The cognitive interview and vulnerable groups: A practitioner's perspective

Roger Nield, Surrey Police,

Rebecca Milne*, Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth

Ray Bull, Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth,

and

Kerry Marlow, South Wales Police.

Running Header:

*Please address the correspondence to Rebecca Milne, ICJS, University of Portsmouth, Museum Road, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO1 2QQ, UK. Email: becky.milne@port.ac.uk; Tel: 00 44 2392 843927.

Abstract

Purpose. To discover practitioners' appreciation of the legislative changes that the *Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999* will have on investigative interviewing and to examine their views about the efficacy of the cognitive interview for use with vulnerable groups.

Method. Police officers, social workers and other cognitive interview users (n=101) completed a questionnaire which asked about their perceptions of the *Youth Justice and Criminal Justice Act 1999* and examined whether (or not) they used the cognitive interview and its constituent mnemonics for interviewing children.

Results. Practitioners thought that a large number of interviewees would be eligible for the special measures allowed within the remit of the act. It was believed that the act would result in achieving best evidence with respect to accuracy and recording of interviews and in less discrimination against vulnerable groups. However, on a more negative note, it was believed that implementing the act would be resourceful in terms of time and money. With regards the cognitive interview, this procedure was seen to be a useful tool when interviewing children for legal purposes though some of its techniques were believed to be more often used and more useful than others.

Conclusion. There seems to be among professionals a general ignorance of the potential of the *Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999* and an organisational complacency towards the provision of relevant specialist training (though this is changing). Supervision and monitoring of interviews should be prioritised to evaluate and improve the interviewing of vulnerable witnesses/victims and to ensure that appropriate interviewing techniques are applied.

The cognitive interview and vulnerable groups: A practitioner's perspective

In the past 20 years there has been much criticism of the way the police in England and Wales have interviewed vulnerable witnesses. For example, the 1991 Orkney child abuse

investigation and the subsequent 'Clyde Report' (Clyde, 1992) identified a serious lack of training for interviewers. Such criticism and the *Criminal Justice Act 1991(CJA)* led to the creation of the Memorandum of Good Practice (MOGP), a guidance document on how to interview children for criminal proceedings (Home Office & Department of Health, 1992).

However, the MOGP and *CJA* did not adequately cater for the most vulnerable people in society such as people with learning disabilities, in essence due to a lack of research on which to base such guidance (Milne and Bull, 1999). Nevertheless, people with learning disabilities are at proportionately greater risk of abuse, one reason being because they are thought by perpetrators to have limited redress through the criminal justice system (Westcott & Jones, 1997). The Government's Speaking up for Justice report (Home Office, 1998) realised this and clarified the need for a greater understanding and assistance to allow access to justice for the most vulnerable witnesses and victims in society. This in turn translated into legislation in the shape of the *Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999* (YJCE Act) which aimed to redress the balance and provide access to justice for all. This, in turn, led to the reassessment of and improvements to the MOGP resulting in the Achieving Best Evidence: Guidance for vulnerable or intimidated witnesses, including children (ABE Home Office & Department of Health, 2002).

The legal definition of vulnerable persons that is provided by Sections 16 and 17 of the YJCE Act includes,

> Any person under the age of 17 years of age, or where the witness "suffers from a mental disorder" or "otherwise has a significant impairment of intelligence and social functioning" or that "the witness has a physical disability or is suffering from a physical disorder," (S16 (1) and (2) *Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999*).
> The Act then defines 'vulnerability' as where the quality of the evidence "is likely to be diminished by reason of fear or distress on the part of the witnesses connection with testifying in the proceedings. The court must consider the nature and circumstances of the offence, the witnesses' age and their social, ethnic, political and religious backgrounds. They must also consider the behaviour of the accused, the accused's family or associates

and any other person involved in the proceedings towards the witness and finally the witness's views" (S17 (1), (2) and (3) *Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999*). This definition encompasses the following groups; children, children with learning disabilities, adults with learning disabilities, and people with mental illness. It also encompasses highly traumatized victims of crime such as race hate crime victims, victims of sexual assault, and of domestic violence.

Psychological research has shown that the main problem when interviewing vulnerable groups is that of errors of omission (e.g. Milne, Price, & Bull, in submission; Milne & Mead, in submission). Thus, there is needed to develop ways to improve the quantity of recall from such groups. A technique, which aims to do just this, is the cognitive interview (CI) (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). The original CI consisted of four mnemonic techniques aimed to improve memory retrieval: (i) the mental reinstatement of context; (ii) report everything, (iii) recall events in different temporal orders; and (iv) change perspective (See Milne & Bull, 1999 for a full description of the techniques). However, after the original CI was put into practice by the police it was found to be insufficiently socially supportive of potential witnesses and as a result Fisher and Geiselman incorporated additional techniques drawn from social psychology to aid communication and the 'enhanced cognitive interview' (ECI) was produced (Fisher, Geiselman, & Raymond, 1987). The enhancements in the ECI were; (i) rapport building; (ii) control of the information flow is transferred to the interviewee; (iii) questions put to the interviewee are compatible with the interviewees' mental representation; (iv) witnesses are encouraged to attain focussed retrieval; and (v) witnesses are encouraged to use visual imagery.

The CI/ECI has proven effective in enhancing both the quality and quantity of detail recalled by interviewees (see Kohnken, Milne, Memon, & Bull, 1999 for a meta-analysis). In addition, research has found the techniques to be useful when interviewing vulnerable groups such as children (e.g. Granhag & Spjut, 2001; Milne & Bull, in press a); children with mild learning disabilities (e.g. Milne & Bull, 1996; Robinson, 1998); children with severe learning disabilities (Mead & Milne, in submission); adults with mild learning disabilities (e.g. Milne, Clare & Bull, 1999), and the elderly (Milne, McAlpine, & Bull, 2000). As a result the CI/ECI has

been incorporated into training given to all English and Welsh police recruits since 1992 and in 'retrograde' training to all serving officers who may be required to interview compliant interviewees through the 'National Interviewing Package' or PEACE (Central Planning and Training Unit, 1992). The PEACE acronym represents the phases of the interview; 'planning and preparation', 'engage and explain', 'account', 'closure', and 'evaluation'. In addition, the CI/ECI has been noted in ABE as a potential tool for interviewing vulnerable groups. In practice, the police perceive the CI/ECI as a useful and effective interviewing model for use with adults, though they do believe that it is time-consuming (Kebbell, Milne, & Wagstaff, 1999; Milne & Bull, in press b) and as a result some of the techniques (for example, context reinstatement and report everything) are reported to be more often used than others (e.g. reverse order recall and change perspective) (Kebbell et al, 1999; see Milne & Bull, 2002 for an overview). Research examining actual real life interviews has indeed found this selective usage to be the case (Clarke & Milne, 2001). This raised the questions which form the basis of the present study, namely: (a) to assess the perceived impact of the YJCE Act on practitioners and the criminal justice system as a whole; and (b) to examine the perceived use and effectiveness of each of the ECI techniques for interviewing vulnerable groups.

Method

Sample and procedure

One hundred and fifty police officers and social workers from England and Wales were asked to complete a questionnaire. In the covering letter of personal introduction it was stated that the purpose of the study was "targeted at how children and other vulnerable groups are interviewed in order to provide evidence in criminal proceedings". The respondents were reassured that the responses were confidential. The questionnaires were completed between February and December 2001, in the respondent's own time and payment was not made for participation. The respondents were drawn from police officers, social workers and others

attending training in ECI techniques, and police officers and social workers who are involved in interviewing vulnerable groups in Surrey, Cambridgeshire, Greater Manchester, and Wales.

Materials

The questionnaire was based on that used in Kebbell and Milne (1998) and Kebbell et al (1999) and was developed by adding questions concerning the YJCE Act and the use and effectiveness of the CI for vulnerable groups. (The questionnaire was piloted and amended accordingly).

In part one of the questionnaire the participants provided details about themselves including age, gender, occupation, job title/rank, region/police force, and role within the organization. The second part gathered general interviewing data regarding how many vulnerable persons the participants interviewed (or interview monitored) in a month. Participants were then asked to answer questions based on their experiences, asked for their understanding of the YJCE Act, and the positive and negative impacts the Act could have. The third section considered possible operational problems with the YJCE. In the fourth section the participants' views were sought regarding the use and efficacy of eight of the ECI technqiues for interviewing child witnesses and victims. The techniques were; (i) establish rapport, (ii) mental reinstatement of context, (iii) report everything, (iv) encourage concentration, (v) recall in different temporal orders, (vi) transfer of control of the interview to the interviewee, (vii) imagery, and (viii) witness compatible questioning. In each instance an example was given to aid the participants who in turn were asked to answer the questions by circling a response on a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (always) for use, or 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely) for effectiveness. The participants were also invited to give the positives and negatives of using the ECI with children based on their experience. The missing ECI instruction, (change perspective) was not included due to criticism of its value for use with children (see Milne & Bull, 2002 for a full discussion of this issue). Finally, part five concerned the amount of interview training the participants had received.

<center>Results</center>

A total response rate of 66.4% was attained (101 participants). Of those 101 participants,

74.3% were serving police officers (n=75), and 19.8% were social workers (n=20), and 5.9% (n=6) were from other roles within the criminal justice system (e.g. crown prosecution service). It was appropriate that 81% (n=60/81) of the police officers were constables as it is common for this rank to do most investigative interviewing, with 19% (n=20/81) being sergeants. One officer was of inspector rank. All the officers had completed their probationary period (2 years training, National Police Training, 2000), and all would be considered experienced officers with 52% of them having between five and fourteen years service and 38% between fifteen and twenty-four years policing experience. All the police respondents were in roles requiring specialist interviewers (see Cherryman & Bull,2001 for a definition). The social workers had a range of experience from three months to twenty-seven years. Two had supervisory experience. The mean age of the social workers was thirty-eight years with a range of 30-61 years (SD=1.39) and the police officers had a mean age of thirty-eight years with a range of 20-49 years (SD=7.53). Overall there were 53 males and 48 females.

To examine the interviewing experience of the sample, the respondents were asked to identify how many interviews with vulnerable adults and children they conducted in a typical month and how many interviews they monitored (i.e. supervised). Police officers seemed to interview more vulnerable adult witnesses/victims (*M*=14, range 0-20) and more children (*M*=2, range 0-16) than social workers (vulnerable adults *M*=0.85, range 0-9; children *M*=1, range 0-6). As most respondents were not managers, the numbers of interviews monitored in a typical month was proportionally lower. Police supervised on average two vulnerable adult interviews and 1.5 child interviews (ranges; 0-16 and 0-12 respectively). Social workers monitored fewer interviews (0.15 for vulnerable adult interview and 0.35 for child interviews, ranges; 0-3 for vulnerable adult and 0-7 for children's interviews). Overall the participants were experienced at interviewing children and vulnerable adults and well placed to take part in this research.

Impact of the *Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999*

All participants were asked for their perceptions concerning the implementation of the YJCE Act. It was first determined how many individuals the practitioners' thought would be deemed vulnerable and therefore eligible for the special measures provided within the recent

legislation. They indicated that fifty-four percent of police interviews and fifty three percent of social work interviews would be with vulnerable groups. This indeed is a large number of interviews.

Next respondents were asked for their positive and negative perceptions of the impact of the YJCE Act. As can be seen from Table 1, both social workers and police officers noted that the primary benefit of the YJCE Act would be accuracy in recording and presenting evidence. The second benefit noted by both groups was less discrimination against vulnerable people and the third was that the act could improve crown court practices. Very small numbers of respondents (amounting to less than 10%) noted that support for vulnerable persons, more cases presented at court, and improved safeguards which are some of the main aims of *Speaking up for Justice*. There were a number of concerns raised with regard to the inception of the YJCE Act, and as can be seen in Table 1, both police officers' and social workers' main worry was cost in terms of time and money. Interestingly it was social workers that noted the difficulty in identifying those who are vulnerable (see Gudjonsson, Clare, Rutter, & Pearse 1993, for problems of identification).

Insert Table 1 here

Interviewing vulnerable groups

        The respondents were asked who should interview vulnerable groups for legal purposes in the light of the new legislation. The study showed a marked difference between the police and other respondents. Of police officers 68% (n=51/75) offered that interviewing should be undertaken by the police; 44% by the police generally, 14% by specially trained officers, and 10% by specialist officers. Only 10% thought that vulnerable people should be interviewed by social workers and 16% were undecided. The social worker participants (n=9/20) suggested that specialist teams, social workers and police, 33% for each, should interview vulnerable witnesses and one respondent suggested they be dealt with by lawyers.

Insert Table 2 here

Next consideration of the ways of interviewing vulnerable interviewees was sought. When asked " in planning and preparing an interview, what points do you consider are the most important for child witnesses and for adult vulnerable witnesses?" 79% indicated that children and vulnerable adults required the same consideration. When asked what factors are considered imperative to facilitate an effective interview with a vulnerable person the answers given are in Table 2. As can be seen, both social workers' and police officers' primary consideration was 'a good environment' as vital for an effective interview. 'Type of vulnerability' ranked second. 'Rapport building' was third most important and 'having an appropriate adult' fourth. Due to the practitioners having more experience at interviewing children than vulnerable adults, they were asked to rate (on a scale from never to always; 1 to 5 respectively) how often they had enough time to conduct a child witness interview. It was found that 60% of social workers either never of rarely had enough time to interview children, whereas 33% of police officers thought this was the case.

Use of the ECI

In the past police officers and social workers have been trained to interview in a phased approach to interviewing as outlined in the MOGP (superseded by ABE, 2002). Thus the overall perception of the use of the MOGP interview compared to the enhanced cognitive interview (ECI) was examined and it was found that of trained participants only 16% noted that the MOGP interview was better, with 68% of social workers and 55% of police officers indicating that they were of equal value. Indeed, 16% of social workers and 19% of police officers found the ECI was more useful than the MOGP, and 13% of police officers reported the ECI was *much more useful* than the MOGP. The questionnaire went on to ask participants their experience of how often they use and how useful they find the eight constituent techniques of the ECI are for interviewing child witnesses and victims.

Insert Table 3 here

Of the sample, eight of the social workers and fifty-one of the police officers had been formally trained in the use of the ECI. This training varied in length with the majority receiving a week long course with 9 police officers receiving a full two weeks instruction and 4 social workers and 19 police officers having between one and three days input. Trained and untrained practitioners' reports of how often they use the eight ECI techniques were compared (where 1=never and 5=always) in a series of Mann-Whitney tests. (It is to be noted that scores from police officers and social workers were combined due to too few social workers being trained in the ECI). Practitioners in the trained group were no more likely to report that they used any of the techniques more frequently than were the untrained practitioners; rapport (z=0.7, p=n/s), mental reinstatement of context (z=0.8, p=n/s), report everything (z=0.1, p=n/s), encourage concentration (z=0.4, p=n/s), different orders (z=0.3, p=n/s), transfer control (z=0.8, p=n/s), imagery (z=0.4, p=n/s) and witness compatible questioning (z=0.1, p=n/s). From Table 3 it can be seen that the perceived use for children of the ECI components centered around the mean or below. The technique most often used being 'rapport' with the least often used being 'recall in different orders'.

Insert Table 4 here

To explore practitioners' perceptions of the usefulness of each of the ECI techniques the responses of trained practitioners were explored in more detail. From Table 4 it is apparent that trained practitioners report using some techniques more frequently than others. Practitioners stated that they used 'establish rapport' (ranked 1; Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) Z=2.6, p<0.0001) most frequently, followed by report everything (ranked 2; K-S Z=2.4, p<0.0001), witness compatible questioning (ranked 3; K-S Z=2.4, p<0.0001), context reinstatement (ranked 4; K-S Z=2.3, p<0.0001) and encourage concentration (ranked 5; K-S Z=2.3, p<0.0001). Less frequently used were 'transfer control' (ranked 6; K-S Z=1.8, p<0.0001), imagery (ranked 7; K-S Z=1.8, p<0.0001), and different orders (ranked 6 K-S Z=1.8, p<0.0001). Table 4 displays the percentage of responses for each category. A Kendall coefficient of concordance showed that practitioners

were consistent in their use of these rankings ($W(7) = 0.27$, $p<0.0001$). However, it is noticeable that for some techniques, such as imagery, different orders, and transfer control that a large number of practitioners report that they have never used the technique.

Table 4 also illustrates practitioners' perception of the usefulness of the individual components of the ECI. Firstly, it was determined which of the techniques were perceived as most useful; rapport was deemed the most useful when interviewing children (ranked 1; K-S Z=2.8, p<0.0001), then report everything (ranked 2; K-S Z=2.4, p<0.0001), then witness compatible questioning' (ranked 3; K-S Z=2.4, p<0.0001), context reinstatement (ranked 4; K-S Z=2.5, p<0.0001), encourage concentration (ranked 5; K-S Z=2.3, p<0.0001), 'transfer control' (ranked 6; K-S Z=2.0, p<0.0001), imagery (ranked 7; K-S Z=1.8, p<0.0001), and different orders (ranked 8; K-S Z=1.8, p<0.0001). A Kendall Coefficient of concordance showed that practitioners were also consistent in their use of rankings (W(7)=0.0229, p<0.0001). Ranks for frequency of use and perceived usefulness were also found to be significantly correlated using Spearman's correlations. Thus those techniques rated as the most useful were also the most frequently used (see Table 5).

Insert Table 5 here

Discussion

The majority of the respondents were experienced interviewers with all the police respondents in roles requiring specialist interviewing and fifty-two percent having between five and fifteen years service. The social workers also were well versed with regard vulnerable groups and had between three months and twenty-seven years service. In addition, participants had conducted interviews with children, vulnerable children and adults, though the police seemed to have more of an active role in this respect, (i.e. conducted more interviews). This is not surprising as research suggests that the police tend to take the lead in the majority of joint investigative interviews, though there are exceptions (Westcott, Davies, & Bull, 2002). It seems to be that social workers feel that because they do not have the basic interview training that the police have,

(i.e. PEACE) they are not as qualified in conducting interviews. However, Clarke and Milne (2001) found that police officers' skills even after PEACE training are somewhat lacking with regard witness interviews. Interestingly, it was social workers who thought that they were not afforded enough time to conduct appropriate interviews with children, though it was the police officers who conducted the majority of interviews.

The YCJE Act is a brave legislative attempt at bringing access to justice to vulnerable groups in society (Milne & Bull, in press b). It was noted by the police officers and social workers that the act encompasses a large number of people. This will mean that there will be an ever increasing number of interviews with witnesses and victims being conducted on video as their evidence-in-chief and thus for the first time open to public scrutiny. This is worrying given that Clarke and Milne (2001) found that police officers' skills in this domain was poor. They concluded that the interviewing of witnesses/victims was far worse than that of suspects and this may be due to poor planning and preparation. In the present study the main considerations for planning and preparation were identified as having the right environment, the type of vulnerability, and rapport building. This is interesting in that the main focus of an interview is to gain an accurate account of events. To obtain the account the interviewer needs to assess the communication levels of the interviewee. This can be achieved by gathering information from other sources, but should also be assessed by the interviewer by using a practice interview recommended in ABE. The full implications of the YJCE Act were yet to be realised by the majority of practitioners who took part in the present study.

Those experienced in both the interviewing of children and the ECI found that the ECI was superior or equal to the phased interview as recommended in the MOGP (1992) and ABE (2002), with the ECI being considered to be more useful than the MOGP by thirty two percent of respondents whilst fifty five percent considered it at least as useful. The results identified that the constituent techniques of the ECI were no more likely to be used by trained than untrained practitioners suggesting that they may be an understanding of the effectiveness of the ECI but is not indicative of the use of the ECI techniques in the workplace. Regarding the application of the ECI to vulnerable groups respondents identified that if time pressures could be overcome it was

likely to provide more complete recall with clear descriptions and more detail. Concerns were noted about the suggestibility of vulnerable witnesses, their memory capacity, and the ability to recall events in sequence. These concerns suggest that there is a lack of awareness and understanding of how memory works and the application of the ECI and the phased approach to interviewing to reduce suggestibility. No respondents suggested greater error or confabulation rates with the ECI but one commented that the ECI maybe useful in breaking down manufactured allegations, these findings are in line with previous research (Milne & Bull, 1999).

Among trained practitioners there was agreement that some components of the ECI were used more frequently than others and were seen as more useful than others. Establish rapport (most used and reportedly most useful), report everything, encourage concentration and witness compatible questioning were all rated highly. Interestingly these are techniques that tend to influence the social dynamics of the interview situation in turn facilitating recall. Less often used and perceived as less useful were the cognitive mnemonics being mental reinstatement of context, change order of recall, and use of imagery. These are all aimed at facilitating memory retrieval in attempt to counteract errors of omission. Kebbell et al (1999) also found that it was the cognitive components of the ECI that police officers found least helpful when interviewing adult interviewees. The MOGP and ABE both identify that the interviewer should assess the interviewees' social and cognitive ability. The respondents believed that rapport was used the most often yet it is evident that it was only used in a social context. Without identifying an interviewees'cognitive ability would suggest that the ECI is not being fully utilised.

The concerns and limitations within this study were that the responding practitioners were heavily weighted towards police officers (79%) and this group receives more formal training in the interviewing of vulnerable groups than social workers or lawyers (Milne & Bull, 1999). Also the study is concerned with practitioners' perceptions, and differences may occur between the reported belief concerning what happens during interviews and what actually occurs (Milne & Bull, 1999) (i.e. what people say they do is not what they actually do). Future research should examine the actual use of the phased approach of interviewing recommended in ABE and the use and efficacy of the ECI for vulnerable groups in the field.

Due to the current state of training, both legislative and in interviewing techniques, the number of training authorities within the police service, and between different agencies involved, the adoption of the changes brought in by the YJCE Act will be slow and policies and practices will differ across the country. At least the UK was courageous enough to try to attain equality for all members of society and equal access to justice for all.

References

Cherryman, J. and Bull, R. (2001) Police officers' perceptions of specialist investigative interviewing skills. *International Journal of Police Science and Management, 3*, 199-212.

Clarke, C., and Milne, R. (2001). *National evaluation of the PEACE investigative interviewing course.* Police Research Award Scheme. London: Home Office.

Clyde, J. (1992) *The report of the inquiry into the removal of children from Orkney in February 1991*. HC 195. Edinburgh: HMSO.

CPTU. (1992) *The interviewers rule book.* Central Planning and Training Unit. Harrogate: Home Office.

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

Fisher, R.P., Geiselman, R.E. and Raymond, D.S. (1987) Critical analysis of police interviewing techniques. *Journal of Police Science and Administration. 15*, 177-185.

Granhag, P. A. and Spjut, E. (2001). Children's recall of the unfortunate fakir: A further test of the enhanced cognitive interview. In R. Roesch, R.R.. Corrado., and R. Dempster (eds). *Psychology in the courts.* London: Routledge.

Gudjonsson, G., Clare, I.C.H., Rutter, S., and Pearse, J. (1993) *. Persons at risk during interviews in police custody: The identification of vulnerabilities.* Research Study No. 12. The Royal Commission on Criminal Justice. London. HMSO.

Home Office (1998). *Speaking up for justice*. London: Home Office.

Home Office and Department of Health (1992) *Memorandum of Good Practice on video recorded interviews with child witnesses for criminal proceedings.* London: HMSO.

Home Office and Department of Health (2001). *Achieving best evidence.* London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Kebbell, M.R. and Milne, R (1998). Police officers' perception of eyewitness factors in forensic investigations. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 323-330.

Kebbell, M.R., Milne, R. and Wagstaff, G. (1999). The cognitive interview: A survey of its forensic effectiveness. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 5, 101-116.

Kohnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999). The cognitive interview: A meta analysis. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 5,* 3-28.

Milne, R. and Bull, R. (1996). Interviewing children with mild learning disability with the cognitive interview. In N. Clark and G. Stephenson (Eds.) *Investigative and forensic decision making.* Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Milne, R and Bull, R. (1999) *Investigative Interviewing: Psychology and Practice.* Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Milne, R and Bull, R. (2001) Interviewing witnesses with learning disabilities for legal purposes. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 29*, 93-97.

Milne, R and Bull, R (2002). Back to basics: A componential analysis of the original cognitive interview mnemonics with three age groups. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 16,* 743-753.

Milne, R and Bull, R (in press a). Does the cognitive interview help children to resist the effects of suggestive questioning? *Legal and Criminal Psychology*.

Milne, R. and Bull, R. (in press b).Interviewing by the police. Chapter to appear in Carson, D., and Bull, R. (Eds), *Handbook of Psychology in Legal Contexts (Second Edition).* Chichester: Wiley.

Milne, R., Clare, I.C.H. & Bull, R. (1999) Interviewing Adult s with learning difficulties with the cognitive interview. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 5*, 81-100.

Milne, R., McAlpine, S. and Bull, R. (2000). *The cognitive interview – does it enhance older people's recall?* Paper presented at the Biennial American Psychology and Law Society Conference, New Orleans.

Milne, R., and Mead, S. (in submission). Assessing the impact of the cognitive interview on children with severe intellectual disabilities. *Psychology, Crime and Law*.

Milne, R., Price, E. and Bull, R. (in submission). The cognitive interview and children with mild learning difficulties. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*

Robinson, J. (1998). *Suggestibility and children with mild learning disabilities. The use of the cognitive interview.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Liverpool.

Westcott, H., Davies, G., and Bull, R. (2002).*Children's testimony: A handbook of psychological research and forensic practice*. Chichester: Wiley.

Westcott, H., and Jones, J. (1997). *Perspectives on the memorandum: policy, practice and research in investigative interviewing*. Aldershot: Arena. in the past 20 years

Table 1. Perceptions in percentages of the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act 1999.

Perception	Police n=64	Social worker n=20
Accuracy in recording and presenting evidence	26	20
Less discrimination against vulnerable people	21	20
Improve crown court practices	14	15
Recording of all data	8	15
More professional police	8	5
Support for vulnerable persons	8	5
More cases adopted and presented at court	7	5
Improved safeguards	6	0
Easier to record statements	1	0
Improve officers abilities	1	0
Increased time for interview	20	20
Increased training costs	17	20
Increased costs for interview venues	15	10
More expensive equipment	14	5
Greater financial costs	8	10
Negative effect on court process	7	0
Worse training provision	5	20
Harder to identify vulnerable people	5	0
Harder to build rapport	3	0
More work	2	5
Cross examination at magistrates courts	2	5
It is an oppressive system	1	5
It will increase fear	1	0

Table 2: To show the importance of factors perceived to be required for an effective interview as a function of occupation.

Importance of Factors Required for an Effective Interview	%	%

	SW	PO
	n=18	n=68
Environment	20%	28%
Type of Vulnerability	20%	15%
Rapport Building	15%	14%
Appropriate adult	15%	13%
Points to Prove	0%	10%
Developmental Age of Person	5%	8%
Time for interview	10%	5%
Age	0%	3%
Trust	5%	2%
Appropriate questions	5%	1%
Ethnicity	5%	1%
Special needs	0%	1%

Table 3. Mean reported use of CI techniques by trained and untrained practitioners.

Technique	Trained practitioners	Untrained practitioners
Establish Rapport	2.9 (2.3)	2.9 (2.0)
Report Everything	2.4 (2.0)	2.4 (1.9)
Witness Compatible Questioning	2.1 (1.7)	2.1 (1.7)
Context Reinstatement	2.1 (1.8)	1.8 (1.8)
Encourage Concentration	2.0 (1.6)	1.8 (1.4)
Transfer Control	1.7 (1.6)	2.0 (1.5)
Imagery	1.6 (1.5)	1.4 (1.3)
Recall in different Orders	1.3 (1.1)	1.5 (1.3)

*Standard deviations in parenthesis

Table 4. Cognitive interview trained officers' frequency of use and perceived usefulness of cognitive interview techniques.

Question	Percentage of responses					
	1 *never or not at all*	**2** *rarely or not very*	**3** *usually or quite*	**4** *almost or very*	**5** *always or extremely*	Mean (SD)
Rapport						
how often used	**00**	**00**	**02**	**16**	**44**	**2.9 (2.3)**
how useful	**00**	**00**	**05**	**32**	**25**	**2.7 (2.2)**
Context Reinstatement						
how often used	**01**	**07**	**32**	**11**	**12**	**2.1 (1.8)**
how useful	**01**	**02**	**30**	**26**	**04**	**2.2 (1.8)**
Report Everything						
how often used	**01**	**01**	**18**	**27**	**16**	**2.4 (2.0)**
how useful	**01**	**01**	**21**	**30**	**10**	**2.3 (1.9)**
Encourage Concentration						
how often used	**00**	**17**	**32**	**12**	**04**	**2.0 (1.6)**
how useful	**00**	**01**	**11**	**27**	**25**	**2.0 (1.7)**
Recall in Different Orders	**23**	**30**	**14**	**01**	**00**	**1.3 (1.1)**
how often used	**23**	**23**	**14**	**01**	**00**	**1.4 (1.3)**
how useful						
Transfer Control						
how often used	**17**	**18**	**14**	**16**	**02**	**1.7 (1.6)**
how useful	**16**	**11**	**17**	**19**	**02**	**1.8 (1.6)**
Imagery						
how often used	**19**	**16**	**19**	**13**	**00**	**1.6 (1.4)**
how useful	**18**	**08**	**20**	**14**	**00**	**1.7 (1.8)**

Witness Compatible Questioning						
how often used	01	08	35	18	04	2.1 (1.7)
how useful	02	06	32	23	04	2.2 (1.7)

Table 5 To show correlation between perceived use and usefulness of the CI components

Use of Usefulness of	Rapport	CR	RE	Conc	RO	TC	Imagery	WCQ
Rapport	0.9							
CR		0.94						
RE			0.94					
Conc				0.92				
RO					0.96			
TC						0.96		
Imagery							0.91	
WCQ								0.96

***All significant at the p<0.0001 level