

Prof. Rebecca Milne, Institute of Criminal Justice Studies, University of Portsmouth.

Policing society is an ever-demanding task, especially in this ever changing landscape. Psychology as a discipline embarked on its relationship with crime and justice well over 100 years ago. However, nowadays forensic psychology has evolved from not just explaining observed behaviour but also to suggesting practical improvements to policing and investigation through quality research (Griffiths & Milne, 2018). Indeed, partnerships involving academics and practitioners are at the heart of the Evidence Based Policing movement. This special edition concerns not simply ‘what works’ but whether there is a successful transition from theory, to research, to practice. What is the *actual* impact of psychology on policing and specifically investigative practice and what are the barriers and enablers to success. This special edition contains a collection of papers with authors from five different countries who evaluate different aspects of the criminal investigation process.

The first paper (Poyser & Milne) sets the scene and relates to how miscarriages of justice are primarily responsible for stimulating change in the first place. The paper examines whether the police investigative process as a whole might be viewed as the nucleus around which most of the causes of miscarriages cluster. It is well documented that one key cause globally is misidentification. The second paper (Pike, Havard, Harrison, & Ness) canvassed views from practitioners about identification procedures and how they could be improved. The results revealed a fundamental mismatch between research and practice.

At the heart of many miscarriages have been coercive interrogation practices (physical and psychological), and a closed, guilt biased, tunnel-vision investigative mindset. The next three papers concern interrogation and investigative interviewing practices across China, USA, and Belgium. Article three (Zeng, Huang, & Bull) is the first to empirically examine actual Chinese police interviews with suspects and investigates the power dynamics therein. In an attempt to change the ethos and cultural tone of interactions with those suspected of crime, many countries have started to adopt/adopted ethical investigative interviewing practices that engender an

open-minded approach to information gathering. Paper four (Kelly & Valencia) looks at the relationship of question type and interview technique usage to suspect engagement using a sample of real-life interviews from the USA. Those deemed vulnerable (e.g. children) need special consideration and safeguards within the forensic interview environment. Paper five (Schoovaerts, Vanderhallen & McIntyre) evaluates whether legal assistance in Belgium in real life interviews with child suspects provide that safety net. Investigative interviewing training regimes have played a large part of changing practice in the ethical questioning of those suspected of wrong-doing. Paper six (Akca, Dion-Lariviere, & Eastwood) is a systematic review of thirty papers that have evaluated the impact of such training on practice. What training works? Finally, paper seven (Cullen, Adam, van Golde) conducted an exploratory review of policing documents within Australian states and territories, to determine the extent to which best-practice identification and investigative interviewing procedures have been adopted into police practice.

Taken together these papers provide a window into how well the research base actually meets practice. Transference is the key challenge for us all. I hope that readers find these papers stimulating and that they contribute further to the development of new research which in turn impacts upon theory, practice and on justice.