers given to the more general questions, assuming that the varying answers from 1-5 were of significance, meaningful, and able to be measured for frequency and perceived effectiveness.

These assumptions and the data that followed from their tests are presented in tables listing the averages of their frequency and perceived effectiveness based on the scale provided by researchers. Those averages were then categorized by their domain type as they were put in their table, so that clear illustrations of the most and least frequent techniques used were associated with their domain. The data was then coded and written out in narrative structure, explaining the correlation of the domains with the most frequently used and least frequently used techniques.

Method One's utilization of statistical relevance placed value on the statistical correlation between expertise and the preference of the rapport and relationship building domain. Because their survey was only advertised to experienced active and retired interrogators, they place a large value on expertise, counting it as statistically relevant to the objective truth of what, in fact, is the most effective technique to gathering HUMINT. They "aimed to recruit and survey respondents with varying levels of experience in their field" by recruiting contacts from "Fort Huachuca, the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, the FBI training facility at Quantico... the FBI Agents' Association, the Society of Retired Special Agents of the FBI... the Marine Corps Interrogator Translator Teams Association...[and] the FBI National Academies Association (FBINAA)" (Redlich et al., 2014, pp. 819-820). Because their study is based around this set of experienced population, the presence of expertise is valued for the gaining of data that most closely resembles the objective truth. It can be inferred that from their inclusion of solely experienced interrogators the researchers believe that the answers obtained by the experts are likely to be the closest to the objective truth, as their perceptions were gained from sensitive and serious context where national security was at risk, and they depended on their perceptions to choose the most effective domains/techniques to solve serious and pressing problems. This population, therefore, is deemed the closest mirror to the objective truth.

The survey is set up in a way that creates a causal model. The use of one or more specific techniques is the proximate cause of cooperation, while the choosing of a certain domain is the cause of employment of those techniques. The choosing of the domain is based on the characteristics of the subject, as cited in the three vignettes section of the survey, plus the

perceived effectiveness of that domain after weighing possible consequences. The ultimate cause of cooperation is how the specific domain makes the subject feel. In the survey, rapport and relationship building is defined as reducing anxiety, fear, and building a bond with the subject, and ultimately because of these characteristics, it has, for the surveyed pool, been the most effective, which causes it to be the most frequently chosen. Moreover, the researchers deem these results to mirror the objective truth due to their high value placed on the perceptions of these experts.

How does method 2 discover and test facts?

Through manipulation of conditions, method two tests approaches to find the causes of the desired effects. The experiment assumes that a causal model that leads from the approach chosen to the gaining of relevant details will be found, so that the approach causing the gain of the most relevant details can be illustrated clearly as the most effective. The researchers observe if the approach will directly lead to the desired effect, which is the gaining of as many relevant details as possible. Unlike Method One, the direct approach is not assumed to be irrelevant and is included in the experiment. Method Two's researchers assume that the direct, negative emotional, and positive emotional approaches are all relevant approaches to be tested for effectiveness. The relevant details given in the experiment were assessed and coded into tables of Mean proportion of details given by culpability and approach and Percentage of participants who admitted a phone was present, as well as gave all equations used in coding with their narrative explanation surrounding the tables and explaining the experiment.

The experiment uses counterfactual tests to clearly test which causes lead to which outcomes. Based on the notion of *if not the cause, then not the effect*, approaches are implemented to see which approach causes the most effective outcome. Many of the participants under the same conditions gave results, or gave relevant details, extremely similar if not identical, which increases certitude that the effects the approaches caused were correct. As an approach is applied, relevant details are reported depending on that approach. Therefore, the researchers assume that the result of the most relevant details only occurs if the specific approach which yielded it is taken. So the experiment's predicted rule is the generalization that the

approaches causing the gain of the most relevant details are the approaches that are most effective in interrogations.

However, the counter-factual test can result in asymmetry when there are multiple causes leading to an effect. Within the experiment, the cause of the gaining of details was not only the approach but also the participant's culpability, characteristics, and the characteristics of the interrogation—length, interrogator personality, and the perceived gravity of the consequences. Limitations of the experiment were assessed and cited as issues in viability by the researchers. This caused the researchers to use narrative explanation to fill the gaps in the causal model they created, drawing upon the conditions and contexts of real interrogation settings to fill in missing pieces of the relationship between the data and real interrogations. I.e. negative and positive approaches were shown to be equally effective in the experiment but experts understand the consequences of negative approach within real interrogation settings would change effectiveness, so therefore, these results were skewed by the experiment's limits of not mirroring length and severity of realistic interrogations. The counter-factual test resulted in the rule that negative and positive approaches were equally as effective in obtaining the most relevant details for interrogation, but logic counters this idea that negative approach interrogation will not give any risks or consequences in the long-term and is just as effective as the positive approach.

Formal Assumptions

Surveys are a tool for quantitative research “used to conduct a census—an enumeration of the total population” by social scientists (Ballou, 2008). The researchers of Method One used the survey to empirically and scientifically study the social phenomenon of intelligence gathering. Despite an assumption that the research of Method One is not scientific because it studies the perceptions of individuals—usually subjective data—the survey “is scientific because there is an established process that can be followed, documented, and replicated” (Ballou, 2008). Therefore, the findings retrieved from Method One's survey are scientific explanation, because while there are certain amounts of subjectivity related to perception—perceptions can be studied and concluded to be objective; it is an objective fact that the majority surveyed perceived rapport and relationship building as the most effective domain.

Perceived effectiveness like in source one is the closest we can get to data on effectiveness in real world interrogation settings. One can never prove the interrogation was as

effective as it could have been, that the information was 100% truthful, or if they received all of the relevant information a subject had, but the interrogator can gauge the effectiveness of the interrogation nonetheless with the cooperation and info given by the subject based on certain techniques. In Method Two, effectiveness is not perceived but instead directly compared as the experiment manipulated the interrogation and already knew all the relevant information the subject could tell the interrogator. Method Two is, if anything, a viable test to support the perceived effectiveness the survey found, because it confirms Method One's finding that positive approach, or rapport and relationship building, can cause effective cooperation. By creating an environment to test how much relevant information each technique gains, one can clearly see the difference in effectiveness of certain approaches and moreover, because those findings correlate with the survey's perceived effectiveness, the perceived effectiveness can be given a higher degree of support.

The discrepancy between Method One's findings of rapport/positive approach between that of Method Two's, which showed that there was little to no difference in effectiveness between that and the negative emotional approach, was addressed and accounted for by the limitations of the experiment. While Method Two can be useful as evidentiary support for Method One, as it shows direct data from an experiment to support the perceptions of experts, the limitations it was bound by caused the data to seem somewhat lesser than that of Method one as a mirror for objective truth. Their procedures limited them to "conducting interrogations that [were] substantially shorter than actual intelligence interrogations and our academic dishonesty paradigm involves illicit behaviors that are less significant...than acts of terrorism, for example," so the experiment's results were slightly skewed for lack of realistic characteristics related to authentic interrogation settings (Evans et al., 2014, p. 873). Although, Method Two's experiment highlighted and tested the goals of HUMINT gathering, which are the relevant details reported, in a clear, controlled manner, the experiment's specific manipulation and set up was not closely enough related to the realistic conditions to completely replace the experience of actual interrogations which it set out to do. The results, therefore, did not best answer the question *What Domains and techniques are found most frequently by interrogators to be most effective?* Instead it answered the question of *which technique is found to be the least effective?* Because the skewed experiment found that positive emotional and negative emotional approaches were equally as effective, their conclusion without recognitions of warping by limitations would have

been that there is not a more effective approach between the two. The researchers therefore had to acknowledge gaps of the experimental realism and fill them with inference attesting that a negative approach within the lengthy and intense settings of interrogation would yield costly consequences to cooperation by creating negative perception of the interrogator and the interrogator's government, which could create long-term consequences down the road, thus a positive approach is more effective, as it yields the desired results, while being less costly. This narrative aligns with the data found by Method One which obtained it by scientific means instead of by assumption, making Method One the more reliable scientific study for the question.

Therefore, source one's survey of active and retired highly experienced interrogators answers the question the best by collecting statistical data between techniques/domains and effectiveness to show relationships of which approaches cause the most effective outcomes. Despite the negative connotation of results being based on perceived effectiveness, the results of the survey are objective in the fact that they report the domain believed to be the most effective by a pool of highly experienced interrogators that have gained their perception from real interrogations. The perceived effectiveness of 21+ year experienced interrogation agents is more viable data—easily believed to be more closely to the objective truth— than that of an experiment lacking the key components of interrogations that directly affect the outcomes of cooperation and gain of relevant details. The survey is the only one of the two methods that directly takes data from real HUMINT interrogation experiences and contexts to record which techniques and domains caused the best and most effective interrogation outcomes in the past. Moreover, generalizations can be made from the research's findings about which domains are the most effective, and these generalizations are viable theories not littered with errors like the results of Method Two's experiment.

Conclusion

These findings have obvious and applicable relevance to our safety, so the results of the data are extremely relevant for real world application. Given the data from Method Two—the method deemed more viable out of the two—the domain that is the most effective is the rapport and relationship building domain. For application in the real world, this result is very important and can dramatically increase the effectiveness of interrogations, and therefore increase in efficiency approaches to national security. Before this research was conducted, there was little

known about the relationship between cooperation and techniques used, but now specific techniques which fall under the rapport and relationship domain can be shifted into the main focus and utilization of federal agents. In comparison to the current protocol of using the Direct Approach first according to the US Army Field Manual which, as it was tested in method two, was shown to be of little effectiveness. US HUMINT departments can utilize the information from these studies and shift away from the Direct Approach in favor of those that elicit faster and more efficient results. New interrogators should focus training around perfecting these techniques and their usage of the rapport domain, so as to be as effective as possible upon trying to gain HUMINT for whatever national security goal they are challenged with. The discourse on this domain must also be put into focus, so as to change connotations of HUMINT interrogations from the negative perceptions of torture to the positive perceptions of more effective and humane approaches that actually work—changing of connotation can also be a tool to effect cooperation in and of itself. The discourse must also publish that while the rapport and relationship building domain may have a positive connotation, it does not amount to being soft on the suspected enemies of the state, and that it does, in fact, keep American citizens safer, while also strategically gathering information and creating intelligence environments that promote future cooperation.

References

- Ballou, J. (2008). Survey. In P. J. Lavrakas, *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Evans, J., Houston, K., Meissner, C., Ross, A., LaBianca, J., Woestehoff, S., & Kleinman, S. (2014). An empirical evaluation of intelligence-gathering interrogation techniques from the United States Army field manual. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28(6), 867-875.
- Redlich, A., Kelly, C., & Miller, J. (2014). The who, what, and why of human intelligence gathering: Self-reported measures of interrogation methods. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28(6), 817-828.
- Kleinman, A. M. (2013). A taxonomy of interrogation methods. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 19(2), 165-178.