An Open Access Journal Available Online

Rapport Building Strategies in Police-Suspect Interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria

Temidayo Akinrinlola
McPherson University, Abeokuta, Nigeria

Abstract

Police-suspect interaction (PSI) thrives on discursive negotiation of intentions between investigating police officers (IPOs) and suspects. With regard to the Nigerian context, a plethora of studies have anchored the deployment of physical torture in extracting confessional statements from suspects. This study investigates rapport building strategies adopted by IPOs in seeking confessional statements from suspects during interrogation sessions. The study adopts Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistic theory, considering its emphasis on how context-specific strategies are engaged in negotiating participants' goals in discourse. Data for the study comprise interrogation sessions on conspiracy, robbery, kidnapping and forgery at the State Criminal Investigation Department, Ìyágankú, Ibadan, Nigeria. Findings reveal that topic change is adopted by IPOs to signal defection in a bid to glean confessional statements from suspects. IPOs also engage empathy, common interest and positive reinforcement to identify with suspects. This study concludes that rapport building in PSI is a function of power relations between IPOs and suspects. **Keywords**: Rapport building, Confessional statements, Police-suspect interaction, Nigeria.

Introduction

Police-suspect interaction (PSI) is a co-operative activity that relies on discursive practices between investigating police officers (IPOs) and suspects (Ajayi, 2016). The institutional practices are pointers to the realisation of the participants' goals in such encounter. While IPOs are curious to get suspects to confess to crime, suspects deploy discursive resources to establish their innocence. IPOs adopt quite a number of strategies to glean confessional statements from suspects.

With respect to the Nigerian context, IPOs subject suspects to physical torture in a bid to elicit confessional statements (Akinrinlola, 2016; Ajayi, 2016; Ajayi and Oyetade, 2016). An IPO is charged with the responsibility of dealing with criminal cases while a suspect is a person assumed to have committed a crime. The difference in social status and goals of the participants informs the context of the encounter (Omoronghomwan, 2018). This study agrees that scholarly interventions, from the Nigerian context (see Udoh, 2010; Farinde *et al.*, 2015; Ajayi, 2016, Akinrinlola, 2016; Sunday and Akinrinlola, 2017; Akinrinlola, 2018; Omoroghomwan, 2018; Akinrinlola, 2019), have interrogated police discourse from the discourse analytical rubric. Ajayi (2016) and Akinrinlola (2016) are examples of studies that identify the use of physical threat by IPOs in extracting confessional statements from suspects. This study contends that the adoption of physical threat during interrogation could culminate in achieving false confession from suspects (Akinrinlola, 2016). Existing studies' accent on physical abuse as a means of gleaning confessional statements from suspects reveals that the place of rapport in PSI in Nigeria has been ignored (Akinrinlola, 2019). Paucity of scholarly works on rapport-mediated strategies in getting suspects confess to crime has undermined how discursive devices are used to negotiate civility in PSI. Besides, existing studies do not anchor, with regard to the Nigerian experience, the strategies adopted in creating, managing and sustaining relationships between IPOs and suspects during PSI. To address this void in forensic discourse scholarship, particularly in the Nigerian context, this study examines rapport building strategies in PSI in Ibadan. This study maintains that, creating rapport with suspects remains one of the strategic ways through which IPOs get the better part of suspects during crime investigation in Ibadan. Rapport building is a process of harmonious understanding with another individual in communication interaction (Jonathan and Nadja, 2015). IPOs appeal to suspects' physical, social and emotional spheres in a bid to achieve their institutional goal.

This study argues that elicitation of confessional statements from suspects transcends the deployment of force, hence the adoption of rapport building strategies in gleaning confessions from suspects. Studies have not adequately engaged the resourcefulness of Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistic model in interpreting how contextual dynamics shape rapport in institutional setting like PSI (Akinrnlola, 2019). Since Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistics model concerns how participants in communication device strategies to track interactional goals, this study investigates, through the interactional sociolinguistic lens, how rapport is created and deployed by IPOs in PSI in Ibadan.

This study is set to engage these questions: What are the strategies adopted by IPOs in building rapport with suspects during interrogation sessions? What implications does rapport-mediated approach to police interrogation have for crime investigation in Ibadan? The choice of Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistic model is premised on its strengths in handling how interactants' motivations are contextually shaped. Apart from revealing how civility is enacted, managed and sustained between IPOs and suspects in PSI, this study will expand existing frontiers of studies in PSI with regard to the Nigerian context.

On Rapport Building in Discourse

Rapport building refers to a connection or relationship with interactants in

communication (Jonathan and Nadja, 2015). It could be described as the state of mutual understanding with one another. Such mutual agreement creates trust, mutual cohesion and harmony (Kassin *et al*, 2007; Yves, 2006 and Vallano & Compo, 2011; Allisson, 2013). Rapport concerns the ability of interactants to create an enabling environment that will facilitate the realisation of the goals of interaction (Kassin *et al,* 2007). Establishing such enabling environment involves paying attention to and appreciating the thoughts, feelings and perceptions of fellow interlocutors (Yves, 2006). It could be described as the process of responsiveness at the unconscious level. Leach (2005) submits that rapport building in conversation helps to get the unconscious minds of fellow interactants to accept and process the suggestions of others. Rapport building in communication enables the speaker to sustain interactants' unconscious minds. The sustenance of such unconscious minds enhances the goal of the interaction. The study identifies rapport building as an important aspect of the unconscious state in human interaction. It further describes rapport building as a communicative tool a speaker uses in influencing listeners to identify the intention of a discourse. Abbe and Brandson (2013) note that rapport building in conversation is a process enacted to attract friendliness in interaction. They note that rapport is all about building understanding and demonstrating it in communication interaction; it is about finding what appeals to fellow interactants. With particular reference to interaction, building rapport entails studying how fellow interlocutors handle information, their intentions and their body language. Charles (2007) notes that frequent syntactic and lexical anomalies do not produce rapport; he notes that the context of discourse reveals rapport. Scollon and Scollon (1995) further observe that rapport building favours the interactional aspect of language which is aimed at maintaining social relationship. To Qatey (2008), rapport management in discourse helps to track inherent speech acts. This study maintains that rapport building is a significant communicative tool which helps interlocutors in institutional setting, like PSI, to achieve institutional goals.

Perspectives on Interaction in Police-Suspect Discourse

A handful of linguistic studies (e.g., Benneworth 2009; Udoh, 2010; Szczyrbak, 2014; Farinde et al. 2015; Akinrinlola, 2016; Sunday and Akinrinlola, 2017; Omoronghomwan, 2018; Akinrinlola, 2019; Kelly, Dawson and Hartwig, 2019) have investigated police discourse from different perspectives. Working with paedophilic cases, Benneworth (2009) observes that IPOs elicit constitutionally preferred confessions from suspects. Using suspects of paedophilic cases, the study interrogates a 54-year-old man sexually molesting a female of 8-12. Engaging the data from the critical discourse analytical framework, the study reveals that the suspect weaved his responses to defeat the IPO's investigative skills. On the dynamics of context in police interview, Kelly, Dawson and Hartwig (2019) investigate how IPOs engage space (a non-verbal mode) to institute and sustain control over suspects during crime investigation. Working with 77 interviews, the study submits that space (the physical distance between an IPO and a suspect during PSI) is a significant contextual variable that facilitates access to suspects' confessions. This study agrees that Benneworth (2009) and Kelly, Dawson and Hartwig (2019) are relevant studies in PSI. However, the studies do not examine police-suspect interviews from the lens of interactional sociolinguistics. Besides, the studies do not engage how rapport functions

as instrument of gleaning confessional statements from suspects.

Farinde *et al* (2015) examine police interrogation with emphasis on the themes that run through the discourse. Using the meta-pragmatic model, the study reveals that police interrogation is laden with themes of assault, house breaking, affray, and obtaining by false pretence. Considering the influence of police behavioural pattern on criminal identification, Omoroghomwan (2018) examines two known police behavioural strategies towards criminal identification among police personnel in Nigeria. The study analyses two hundred and seventeen (217) respondents and reveals that police officers' use of service and defection strategies are vital to criminal identification. It establishes that the strategy assists the police in tracking criminal activities. From the pragmatic viewpoint, Szczyrbak (2014) studies pragmatic markers used in police interviews. He specifically engages the use of *I mean* and *you know* in PSI. The study reveals that the said pragmatic markers perform the functions of inviting the addressee's inferences, serving interpersonal functions, managing turns and serving repair mechanism.

Akinrinlola (2016) investigates elicitation and response strategies in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. The study adopts a fusion of Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis and Mey's pragmatic act theory as a theoretical model. The study reveals that IPOs mostly resort to physical force in gleaning confessional statements from suspects. On negotiation tactics in PSI, Sunday and Akinrinlola (2017) investigate negotiation tactics in police interrogation sessions in Ibadan. The study reveals that IPOs use presentation of evidence strategy as a means of luring suspects to confess during investigation. On the dynamics of turn

management in PSI, Akinrinlola (2018) reveals that turn units are strategic discourse markers which express power and control in PSI. Akinrinlola (2019) investigates the discursive roles of deixis in PSI. Tape-recorded interrogation sessions on rape, burglary and stealing, affray, obtaining by false pretence, arson, kidnapping and robbery were analysed, using insights from critical discourse analysis. The study reveals that IPOs and suspects manipulate deixis to express collectivism, self-assertion and labelling. The coverage of these studies indicates that in Nigeria, rapport management in PSI has not enjoyed sufficient scholarly attention. Existing police studies in Nigeria (see Akinrinlola, 2016; Udoh, 2010; Farinde et al, 2015; Ajayi, 2016, Akinrinlola, 2016; Sunday and Akinrinlola, 2017; Akinrinlola, 2018; Omoroghomwan, 2018; Akinrinlola, 2019) are devoted to examining how discursive devices are deployed in PSI. The studies' non-anchorage of context underestimates how participants in PSI explore rapport building strategies in achieving goals in such encounters.

Omoroghomwan's (2018) study is relevant to the present study, considering its emphasis on police behavioural patterns in crime identification. However, this study maintains that crime investigation goes beyond crime identification. The participants involved in the discourse deploy discursive devices in negotiating social acts in tandem with their goals. Although Akinrinlola (2016), Sunday and Akinrinloa (2017), Akinrinlola, 2018 and 2019) are refreshing explorations in PSI, the studies do not echo the deployment of rapport in sustaining interaction in PSI. A significant void in the studies is the non-articulation of strategies adopted in establishing, managing and sustaining rapport in PSI in Nigeria.

Interactional Sociolinguistic Theory

Interactional sociolinguistics theory (IST) is rooted in anthropology, sociology and linguistics. It relates anthropology, sociology and linguistics to culture, society and language. Gumperz (1999: 56) notes that IST "borrows insights from other linguistic schools of thoughts". Discussing the tenets of IST, Gumperz maintains that it concerns how people from different cultures may share knowledge of a language but differently contextualise what is said such that different messages are produced (Gumperz, 1982). To Gumperz, IST harps on how language is situated in a particular social life, and how it reflects different types of meaning and structure. He notes that IST "adopts a micro-analytic approach within a wider socio-cultural context, and allows explicit account of the unstated assumptions and background knowledge the participants bring to bear as part of the interpretive process (Gumperz, 1999: 102). He emphasises the significance of contextualisation cues such as prosodic and paralinguistic features, conversational routine, identifiable conventions which participant use in negotiating meaning in interaction (Gumperz, 1999).

Tarone (2008) notes that, IST examines the relationship between language and social context. In studying this relationship, it relies on data from institutional settings. Gumperz (1982) observes that IST investigates participants' interpretation of an ongoing transcribed text to deduce sociocultural assumptions and expectations. It identifies conversational inference as an important element that drives participants' goals in communicative situation (Gumperz, 1999). He notes that participants glean meaning from words, phrases and sentences as they occur. They also make active predictions about what will come next, based on the line of interpretation suggested by on-going talk as measured against prior interpretive experience. Gumperz (1982)

contends that participants in discourse are guided by conversational ethics and interpretive norms which are culturally reinforced and revised in the light of an on-going interpretation. IST favours cross-cultural communication (Gumperz, 1999). By interviewing participants, Gumperz (2003) notes that research in IST focuses on linguistic devices and strategies used in signaling intentions and meaning. From similar perspective, Gumperz and Hymes, 1972; Chick,1987 and Rampton, 2017) submit that IST investigates how grammar, culture and interaction convention, inferencing and contextualisation reveal participants' sociolinguistic resources and institutional power in discourse. IST pays attention to the interpretive nature of language. It favours the use of discourse strategies within a particular cultural milieu, and examines the effects of such strategies on communication (Schiffrin, 2009). For the purpose of this study, we interpret the selected interrogation sessions in terms of how IPOs adopt rapport building strategies in gleaning confessional statements from suspects.

Methodology

Interrogation sessions on forgery and conspiracy, robbery and kidnapping, were tape recorded at the State Criminal Investigation Department (SCID), Ìyágankú, Ibadan. The SCID is a Department of the Nigeria Police Force devoted to crime investigation. It is a unit to which all serious crime cases are referred. For ethical reasons, permission to tape-record interrogation sessions was also sought from the suspects, and such permission was documented. The names and locations of suspects were coded with the use of alphabets. The non-participant observation technique was adopted. Each of the recorded cases was recorded for minimum of two hours. Two sessions were recorded for each suspect. The

study also adopted structured and unstructured interview. Fifty IPOs (twenty of which were within the rank and file and thirty within the inspectorate cadre and above) were interviewed on the motivation behind IPOs' recourse to rapport building during interrogation sessions. The essence of such interview was to compare the submissions of the IPOs with the results of the study.

Four interrogation sessions on conspiracy, robbery, kidnapping and forgery cases were purposively selected because of their relative manifestation of rapport building strategies in extracting confessional statements from suspects. The recorded conversations were rendered in English, Yoruba and Pidgin. Data were transcribed into text, and conversations in Yoruba and Pidgin were translated into English. Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistics was adopted to investigate how IPOs deploy rapport building as a means of eliciting confessional statements from suspects. Rapport building strategies were identified and described in terms of how they facilitate elicitation of confessional statements from suspects. The strategies are described in accordance with Gumperz's tenets of interactional sociolinguistics. The study describes the implications of identified rapport building strategies for the language of crime investigation in Ibadan.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Analysis of sampled data reveals that, in order to build rapport with suspects, IPOs appeal to Gumperz's contextualisation, paralinguistic cues, inference and discursive strategies to negotiate topic change,

empathy, common ground and positive reinforcement. These discursive strategies are presented in the data below:

Excerpt 1

Excerpt 1 presents a case of conspiracy. The suspect was arrested for misappropriating the sum of five hundred and twenty two thousand naira. His boss noticed the traces of such mischievous moves and invited the police to arrest the suspect.

Resort to topic change

One of the rapport-based strategies adopted by IPOs in luring suspects to confess is contextual manipulation of topics of interrogation. An example from our data is presented below:

1. P: Dem sey you steal five hundred and twenty-two thousand.
          You were alleged to have stolen the sum of five hundred and twenty-two thousand naira.

2. S: Oga, I don tell my oga everything.
          Sir, I told the whole story to my boss.

3. P: We get evidence for hand o.
          We have evidence for hand.
          We have some evidences.

4. S: I neva do dis kind tin for my life.
          I have never done this kind of thing in my life, Sir.

5. P: The good thing be sey the person wey bring this matter here fit no go court sef.
          The good thing is that the complainant may not be interested in further litigation.

6. S: Oga, make you help me o. I neva see this kind tin for my life.
          Sir, kindly assist me. I have never experienced this kind of thing in my life.

7. P: Make you co-operate with us o for this matter. You go help me get people wey join hand
            for this crime sef.
            You should cooperate with me in this matter. You also need to help me track the other
            culprits.

8. S: I go do am, oga. I sey this kind thing I neva see am.
            I will do, Sir. I said I have never seen something like this before.

9. P: Wetin you fit tell me about other workers for the company? Make you talk true o.
            What can you tell me about other workers in the company? You should tell the truth.

10. S: Officer, my oga know sey I no dey do this kind thing.
            Officer, my boss knows I don't do this kind of thing.

11. P: We see fifty thousand naira for your account. If we beg your oga, you fit pay am the
            remaining money?I no sabi Mathematics well o. I for tell you the balance.

            We saw fifty thousand naira in your bank account. If we appeal to your boss, are you
            ready to refund the remaining money? I am not good at Mathematics, I would have told
            you the balance now.

12. S: Make you just help me, oga
            Just help me, Sir.

Excerpt 1 presents a case of conspiracy. In the interrogation, the IPO adopts change of interrogation topic as a rapport building strategy to elicit confessional statements from the suspect. In line with Gumperz's tenets of interactional sociolinguistics, topic manipulation is employed by the IPO to achieve his institutional goal in the encounter. The IPO in line 1 rides on his institutional power to allege the suspect for stealing the said sum of money. The IPO's choice of *allege* constricts the suspect's appeal to innocence. In response, the suspect conceals the expected response through the use of the affirmative sentence, *I told the whole story to my boss*. Here, his involvement in the crime is deliberately delayed. Even when the IPO further threads the path of allegation in line 3 by asserting that evidences have been established against the suspect, the suspect appeals to impeccable crime history to appeal to innocence. In line 5, however, the IPO further changes the topic by engaging the disposition of a third party (the complainant). The introduction of the positive disposition of the complainant serves to douse the fears of the suspect. In other words, the IPO changes the topic by deliberately shifting the suspect's attention to the disposition of the complainant. This is in tandem with Gumperz's 1999 discourse cues of sustaining rapport in interaction. The IPO in line 5 makes the complainant the subject of the discourse by engaging his (complainant's) attitude to the case being examined. The IPOs' mention of the complainant's disinterest in court case tends to assuage the tension and fears of the suspect. The IPO's use of topic change in line 5 equally ensures the calmness and attention of the suspect. Such change of topic of the interrogation enables the IPO to get a better part of the suspect in terms of elicitation of relevant information that could establish the suspect's incrimination. Although the IPO's inclusion of *may* in line 5 is rendered to shroud certainty of the complainant's decision, the IPO's statement is line 5 is intended to create a positive identity for the complainant.

Line 7 presents another instance of topic change initiated by the IPO. The IPO appeals to topic change by exonerating the suspect and alleging the suspects at large. He builds rapport with the suspect by asserting that the real culprits will be arrested through the co-operation of the

suspect. The IPO's use of the nominal choices, *culprit* and *cooperate* has contextual implications. While the choice of *culprit* contextually alleges and incriminates the suspect, the choice of *cooperate* constructs a positive identity for the suspect; the suspect is portrayed as an agent who is capable of tracking other suspects at large. The assumption is that the suspect may be freed after confessing the locations of the other suspects. The topic change strategy adopted by the IPO in line 7 is in tandem with Gumperz's model of rapport management in interaction. We can infer, from the IPO's statement, that, the suspect may not be a major culprit in the case. In creating further network of rapport with the suspect, the IPO requests information about other workers. He, however, includes that the suspect should tell the truth. From the IPO's words, one could infer that the suspect is not believed to have been sincere in his responses.

Line 11 captures the IPO's resort to civility as against interrogating the suspect within the confines of the law. His resort to civility is another instance of change of topic in the discourse. Instead of engaging the dictates of the law, the IPO chooses civility in a bid to allay the fears of the suspect. The IPO's utterance in 11 is greeted with an affirmative response in line 12. The suspect expresses agreement by seeking the help of the IPO. The interaction in excerpt 1 shows the adoption of topic change as an instrument for eliciting confessions from the suspect. The IPO resorts to the use of topic change by shifting attention of the suspect to the disposition of the complainant, thereby exonerating the suspect and alleging other suspects. The IPO frames civility to allay the fears of the suspect. The suspect responds by expressing agreement to the IPO's rapport building strategy. Forty two IPOs, out of the fifty interviewed, confirmed that topic change remains a viable strategy of building

rapport with suspects during interrogation. While this study agrees with Szcsyrbak (2014) and Farinde *et al* (2015) on lexical markers that run through interrogation session, the study extends the scope of existing literature by contending that IPOs resort to discourse cues in building rapport with suspects during interrogation sessions.

Excerpt 2

Excerpt 2 captures a case of robbery. One XX was arrested for being part of the gang that allegedly robbed one Mr. XX of some valuables in Ibadan. The interaction manifests the deployment of appeal to empathy.

Appeal to empathy

IPOs resort to identifying with the psychological state of suspects in a bid to achieve confession during interrogation sessions. An instance of IPOs' recourse to empathy as a means to an end is described in the excerpt below:

1. P: You don suffer too much here. I know how e dey be.
   You have suffered a lot, here. I know how it feels.

2. S: Oga, I don tire.
   Sir, I am tired.

3. P: You never tell us how una do the deal o. I know sey sergeant XX don suffer you.
   You have not told us how you carried out the deal. I know Sergeant XX has been very tough on you.

4. S: Oga, I don weak o.
   Sir, I am weak.

5. P: This kind thing fit affect your brain self.
You still fit continue with my questions?
    This kind of experience can even affect you
mentally. Can you still continue with this
    interrogation?

6. S: I go try now.
     I will try.

7. P: You fit no join the gang that day o, but
you know how the thing be.
    You may not have joined the gang on that
day, but you knew about the plans.
8. S: Oga, I go tell you my own torry.
     Sir, I will tell you my own side of the
story.

9. P: You don chop? I know sey dem no catch
you with gun, and I know how e dey be to be
    arrested with these other suspects.
    Have you eaten? I know you were not
caught with a rifle, and I understand how it feels
to
    be arrested alongside the other suspects.

The IPO in excerpt 2 empathises with the
suspect in order to elicit confessional
statements from him. The American
Psychological Association Dictionary
(2007:129) defines empathy as "an
understanding of a person from his or her
frame of reference rather than one's own so
that one experiences the person's feelings,
perceptions and thoughts". It is a capacity to
share in and respond to the concern or
feeling of others. Empathy constitutes an
interactional strategy employed by the IPO
in developing rapport with the suspect being
interrogated. In line 1 of the interaction, the
IPO consciously appeals to the suspect's
ordeal by identifying with his plight. Appeal
to empathy is adopted as a rapport building
strategy to anchor the distress of the suspect.
The use of empathy by the IPO agrees with
Gumperz's (1999) submission that
participants in discourse locate the
emotional cues of fellow interactants in a
bid to achieve communication goals. The

IPO recounts the harsh treatment the suspect
has received in the course of the
interrogation with a view to dousing the
emotional stress of the suspect. The IPO's
statement in line 1 is not geared towards
assisting the suspect, but to locate the
feelings and perceptions of the suspect.
In line 3, the IPO delves into the suspect's
involvement in the said crime, but subtly
hints on the suspect's psychological trauma
occasioned by the unfriendly interrogation
processes. The IPO reiterates the
psychological impact of the torture the
suspect has undergone in custody. Such
reiteration is geared towards identifying
with the identity of the suspect. The IPO
uses empathy as a rapport building strategy
to create a sense of belonging with the
suspect. While the IPO continues to appeal
to empathy, the suspect keeps affirming the
IPO's claims. In line 5 for example, the IPO
wonders if the suspect could still withstand
the psychological stress the interrogation
demands. There is deliberate neglect of the
case being interrogated; the IPO ignores the
prescription of the suspect's offence with
regard to the Nigerian criminal law, and
empathizes with the suspect. The IPO's
resort to empathy is borne out of the need to
develop rapport with the suspect. Such
relationship is geared towards eliciting
confessional statement from the suspect. The
IPO's statement in line 7 establishes that he
is interested in incriminating the suspect, but
such incrimination process starts by
identifying with the psychological state of
the suspect

In line 9, however, the IPO technically
'withdraws' the suspect from the crime list,
though such act is a ploy to elicit confession
from the suspect. The IPO further constructs
empathy in line 9 by affirming that the
suspect was not caught with a gun. The
IPO's utterance in line 9 presupposes that
the suspect might not have committed the

crime. In the entire interaction, there is the deployment of appeal to empathy as a rapport building cue to appeal to the suspect's emotions in order to enhance the elicitation of confessional statements from him. In line with the findings of the interrogation sessions, thirty nine IPOs affirmed the use of appeal to empathy as a veritable strategy of building rapport with suspects. This study contrasts sharply with the findings of Ajayi (2016) and Akinrinlola (2016) on the use of physical torture in eliciting confessional statements from suspects. While Ajayi (2016) and Akinrinlola (2016) hold that physical force is predominantly used in PSI, this study contends that IPOs also resort to rapport building strategies.

Excerpt 3

Excerpt 3 presents a case of kidnapping. The suspect, a male, was arrested in connection with a case of kidnapping in XX.

Tracking common grounds/interests

Apart from appeal to empathy, IPOs track areas of common interests with suspects during crime investigation. The excerpt below presents the deployment of common interests in negotiating rapport in PSI:

1. P: O ní o wà ní sóòsì nígbàtí ìsẹlẹ̀ náà sẹlẹ̀.
    You said you were in church when the incident happened.

2. S: Bẹ́ẹ̀ni ògá.
    Yes, Sir.

3. P: Sé o gbọ́ pé ọmọ náà sọnù?
    Did you hear about the baby's disappearance?

4. S: Bẹ́ẹ̀ni. Wón sọ fúnmi.
    Yes; I was told.

5. P: Wón rí ọmọ náà ní ilé rẹ lána, sùgbón àwon òbí rẹ̀ ò ri món.
    The baby was last seen in your apartment, but suddenly the parents could not see her again.

6. S: Mo lọ sí ilé ìjọsìn ní agogo márun, ògá.
    I left for church service at 5. pm, Sir.

7. P: Mo ri pé ò n gbé ní 6 XX. Ibẹ̀ ni mo ti dàgbaà.
    I understand you live at 6 XX. That was where I grew up.

8. S: Ojú yín jọ ẹni tí momàn.
    Your face looks quite familiar.

9. P: O wà ní sóòsì nígbà tí ìsèlè náà sẹlẹ̀. Sóòsì wo lòn lọ?
    You were in church when the incident happened. Which church do you attend?

10. S: Mo ń lọ sí XX.
    I attend XX.

11. P: Sé olùsọ́ àgùntan XX sì wà níbẹ̀?
    Is pastor XX still there?

12. S: (*Ó rẹrin*) Bẹ́ẹ̀ni ògá.
    (*Laughs*) Yes sir. It is a small world.

13. P: Gẹ́gẹ́ bi ọlọ́ọ̀pá, mi ò fẹran ejọ́. Mo sì mò pé iwọ náà ò fẹran ejọ́.
    As an IPO, I am not interested in litigation, and I am sure you do not like that, too.

14. S: Bẹ́ẹ̀ni ògá.
    Yes sir.

15. P: Sé ọmọ XX ni e tàbí XB?
    Are you from XX or XB?

16. S: Ọmọ NXX ni mí.
    I am from XX.

17. P: Sé o mo Baba XX? Àburo bàbá mi ni.
    Do you know Baba XX? He is my Uncle.

18. S: Oh! Ènìyàn dáadáa niwó
    Oh! He is a very nice man.

The IPO deploys common grounds in achieving the goal of the interaction in excerpt 3. Gumperz (1991) submits that participants in discourse negotiate interaction by tracking issues that are common to both parties. This view is also supported by Gumperz's (2003) submission that interaction is strengthened by features that are peculiar with participants in communication. To allege the suspect of the crime, the IPO asks if the suspect is aware of the baby's disappearance in line 2, and the suspect responds in the negative. However, the IPO builds rapport with the suspect in line 7 by seeking information about the suspect's location. Having realised that the suspect lives at XX (where the IPO grew up), he (the IPO) explores such common interest to build rapport with the suspect. The goal of exploring such common interests is to enhance the suspect's cooperation and eventual elicitation of confessional statements. The IPO's admitting that: *That was where I grew up* creates an atmosphere of relief in the suspect. The IPO's resort to tracking common ground is an instance of Gumperz's interactional strategy adopted in managing rapport in institutional setting. In connection with Gumperz's view on how goals are negotiated in discourse, the IPO further dwells on appeal to common grounds in line 11 (Is pastor XX still there? (*Laughs*) to identify another social index (i.e., religion) that connects them (the IPO and the suspect). The IPO's laughter, a paralinguistic device, serves to douse the suspect's tension and fears. The facts that they are both Christians, they attend the same church, and they were pastored by the same clergyman are factors that are common to the participants. To the suspect, these same features also rub off positively on the interrogation session. The fact is that these features are brought up by the IPO to elicit confession from the suspect. The IPO

engages negotiation of identity by tracking common grounds to achieve the goal of the interaction.

Another instance of common ground identified in the interaction is the disposition of the participants to litigation. In a bid to achieve his goal of the interaction, the IPO introduces his dislike for litigation. The introduction of his disposition to litigation is premised on the fact that the suspect does not want the case taken to court. He states that, *As an IPO, I am not interested in litigation, and I am sure you do not like that, too*. Lines 15-18 capture instances of common grounds in the interaction. The IPO's mention of a certain man known by the suspect suggests intimacy with the suspect. The IPO's tracking of common grounds on the bases of location, faith and disposition to litigation are interactional cues geared towards sustaining the suspect's co-operation. The result of the interview conducted reveals that forty four IPOs submitted that tracking common grounds with suspects is a potent strategy of rapport building in investigative police in Ibadan. Although this study synchronises with Omoroghomwan (2018) in terms of scope, the goals are different; while Omoroghomwan's study is devoted to behavioural strategies involved in achieving success in police interview, the present study identifies how rapport is built between IPOs and suspects.

Excerpt 4

The case below is that of forgery and conspiracy. The suspect, who has served as an accountant with a company for over seven years, was arrested for allegedly manipulating the details of transaction and

misappropriating the sum of three hundred thousand naira.

Appeal to positive reinforcement

Another strategy adopted by IPOs in building rapport with suspects in the interaction is the deliberate recourse to positive reinforcement. IPOs construct their contribution to enhance their relationship with suspects. The case of forgery and conspiracy below is an example from our data:

1. P: We noticed that you manipulated some figures on the receipts.
2. S: Sir, I have been working with him for many years. I cannot do that.
3. P: You may not have done it. Your boss told us you have been a committed staff.
4. S: Yes, Sir.
5. P: Do you know your case is a bail-able one? (*Smiles*)
6. S: No, Sir.
7. P: The sum of three hundred thousand was missing. I want to assure you that you may

        not be prosecuted if you cooperate with me.
8. S: Okay, Sir.
9. P: Your boss said you have been hardworking and responsible. That is good of you.
10. S: Thank you, Sir.
11. P: How did the manipulation of figure happen?
12. S: I was not aware, Sir.
13. P: Who is in charge of the unit?
14. S: I am, Sir. I am an honest person, sir. The theft happened in unit, and I am ready to pay the

        stolen money.

Excerpt 4 captures IPOs' use of positive reinforcement to build rapport with the suspect. Verplanck (2019) describes reinforcement as a discourse strategy aimed

at making a listener feel good about themselves. As a discourse device, positive reinforcement is employed by participants in discourse to create convivial atmosphere that will positively impact the conversation. The IPO alleges that the suspect manipulates some figures on the receipts. While the lexical deployment of *we* in line 1 constructs power, the use of *noticed* by the IPO gives pungency to the plausibility of the allegation made against the suspect. The choice of *we* introduces the IPO as a representative of the Nigeria Police Force where power springs. It presupposes that members of the Force are individuals who have good knowledge of the law. Considering Gumperz's (1991) emphasis on the discursive import of strategies and discourse devices in tracking meaning in interaction, the IPO uses the lexical choice *noticed* to institute a case against the suspect in line 1. However, in line 2, the suspect appeals to denial to seek exoneration. In pursuing his institutional goal further, the IPO engages positive reinforcement by appealing to the sensibility of the suspect in line 3. The IPO appeals to the suspect's positive values by a discursive use of *may* in, '*You may not have done it* (line 3). The use of *may* in this context is a form of positive reinforcement strategy to avoid legitimising the suspect's involvement in the crime. Besides, the IPO also harps on the suspect's encouraging recommendations from his boss. All these combine to signal positive reinforcement on the part of the IPO.

Another instance of positive reinforcement identified in the excerpts is demystification of suspects' crime. Gumperz (1982: 102) notes that "participants in interaction manipulate context to achieve the goal of communication". The IPO resonates positive reinforcement by demystifying the severity of the suspect's crime in line 5 (Do you know your case is a bail-able one? *Smiles*).

The severity of the suspect's is demystified by the IPO's use of *bail-able*. The choice of *bail-able* presupposes that the suspect has committed an offence that could attract severe punishment. It also presupposes that the suspect would not be charged to court if he (the suspect) could meet some bail conditions. To further track positive reinforcement on the part of the suspect, the IPO makes recourse to demystifying the legal implications of a case of forgery and conspiracy by informing the suspect that such offence could be settled in the Police Station. Since the IPO's goal is geared towards eliciting confessional statements from the suspect, he appeals to the suspect's senses again in line 7 by promising the suspect of release from custody if he (the suspect) co-operates. The resort to promising is a ploy by the IPO to incriminate the suspect. The social acts of assuring and promising are expressed in line 7 to further reinforce the IPO's commitment to the suspect's case.

Accent on positive reinforcement continues in line 9 of the extract. The IPO reminds the suspect of the good credentials he has before his boss. All these are devices to achieve the suspect's co-operation. The above interaction manifests the deployment of reinforcement strategy by the IPO to achieve his institutional goal. In line with the tenets of Gumperz's interactional sociolinguistics, the context of the interaction, the roles of the social actors involved in the interaction (IPO and suspect), the differing goals of the participants, the deployment of discourse devices and acts performed influence the entire interaction. It could be inferred from this study that, the goals of the IPO and suspect and the convention of the institutional setting help to achieve meaning in PSI. While thirty-six IPOs identified with the use of positive reinforcement as a means of building rapport with suspects during PSI,

only fourteen suggested other options such as, promising and changing of interrogation topics . This study differs from Akinrinlola's (2019) investigation of deixis as a discourse strategy in PSI, Ibadan. While Akinrinlola's (2019) study examines the use of deixis to express ideologies in PSI, this study engages IPOs' strategies of building rapport with suspects during interrogation sessions.

Discussion and Conclusion

Having identified and discussed the discursive dimensions used by IPOs in building rapport with suspects during crime investigation, this section is devoted to describing the implications of the aforementioned rapport building strategies for the language of crime investigation in Ibadan. Contrary to Ajayi's (2016) and Akinrinlola's (2016) submission on the use of force in the language of police interrogation in Ibadan, this study posits, from the cases identified and described above, that the language of rapport building in PSI is interactive, persuasive and civil. Interrogation sessions at the Criminal Investigation Department, Ìyágankú, Ibadan, feature a discursive engagement with the resources of language to achieve institutional goals. The structure of the discourse, as revealed by this study, is such that features the persuasive use of discursive devices to build, manage and sustain rapport in PSI. Since the study adopts the interactional sociolinguistic theory, emphasis is placed on how IPOs build rapport with suspects with a view to gleaning confessional statements from them.

The study also reveals that the language of PSI in Ibadan is manipulative. IPOs use language to allege suspects, but such allegation is subtly expressed. Besides, the language of the entire interrogation is strategic. There is the contextual deployment

of discourse devices to elicit confessional statements from suspects. Some of these strategies touch on suspects' emotions; the strategies are consciously created to achieve emotional stability of the suspects so as to get a better part of the suspects during crime investigation. The study reveals that the language of PSI is characterised by discursive features of rapport management. An interview conducted during the course of gathering data for the study reveals that members of the NPF resort to the use of manipulative techniques in handling unyielding suspects at the State CID, Ibadan.

This study maintains that elicitation of confessional statements from suspects does not always involve the use of physical torture as some studies have established. IPOs explore contextual dynamics to build rapport with suspects with a view to gleaning confessional statements from them. The study holds that the strength of interaction influences the elicitation of confessional statements from suspects. Considering the context of the selected interaction, the participants involved, the discursive use of discourse devices, the social acts negotiated by the participants and the intentions of the participants, the study shows that, in order to elicit confessional statements from suspects, IPOs resort to the use of topic change, tracking common grounds/interest, appeal to empathy and resorting to positive reinforcement as rapport building strategies. The identified strategies are deployed by IPOs to achieve their institutional goals. This study recommends the constructive deployment of rapport building strategies by IPOs during crime investigation in Ibadan, Nigeria.

References

Abbe, A.& Brandson, S.E. (2013). The role of rapport in investigative interviewing: A review. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offenders Profiling*. 10(20), 237-249

Ajayi, T.M. (2016). (Im)politeness and power abuse in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria. PhD Thesis, Department of Linguistics and African Languages, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Ajayi, T.M**.** and Oyetade, S.O. (2016). Impoliteness in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of West African Languages*, 43(2), 42-60

Akinrinlola, T. **(**2019). Deixis as a discourse strategy in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of English Scholars'Association of Nigeria* (JESAN). 21(2), 49-60

Akinrinlola, T. (2018): Turn management strategies in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria. *The Quint*. 10(2), 146-177

Akinrinlola, T. (2016).Discursive elicitation and response strategies in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria. PhD Thesis, Department of English, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Allison, L.J, Alison, E., Noone G., Elntib, S. and Christianson, P. (2013). Why tough tactics fail and rapport get results: observing rapport-based interpersonal techniques to generate useful information from suspects. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*. 19(1), 411-431

The American Psychology Association Dictionary. (2007). Washington

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine

Benneworth, K. (2009). Police interview with suspected paedophiles: a discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 20 (5), 555-569

Charles, M.L. (2007). Language matters in global communication. *Journal of Communication*. 44(1), 260-282

Chich, J.K. (1987). Interactional sociolinguistics: insights and applications. PhD thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Natai, Durban

Farinde, RO., Olajuyigbe, O.A., &Adegbite, M. (2015). Discourse control strategies in police-suspect interaction in Nigeria.*International Journal of English Linguistics.*5 (1), 1-13

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia. Pennsylania University Press

Goffman, E. 91974).*Frame Analysis. An Essay on the Organisation of Experience*. New York: Harper and Row

Gumperz, J.(2003). Interactional sociolinguistics: a personal perspective. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H.E. Hanulton (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishing

Gumperz, J.(1999). On interactional sociolinguistics method.In Saragi, A and Roberts, C. (Eds).*Talk, Work and Institutional Order*. Berlin: Mouton

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies: Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press

Jonathan, P.and Nadja, S.C. (2015). Rapport building with co-operative witness and criminal suspects: A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychology Public Policy and Law*. 21(1), 85-99

Kassin, S.M., Leo, R.A., Meissna, C.A., Richman, K.D., Colwell, L.H., Leach, A.M. and Le, D. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: a self report survey of police practices and beliefs. *Law and Human Behaviour*. 31(1), 381-400

Kelly, C., Dawson, E & Harwig, M. 2019. Context manipulation in police interview: a field experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. 22(2), 12-24

Leach, M.J. (2005). Rapport: key to treatment success. *Complementary*

Therapies in Clinical Practice. 11(1), 262-265

Omoroghomwan, Bernard (2018). Police behaviour and identification of criminals in Nigeria: a study of the South-South States. *SosyalBilimlerMetinleri.* 2(1),1-17

Rampton, B. (2007). Interactional sociolinguistics. papers in interactional sociolinguistics, Tilburg. *Papers in Culture Studies*. 175

Schiffrin, D. (2009). *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

Scollon, R. and Scollon, S.W. (1995).*Intercultural Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell Publication

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Face (impoliteness) and rapport. *Culturally Speaking:Culture , Communication and Politeness Theory*, ed. by H. Spencer-Oatey. London: Continuum 11-47 International Publishing

Sunday, A.B. and Akinrinlola, T. (2017).Negotiation tactics in police-suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Journal of Communication and Language Arts*. 8 (1), 161-181

Szczyrbak, M. (2014): Pragmatic marker use in police interviews: the case of 'I mean' and 'you know. *StudiaLinguisticaUniversitatisLagellonicaeCracoviensis*, 131(4), 371-379

Tannen, D. (1984). *Conversational Style: Analysing Talk among Friends*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex

Tarone, E. (2008). A sociolinguistic perspective on interaction in SLA. In A. Macckey and C. Polio (Eds.) *Multiple Perspectives on Interaction in SLA*. Routledge Publishers. 122-135

Vallano, J.P. and Compo, S. (2011). A comfortable witness is a good witness: rapport building and susceptibility to misinformation in an investigative mock-crime interview. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. 25(1), 960-970

Verplanck, W.S. (2019).The control of the content of conversation: reinforcement of statements opinion. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* 51(3), 668-676

Yves, M. (2006). The psychology of rapport: Five basic rules. In Williamson, T (eds). *Investigative Interviewing: Rights, Research Regulation*. 21(1),87-105

About the Author

Temidayo Akinrinlola lectures in the Department of English Studies, McPherson University, Seriki Sotayo, Ogun State. His areas of specialisation are Forensic Discourse Studies, Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis and Text Linguistics. He has published in learned local and international journals.