



## LIVED EXPERIENCES OF THE POLICE INVESTIGATORS IN TESTIFYING BEFORE THE REGIONAL TRIAL COURT

<sup>1</sup>Arjay V. Maristela and <sup>2</sup>Wilfredo D. Dalugdog

<sup>1</sup>Patrolman, Siniloan Police Station, Philippine National Police

<sup>2</sup>College of Criminal Justice Education, Laguna State Polytechnic University – Siniloan Campus

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Received in revised form

18<sup>th</sup> February, 2021

Accepted 29<sup>th</sup> March, 2021

Published online 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2021

#### Key Words:

Arresting Officer, Police Investigator, Regional Trial Court, Testimony

### ABSTRACT

The interpretative phenomenological research approach is used in this study to determine the lived experiences of the ten (10) police investigator – participants in testifying before the Regional Trial Court (RTC) from the different police stations at the 4<sup>th</sup> District of Laguna. The participants of this study were selected using a purposive sampling technique. In gathering the data, the researchers conducted a face-to-face interview employing unstructured interview guide to document the lived experiences, problems encountered and solutions applied by the police investigator – participants in testifying before the RTC. The data were analyzed based on Lichtman's (2013) three C's of analysis, from Coding to Categorizing to Concepts. The study revealed that the 10 participants experience nervousness in testifying, especially for testifying for a first time. They usually experienced the same problems as they handled a lot of works that leads to the anxiety experienced by the participants in the preparation of the case as they are not having enough sleep and rest before going to a witness stand. The findings of the study imply that the police investigators need to have a refresher training course in the preparation and in testifying inside the Courtroom.

Copyright © 2021 Arjay V. Maristela and Wilfredo D. Dalugdog. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Arjay V. Maristela and Wilfredo D. Dalugdog. "Lived experiences of the police investigators in testifying before the regional trial court", 2021. *International Journal of Current Research*, 13, (04), 17091-17096.

## INTRODUCTION

When a crime is committed investigators are normally tasked with identifying who committed the crime and then bringing the perpetrator to justice (Terry, 2009). To determine the responsible person in the commission of the crime the investigator has to conduct a criminal investigation for him or her be able to bring the offender to justice. According to the Philippine National Police Manual of the Directorate for Investigation and Detective Management (PNPM-DIDM, 2011), criminal investigation is the gathering of information in order to achieve three goals: identifying the guilty part, locating the guilty party, and providing proof of his (suspect) guilt. On this study, researchers focused on the lived experiences of the police investigators in testifying before the RTC. Testifying at the RTC and other courts in the Philippines is one of the functions of the police investigator as investigator of the case and as arresting officer.

This will be conducted from the time the investigator and / or arresting officer will be requested by the Court to testify in the witness stand. The investigator will testify based on the results of the criminal investigation and the arresting officer will testify on how did he arrested the suspect. In order to prove the accused's guilt in court, the truth of the crime's presence must be established; the accused must be known and connected with the crime; competent and reliable witnesses must be available; and physical evidence must be properly identified. The investigator must be well-versed in the elements of a particular crime (PNPM-DIDM, 2011, p. 1-7). All of these will be done with the presence of the police investigator. The testimony of the police investigator in a witness stand is important as he will be the one to identify the evidence presented by the defense prosecutor and attorney in the court. As stated by Foronda (2009) the qualification of an investigator in the Philippines includes: capable of observation, rational thinker, knowledgeable about the laws on crime, evidences, arrest, investigative concepts, techniques, scientific aids, laboratory services, and about criminals and their modus operandi, power of intellect, cooperative and can work with others, observant of professional ethics, has leadership potential, and reliable, honest, and physically, and mentally fit.

\*Corresponding author: Arjay V. Maristela, Patrolman, Siniloan Police Station, Philippine National Police.

According to Foronda (2009) the basic functions of the police investigator in the Philippines includes: providing emergency assistance, securing the crime scene, photographing, videotaping and sketching, taking notes and writing reports, searching for, obtaining and processing physical evidences, obtaining information from witnesses and suspects, and conducting raids, surveillance, stakeout and undercover assignment, and testifying in court, investigating and monitoring research. Meanwhile, criminal investigation is so important to the entire criminal justice system that its absence, tardy or shoddy execution may lead to delay in the administration of justice, the victimization of innocent citizens and escape of offender from paying for their misdeeds and being formed (Ladapo, n.d.). Statistically speaking, as cited by Ladapo (n.d.) the results of the study conducted by Chief Bayo Ojo in 2006, that 17.1% of prison inmates in Nigeria were awaiting trial because investigations into the allegations levelled against them were yet to be completed, 3.7% were incarcerated perpetually by default because their investigation case files could not be found, while 7.8% of the inmates' trials were stalled because of the absence in court, of police investigators and other witnesses whose attendance is the duty of the investigators to procure. Experienced investigators use a notebook to document pertinent case information. The court requires investigators to consult their notes before the trial to refresh their memory (PNPM-DIDM, 2011, p.1-8). The investigation's data should be reported in a complete, precise, and legible manner so that if another investigator is needed to take over the investigation, he may make intelligent use of the notebook (PNPM-DIDM, 2011, p.1-8).

The investigator-on-case and arresting officers must make every effort to attend court hearings, while Chief of Police (COPs)/Heads of Units must supervise and ensure the presence of witnesses/es (PNPM-DIDM, 2011, p.1-5). As investigator on case and arresting officer will be requested by the court to present the evidence or to give testimony regarding the case and even the arrest. On these instances, the testimony of the police investigator is important to bring the offender to justice. The testimony of the police investigator is very important in these instances as mentioned by Brian and Cruickshank (2017) good evidence alone may not be enough if the evidence is presented badly as part of a poor witness performance, once again suggesting that police officers must devote time and effort to preparing to be individual witnesses in court. Based on the DIDM Investigative Directive Number 2017-16, among the deficiencies observed on the part of the investigation units/offices to include unit commanders are: frequent change of investigators brought about by reassignment, poor record-keeping/documentation, no proper turn-over of the case/case folder between the outgoing and the incoming investigators, and no investigator assigned on the case that was handled and left by the previous investigator. Since 2011, the DIDM is implementing the conduct of investigation competency trainings PNP-wide aimed at increasing the level of performance of investigators as well as enhancing public confidence on the effectiveness of police investigators services. Subsequently, all Regional Directors, PROs were directed to relieve investigators without formal investigative trainings and to assign PNP personnel who are graduates of investigation courses (IOBC, CIC and its equivalent trainings) to any investigative position in order to utilize their acquired skills and knowledge in investigation to increase crime solution efficiency (DIDM Investigative Directive Number 2017-16). With this, the researchers become interested in

conducting this research study. Specifically, this study aims to determine the experiences, problems encountered and solutions applied by the police investigators in testifying before the RTC.

## OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of this study are to document the lived experiences, problems encountered and solutions applied to the problems encountered by the police investigators in testifying before the Regional Trial Court.

## METHODOLOGY

This study used an interpretative phenomenological research design using a generic approach to interpret and analyze the data gathered. Generic approach according to Lichtman (2013) is pertains to the use of different qualitative methodologies for the collection and analysis of data. With this, the researchers used the "Delayed" retrospection technique to describe the lived experiences of the police investigator – participants in testifying before the RTC. As cited by Pareja (2013) the "delayed" retrospection technique is one of the techniques used for introspection approach. She quotes "Introspection is the process of observing and reporting on one's own thoughts, feelings, motives, reasoning processes, and mental states, often with a view of determining the ways in which these processes and state shape behaviour". The "delayed" introspection method was considered because Protocol Analysis Method like Think Aloud is not possible considering the nature of the work of the police investigator, specifically, their lived experiences in testifying to the RTC as investigator of the case including their problems encountered and solutions applied to lessens if not possible to prevent, hence, the appropriateness of "delayed" retrospection technique (Pareja, 2013).

The participants of the study were composed of 10 police investigators from the 10 municipal police stations at the 4<sup>th</sup> district of Laguna. The participants were selected purposively using a fixed-criteria: first, he/she must have experienced in testifying at the RTC as investigator, second, he/she must be a police investigator for at least a year, and third, he/she must be willing to take part in this study. All participants are informed about the objectives of this study. Prior to the conduct of this study, the researchers secured a consent form from the participants that includes the used of audio recorder as tool to record all the data to be gathered.

The researchers assured all participants that no information that may identify them will be included in this study. They also understand that they can refuse to answer any question they would prefer not to answer. All participants are college graduate with different courses like criminology, education and psychology, but with the same specialized training for police investigator provided by the Philippine National Police these are Crime Investigation and Detection Course (CRIDEC) for five (5) months and Criminal Investigation Course (CIC) for forty-five (45) days inclusive with these trainings is the mock trial and so forth. This study was conducted in the 4<sup>th</sup> District of Laguna consist of the municipal police stations of Sta. Maria, Mabitac, Famy, Siniloan, Pangil, Pakil, Paete, Kalayaan, Lumban and Pagsanjan where the 10 police investigators are assigned.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part discussed the results and discussions in line with the objectives of the study.

**General Preparations:** Three themes originated from the responses of the participants about their lived experiences in testifying before the Regional Trial Court (RTC). These include how they feel in testifying at the RTC, their English language fluency, volume of cases handled by the Police Investigators, and frequency of testifying at the RTC per week. Police investigator – participants have experienced problems in testifying at the RTC, their answer to the questions given by the Prosecutor or Judge during the cross-examination, and asking irrelevant questions; when the case was filed for a long time, and missing documents because there is no proper turn-over of case folder. Since, problems experienced by the Police investigator – participants were identified. Participants applied immediate solutions to address the problems experienced in testifying at the RTC. These solutions can be adopted or modified by the Police Investigators in the Philippines. Specially, when they are testifying at the RTC for the first time. Based on the data gathered the study revealed that the 10 participants who participated on this study had testified at the RTC.

**Police investigator – participants commented their lived experiences in testifying at the RTC:** As cited by Brian and Cruickshank (2017) the study found out by Stockdale and Gresham (1995) that officers often performed below the standards expected of them when presenting evidence in courts. For example, the ability to remain calm whilst being challenged, controlling emotions, speaking confidently and inhibiting aggression were identified as areas for improvement. The police investigators at the 4<sup>th</sup> district of Laguna are still experiencing this feeling as commented by most of the participants of this study. *“I felt nervous in testifying at the RTC, especially, for testifying at first time and I also felt that both of my knees are sweating.”*

In the Philippines, the police investigator is trained in Crime Investigation and Detection Course (CRIDEC) and Crime Investigation Course (CIC) wherein one of the parts of the training is the mock trial. In this part, the police officer endorsed by the Chief of Police to undergo the said training for him or her be familiarized or knowledgeable with the court testimony but not all participants to CRIDEC or CIC trainings have experienced be a witness as investigator because the participants are group depending on the number of participants with small chances that all participants will experience to become a witness as investigator. With this, as stated by Baer (2015) most of the law enforcement officers have little to no formal witness testimony training. As commented by one of the participants: *“I also felt afraid and nervous as I don't have a training to speak in front of the judge or the Court.”*

There are also instances that the police investigator had experienced that his credibility was questioned by defense attorney. *“During the cross-examination the defense attorney is destroying the credibility of my statement as he is trying to make a loophole into it.”* According to Neal (2014), Brodsky's suggestions for cross-examination training involve making the witness examine the forms in which the expert's reputation

might be affected. As cited by Baer (2015) confidence is the strongest factor of witness credibility. Confidence is made up of verbal elements, including tone of voice, speech clarity, and speech pacing, and non-verbal elements, including posture, emotional control, and eye contact. However, there are also instances that the police investigator is experiencing difficulty in answering the English question. As commented by one of the participants and I quote *“I experienced an English question during my testimony inside the court because the Judge is preferred to speak in English than Tagalog. Thus, I have to speak in English to answer the judge question. But, I was frightened to answer in English because I am not that good in English. Maybe my answer in English has different meaning in Tagalog that could lead me to be sent in jail or I could be charged in contempt.”* This difficulty experienced by the police investigator is similar to the study found out by Pareja (2013) that the 21 police investigator – participants in the province of Cavite have been encountering difficulty in their language ability on translation specifically on vocabulary and grammar. They tend to resolve the problem on vocabulary by consulting a colleague, or a dictionary, or by googling the words (Pareja, 2013). Another difficulty encountered by the investigator-participants is on the grammar of the English language. According to the 27 participants they have a hard time on combining words together to form a sentence based on the narration of the subject in Filipino language (Pareja, 2013).

Usually, the police investigator is called to testify in court as he is the investigator of the case, but there were instances that the arresting officer is called to testify. *“It is true that not all investigators are meant to testify in court as investigator because arresting officer can be called by the court to testify. There are times that the court requested us to appear in court to testify, but not as an investigator but as an arresting officer or searching officer, but on the other hand I am still a police investigator”*

As stated by Foronda (2009) the basic functions of an investigator in the Philippines include: providing emergency assistance, securing the crime scene, photographing, videotaping and sketching, taking notes and writing reports, searching for, obtaining and processing physical evidences, obtaining information from witnesses and suspects, and conducting raids, surveillance, stakeout and undercover assignment, and testifying in court, investigating and monitoring research. With these basic functions of the police investigator it could be gleaned that the investigator has a lot of duties and responsibilities to be done. As stated by Kumar and Kamalanabhan (2014) based on their interview with the participants of their study that the most common potential stressor was work overload. As commented by one of the participants: *“sometimes, police investigator handled many cases that led him to forget most of the case. The investigator must come earlier in the court than the set schedule of hearing.”* According to Kumar and Kamalanabhan (2014) the word overload that is the most common potential stressor are the tasks like investigation, maintaining law and order, court duty and emergency situations.

Likewise, Brian and Cruickshank (2017) have said that being a witness in court has long been identified as a stressful experience. Specifically, a range of interlacing issues makes cross-examination difficult for witnesses, including police officers. It is similar to the comment made by one of the participants of this study and that we quote: *“Yes, I*

experienced to testify at the RTC for almost 100 times and the number of cases is almost 50 cases, and out of that cases only 10% were completed. The police investigator can testify at the RTC many times for a week because for a single case the investigator can testify many times and it depends on the request of the Court for me to testify, especially, if the case is still under trial. It is difficult if the question is from the defense attorney because the only answer that can be spoke is “yes” or “no”, I cannot say what I wanted to say.” However, there were instances that the police investigator was called to present the evidence involved at the crime. “Sometimes, police investigators are called to court to present the evidences, and I was asked about the evidences such as physical evidence or murder weapons. Sometimes, I was summoned to go to court to show the evidences, but when I was there, the evidences are all gone. I must go to court because there was a subpoena from the court addressed to me. When I was there, I can already say that the evidences is out of my custody.”

The study revealed that the police investigators at the 4<sup>th</sup> district of Laguna are usually experiencing nervous or not calm to testify in court, especially for the first-time testimony. Police investigator-participants are experiencing difficulty in English questions as they were usually confused with the questions given by the defense prosecutor. But, they are allowed to request from the judge to speak in Tagalog for them not to answer incorrectly. However, due to the volume of worked assigned to the police investigators there were instances that some police investigator-participants are not able to review the case prior to the court testimony. With this, this can escalate the nervous feeling of the police investigator-participants during the court testimony. Police investigators were not just called to testify as investigators, they were also called testify in the court as arresting officer for them to be able to describe to the court how did they arrest the suspect.

#### **The problems encountered by the police investigators in testifying before the Regional Trial Court. Comments of the police investigators:**

Police investigator – participants have experienced difficulty in English question. As they commented:

“The problems of the investigator in testifying is when the defense prosecutor have seen a loopholes on the statement of the investigator during his testimony.”

“Terminology used by the lawyers that can be understood by the Criminology graduate and not easily be understood by the graduate of other courses.”

“By answering the question of the defense using an English language, the meaning of the answer could be different from English to Tagalog”.

Pareja (2013) found that there were two major difficulties in writing law enforcement reports: conducting an interview with the subject (criminal suspect, the victim, or the witness) and the writing of the narratives. However, as stated by Pareja (2013) despite that fact that law enforcement officers are graduates of a four-year course like Bachelor of Science in Criminology or other related course, majority of them encounter difficulties in writing reports. As commented by one of the participants of this study:

“There is a possible minor problem of the police investigator like the question in English because the Judge would say that we are a college graduate so we are necessary to speak in English during the trial. Even though we are college graduate it doesn't mean that we are good in English”.

As stated by Tong and Bowling (2006) a number of causes célèbre have brought to light investigative errors which have been blamed for delays in discovering crucial items of evidence, failure to identify suspects and the collapse of criminal prosecutions. In the worst cases, investigative errors have led to convictions later found to have been unsafe and unsatisfactory. This instance is somewhat similar with the comments of the participants of the study: “During the hearing, the problem which I encountered is the defense lawyer because he can do all things to destroy my credibility as police investigator, particularly, when he will file a perjury case against my wrong statement”.

But, Police officer can be effective in giving testimony in court by improving their education, training and preparation (Brain and Cruickshack, 2017). Thus, if the police investigator did not review or prepare the case to be testified, most probably, he will be having difficulty in answering the questions giving by the defense prosecutor or a judge. As commented by one of the participants of this study,

“If the investigator is not prepared to testify in court especially when the case was filed for a long time, he cannot remember it when he did not able to review it. The other problem that can be encountered is the questions that cannot be answered because the case was filed for a long time and the case was forgotten by the investigator. Aside to that, another problems that the investigator will experience is by stuttering in his answer towards the question given by the defense or the judge because the investigator was confuse with the question.”

“It is true that the problems of the Investigators is when you forgot the content of your affidavit, because the defense can use that to rebut you, and you must be familiarized with the markings on the evidence and there are some that could led for the dismissal of the case and that is the big problem. The defense lawyer will really trying to confuse investigators until our answer will go wrong and to have a contradiction to our affidavit and to what we had said, that can lead to a doubt and it can result for the acquittal of the case. One of our problems is when there's two police witnesses or more, it turned out with a different statement or our statements did not match that can lead to weaken the case that is a big problem of the investigators that testified. We also have a problem in the cross-examination that is answerable by yes or no only. I experienced here the questions that is hard to answer by yes, because I really have an explanation to that question of why yes is my answer, but we can't explain it because we should follow the rules of answering by yes or no only.”

“There is a common problem like when there's a lost document in the case folder. One more, there's a time in the drug case that we misplacethe picture that we take on the crimes scene just like on some evidences, sometimes we don't know where the evidence is and there is pinpointing to each other that the evidence is in the investigator and the court.”

Likewise, “the common problems that we encountered as investigator, eh, is in the part of the defense because they gave

*irrelevant questions that led us to convince by them the judge that our statements during testimony and they will destroy the credibility of our statement. There's also an irrelevant question by the defense that sometimes cannot be objected by the prosecutor, because of that, the judge did nothing except to accept the questions and answer all of those and that is the possible problem."*

*"The problems that we have here are the evidences that we forgot where those are, sometimes we thought that the evidences are on the arresting or we handed it to the arresting but it was already submitted in the court. One of the problem that we encountered here is the drug cases, on the first police who testified as a witness to the same case, that's why there is a loopholes or doubt from the statement and that is one of the problem."*

*"One of the problems which we experienced as investigators are the PAO lawyers or the defense because they will try to confuse us until they have seen loopholes to dismiss the case. One more problems are the lost case folder, especially when we are re-assign to other police station, we did not know where to find the case folder, and for this we testify in the court we did not review the case. It is true that time can be a problem in a witness stand, the date and events of the crime incidents, because if you do not know those it will become a big problem. Another one is when you have been taken by your nervous it will let you be confused until you answer incorrectly that will led to dismiss the case."*

These comments of the participants have something to do with Baer (2015) as she cited (Potter and Brewer, 1999) that inconsistent testimony, rehearsed testimony, needing prompting, or pretending not to hear questions suggested inaccurate testimony. In addition to these behaviors, fidgeting, projecting a lack of confidence, and avoiding eye contact also indicate inaccurate testimony. In other words, there are both verbal and nonverbal actions that may adversely affect a witness's efficacy (Baer, 2015.). According to Neal (2014), witness behaviors included poor posture, fidgeting, expressiveness, gaze, voice quality, response quality, disdain, other person objects, general integrity, trust, and emotion.

*"Investigators problem is if we did not really reviewed the case. The problem here is when they ask me a question that I did not read or review the statement, it is really a problem and that can be a points for the defense. There is also an instances that the defense lawyer knew that we reviewed, they can asked different questions that we cannot answer."*

The study revealed that the police investigator – participants have encountered problems in testifying before the RTC. Obviously, they encountered difficulty in English question from the defense prosecutor. They were requesting to repeat the question or translate the English question in Tagalog and they prepared to answer the English question in Tagalog for them to avoid giving statements contradictory to the affidavits made. Another problems being encountered by the investigator is the defense prosecutor as he will be the one to destroy the credibility of the police investigator as he witness on a witness stand.

**Solutions applied by the police investigators on the problems encountered in testifying before the Regional Trial Court. Comments of the participants:**

*"..by reviewing the case, understanding clearly the questions before answering it, and if I don't understand the statement of the person who asked like in English language I request to repeat the question or translate it in Tagalog." "relaxing the mind and to avoid the feeling of nervousness of the chest and it is necessary for us that we memorize our statement. When it comes to English question it can be requested to translate it or repeat the question if we cannot understand the question and we can also request to the court that we can answer the question in Tagalog. One more, it is necessary that we know the time when the incident occurred, what time, we know the date, the place, the events and other things."*

*"It is true that nervousness will be felt in the court room but it is important for us to overcome the problems and nervousness that we felt through relaxing our self, by being calm and focus to our statement and avoid being distracted to the people around and those questions to be asked are those necessary to be answered and we avoid flowering words in answering that would led us and it could be the cause of the loopholes of the statements of the investigators. To the English terms, we can request to translate or we are allowed to speak in Tagalog for understanding better. Another is we need to "stand still" in front of the court even though we felt nervous it is necessary to "stand still" and show them that we don't nervousness. Another, in all the case that that we handled, we always put it or wrote it on to what we called "investigator's notebook" for us to have a basis or records. The most important of all the solutions and preparation for me as investigator is to pray to be prepared in facing the court." "We need to review the case and look out at the statement, the documents should be complete and most of all we are ready to face the court and all the possible things they will search on us at the court must be shown to them and we must memorize the statements and understood all the questions they had asked about us."*

*"The first thing that I do as an investigator is to review in advance in a way of being prepared before the scheduled hearing. I must reviewed the case earlier and I must attend the court earlier than the scheduled time of hearing. Another one of my ways to overcome those possible problems is to memorize my affidavit and every details of it. Always stay put in my affidavit and avoid adding some words to be spoken too."*

*"The first solution that I do is to make my own affidavit, I am the one that mark an evidence, I am the one that brings the evidence to the crime laboratory, I am the one who inventory the evidence and I must have a personal knowledge on how to process the drug cases. On the heinous crime I must be personally involved in the investigation process and the affidavit I did not allow someone to make it, not that I'm just going to sign it, it should be made by me and what the incidents happened that what is written on the affidavit. The most important of all is that I am prepare to all the things that may occur and I know what I am doing." "One of our solutions when we encounter a problem is, we consulted it to the prosecutor for them to tell us what we should do. The investigator must have a rapport to the prosecutor to prosecute the case. One thing that objects is the prosecutor towards the question by the defense if ever the question is irrelevant."*

*"Our first solution to the problems is to be prepared for the case, our mind must be prepared to the possible questions to*

be asked to us, and in terms of evidence we must know where the evidences are and with whom and it is necessary that we remember the evidence to whom we passed it already. In drug cases, we must get the copy first or the statement or the answer of the first police officer who testified before us, for us to have the same statements and not contradictory statements to the first police who testified before us. Let say, we are asking them what are the questions being asked to them inside the court? For use to be prepared what are the possible questions to be asked to us. The most important is that we are prepared and we clearly reviewed the case folder that we had on our hand.”

“At first, we reviewed our statement, like when did the incident take place or occur, and in what place, for us to avoid being confuse to the case. We also need to alert our mind and focus to the questions. One more we need to polish our preparation of the case for when the time of the hearing comes, we know what to answer. The most important in the preparation of the case is on the day of the incident occurred we must fixed our statement to avoid the possible problems and for us to understand the case well and review the case.”

As stated by Brian and Cruickshack (2017) that the key factors in effectively presenting evidence are reviewed and directions outlined for building knowledge on preparing police officers to perform in court. This has something to do with the comments answer by one of the participants of this study. The investigator must review the case before he testify in the court for him to be prepared for the questions to be asked by the defense prosecutor. This statement is similar to the comments of one of the participants of this study. “First, it is really necessary to review before we testify because there is a big chance for us to win the case. As investigator, one of our solutions to our problems are the direct testimony we have a wrong answer there after that we are asking to the prosecutor to have a re-direct to correct the wrong answers that we had.”

As stated by Neal (2014) it appears that self-preparation is one of the most common methods of expert witness preparation. As condensed by Neal (2014) the three basic components of witness preparation includes: witness education, attorney education, and modification of testimony delivery. Witness education consists of orienting witness to the trial process and physical layout of the courtroom in addition to reviewing prior statements and the subject matter of testimony (Neal, 2014). Witness education is critical in preventing witnesses from making inconsistent comments and becoming anxious or awkward on the stand (Neal, 2014). The data shows that the participants of the study have almost the same solutions applied to prevent future problems that may encounter in testifying before the RTC. The solutions applied by the police investigator-participants are: by reviewing the case before testifying at the court, be prepared with the questions to be asked by the defense prosecutor, making their own document like affidavit, notebook of investigator as their basis during the court testimony and guide in making a police reports.

## CONCLUSION

The 10 police investigator – participants at the 4<sup>th</sup> district of Laguna have the same experiences in testifying before the RTC. They all have experienced the feeling of nervousness on the first time of their testimony and most of the participants have difficulty in English language as this language is the most preferred to be used by the judge and defense prosecutor. With this, they are requesting to the defense prosecutor to repeat the question or translate the English question in Tagalog for the

police investigator – participants be able to understand and answer the question correctly and accurately. Participants have experienced difficulty in reviewing their handled case as they were having lots of works to be done as police investigator. However, the police investigator – participants have a ready solutions to be applied towards the problems which they encountered in testifying before the RTC. Based on the findings, the researchers will recommend to conduct a refresher training course for the police investigator – participants undergo a Crime Investigation and Detection Course (CRIDEC) and Crime Investigation Course (CIC) cater by the Philippine National Police. English enhancement course will also be recommended for the police investigator – participants to undergo for them to be able to have a confidence in answering the English questions. The researchers would like to recommend a stress management training to police investigator – participants as they were handling different tasks as police investigator. Attending and watching actual hearing or trial inside the court will help police investigator – participants be familiarized with the question possible to ask from him in the near future.

## REFERENCES

- Baer, E. L. 2015. *The Effects of Testimony Training on Law Enforcement Officer Self-Assessment of Testimony Skills*. Western Journal of Criminal Justice – Current Issues, Vol. 7, Issue 1. <http://www.wiu.edu/coehs/leja/cacj/research/current.php>
- Brian, D.J., and Cruickshack, A. 2017. *Police officers giving evidence. Discussing gaps, contradictions and next steps*. The Police Journal Theory, Practice and Principles, 90 2. pp. 160-172. ISSN 0032-258X.
- Cramer, R.J., DeCoster, J., Neal, T.M.S., & Brodsky, S.L. 2013. The Observed Witness Efficacy Scale: A measurement of effective testimony skills. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 1691-1703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12124>
- Directorate for Investigation and Detective Management. DIDM Investigation Directive Number 2017 – 16. Guidelines on the Transfer of Investigators. Directorate for Investigation and Detective Management Philippines National Police. 2011. *Criminal Investigation Manual Revised*.
- Kumar, V., and Kamalanabhan, T.J., 2014. Sources of Stress among Police Officials: A Qualitative Investigation.
- Ladapo, O. A. n.d.. *Effective Investigations, A Pivot To Efficient Criminal Justice Administration: Challenges In Nigeria*. African Journal of Criminal and Justice Studies, Vol. 5, # 1 & 2. <https://www.umes.edu/> uploaded Files/\_WEBSITES/AJCJS/Content/5%201%202%20ladapo%20proof.pdf
- Lichtman, M. 2013. *Qualitative Research in Education. A User's Guide*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Neal, T, M.S., 2014. Expert Witness Preparation: What Does the Literature Tell Us?. *The Jury Expert*.
- Pareja, T. P. 2013. Selected Police Investigators' Difficulties Encountered in Writing Law Enforcement Reports in Cavite: Basis for Designing an English Writing Course. *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*. ISSN: 2165-6258.
- Terry G. 2009. “The criminal investigator” *Australia police journal*, 63 4, 156-163. <https://research.bond.edu.au/en/publications/the-criminal-investigator-2>
- Tong, S. and Bowling, B. 2006. *Art, craft and science of detective work*. The Police Journal, 79 4. pp. 323-330. ISSN 0032-258X.