

Chapter 7

Patterns of Cooperation between Police Interviewers with Suspected Sex Offenders

Tatiana Tkacukova and Gavin E. Oxburgh

Introduction

The ethos of fair investigative interviewing, which has been developing in the United Kingdom for over 30 years, views the interviewer as a neutral participant fulfilling an “inquisitorial role rather than the traditional prosecutor one” (Williamson 1994, qtd. in Milne and Bull 1999: 158). The move from a confession-seeking objective of police interviewing to a more balanced information-elicitation and search-for-the truth approach of investigative interviewing has given rise to the need to unify interview-management techniques and the subsequent development of the PEACE framework in the early 1990s. PEACE is the mnemonic acronym for the five stages of the interview process: *Planning* and preparation; *Engage* and explain; *Account*, clarify, and challenge; *Closure*; and *Evaluation*. The PEACE model of interviewing recognizes the fact that conversation and, by extension, interviewing are complex activities involving several interlocutors (Milne and Bull 1999: 55). Since structuring and managing underlying conversational complexities is not a straightforward process, training materials for interviewing (e.g., Centrex 2004) provide detailed guidance on such aspects as interview phases, planning and preparation, establishing rapport, engaging with the interviewee, managing first impressions, and other important factors. What is often disregarded, however, is that in complex cases or cases with serious allegations, there are generally two interviewers in the police interview, and, irrespective of which role they assume, the presence of two police officers can interfere with an interview’s dynamics. This chapter discusses the implications of tandem interviewing on interview dynamics and illustrates the advantages and disadvantages of different cooperation patterns.

Where two police officers share the interviewing process, their roles need to be preplanned during the planning and preparation phase (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 53). That said, clear guidance on the preferred cooperation process is nonetheless missing from training materials (e.g., Centrex 2004; Ministry of Justice 2011). Similarly, previous research on psychological and linguistic aspects of investigative interviewing (e.g., Oxburgh, Myklebust, and Grant 2010; Grant, Taylor, Oxburgh, and Myklebust 2015) has generally focused on the questioning process as a whole, disregarding the degree of contribution of each interviewer or patterns of cooperation between them. This chapter aims to fill the void in research by analyzing the frequency, occurrence, and function of second interviewers' turns in 20 interviews with suspected sex offenders.

In general, there are several options for the involvement of the second interviewer, as well as several potential pitfalls resulting from inappropriate interjections during and interruptions of the interviewing process. Prior agreement during the planning and preparation stage on the respective roles of interviewers is essential for the success of the proceedings (see Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 53). The main function of the second interviewer lies in critical active listening, monitoring the interviewing process, and taking notes, thus minimizing any distractions for the lead interviewer (*ibid.*). Depending on the nature of the case and the prior agreement between the interviewers, the lead interviewer could either conduct the interview on his or her own and allow the second interviewer an opportunity to ask clarifying questions only in the final stage of the proceedings or stop at regular intervals (e.g., at the end of each topic or stage) to allow the second interviewer to inquire about any additional details before moving to the following topic or stage (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 53–54). The success of cooperation between all participants in an interview and the smooth running of the proceedings will naturally depend on how effectively the interviewers manage to pass agendas and topics on to each other, collectively build the rapport with the interviewee, and retain a coherent information-elicitation process, including adhering to the questioning strategy and topic management. Some potential pitfalls may include situations in which interviewers compete for the floor or ask repetitive questions, or in which the second interviewer digresses to a new topic or stage or does not recognize that the lead interviewer may need to change the strategy in the middle of questioning to postpone some unexplored topics to a more advanced stage of the interview (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 54). Despite the significance of the real impact the second interviewer has on the

proceedings, together with the seriousness of potential difficulties a lack of coordination may cause, the second interviewer's role has not been given as much direction or research prominence as it deserves. By discussing cooperation strategies employed in practice in the analyzed dataset, we aim in this chapter to start the debate on how best to accommodate any potential challenges.

There are many reasons for researchers and practitioners to focus on cooperation patterns and the number and type of contributions made by the two interviewers. It is usually for more serious crimes and for the interviewing of high-interest suspects (i.e., murderers and sex offenders) that two interviewers are required, so the impact of research could therefore be significant. From the perspective of psychology-oriented research, the mere fact of the physical presence of two interviewers influences the way rapport could be established (compare with, e.g., Holmberg 2009; Shepherd and Griffiths 2013: chap. 6), the basics of conversation and nonverbal communication managed (Shepherd and Griffiths 2013: chap. 3), note-taking and active-listening strategies planned (Shepherd and Griffiths 2013: chap. 7), empathy used (Dando and Oxburgh 2016), psychological well-being retained and comprehensibility and meaningfulness established (Holmberg 2009), and professional development training courses conducted (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: chap. 8). The cooperation between the two interviewers could also potentially influence strategies for the detection of deception (e.g., Vrij, Fisher, Mann, and Leal 2009; Dando and Bull 2011; Gamson, Gottesman, Milan, and Weerasuriya 2012) and research on the psychological aspects of (false) confessions (Gudjonsson 2003: chap. 8). Linguistically oriented research would also benefit from investigations of the impact of two interviewers' voices had on the macrolinguistic level of narrativization and genre specification (Gibbons 2003: 142), intertextuality (Rock 2013), and power relations (Haworth 2006; Newbury and Johnson 2007), as well as the micro level of turn-taking management (Carter 2009) and questioning strategies (Grant, Taylor, Oxburgh, and Myklebust 2015). This chapter will analyze the most significant aspects, which form a starting point for further research.

Data

The dataset consists of 20 audio-recorded interviews with suspects of sexual offenses, including nine with suspects accused of possessing and/or making child pornography images; six with suspects accused of the sexual abuse of minors; and five with suspects of adult rape and sexual

assault. The wide range of sexual offenses illustrates a sample of naturally occurring data. For the purposes of this study, the part with police cautioning was disregarded because the primary aim is to investigate the dynamics between two police interviewers during the interviewing process itself (the main body of the interview). The overall duration of all the interviews analyzed is approximately 33 hours (see table 7.1 for the mean length of the interviews), which presents a representative dataset for a pilot study. The advantage of this medium-sized dataset is that it permits a combination of quantitative approach and detailed qualitative analysis.

The interviews were first transcribed using a verbatim orthographic transcription (e.g., includes false starts) and then fully anonymized, ensuring that any identifiable information (including names, locations, addresses, and dates) was removed. The parts of the interviews that were relevant to cooperation between the interviewers (i.e., turn-taking between the two interviewers during their discussions or handing over of questions) were additionally transcribed following the conversation-analysis (CA) approach, which enables a detailed transcription of turn-by-turn unfolding of utterances, using specific signs to mark, for instance, pauses, overlaps, hesitations, and intonation (see the next section, “Methodology,” for a more detailed account of the CA approach).

Methodology

Given that cooperation patterns and dynamics between interviewers have not been previously researched, our study is largely exploratory. The initial investigation of the topic aims to define the variables for further, large-scale research. The study integrates quantitative and qualitative research methods by including three stages of the analysis: (1) qualitative categorization of individual interviews according to the PEACE model; (2) quantitative analysis of interviewers’ participation in different interview phases; and (3) qualitative analysis of cooperation patterns.

Theoretical Framework and Data Analysis

The underlying theoretical framework of this study is based on conversation analysis (CA), which provides a linguistic model for analyzing conversations in a wide range of settings, putting special emphasis on patterns of interaction, the role of speakers, function of turns, and turn-taking mechanisms, as well as the construction and reinterpretation of meaning through the

sequential unfolding. Because of its suitability for examining naturally occurring data organized sequentially, CA is well established in the linguistic strand of research on police interviewing (Heydon 2005; Haworth 2006; Carter 2009; Grant, Taylor, Oxburgh, and Myklebust 2015). The CA approach is nonetheless often combined with critical-discourse analysis and pragmatics, since a mixed-method approach allows a more detailed analysis of power relations, control, and resistance in institutional settings (e.g., Haworth 2006). Given that the aim of this chapter is to follow patterns of cooperation, the CA analysis alone provides a substantial framework for investigating police-interview dynamics, including turn-taking management, cooperation strategies, and turn-by-turn unfolding of meaning.

The first stage of the qualitative analysis involved dividing the interviews into three parts according to the PEACE model. The interview itself involves three main phases (engage and explain; account, clarify, and challenge; and closure) and accordingly the analyzed data are divided into those parts. As previously mentioned, the police caution stage was excluded from the analysis because it was not deemed relevant to the main focus of our study.

To ensure the objectivity and reliability of the initial qualitative analysis, the identification of the three interview phases was conducted by three researchers who independently coded the same interviews. The percentage of agreement method was then used to code for inter-rater reliability (85 percent) and any disagreements were resolved by discussing differences. To minimize the risk of misidentification and to help ensure that the interviews were coded in a consistent way, a strict set of criteria was established for all researchers to follow. The explain-and-engage phase was identified as immediately following the caution (unless it was a follow-up interview). The beginning of the account, clarification, and challenge phase was defined as the point when interviewers first challenged the suspect's account by introducing additional evidence or victims' and witnesses' accounts, or by contesting evidence elicited from the suspect. The closure phase was identified according to discourse features of summing up and offering a final opportunity for the suspect to add anything he or she wished. Although the authors are fully aware that interviews cannot be strictly divided into three parts (because interviewers move fluidly between stages), the risk of incorrect division was minimized by having the coding process verified. In addition, when there was a considerable move to a previous stage (e.g., from C to E), the text was coded accordingly. For instance, interview 2 concerned two crimes committed on two different occasions; the interviewers therefore dealt first

with one crime before proceeding with the other one, which means that the interview pattern was “E–A–E–A–C instead of the more common E–A–C.

The second stage of the analysis (quantitative analysis) involved quantifying the interviewers’ contributions according to the number of their respective turns in the interview phases. The third stage of the analysis, the final qualitative analysis, aimed to identify patterns of cooperation as well as illustrate turn-taking management between the two interviewers and the function of second interviewers’ questioning turns.

Results

The results of the quantitative analysis offer insight into the distribution of interactional space between two interviewers and their degree of participation in different phases. The overall mean ratio between the first interviewers’ (Int1) turns and the second interviewers’ (Int2) is listed in table 7.1 along with the mean number of turns (the results for individual phases are discussed in the following sections).

{~?~IM: insert table 7.1 near here.}

Table 7.1 Ratio of interviewers’ turns

	Int1	Int2	Number of questioning turns
Mean	75%	25%	378.6
Median	75%	25%	248.5
Standard deviation	0.04	0.04	61.5

The sample of interviews contains varied response lengths: there are, on average, 378 questioning turns per interview, with the median being 248 questioning turns per interview. The results of the ratio of interviewers’ turns illustrate that the lead interviewer plays a more active role in the interviewing process, with 75 percent of questioning turns, as opposed to 25 percent for the second interviewer. More important, however, is the distribution of interactional space in the three interview phases: (1) engage and explain, (2) account clarification and challenge, and (3) Cclosure. Further quantitative results are presented alongside qualitative analysis according to individual interview stages. Discussion of the key aspects of tandem interviewing is presented in the sections “The Role of the Second Interviewer” and “Passing the Floor” below.

Engage and Explain Phase

In the engage-and-explain phase, interviewers generally aim to elicit an open account from an interviewee by asking open questions (those that begin with, e.g., “Tell,” “Explain,” “Describe”) and then following up with probing questions (e.g., “What,” “When,” “Where,” “Who,” “Why,” “How”) (Oxburgh, Myklebust, and Grant 2010: 50). Because the interviewee is encouraged to contribute to the reconstruction of events, the potential for the second interviewer’s participation during this phase is limited. Figure 7.1 illustrates the normal frequency distribution of the ratio of the second interviewers’ turns in the data (e.g., in eight interviews the ratio of the second interviewers’ turns is below 5 percent).

{~?~IM: insert figure 7.1 near here.}

CAPTION:

Figure 7.1 The normal frequency-distribution histogram for the second-interviewer turn ratio during the interview phase of the first **E (explain and engage)**. The weighting of each interview part is 100 percent.

The great majority of interviews display up to percent of second-interviewer turns, with the arithmetic average ratio amounting to approximately 12 percent. The highest ratio of second-interviewer’s contributions (50 percent) comes from an interview in which there were no clear distinctions between the two interviewers throughout the whole interview. The most frequent function of the second interviewer’s turns in this first interview phase is to clarify and check the previously elicited information (see excerpt 7.1).

Excerpt 7.1: Interview 7 (clarifying questions posed by the second interviewer)

- 1 Int1: (26.0) Name, just for the time being\ up to (.) the flat\
- 2 Int2: hmm\
- 3 Int1: (. . .) Got anything?\
- 4 Int2: Uh: who has access (.) to your flat?/
- 5 S: (5.0) How do you mean?
- 6 Int2: (.) So, is there anyone else that ca::n go in freely, has a key that can go in to your
- 7 flat?/

8 S: No\=

9 Int2: =OK/ has there ever been?/

10 S: No\

11 Int1: (16.0) OK?/

12 Int2: Yep\

13 Int1: (6.0) Now/ (. .) we- we've talked about the flat and the flat i::s (.)
u:m/ very important\
14 because i::t's been described to us/ and pointed out to us by\ (victim)\ as being
where (. .)

15 u:m, these offenses occurred basically\

Excerpt 7.1 illustrates that the second interviewer pursues one specific line of questioning to clarify a detail of the topic previously explored in the interview (lines 4, 6–7, and 9). The turn-taking management between the interviewers is well organized: in lines 1 and 3 the lead interviewer checks with the second interviewer to see if he or she has any questions; in line 11 the lead interviewer checks whether the clarifying questions regarding the topic are completed before moving to a short summary of previously elicited information (lines 13–14) and the subsequent elicitation of another topic (lines 14–15). The second interviewer is thus given a limited amount of time to ask clarifying questions on a specific topic. All of the second interviewer's questions are closed-ended questions: one closed wh- question (line 4) and two yes-or-no questions (lines 6 and 9). The questions asked are in line with the role assigned to the second interviewer here, that is, clarifying issues on a specific topic. Thanks to the fact that the second interviewer's role is clearly signaled to the suspect, the interaction between them proceeds without any problems.

The interviews with a higher ratio of participation by second interviewers display one similarity: they require more turns than in excerpt 7.1 for passing the floor as both interviewers discuss the process in front of the suspect (see excerpt 7.5) and ask the questions interchangeably (see excerpt 7.2). Neither of the approaches benefits a clear interview structure.

Excerpt 7.2: Interview 9 (discussions about the questioning strategy)

- 1 Int: taxi/- (.) straight back to yours/ or a::ny stops at all on the way?/=
- 2 S: =no\, straight back yea\
- 3 Int1: (. . .) *coughs* (. .) NAME, I'm not/ (. .), you know I've gone
- 4 through the night out I wasn't really gunna touch too much
- 5 further on that, unless you have anything to: a:sk about the (.)
- 6 drinking etc\
- 7 Int2: no/- no I was/, you know I was just gunna ask if anybody fell out
- 8 then you covered it with your last question/ . . .
- 9 Int1: [yea/
- 10 Int2: [so er:m/, th- th- there we go
- 11 Int1: ok/
- 12 Int2: (. . .) ju:st there is some- some background about the friends/, I
- 13 don't know wh- when/, about how long people have know:n/ . . .
- 14 Int: [yea we . . .
- 15 Int2: [each other and stuff like that/, I don't know whether you wanna
- 16 come back later or?/=
- 17 Int1: =I think so yea/, we- we'll do that after we just . . .
- 18 Int2 [yea . . .
- 19 Int1: [skipped through the account, shall I make a note of that then?\
- 20 Int2 Yep/
- 21 Int1: (. . .) we'll be chatting aside like that u::m\=
- 22 S: =that's fine yea\

Excerpt 7.2 illustrates lengthy discussions between interviewers related to the topics to be

covered (lines 3–20). There is frequent overlapping speech occurring in lines 9–10, 14–15, and 18–19 when the second interviewer briefly confirms the explanation of the strategy presented by the lead interviewer (lines 9, 11, 14, 18, and 20). In line 21 the lead interviewer clarifies to the suspect that they will be having these discussions “aside.” Such elaborations of details in front of the suspect are undesirable and should be resolved in the preparatory stage of the interviews (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 54). The suspect may potentially feel conspired against, left out, or not in control of his or her own testimony, which could be detrimental to their emotional and psychological condition. Although the suspect confirms that it is not a problem, the discussions do bring out the police interviewers’ institutional power and place it in a negative light, which could potentially be further exposed in court.

Account Clarification and Challenge Phase

In comparison to the previous interview phase, the account clarification and challenge phase allows the second interviewer to be more active—challenging the suspects’ accounts, complementing the first interviewers’ questions, and checking that all preplanned aspects and newly arising issues are fully covered (see fig. 7.2).

{~?~IM: insert figure 7.2 near here.}

CAPTION:

Figure 7.2 The normal frequency-distribution histogram for the second interviewer for the interview part of **A** (account clarification and challenge). The weighting of each interview part is 100 percent.

The average ratio of second interviewers’ turns is 22 percent, which is almost twice as high as their average ratio in the previous stage (i.e., 12 percent of second interviewers’ turns). Similarly to the engage and explain phase, there is one interview that stands out, with 85 percent of turns, owing to a problematic distribution of the interviewers’ roles. The predominant majority of the interviews, however, is positioned in the spread between 1 percent and 40percent. This is mainly because second interviewers have specific topics to deal with, which are either preplanned during the stage of preparation and planning or arise during the critical listening and note-taking processes (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 53).

Similarly to excerpt 7.1, extracted from the explain and engage stage, in this more challenging phase there are many instances of the first interviewer’s passing the floor to the

second interviewer, who then asks specific clarifying questions on a predetermined topic. Second interviewers often pursue a specific line of questioning by asking short closed or restricted open questions (“You’ve babysat quite a lot because we’ve talked about that in the previous interview, haven’t we?” or “What does [name redacted] wear to bed?” in interview 2). Clarification of arising issues is thus a very common role for the second interviewer. Another type of collaboration pattern occurring in the phase of “Account Clarification and Challenge” is for the second interviewer to have specific pre-planned topics to cover at the interview (see excerpt 7.3).

Excerpt 7.3: Interview 3 (preplanned topic for the second interviewer)

- 1 Int1: okay/ (.) and so we got an account:/ from all of these people/
- 2 S: yeah/
- 3 (. . .)
- 4 Int1: =we are going to tell you now what other people have said/ and (Int: 2)/ is
- 5 going to tell you what: (name of victim’s mother)\ said/
- 6 S: yeah\

Alongside presenting a clear plan for the interviewing process (lines 4–5), the lead interviewer also highlights the institutional power of the two police officers acting in collaboration through the use of the collective pronoun “we” in lines 1 and 4. It. At a later stage of the interview, the pronoun gains an additional meaning of professional experience and accountability when the lead interviewer provides the rationale for children not disclosing abuse to their parents:

If something happens when u:m, somebody else in the family is involved, we often find that they won’t- children will not tell their mum, they won’t tell their grandmother, they won’t tell any other member of the family\ they will tell their teacher/, or a friend\ (. . .) that’s what we find happens/, and we are (. .) specialists in—in what we deal with, which is child abuse\

The word “specialist” resonates with the frequent use of the pronoun “we” and the detailed explanation of their expertise and findings, which strengthens the police officer’s institutional voice of authority and power. In addition to having more resources available for critical listening and note-taking when there are two interviewers present, interviewing in pairs enables the team of police officers to appear *as* a team, with institutional power and professional expertise. Both advantages are reflected in the higher frequency of second interviewers’ turns in the stage of

account clarification and challenge.

Closure Phase

The interview phase of closure is the shortest interview phase; it comes when suspects are given an opportunity to provide additional information and ask questions. Given that this phase lasted for approximately only six minutes on average in the analyzed interviews, it was more likely that only one of the interviewers participated in the process, as evidenced in figure 7.3.

{~?~IM: insert figure 7.3 near here.}

CAPTION:

Figure 7.3 The normal frequency-distribution histogram for the second interviewer for the interview part of C (closure). The weighting of each interview part is 100 percent.

The phase is predominantly conducted by one interviewer, and the ratio of turns is therefore considerably higher for either the lead or the second interviewer. No distinct cooperation strategies were found during closure because interviewers followed previously applied procedures. The following sections summarize two aspects essential to be considered for tandem interviewing: the role of the second interviewer and passing the floor.

The Role of the Second Interviewer

As discussed above, there are two main patterns of collaboration found in the dataset: the lead interviewer conducts the interview and the second interviewer (1) covers preplanned topics (see excerpt 7.3) and/or (2) asks clarifying questions at the end of established topics and before the beginning of new topics (see excerpt 7.1). In any of these patterns, critical-listening skills are essential in order for the second interviewer to recognize details that were deliberately left out and only ask clarifying questions related to previously discussed issues (Ord, Shaw, and Green 2011: 54). One of the interviews that was excluded from the analyzed dataset was an interview of a suspect in a case of sexual assault of a minor conducted by one interviewer: it was the only interview of a high-interest suspect with just one officer. An extract from that interview serves as an illustration of how difficult the proceedings are without the input of the second interviewer: “Right at the moment, I just want to go away and think about whether I need to ask you any more questions but ultimately you’ve admitted kissing and fingering her yesterday” (interview 21).

The presence of the second interviewer was found to affect the following aspects of the interview:

1. as an institutional reinforcement of professional expertise (e.g., as strengthened by the use of “we” in excerpt 7.3);
2. as a way of strengthening the expression of empathy and compassion (e.g., the use of collective pronoun in “[we] do understand\ (. . .) that it was a big up for you finding out that” in interview 18);
3. as a source of the reiteration of the seriousness of the situation (e.g., “I have to make this clear, [suspect’s name], they are there (. . .) [Interviewer 1] has made it absolutely clear that one of the issues with this sort of material is that the person looking at that material if they are doing it on purpose may have a sexual interest towards children and we have a duty to ensure that children are protected, so we are going to give you one more opportunity, it’s really quite serious, (. . .)” in interview 17);
4. and, most important, as a mechanism for quality assurance of communication.

Whereas the first three features are related to the psychological advantages of the role of interviewers (i.e., the physical overbalance or prevalence of two officers over one suspect as well as long-standing, institutionally supported and developed expertise and specialism), the latter aspect is of particular importance to the communication process. As an active listener, the second interviewer is in a good position to recognize any potential misunderstandings, as shown in the following:

Excerpt 7.4: Interview 10 (second interviewer’s quality assurance of the communication process)

- 1 Int1: Yeah ok\ (. . .) a::nd u:m what did you tell her exactly?/
- 2 S: (. . .) In words?/
- 3 Int1: (. . .) Yeah\

4 Int2: (.) You're not going to remember the exact words, are you?/
5 S: Yea::h/ (. .) I can't remember the exact words/ but\ (. . . .) I said to my wife\
6 she noticed that I wasn't like\
7 oh but was it just kissing or- like in a conversation/ the conversation was going,
8 we had a fumble\ (. .) you know/, (. .) I had sex/, obviously she was upset/ and
9 like that\
10 word yeah\
11 Int1: (. .) Ok DC any questions about this account?/ I was going to go onto
12 my agenda now unless you've got any questions?/ (5.0) Ok\
13 before?/
14 S: (. .) No\
15 Int1: That's the first time you've seen her?/
16 S: Yeah\
17 Int1: Ok\ (7.0) how do you know that she consented/ (. .) to the sex\
18 Int2: (. . .) Do you understand the question/, I'm concerned about the words\
19 Int1: Yeah/
20 Int2: You understand what the officer is saying?\
21 S: =How do I know/ she has agreed/ (. .) to have sex with me?/
22 Int1: Yeah\ (6.0) [others speaking—INAUDIBLE] (4.0) how do you know that she
23 wanted to have sex with you?/

24 S: (8.0) What/, after we kissed she, I licked her\, and she gave me a blow job
25 and everything\ (. . .)

In line 4 the second interviewer identifies a possible misunderstanding on the part of the suspect (line 2) and ensures the suspect does not feel obliged to provide a verbatim account of his words: the human memory processes the gist of the message and cannot recreate verbatim accounts (Lim 1993). Similarly, in line 21 the second interviewer checks the comprehensibility of the lead interviewer's question referring to the concept of consent. This prompts the suspect to explain the term (line 21) and the lead interviewer to rephrase the question (lines 22–23). Once common ground and correct terminology have been established, the interview proceeds. The role of quality assurance of communication shows the difference the second interviewer can make to ensure the objectivity, fairness, and clarity of the interviewing process. According to Ord, Shaw, and Green (2011: 54–55), the role of the second interviewer should not be seen as less demanding than or inferior role to that of the lead interviewer: both roles contribute to the proceedings in equal shares, albeit from different perspectives.

Passing the Floor

The most frequent strategy for passing the floor between the interviewers is when the lead interviewer asks the second interviewer whether he or she has any additional questions about a specific topic (e.g., “Have you got anything DC [name extracted] about the walk down (.) and just ending at the walk there?” in Interview 14; “Ok\ (. . .) DC [name extracted] any questions at this point?/” in interview 10). Once the second interviewer finishes his or her line of questioning, the lead interviewer proceeds to the following topics or stages (similar to examples 7.1 and 7.2 above). Passing the floor follows the scenario:

Excerpt 7.5: **Interview 7** (passing the floor)

1 **Int1:** (26.0) Ames, just for the time being\ up to (.) the flat\
2 **Int2:** hmm\
3 **Int1:** (. . . .) Got anything\
4 **Int2:** Uh: who has access (.) to your flat?/

5 S: (5.0) How do you mean?

6 Int2: (.) So, is there anyone else that ca::n go in freely, has a key that can go in to your
7 flat?/

8 S: No\=

9 Int2: =OK/ has there ever been?/

10 S: No\

11 Int1: (16.0) OK?/

12 Int2: **Yep**

13 Int1: (6.0) **Now/ (. .) we- we've talked about** the flat and the flat is:: (.)
u:m/ very
14 important\ because it's:: been described to us/ and pointed out to us by\ (victim)\
as
15 being where (. .) u:m, these offenses occurred basically\

Thanks to the CA transcription, it is evident that once the first interviewer passes the floor, the second interviewer is ready to take the floor as there are no pauses between lines 3 and 4 (apart from the hesitation marker “uh,” signaling the change of the interaction pattern). The smooth process of passing the floor requires an effective strategy for note-taking and critical listening, which are a part of rigorous planning and efficient teamwork. Not all instances of passing the floor were equally smooth: in fact, three interviews in the analyzed dataset included long and frequent discussions between interviewers on questioning strategy (which is why figs. 7.1 and 7.2 show high ratios of second interviewers' turns in some interviews).

Excerpt 7.6: Interview 9 (interviewers discussing questioning strategy)

1 Int1: yeah\, I- I- it sort of leads quite nicely into/ (.) discussing about ho:w well friends:
2 that they have been and were/but I don't know whether it leads into discussing
about

3 the friendship now/or- or whether just going straight on into the/= . . .

4 Int2: =I- I think that=

5 Int1: =the account/

6 Int2: I'd rather cover the account\ and then we'll/

7 Int1: [yeah, ok/]

8 Int2: we'll talk about your relationship with her\

9 S: ah-hmm\=

10 Int2: =after that because you'll be:/ you've got something about the other friends et
cetera/

11 Int1: [yeah exactly]

12 Int2: . . . and so I think so we'll keep that as a separate topic\
13 Int1: [ok], (. .) so you've had this conversation/and- and you've been talking about
14 several different topics/ . . .

15 S: ah-hmm/

In the excerpt, the interviewers indicate what evidence they have (lines 10–11) and reveal the topics they want to cover as well as the order of topics to be covered (lines 2–3, 5, 8, 10, and 12); the discussions happen in front of the suspect. The lack of pre-interview planning and lengthy discussions on the questioning strategy can confuse suspects and create an impression of an unprofessional approach to interviewing. It is crucial for police interviewers to be aware of the fact that interviews have multiple uses and are aimed at a variety of audiences (Haworth 2013). Audio recordings and verbatim transcripts of interviews are constantly being reinterpreted and recontextualized during follow-up interviews, interviews with other people involved in the case, and, potentially, court hearings and appeals. Explicit discussions of the interview topics could be reinterpreted, for instance, as an ambiguous coercive strategy. The default position of the interviewer is that of power, because it is the interviewer who both holds institutional power and controls such aspects as question design, choice of topics, sequence of topics, third turns,

and turn-taking (Thornborrow 2002). In addition, the well-being of the suspect and therefore the ethos of the PEACE model cannot be supported under the stressful circumstances when the interviewee may feel that he or she has no control over the course of the interview and that interviewers may be intentionally discussing the procedure to show the amount of evidence the police could have.

Conclusion

The results of the pilot study illustrate that there is more incentive for the second interviewer to contribute to the questioning during the account-challenging phase than the other stages. But the importance of the second interviewer's role is paramount throughout the whole proceedings. The roles they conduct range from note-taking and critical listening to following a specific line of questioning. Efficient preparation and teamwork allow the police officers to highlight the seriousness of the charges, express compassion, reinforce their professional expertise, and safeguard quality assurance of communication. Tandem interviewing nonetheless has its pitfalls, mostly caused by poor preparation or ineffective critical listening, which may result in, for instance, inappropriate discussions about the questioning strategy before the suspect. Given the lack of clear guidance on cooperation strategies, the aims of further research should include raising awareness of different options available to interviewers and the effect different tactics could have, as well as establishing clear guidelines on cooperation strategies in tandem interviewing. Further research into the topic is particularly needed because interviewing in pairs is conducted with high-interest suspect groups and can thus have an impact on establishing rapport, managing communication, detecting deception, and employing empathy.

References

- Carter, Elisabeth. 2009. "Policing Talk: An Investigation into the Interaction of the Officer and the Suspect in the Police Interview." *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 16(1): 165–168.
- Centrex. 2004. *Practical Guide to Investigative Interviewing*. London: Central Police Training and Development Authority.
- Dando, Coral J., and Gavin E. Oxburgh. 2016. "Empathy in the Field: Towards a Taxonomy of Empathic Communication in Information Gathering Interviews with Suspected Sex

- Offenders.” *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context* 8(1): 27–33.
- Dando, Coral. J., and Ray Bull. 2011. “Maximising Opportunities to Detect Verbal Deception: Training Police Officers to Interview Tactically.” *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling* 8(2): 189–202.
- Gamson, Rachel, Jessica Gottesman, Nicholas Milan, and Sitara Weerasuriya. 2012. *Cues to Catching Deception in Interviews*. College Park, MD: START. Accessed 15 February 2016.
- <https://www.start.umd.edu/sites/default/files/files/publications/CuesToCatchingDeception.pdf>.
- Gibbons, John. 2003. *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grant, Tim, Jennifer Taylor, Gavin Oxburgh, and Trond Myklebust. 2015. “Exploring Types and Functions of Questions in Police Interviews.” In *Communication in Investigative and Legal Contexts: Integrated Approaches from Forensic Psychology, Linguistics and Law Enforcement*, edited by Gavin Oxburgh, Trond Myklebust, Tim Grant, and Rebecca Milne, 15–38. Chichester: Wiley.
- Haworth, Kate. 2006. “The Dynamics of Power and Resistance in Police Interview Discourse.” *Discourse & Society* 17(6): 739–759.
- Haworth, Kate. 2013. “Audience Design in the Police Interview: The Interactional and Judicial Consequences of Audience Orientation.” *Language in Society* 42(1): 45–69.
- Heydon, Georgina. 2005. *The Language of Police Interviewing: A Critical Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Holmberg, Ulf. 2009. “Investigative Interviewing as a Therapeutic Jurisprudential Approach.” In *International Developments in Investigative Interviewing*, edited by Tom Williamson,, Becky Milne, and Stephen P. Savage, 149–175. London: Willan.
- Lim, Phyllis Louise. 1993. “Meaning versus Verbatim Memory in Language Processing: Deriving Inferential, Morphological, and Metaphorical Gist.” Accessed 19 May 2016.
- <http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/186487>.
- Milne, Rebecca, and Ray Bull. 1999. *Investigative Interviewing: Psychology and Practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Newbury, Phillip, and Alison Johnson. 2007. “Suspects’ Resistance to Constraining and

- Coercive Questioning Strategies in the Police Interview.” *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 13(2): 213–240.
- Ord, Brian, Gary Shaw, and Tracey Green. 2011. *Investigative Interviewing Explained*. Australia: LexisNexis Butterworths.
- Oxburgh, Gavin E., Trond Myklebust, and Tim Grant. 2010. “The Question of Question Types in Police Interviews: A Review of the Literature from a Psychological and Linguistic Perspective.” *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law* 17(1): 45–66.
- Rock, Frances. 2013. “Every Link in the Chain”: The Police Interview as Textual Intersection.” In *Legal-Lay Communication: Textual Travels in the Law*, edited by Chris Heffer, Frances Rock, and John Conley, 78–103. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shepherd, Eric, and Andy Griffiths. 2013. *Investigative Interviewing: The Conversation Management Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thornborrow, Joanna. 2002. *Power Talk: Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Vrij, Aldert, Ronald Fisher, Samantha Mann, and Sharon Leal. 2009. “Increasing Cognitive Load in Interviews to Detect Deceit.” In *International Developments in Investigative Interviewing*, edited by Tom Williamson, Becky Milne, and Stephen P. Savage, 176–189. London: Willan.
- Williamson, Tom M. 1994. “Reflections on current police practice.” In *Suspicion and silence: The rights of silence in criminal investigations*, edited by Derek Morgan and Geoffrey M. Stephenson, 107-116. London: Blackstone.