Look Who's Talking!: Interaction Patterns in Police Interviews and their Cultural Dependency

Karlijn Beune, Ellen Giebels

University of Twente, the Netherlands

and

Paul J. Taylor

Lancaster University, UK

Authors' Note

We would like to thank police district 'Binnensticht' in Zeist (The Netherlands) for their help with the data collection. This research formed part of the first author's doctoral dissertation.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Karlijn Beune, Department of Psychology & Communication of Health & Risk, Citadel Building, University of Twente, P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE, Enschede, The Netherlands; e-mail: k.beune@utwente.nl.

Abstract

Based on 27 authentic, videotaped police interviews, we examine how use of different influencing behaviors by police officers impacts on suspects' information provision. Our analysis focuses on variations in cue-response patterns across suspects from cultures that tend to utilize more direct and content-oriented communication (i.e., low-context cultures) and cultures whose communication is typically more indirect and context orientated (i.e., high-context cultures). As expected, *rational arguments* were more effective in eliciting case-related personal information from low-context suspects compared to high-context suspects. Contrary to our expectations, high-context rather than low-context suspects seemed to respond negatively in terms of explicitly refusing to give information to *being kind*. Additional analysis considered the effects of two types of intimidating behavior (intimidating the individual versus the context) across the low-/ high-context suspects. Results showed that *intimidating the individual* was more effective at eliciting case-related personal information from low-context suspects, while *intimidating the context* appeared to be more effective in eliciting case-related contextual information for high-context suspects.

Keywords: police, interrogation, interviewing, culture, interaction, if you are allowed 6 keywords, perhaps also "proximity coefficient"?

Look Who's Talking! Interaction Patterns in Police Interviews and Their Cultural Dependency

How should police officers deal with a situation in which a suspect is reluctant to talk or resists providing relevant answers? Research suggests that many police officers are unsure about what to do when a suspect shows signs of resistance (Moston & Engelberg, 1993) and that they often interpret resistance as an indication of guilt (Milne & Bull, 1999). Yet, suspects may show resistance for a number of reasons, even when they are not guilty. For example, they may not trust the police to recognize their innocence, or they may be concerned about incriminating themselves in the enquiry (see also Shepherd, 1993). In recognition of such possibilities, many in the field of investigative interviewing are moving away from seeking to understand how to obtain a confession and moving toward seeking to understand how to gather information from the person interviewed (Bull & Milne, 2004). This focus on information-gathering rather than accusatory behaviors is particularly found in Western European countries, such as the United Kingdom and the Netherlands (e.g., Beune, 2009; Beune, Giebels, & Sanders, 2009; Milne & Bull, 1999; Soukara, Bull, Vrij, Turner, & Cherryman, 2009), and some parts of Canada (Snook, Eastwood, Stinson, Tedeschini, & House, in press). As noted by Walton (2003), information obtained in investigative interviewing may serve a variety of purposes, such as serving justice (Dillon, 1990), establishing a motive (McConville & Baldwin, 1982), or trying to discover a clear overall pattern of a case, with respect to the evidence and its implications (Irving, 1980). In essence, any information provided by a suspect—whether true or false—may confirm or disconfirm information from other

sources (McConville, Sanders, & Leng, 1991). Therefore, the provision of any case-related information by a suspect may be considered helpful in legitimizing a police narrative and, ultimately, in finding the truth (Baldwin, 1993).

In general, investigative interviewing may be considered a formal way of questioning a suspect or anyone else who is reluctant to freely provide information (s)he possesses (Buckwalter, 1983). In order to overcome this resistance and to acquire information, it is of the utmost importance that these conversations are carefully managed (Shepherd & Kite, 1988). Effective information gathering may thus depend on the officer's knowledge about how to present messages in a way that appeals to, and persuades, the suspect to talk. This suggests that interpersonal influencing, defined as the deliberate action(s) of an agent (e.g., police officer) toward a recipient (e.g., suspect) with the intention of altering the recipient's attitudes and/or behaviors (cf. Gass & Seiter, 1999), may be an important aspect of police interviews. However, to date, few studies have examined police interviews from an influencing perspective, and little is known about the effectiveness of specific influencing behaviors (King & Snook, 2009). Moreover research on the moderating role of culture in police interviews is virtually absent (cf. Gudjonsson, 2003). This is important since the impact of influencing behavior has been found to be culturally specific (e.g., Giebels & Taylor, 2009), while an increasing number of suspects deviate from the mainstream's cultural background.

One study that does take these factors into account is a recent study by Beune, Giebels, and Sanders (2009). They demonstrate that police officers frequently use influencing behavior in response to mock theft suspects who refused to cooperate fully at the outset of an interview. Specifically, they found that two influencing behaviors,

rational arguments and *being kind,* are important components of effective police interviews. More importantly, they showed that these tactics work out differently for suspects from societies that may be considered as having low-context cultures, such as the Netherlands, and suspects from societies that can be considered as having more high-context cultures, such as Turkey or Morocco (cf. Onkvisit & Shaw, 1993).

In the current study, we build on previous research in three ways. First, the Beune et al.(2009) study examined simulated police interviews in which students were instructed to steal a fixed amount of money and were then interviewed by police officers. The question is to what extent these findings are transferable to real-life settings (see, Mann, Vrij, Fisher, & Robinson, 2008, for a similar argument). One might argue that the stakes for both suspects and police officers are much higher in authentic police interviews, and that this may lead to a different interaction process to that found in the simulations (cf. Roger & Schumacher, 1983). For example, police officers in authentic interviews may be more prone to put pressure on suspects, and at the same time, suspects may be more likely to resist this pressure rather than cooperate. Indeed, research suggests that when dealing with non-cooperative suspects, police officers sometimes use more confrontational strategies, such as accusations (Moston & Engelberg, 1993) and warnings (see also, Kassin et al., 2007; Leo, 1996). While these 'intimidation' (Giebels & Taylor, 2009) behaviors are generally considered inappropriate, police officers do report using these behaviors (Kassin et al., 2007). Moreover, examples of intimidating behaviors are also observed by researchers (Moston & Engelberg, 1993) even in a simulated context (see Beune et al., 2009). In the current study, therefore, we examine the effects of three

influencing behaviors—*intimidation*, *rational arguments*, and *being kind*—on the information-gathering process in authentic police interviews.

Second, in the Beune et al. (2009) study, the behavior of police officers was aggregated over the entire interaction and related to interview *outcomes*, including the suspects' overall willingness to provide information, the perceived quality of the relationship, and whether or not the suspects admitted their guilt. However, like in other police-civilian interactions, interviewing a suspect in an investigative context involves a complex conversation that unfolds over time (Giebels & Taylor, 2009; Taylor & Thomas, 2008). That is, the police officer and suspect engage in a dynamic interaction through which they respond to each other's behaviors over time (cf. Brett, Northcraft, & Pinkley, 1999; Kelley, 1997). When the primary purpose of investigative interviewing is information gathering, the "outcome" of the interview occurs repeatedly across the interaction (i.e., information is gathered or not gathered) rather than once at the interview end-state. This suggests that it is important to understand the actual cue-response makeup of the interaction (Taylor et al., 2008). Accordingly we examine behavior at the micro-level of cue-response patterns, focusing on the impact of police interviewers' cues on suspects' provision of information. Specifically, we consider the impact of influences strategies on suspects' provision of case-related information, or reluctance to provide such information, across the interview.

Our focus on the information-gathering process, as opposed to interview outcomes (Milne & Bull, 1999), is important for two reasons. First, assessing overall interview effectiveness in real life seems to be problematic (Baldwin, 1993). Although one may sometimes presume guilt (or innocence) beyond a reasonable doubt, one can

never be certain that the truth is actually found (Kassin, Goldstein, & Savitsky, 2003). For instance, an innocent suspect may be truthfully denying the crime. Moreover, focusing on a confession may result in too much pressure being exerted and, consequently, even result in false confessions (cf. Vrij, 2004). As such, a confession (or the lack thereof) may say little about interview effectiveness. Likewise, overall information provision may be considered a rather crude measure of interview effectiveness. For example, it does not take into account different types of information or how suspects respond to a specific message or series of messages during the interview. Indeed, there is growing evidence to suggest that the order in which behaviors occur –the interrelationships among behaviors– has a significant impact on their meaning and effects (Adair, 2003; Adair & Brett, 2005; Beune, 2009; Giebels & Noelanders, 2004; Taylor, 2002; Taylor & Donald, 2003, 2004; Vrij et al., 2008).

Third, previous work showed that the effectiveness of different influencing behaviors varies across cultures (e.g., Adair & Brett, 2005; Fu & Yukl, 2000; Giebels & Taylor, 2009). Since authentic police interviews often involve suspects from different cultural backgrounds, we include differences in cultural communication in building up our hypotheses and analyses. In line with previous research (Adair, 2003; Adair & Brett, 2005; Adair et al., 2004; Beune et al., 2009; Giebels & Taylor, 2009), we base our hypotheses on Hall's (1976) theory on low-/high-context communication cultures. According to this theory, people in low-context cultures are highly individualized and view themselves as being independent from others. As a result, communication tends to be more explicit and direct; the content of a message is important, meaning that most (if not all) information is conveyed in explicit codes (Hall, 1976). In contrast, high-context

cultures are characterized by strong social bonds, and individual feelings and opinions are suppressed to serve the community (Hall, 1976). Consequently, communication tends to be indirect, evasive and relationship-oriented (Brinker Dozier, Husted, & McMahon, 1998).

Although individuals within a society may vary in their communication style, low-context communication is predominant in Western, more individualistic cultures, while high-context communication is characteristic of non-Western, more collectivistic cultures (Adair, 2003; Adair & Brett, 2005; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 2001; Triandis & Suh, 2002). These differences in communication styles may have consequences for the effectiveness of different types of influencing behavior in police interviews. To explore this possibility, we compare police interviews with suspects from the Netherlands, which can be regarded as a low-context culture, and from Morocco, a relatively high-context culture (e.g., Giebels & Taylor, 2009). Since police contact with minority groups in the Netherlands is most frequently with Moroccan suspects (Jennissen & Blom, 2007), we focus our comparison on this group. In the following sections, we discuss how the cultural background of suspects may impact the investigative process and relate this to the effectiveness of *rational arguments*, *being kind*, and *intimidation*.

Information-Gathering Influencing Behaviors

Research suggests that the influencing behavior of police officers is largely based on two strategies: *rational arguments* and *being kind* (cf. Beune, 2009; Beune et al., 2009; Bull & Cherryman, 1996; Hartwig, Granhag, Strömwall, & Vrij, 2005; Moston & Engelberg, 1993). *Rational arguments* refer to messages based on logic and rationality,

while *being kind* refers to all friendly and helpful behavior, usually expressed through active listening behavior (Beune et al., 2009; see also Giebels & Taylor, in press). Generally, reasoned argumentation is considered a core element of successful police interviews (Walton, 2003) because police interviews are conducted in the specific context of proof (Baldwin, 1993). In these contexts, securing evidence is an important consideration (Williamson, 1993). An important way to address this evidence is by referring to logic and rationality. For example, suspects may be challenged to give explanations for seemingly illogical actions or statements (e.g., "you said you went shopping, but aren't the shops closed at 11 p.m.?"). Suspects may also be confronted strategically with evidence (Hartwig, Granhag, Strömwall, & Kronkvist, 2006), such as physical evidence (Park, Levine, McCornack, Morrison, & Ferrara, 2002) or witness testimonies (Hartwig et al., 2006). The assumption underlying this behavior is that a lack of consistency is considered to make a statement less plausible and, hence, less truthful (cf. Granhag & Strömwall, 1999). In addition, if a suspect cannot provide a logical explanation for his or her inconsistent statements, then this may evoke a feeling of cognitive pressure. To reduce this internal pressure, a suspect is expected to be more willing to tell the truth (cf. cognitive dissonance reduction; Festinger, 1957; see also Beune et al., 2009). Although *rational arguments* may comprise certain accusatory elements (e.g., the confrontation with inconsistencies), the purpose underlying this behavior is to obtain correct and reliable information in order to find the truth. As such, the use of *rational arguments* as an information-gathering strategy is acknowledged in most Western European interviewing methods, including the Dutch Standard

Interviewing Method (Nierop, 2005; Van Amelsfoort, Rispens, & Grolman, 2005), and the PEACE approach (Bull & Soukara, in press; Milne & Bull, 1999)[1].

The use of *rational arguments* may be considered particularly consistent with low-context communication. It is not only direct and explicit, but it is also in line with an important assumption in low-context cultures known as the quality maxim. The quality maxim suggests that one should state only that which is believed to be true on the basis of sufficient evidence (Grice, 1975; see also, Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996). This maxim implies that low-context rather than high-context communication typically centers on logic and proof (cf. Adair & Brett, 2004). In support of this notion, research has shown that influencing people on the basis of (in)consistency is particularly effective in low-context cultures (Cialdini et al., 1999). People from low-context cultures are more likely to change their behavior when confronted with inconsistencies than are people from high-context cultures (see also, Choi & Nisbett, 2000). Taken together, this evidence suggests that *rational arguments* are likely to be more compatible with, and effective for, low-context suspects compared to high-context suspects.

Being kind, another frequently expressed behavior in investigative settings, is also important to the gathering of correct and reliable information (Bull & Milne, 2004; Milne & Bull, 1999). The effectiveness of this behavior can be ascribed to the empathy and respect it portrays to the suspect (cf. Holmberg & Christianson, 2002), which encourages mutual cooperation (Shepherd, 1991). As a consequence, a suspect feels respected and acknowledged, and will be more confident, willing to cooperate and share information (cf. Holmberg & Christianson, 2002). In the Beune et al. (2009) study, it was expected

[1] Please note that *rational arguments* are, thus, less likely to be used as an information-gathering strategy in parts of North America where police officers are trained according to the Reid model of interrogation (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2001) which is primarily accusatory rather than inquisitorial in nature.

that *being kind* would be particularly effective in influencing high-context suspects because it serves a more relationship-oriented purpose. This purpose, the authors suggest, appeals to high-context cultural values because it is more indirect and context-oriented in nature (cf. Brinker Dozier et al., 1998).

Interestingly, however, in the Beune et al. study suspects from low-context and high-context cultures did not differ in their overall willingness to provide information in response to *being kind* and *rational arguments*. One explanation for these unanticipated findings is that the interrelationships between behaviors may obscure direct effects of *being kind* and *rational arguments* on suspects' information provision. That is, suspects may decide to strategically adjust the information they provide in the face of different types of behaviors, and examining aggregated outcomes may not capture these dynamics (cf. Olekalns & Weingart, 2008). To test these possibilities, we retest the hypotheses of the research evidence discussed above using a methodology more sensitive to interaction dynamics. Specifically, we expect that low-context rather than high-context suspects will respond more positively (i.e., provide information) to the *rational arguments* strategy (Hypothesis 1), while high-context suspects will respond more positively (i.e., provide information) to the relationship-oriented strategy of *being kind* (Hypothesis 2).

Intimidating the Suspect?

The dominant view in investigative interviewing research is that accusatory behavior, such as *intimidation*, is inappropriate (Walton, 2003). This is presumably because it is generally perceived as hostile (Cheney, Harford, & Solomon, 1972), aggressive (Sinaceur & Neale, 2005), and may evoke feelings of being disrespected and dominated among suspects (Holmberg & Christianson, 2002). Nevertheless, accusatory

behaviors are still used by police officers (Kassin et al., 2007; King & Snook, 2009; Leo, 1996). For example, a police officer might warn a suspect that a particular course of action will result in certain consequences (Kassin et al., 2007; Leo, 1996; Walton, 2003) or accuse the suspect personally (Moston & Engelberg, 1993). These behaviors could be summarized as one particular influencing behavior: *Intimidation* (Giebels & Taylor, in press). Given the continuous presence of intimidating behavior in investigative interviews, it seems surprising that research has paid little attention to how the use of *intimidation* by police officers may influence the information-gathering process. This may prove to be important because intimidating behavior may potentially serve a legitimate and useful function in certain circumstances (Walton, 2003).

Some initial evidence for positive effects of *intimidation* comes from research on the communication of threats. For instance, Shomer, Davis, and Kelley (1966) found that a threat may serve as a signal to alert the other party when the threat's intention is separated from threat fulfillment. As such, it may reduce uncooperative behavior and facilitate coordination (see also, Cheney et al., 1972). Similarly, Sinaceur and Neale (2005) demonstrated that, when parties engage in relationship building, the expression of threats increases the willingness to make concessions. Finally, research also suggests that intimidation may be effective when it is combined with other, more cooperative, behaviors (e.g., Brodt & Tuchinsky, 2000; Van de Vliert, Nauta, Giebels, & Janssen, 1999). For instance, research on the effects of strategic sequences in police interviews showed that intimidation could stimulate suspects' information provision when it was combined with rational arguments or kind behavior (Beune, 2009). Taken together, there

is evidence suggesting that the use of *intimidation* does not necessarily have to be unconstructive.

However, the effectiveness of *intimidation* might also be dependent on culture (Beune, 2009). A defining feature of people in high-context cultures is that they try to avoid direct confrontation in order to preserve face (cf. Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998; see also, Tse, Lee, Vertinsky, & Wehrung, 1988). The notion that confrontation needs to be avoided is supported in a number of studies. For example, research has shown that high-context Japanese negotiators preferred to frame their conflict more in terms of harmony than in terms of confrontation (i.e., in terms of compromising vs. winning; Gelfand et al., 2001) and engaged in socially desirable behavior for presumably the same reason (Lalwani, Shavitt, & Johnson, 2006). Since *intimidation* is highly confrontational and direct in nature (Kassin et al., 2007), we expect that this strategy may be less appropriate when interviewing suspects from high-context cultures. This suggests that high-context suspects, compared to low-context suspects, will respond less positively (i.e., provide less information) to *intimidation* (Hypothesis 3).

Method

Participants

Data were videotaped authentic police interviews from a central district in the Netherlands. Cases were randomly selected from a series of interviews with either Dutch or Moroccan suspects. The resulting data consisted of 27 police interviews: 12 interviews with Dutch suspects (11 male and 1 female), and 15 interviews with Moroccan (all male) suspects. The average length of the interviews was 95 minutes (SD = 57.2). The videotapes contained all of the conversation recorded during the interviews, minus

possible leads in time (e.g., due to preparation or report typing). All interviews were about suspected involvement in crimes classed in the Netherlands as misdemeanor offences, which include simple assault (14.8%), theft with assault (25.9%), open violence (22.2%), indecent assault (7.4), domestic violence (14.8%; another 14.8% of the cases were classified as "other").

Twelve suspects (M_{age} = 38; SD = 11.3) originated from the Netherlands and so were regarded as low-context (cf. Brett, 2001; Giebels & Taylor, 2009; Hall, 1976; Hall & Hall, 1990; Hofstede, 2001; Triandis, 1994). The remaining fifteen suspects (M_{age} = 25; SD = 6.9) originated from Morocco, or were second generation Moroccans from traditional Moroccan families (e.g., they spoke poor Dutch which indicates that this wasn't their first language). Accordingly, these suspects were regarded as relatively high-context. This categorization of both groups is supported by previous research (Adair, 2003; Adair & Brett, 2005; Brett, 2001; Fu & Yukl, 2000; Giebels & Taylor, 2009; Hall, 1976; Hall & Hall, 1990). Moreover, it is consistent with Hofstede's (2001) individualism-collectivism country index, which scores countries on the extent to which individuals are autonomous versus embedded in groups (see also Giebels & Taylor, 2009). On Hofstede's measure, Morocco is associated with an Individualism index of 46, while the Netherlands is associated with an index of 80. This difference supports our assertion that Dutch and Moroccan suspects represent groups that are comparatively high and low on the cultural values underlying Hall's low-/high-context distinction.

All of the interviews with suspects were conducted by male Dutch police officers (M_{age} = 38; SD = 7.2). All had received professional training in standard interviewing techniques at the Dutch Police Academy. This training contains both relational and

substantive components (see also the Introduction), and is based on the notion that police officers should center on the gathering of correct and reliable information in order to find the truth. This information-gathering purpose is also a fundamental principle of the Dutch training manual for the interviewing of suspects (Van Amelsfoort et al., 2005), and is in line with the UK's PEACE approach (e.g., Milne & Bull, 1999; Soukara, Bull, Vrij, Turner, & Cherryman, 2009). ~~Usually, police interviews involve three phases: preparation, interview, and conclusion (see also Nierop, 2005). Here we focus on the second, interview stage of this process.~~ Finally, all police officers were Dutch nationals (i.e., from a low-context society), and they all reported having five or more years of "substantial experience" with interviewing suspects.

Coding Schemes and Reliability

Using digital video-recordings of the 27 police interviews, two trained coders (unaware of the hypotheses) coded all of the speaking turns of both the police officer and suspect. A speaking turn is the single utterance of one party without interruption of the other party. The speaking turns of the police officers were coded using an established coding framework known as the "Table of Ten," which we modified by dividing *intimidation* into two categories (*intimidating the individual* and *intimidating the context*), and by adding a twelfth "Other" category. The Table of Ten was derived in previous research (Giebels, 2002) and captures the use of ten major influencing behaviors that occur in police-civilian interactions. These influencing behaviors can be either relationship-oriented (i.e., Being kind, Being equal, and Being credible) or content-oriented (i.e., Emotional appeal, Intimidation, Imposing a restriction, Direct pressure, Legitimizing, Exchanging, and Rational arguments). The relationship-oriented behaviors

emphasize the sender and his or her relationship with the other person. For example, *being credible* is used to express expertise or prove reliability (e.g., "I have heard this story many times before during my twenty year experience with police interviewing"). In contrast, the content-oriented behaviors are geared toward framing the substantive content of the message. For example, *emotional appeals* are behaviors playing upon the emotions of the other party (e.g., "So how would you feel about your parents finding out?"). For the purposes of this research, we focus on influencing behaviors in particular. These are *rational arguments,* which are messages that appeal to logic and/or facts; *being kind*, which refers to active listening behaviors expressed to show empathy and friendliness towards the suspect; *intimidating the individual,* which includes messages that intimidate or accuse the suspect personally and imply a warning of particular consequences for the suspect; and *intimidating the context,* which includes messages that intimidate or accuse friends and/or family of the suspect and imply a warning of particular consequences for the family and/or friends (see Table 1 for an overview).

< Insert Table 1>

Because we are interested in determining when suspects provide information, the suspects' speaking turns were coded using two 'information provision' codes. *Case-related personal information* was coded when the suspect gave personal information to explain the motivation behind his actions and/or to explain his feelings, thoughts or background. *Case-related contextual information* was coded when the suspect gave information about the criminal event, involvement of family and/or friends, or other –

non-personal – information. *Refusing to give information* was coded when the suspect remained silent or refused to provide an answer. Finally, an *other* code was used when the suspect's speech act does not easily fit into one of the other three codes (see Table 1 for an overview).

The rationale behind this coding scheme is that, as information-gathering aims at serving justice (Dillon, 1990), the specific aspects of a case need to be addressed. For instance, one could gather information to establish a motive (McConville & Baldwin, 1982) or to crystallize the overall pattern of events in a case (Irving, 1980). When motive is of interest, personal information could be considered of particular importance. When the events leading to the crime are important, contextual information is needed, such as information about possible involvement of others or information concerning the criminal event. In addition, as information provision is generally seen as an act of cooperation (cf. Adair & Brett, 2004), it could be argued that a lack of information provision is suggestive of non-cooperation. This implies that when determining a police officer's efficiency, it is important to examine both the provision of information and the reluctance to do so.

Before coding the 27 interviews, the two coders were trained to use the Table of Ten on unrelated material using the same procedure as described in Beune et al. (2009). This material consisted of parts of videotaped police interviews and included interactions with individuals from low-context and high-context cultures to ensure that the coders were exposed to both types of dialogue. As with the main coding, they were trained to give each speaking turn one code that best described the behavior within the utterance. After 60 hours of training on practice material, Cohen's Kappa was .71, which we considered sufficient for coding the 27 police interviews. The coders then coded 12 of the

27 police interviews examined in the paper. The 12 were chosen at random from the complete data set and included interactions with both low-context and high-context suspects. The reliability of coding, measured using Cohen's Kappa, ranged from .69 to .79 (M = .74), suggesting a good level of coding reliability. After coding the 12 interviews, the coders discussed and resolved areas of disagreement, and one coder proceeded to code the remainder of the material.

Analyzing Cue-Response Sequences

To examine the interrelationships among the influencing behaviors of the police officer and the information suspects provided, we constructed event sequences (Bakeman & Gottman, 1997). Specifically, for each interview, the series of assigned codes were used to create a single sequence in which one code appeared on one line of the data file. This sequence of codes represented the occurrence of police officers' influencing behaviors and suspects' responses across the complete interview. Because the coding was performed at the level of speaking turn, the codes alternated between representing the utterances of the police officer and the utterances of the suspect.

The interrelationships among these codes were examined using proximity coefficients (Taylor, 2006). The proximity coefficient provides a measure of the immediacy with which particular responses follow particular cues on average over an interaction sequence. The coefficient is based on the notion that behaviors close together in a sequence have more in common than behaviors that occur far apart. A current behavior is the result of many previous behaviors within an interaction, but the extent of this relationship is viewed as decreasing as a function of temporal distance from the current behavior. This "inter-connectedness" or "channeling" of behavior has long been

recognized in theory (Auld & White, 1959; Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1968, p. 131) and demonstrated in research (Taylor & Donald, 2003; Thomas, 1985). Thus, rather than considering the immediate relations among behaviors (i.e., conditional relationships), the proximity approach considers the relationships among all behaviors within a sequence of codes as degrees of proximity. In so doing, the coefficient reduces the possibility of overlooking important delayed associations between cues and responses over time (Taylor, 2006).

The proximity coefficient varies between 0.00 and 1.00. If the coefficient equals .00, the behaviors occur only once at the first and last positions of the entire sequence. If the coefficient equals 1.00, one behavior precedes the second behavior immediately without exception. A coefficient between these two limits reflects differing amounts of proximity between two behaviors on average, with a greater value indicating less intermittent behaviors (i.e., more proximity; for a detailed description see, Taylor, 2006; Taylor & Donald, 2007). The practical significance of these values draws on the assumption described above, which is that cue-response tendencies are reflected by greater collocation of behaviors within the interaction. A higher proximity coefficient suggests that this cue-response tendency is more prominent than other possible contingencies under examination, and is the more typical behavioral response to a particular cue.

The value of coefficients derived has a very direct relationship to the type of interaction being examined. For example, when a sequence involves discrete subgroups of behaviors occurring in different periods over time, one will observe high proximity coefficients for contingencies among behaviors within the subgroup, but low coefficients

for contingencies among behaviors across different subgroups. In contrast, when the interaction is dynamic and involves significant interlacing of most behaviors, then the value of the coefficients will be high for most contingencies. In such scenarios, the value of a single proximity coefficient is typically less important than the relative value (and comparison) of several coefficients across cue-response contingencies. Indeed, in fluid interactions such as police interviews, the value of proximity coefficients is often high because interactants use and re-use different constellations of behaviors. The high value of the coefficients, however, does not stop researchers from identifying important relative differences across their independent variables of interest (see, for example, Giebels & Taylor, 2009; Taylor & Donald, 2007). When differences emerge across independent variables (e.g., high- and low-context cultures), this indicates that a cue more readily elicits a response in one condition compared to the second condition. Practically such observations begin to inform our understanding of what cues are key to shaping the interaction found in different contexts.

To further illustrate how the coefficients are derived, Table 2 presents an example of an interaction with a Moroccan suspect. The left-panel of Table 2 shows a sequence of coded utterances as spoken by the police officer (PO) and suspect (SU). In the right-hand panel is the matrix of proximity coefficients derived from this example sequence. A comparison of the left- and right-hand panels makes it possible to explore how interrelationships among behaviors are reflected by values of the proximity coefficients. For exmaple, a suspect always immediately provides contextual information (SU Contextual information) in response to a police officer's kind behavior (PO Being kind). Consequently, the proximity of these behaviors is the maximum possible (i.e., 1.00). In

contrast, instances of the police officer's *rational arguments* (PO Rational arguments) occur only towards the beginning of the sequence, while a suspect's response with personal information (SU Personal information) occurs at the end. The lack of proximity between these two behaviors is reflected by the low value of the coefficient (i.e., 0.222). All of the other relationships in the example sequence fall between these two extremes and, accordingly, have coefficient values that depend on their distances apart in the sequence. For example, PO rational arguments is associated with ascending values of the coefficient when moving from its relation to refusing to provide information (.963), to contextual information (.833), through to personal information (.222). Examining the sequence confirms that rational arguments are closest on average to a suspect's refusal to provide information, is slightly less close to instances of a suspect's contextual information, and so on.

<Insert Table 2>

To test the significance of the proximity coefficients, we used a series of randomization tests (Edgington, 1995; Good, 1994). A randomization test (sometimes known as an exact test or permutation test) provides a robust test of our hypotheses because its approach is free from assumptions about the distribution of proximities among cues and responses (e.g., assumptions about equal variance; Dunlap, Burke, & Smith-Crowe, 2003; Switzer, Paese, & Fritz, 1992). The test begins by making a conventional statistical comparison of the dependent variable across two or more conditions (in our case, a one-way ANOVA test). The result of this test (i.e., the test

statistic) is then evaluated for its probability of occurring (i.e., its *p*-value), but in a different way from that traditionally reported. Specifically, the test statistic is compared not to a table of critical values, but to a sampling distribution that is derived from the available data. This sampling distribution is derived by permuting the original sequence many times (in our case, 10,000 times). On each occasion, an equivalent test statistic is calculated from the new sequence and stored. These stored statistics form a sampling distribution that represents the range of test statistics that might have been observed were the sequence to have occurred at random. This distribution is thus used to assess the probability of obtaining the original test statistic (i.e., to obtain its *p*-value). This is achieved by computing the number of test statistics in the derived distribution that are equal to, or greater than, the original test statistic. The number of equal or higher scores divided by the total number of permutations gives the probability of observing the difference being examined, given that the null hypothesis is true (i.e., a *p*-value). The nearer the observed test statistic to the tails of the derived empirical distribution, the fewer times the observed score appears in the derived distribution, and the lower the resulting probability value. As with conventional approaches, we use $\alpha = .05$ as a measure of test significance for our hypotheses.

Results

Frequency of Behavior

In total, the 27 police interviews contained 17,066 speaking turns (Police officer = 8,536; Suspect = 8,530). Of these speaking turns, 1,852 (21.7%) could be typified in terms of the four influencing behaviors *being kind* (9.5%), *rational arguments* (7.6%), *intimidating the individual* (4.3%), and *intimidating the context* (0.3%). For the suspect,

4902 (57.5%) speaking turns could be typified as *case-related personal information*, and 1595 (18.7%) speaking turns could be typified as *case-related contextual information*. In total, 322 (3.8%) speaking turns were coded as *refusing to give information*. Table 3 contains the (relative) distributions of code frequencies across the low-context and high-context cases. In six of the seven behavioral categories, there was no difference in frequency of occurrence across the low-/high-context conditions, Mann-Whitney U, all *Z*'s between .81 and -.91, *ns*. The exception was for *case-related personal information*, where analysis suggested that low-context suspects appeared to provide more *case-related personal information* than high-context suspects, Mann-Whitney U, $Z = -2.05$, $p < .05$.

< Insert Table 3>

Cross-Cultural Differences in Cue-Response Patterns

Table 4 contains the mean proximity coefficients for the police officers' cues and the suspects' responses for low-context suspects (top panel) and high-context suspects (bottom panel). As can be seen from Table 4, the overall value of the proximity coefficients is relatively high, which is due to the fact that most behaviors occur regularly at all stages of the interaction instead of in discrete periods of interaction (cf. Giebels & Taylor, 2009). Consistent with previous research, this suggests that strategic adjustments by both parties are being made continuously (cf. Olekalns & Weingart, 2008). The data in Table 4 also reveals that all influencing behaviors are relatively closely related to *case-*

related personal information. Nevertheless, analyses of our data suggest that the relationships between the police officer's cues and the suspect's responses varied considerably across police interviews with low-context and high-context suspects. For example, as indicated by the coefficient of .759, low-context suspects responded less immediately to *being kind* with *refusing to provide information*. In contrast, they often responded almost immediately to *rational arguments* with *case-related personal information* ($P = .994$)[2].

<Insert Table 4>

As predicted by Hypothesis 1, and in line with previous research (Beune et al., 2009), we found indications for a main effect of culture on the relationship between the *rational arguments* and the suspect's response of *case-related personal information*. Specifically, this response was significantly more immediate following *rational arguments* in police interviews with low-context compared to high-context suspects, $F = 7.96$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.14$. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis that strategies referring to logic and rationality impact more directly on people from low-context compared to high-context cultures (cf. Adair & Brett, 2004). No effects were found for

[2] Since the effectiveness of influencing behavior may be dependent on timing (e.g., Hartwig et al., 2005; Sinaceur & Neale, 2005), we explored the time factor by dividing all interviews into two time periods (cf. Giebels & Taylor, 2009) before testing our hypotheses. We only found two main effects of time: *intimidating the individual* seemed to be more closely followed by *case-related personal information* in the first part of the interview, compared to the second part of the interview, $F = 8.75$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.17$, while suspects seemed to respond more immediately to *intimidating the context* with *refusing to give information* in the second part of the interview compared to the first part of the interview, $F = 6.67$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.04$. No interaction effects were found, all $F < 4.90$, *ns*. A table of coefficients is available from the first author.

suspects' responses of *case-related contextual information*, $F = 1.55$, *ns*., and *refusing to give information*, $F = 0.88$, *ns*., respectively.

Our second hypothesis predicted that compared to low-context suspects, high-context suspects would respond more positively (i.e., provide information) to *being kind* (Hypothesis 2). This hypothesis was not supported. Providing information did not vary across the two cultural conditions; neither did providing *Case-related personal information*, $F = 2.36$, *ns*, nor providing *Case-related contextual information*, $F = 0.09$, *ns*. Moreover, and contrary to our expectations, for high-context suspects in particular, there was some evidence to suggest *being kind* was related to *Refusing to give information*, $F = 3.67$, $p < .07$, $d = .77$. That is, *being kind* showed a non-significant tendency to be more immediately followed by *Refusing to give information* for high-context suspects compared to low-context suspects.

Finally, we predicted that for high-context suspects in particular, *intimidation* on the part of the police officer would be negatively related to the information suspects provided. Our analyses revealed significant main effects of both *intimidating the individual* and *intimidating the context* (marginally significant) on providing information. However, inspection of our data indicated that the two types of intimidation indeed seemed to have different effects on suspects from low-/high-context cultures and in terms of the type of information suspects provided. Specifically, and in line with our expectations, *intimidating the individual* tended to be less effective at eliciting *case-related personal information* from suspects from high-context compared to low-context cultures, $F = 10.58$, $p < .01$, $d = 1.31$. On average, suspects from low-context cultures were almost twice as fast at providing case-related personal information ($M = 8.34$

behaviors) as their high-context counterparts (M = 15.15 behaviors). Interestingly, and contrary to our prediction, we found some indications that *intimidating the context* was less successful in eliciting *case-related contextual information* from high-context suspects in particular. That is, high-context suspects seemed to respond more immediately to *intimidating the context* than low-context suspects, $F = 3.07$, $p < .10$, $d = .71$. In a similar vein, high-context suspects also seemed to respond less immediately to *intimidating the context* with *refusing to give information* compared to low-context suspects, $F = 2.53$, $p < .07$, $d = .64$. Taken together, our findings seem to partially support Hypothesis 3.

Discussion

A challenge faced by researchers and practitioners of investigative interviewing concerns identifying "good" or "effective" influencing strategies (Baldwin, 1993), and understanding how such strategies contribute to the primary purpose of information gathering (Dando, Wilcock, & Milne, 2009; Dando, Wilcock, Milne, & Henry, 2009). In response to these issues, we examined how police officers' use of different influencing behaviors is related to suspects' responses in terms of information provision. In line with previous work on influencing behavior (Beune et al., 2009; Giebels & Taylor, 2009), we expected this effectiveness to be dependent on the cultural background of the suspect. In line with our expectation, we were able to demonstrate that low-context suspects appear to be quicker to respond to *rational arguments* with case-related personal information provision than high-context suspects. This is consistent with the general assumption that people from low-context cultures highly value logic and deductive thinking (Gelfand & Dyer, 2000). Consequently, low-context suspects may be particularly likely to respond to

behavior that appeals to these values. This notion is supported by a recent study in the field of crisis negotiations, in which Giebels and Taylor (2009) found that when negotiators used persuasive arguments, low-context perpetrators compared to high-context perpetrators responded more immediately with compromising behavior.

Moreover, our findings compliment previous work on influence in police interviews (Beune et al., 2009) by showing that *rational arguments* directly impact on the extent of information provided by low-context suspects. The recognition that people from low-context cultures typically rely on logic and rationality (cf. Adair & Brett, 2004) may be of particular importance for the investigative process, as police interviews are primarily based on reasoned argumentation (Walton, 2003). Indeed, from a legal point of view, police officers have to address certain points of proof, such as evidence, to sustain prosecution (Baldwin, 1993). However, from a cross-cultural point of view, the use of *rational arguments* may be less appropriate in eliciting desirable suspect behaviors when interviewing high-context suspects compared to low-context suspects. This poses the challenge of identifying behaviors that positively impact the information provision of high-context suspects.

A strategy that we predicted to be positively related to the information sharing of high-context suspects compared to low-context suspects is *being kind*. Interestingly, and contrary to what was expected, the data revealed that high-context suspects, compared to low-context suspects, did not seem to differ in the immediacy of their responses to *being kind*. One explanation for this finding may be that we examined *being kind* in terms of the frequently promoted active listening behavior (e.g., Bull & Cherryman, 1996; Milne & Bull, 1999). It might be the case that active listening is not perceived as kind behavior by

suspects, but as inherent to the situation. It is "the job" of the police officer to pose questions and listen to the suspect. Put differently, it might be the case that active listening is not perceived as a kind behavior. However, this does not explain why high-context suspects were found to respond more immediately to *being kind* with *refusing* to provide information than low-context suspects.

One possible explanation may follow from the opportunistic betrayal model, which states that whether someone decides to betray another party's trust is dependent on the perceived likelihood of being punished (Olekalns & Smith, 2007; see also, Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). That is, *being kind* is likely to be perceived as positive and trustworthy, and consequently, one (e.g., a suspect) might perceive the chance of being punished by the other party (e.g., police officer) as being rather small. This could be a cue to deception (Olekalns & Smith, 2007). As deception is more acceptable in high-context cultures (Triandis et al., 2001), it could be argued that high-context suspects are more prone to opportunistic betrayal. However, when the evidence against a suspect is strong, the risk of deception being detected is high (cf. Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). Therefore, a suspect might choose to refuse to provide information instead of providing false information and still believe (s)he will not be punished for this. Understanding of possible cues to deception and their possible relatedness with suspects' cultural backgrounds could be explored in greater depth in future research. Furthermore, it might be interesting to examine to what extent other behaviors that may reflect *being kind* (such as rewarding desirable behaviors, or cooperative statements) may influence low- and high-context suspects' information provision.

Because extant research (reasonably) places a strong emphasis on appropriate questioning strategies (Walkley, 1987), the effects of more intimidating behaviors on the information-gathering process in interviews has remained under studied. This is surprising since research suggests that intimidation is both frequently observed (Leo, 1996; Moston & Engelberg, 1993) and reported (Kassin et al., 2007). We therefore examined the effects of two types of intimidation: *Intimidating the individual* and *intimidating the context*. In line with our reasoning, we found some evidence to suggest that intimidation differently impacts on suspects from low-context and high-context cultures. As expected, our results seemed to suggest that high-context suspects were less likely to immediately respond to *intimidating the individual* with case-related personal information than were low-context suspects. This finding suggests that intimidating behavior is indeed less appropriate in high-context cultures compared to low-context cultures (see also, Fu & Yukl, 2000). It is also consistent with our theorizing and previous research suggesting that the communication of threats is more central to and effective in low-context cultures compared to high-context cultures (Giebels & Taylor, 2009). For instance, Giebels and Taylor found that high-context rather than low-context perpetrators of hostage crises responded more immediately with counter threats and less information provision when confronted with intimidating police behavior. However, in response to *intimidating the context,* high-context suspects compared to low-context suspects seemed to respond more positively with information provision (i.e., high-context rather than low context suspects responded more immediately with case-related contextual information in response to *intimidating the context*).

A possible explanation for this differential and seemingly opposite finding may lie in the target of the intimidating act. That is, *intimidating the context* refers to behavior that accuses, threatens or warns of particular consequences for the suspect's family and/or friends. As family and friends are highly valued in high-context cultures (Hall, 1976), a suspect may be triggered by a strategy that appeals to this value and therefore feel inclined to respond to it (cf. Victor, 1992). This line of reasoning seems to be supported by the overall pattern of relationships between influencing behaviors and the two types of case-related information we examined. For low-context suspects, influencing behaviors were particularly related to personal information but not contextual information, while the opposite was true for high-context suspects. This may be explained by the general assumption that the social context is of particular importance in high-context cultures, while individualistic values are more closely related to low-context cultures (Adair, 2003; Adair & Brett, 2005; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hofstede, 2001; Triandis & Suh, 2002). More precisely, individuals from individualistic cultures prefer dispositional explanations for behavior (e.g., Krull et al., 1999; Lee, Hallahan, & Herzog, 1996; Miller, 1984; Morris & Peng, 1994), while people from collectivistic cultures tend to explain their behavior in terms of person-situation interactions (Choi & Nisbett, 1998; Miller, 1984; Morris & Peng, 1994; Norenzayan, Choi, & Nisbett, 2002). From these points of view, it could be argued that suspects not only react positively to information that is consistent with their cultural background, but also respond with information that is particularly valued by their own culture.

Although we have contributed to previous research, some important questions remain unanswered. One important set of questions relates to the psychological processes

underlying the impact of influencing behavior. For instance, research on the communication of threats suggests that the effectiveness of threats may be determined by the perceived credibility of the communicator (Sinaceur & Neale, 2005). More specifically, threats are only found to be effective when the person who communicated the threat is perceived as being credible. In a similar vein, a recent study on the reciprocity of liking shows that behavioral attraction is only reciprocated when the partner is perceived as benevolent; when benevolence could not be taken at face value, the attraction was significantly reduced (Montoya & Insko, 2008). Together, these findings suggest that research on investigative interviewing might benefit from a closer examination of the psychological mechanisms underlying influencing behavior in police interviews.

A second question could be how well our cultural categorization into low- and high-context describes our groups of Dutch and Moroccan suspects. By assigning suspects to either the low-context or high-context category based on their country of origin, we essentially inferred rather than measured cultural differences. Although this approach has often been used in previous research (e.g., Adair, 2003; Adair & Brett, 2005; Adair et al., 2004; Hall, 1976; Hall & Hall, 1990), other factors besides low-/high-context may underlie our results. For instance, Dutch and Moroccan suspects might differ on other cultural dimensions, such as power distance (Hofstede, 2001). Research shows that high-context suspects rather than low-context suspects are concerned with status differences and establishing dominance (Adair & Brett, 2004). Therefore, it would be interesting to disentangle possible overlap in cultural dimensions to gain more insight

into the unique contributions of different cultural dimensions (see Van de Vliert, in press, for a similar argument).

Another factor that warrants attention is that the groups of Dutch and Moroccan suspects seemed to differ in their average ages. More specifically, the Moroccan suspects were twenty-five years old on average, while the Dutch suspects were thirty-eight years old on average. This may have influenced our results. For instance, research suggests that adolescents, compared to adults, experience less responsibility for their actions and are less likely to adopt the viewpoints of others (e.g., a victim; Modecki, 2008). Hence, this may result in less inclination and/or willingness to provide information. Our data seem to provide some indirect support for this explanation, as Moroccan suspects were significantly less willing to share case-related personal information than were Dutch suspects. However, if this explanation were underlying our results, one would also expect a difference in case-related contextual information, which was not found.

A final area of unaccounted variation lies in the fact that we cannot account for the quality of the information provided by suspects. Although ultimately any information could be considered helpful in (dis)confirming and/or legitimating police narratives (McConville et al., 1991), the purpose of investigative interviewing is to obtain *complete* and *reliable* information (Milne & Bull, 1999) and, ultimately, to find the truth (Baldwin, 1993). Therefore, research has attempted to identify ways to increase the gathering of complete and reliable information. For example, research on investigative interviewing of witnesses has greatly improved with the development of the Cognitive Interview approach (Fisher, Brennan, & McCauley, 2002; Fisher & Geiselman, 1992), which has been found to increase both the quantity and the quality of the information provided (see

also, Milne & Bull, 1999). In addition, there exists a growing body of literature on how to improve the veracity assessment of (trained) police interviewers (e.g., Akehurst, Bull, Vrij, & Köhnken, 2004; Hartwig, 2006, 2007; Hartwig et al., 2006; Hartwig et al., 2005). However, to date, few studies have assessed how specific behaviors of police officers are directly related to the provision of complete and truthful information by suspects (cf. Baldwin, 1993). It is, in our opinion, one great challenge for future research to answer this question, from which, arguably, both science and practice will benefit.

Practical Implications and Conclusions

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that different types of influencing behaviors seem to differently impact the (type of) information suspects provide. Moreover, this process appears to be influenced by the cultural backgrounds of suspects. An important finding is that *rational arguments*, which are an important feature of police interviewing (Walton, 2003), seem to be particularly effective in influencing low-context suspects. That is, when police officers used *rational arguments*, suspects from low-context cultures were, on average, more than twice as fast at providing case-related personal information as their high-context counterparts. In contrast, high-context suspects seemed to be particularly influenced by intimidating behavior when providing information. Compared to low-context suspects, high-context suspects responded positively to *intimidating the context*, but negatively to *intimidating the individual*. Although these results suggest that *intimidation* might sometimes be successful, we would advise police officers to be careful using such behavior.

There are three reasons why police officers might want to assert some caution with respect to intimidation. First, the effect of *intimidation* is found to be highly

dependent upon the context in which it is presented; its effectiveness depends on what specific type of *intimidation* is used and whether it matches a suspect's cultural background (see also Beune, 2009). Second, there is a large body of literature showing that *intimidation* could easily be perceived as a personal attack or evoke hostile counteracts, setting in motion an escalatory, destructive conflict spiral (Giebels & Euwema, 2006). The latter may be particularly important in interviews with suspects from high-context cultures because in high-context cultures relational harmony is strongly valued (Brinker Dozier et al., 1998). Intimidating acts are, therefore, likely to be 'punished' (Giebels & Taylor, 2009). Third, perceptions of inappropriate use of *intimidation* might undermine one's perceived credibility (Heilman, 1974), something particularly problematic when cooperation is needed (cf. Sinaceur & Neale, 2005). Thus, although police officers may sometimes encounter situations in which a firm approach seems to be part of the solution (e.g., when a suspect is obviously not telling the truth) or seems legitimate (Walton, 2003), it is advisable to restrict the use of such behavior to a minimum.

A final conclusion is that different types of influencing behaviors seem to elicit specific types of information from low-context and high-context suspects. When appealed by specific behavior, low-context suspects particularly responded with personal information, while high-context suspects responded primarily with contextual information. Taken together, our findings suggest that police officers would benefit from (being able and sensitive to) incorporating several influencing behaviors into one interview (cf. Vrij, Mann, & Fisher, 2006), particularly since police interviews increasingly involve cross-cultural encounters.

References

Adair, W. L. (2003). Integrative sequences and negotiation outcome in same- and mixed-culture negotiations. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 14*, 273-296.

Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2004). Culture and negotiation processes. In J. M. Gelfand & J. M. Brett (Eds.), *The handbook of negotiation and culture* (pp. 158-176). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). The negotiation dance: time, culture, and behavioral sequences in negotiation. *Organization Science, 16*, 33-51.

Adair, W. L., Brett, J. M., Lempereur, A., Okumara, T., Shikhirev, P., Tinsley, C. H., et al. (2004). Culture and negotiation strategy. *Negotiation Journal, 20*, 87-111.

Akehurst, L., Bull, R., Vrij, A., & Köhnken, G. (2004). The effects of training professional groups and lay persons to use criteria-based content analysis to detect deception. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18*, 877-891.

Auld, F., Jr., & White, A. M. (1959). Sequential dependencies in psychotherapy. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58*, 100-104.

Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J. M. (1997). *Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Baldwin, J. (1993). Police interview techniques: Establishing truth or proof? *The British Journal of Criminology, 33*, 325-352.

Beune, K. (2009). *Talking Heads: Interviewing suspects from a cultural perspective.* University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands.

Beune, K., Giebels, E., & Sanders, K. (2009). Are you talking to me? Influencing behavior and culture in police interviews. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15*, 597-617.

Brett, J. F., Northcraft, G. B., & Pinkley, R. L. (1999). Stairways to heaven: An interlocking self-regulation model of negotiation. *Academy of Management Review, 24*, 452-471.

Brett, J. M. (2001). *Negotiating across cultures*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brinker Dozier, J., Husted, B. W., & McMahon, J. T. (1998). Need for approval in low-context and high-context cultures: a communications approach to cross-cultural ethics. *Teaching Business Ethics, 2*, 111-125.

Brodt, S. E., & Tuchinsky, M. (2000). Working together but in opposition: An examination of the "Good-Cop/Bad-Cop" negotiating team tactic. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 81*, 155-177.

Buckwalter, A. (1983). *Interviews and interrogations*. Boston: Butterworth Publishers.

Bull, R., & Cherryman, J. (1996). *Helping to identify skill gaps in specialist investigative interviewing: Enhancement of professional skills. Final report to the home office police research group*. London: HSMO.

Bull, R., & Milne, R. (2004). Attempts to improve the police interviewing of suspects. In D. Lassiter (Ed.), *Interrogations, confessions, and entrapment* (pp. 182-195). New York: Kluwer Academic.

Bull, R., & Soukara, S. (in press). A set of studies of what really happens in police interviews. In G. D. Lassiter & C. Meissner (Eds.), *Interrogations and*

confessions: Current research, practice and policy. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cheney, J., Harford, T., & Solomon, L. (1972). The effects of communicating threats and promises upon the bargaining process. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 16*, 99-107.

Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). Situational salience and cultural differences in the correspondence bias and in the actor-observer bias. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 949-960.

Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (2000). Cultural psychology of surprise: holistic theories and recognition of contradiction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 890-905.

Cialdini, R. B., Wosinska, W., Barrett, D. W., Butner, J., & Gornik-Durose, M. (1999). Compliance with a request in two cultures: the differential influence of social proof and commitment/consistency on collectivists and individualists. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 1242-1253.

Dando, C., Wilcock, R., & Milne, R. (2009). The Cognitive Interview: The efficacy of a modified mental reinstatement of context procedure for frontline police investigators. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 23*, 138-147.

Dando, C., Wilcock, R., Milne, R., & Henry, L. (2009). A modified Cognitive Interview procedure for frontline police investigators. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 23*, 698-716

Dillon, J. T. (1990). *The practice of questioning*. London: Routledge.

Dunlap, W. P., Burke, M. J., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2003). Accurate tests of statistical significance for r-sub(WG) and average deviation interrater agreement indexes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 356-362.

Edgington, E. S. (1995). *Randomization tests*. New York: Marcel Deckker, Inc.

Elangovan, A., & Shapiro, D. L. (1998). Betrayal of trust in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 547-566.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fisher, R. P., Brennan, K. H., & McCauley, M. R. (2002). The cognitive interview method to enhance eyewitness recall. In M. L. Eisen, J. A. Quas & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Memory and suggestibility in the forensic interview* (pp. 265-286). Mayway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing: the cognitive interview*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Fu, P. P., & Yukl, G. (2000). Perceived effectiveness of influence tactics in the United States and China. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 251-267.

Gass, R. H., & Seiter, J. S. (1999). *Persuasion, social influence and compliance gaining.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gelfand, M. J., & Dyer, N. (2000). A cultural perspective on negotiation: progress, pitfalls, and prospects. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*, 62-99.

Gelfand, M. J., Nishii, L. H., Holcombe, K. M., Dyer, N., Ohbuchi, K. I., & Fukuno, M. (2001). Cultural influences on cognitive representations of conflict:

Interpretations of conflict episodes in the United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 1059-1074.

Giebels, E. (2002). Beïnvloeding in gijzelingsonderhandelingen: de tafel van tien. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie, 57*, 145-154.

Giebels, E., & Euwema, M. (2006). *Conflict management: Analyse, diagnostiek en interventie*. Groningen/ Houten: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Giebels, E., & Noelanders, S. (2004). *Crisis negotiations: A multiparty perspective*. Veenendaal, The Netherlands: Universal Press.

Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2009). Interaction patterns in crisis negotiations: Persuasive arguments and cultural differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 5-19.

Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (in press). Communication Predictors and Social Influence in Crisis Negotiations. In R. G. Rogan & F. Lancely (Eds.), *Contemporary Theory, Research, and Practice of Crisis/Hostage Negotiations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Good, P. (1994). *Permutation tests: A practical guide to resampling methods for testing hypotheses*. New York: Springer.

Granhag, P. A., & Strömwall, L. A. (1999). Repeated interrogations: Stretching the deception detection paradigm. *Expert Evidence, 7*, 163-174.

Grice, H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In E. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Speech acts ed., Vol. 3, pp. 107-142). New York: Academic Press.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: a handbook* (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Matsumoto, Y. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research, 22*, 510-537.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

Hartwig, M. (2006). *Interrogation to detect truth and deception: Effects of strategic use of evidence.* Unpublished PhD thesis, Göteborg University, Sweden.

Hartwig, M. (2007). Guilty and innocent suspects' strategies during police interrogations. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 13*, 213-227.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Kronkvist, O. (2006). Strategic use of evidence during police interviews: When training to detect deception works. *Law and Human behavior, 30*, 603-619.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Vrij, A. (2005). Detecting deception via strategic disclosure of evidence. *Law and Human behavior, 29*, 469-484.

Heilman, M. E. (1974). Threats and promises: Reputational consequences and transfer of credibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*, 310-324.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequence: comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holmberg, U., & Christianson, S. A. (2002). Murderers' and sexual offenders' experiences of police interviews and their inclination to admit or deny crimes. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 20*, 31-45.

Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., Buckley, J. P., & Jayne, B. C. (2001). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (4th ed.). Gaithersberg, MD: Aspen.

Irving, B. (1980). *Police interrogation: A case study of current practice. Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure Research Study No. 2*. London: HMSO.

Jennissen, R. P. W., & Blom, M. (2007). Allochtone en autochtone verdachten van verschillende delicttypen nader bekeken. WODC. Retrieved March, 17, 2008, from http://www.wodc.nl/images/ca07-04_volledige_tekst_tcm44-80361.pdf

Kassin, S. M., Goldstein, C. C., & Savitsky, K. (2003). Behavioral confirmation in the interrogation room: on the dangers of presuming guilt. *Law and human behavior, 27*(187-203).

Kassin, S. M., Leo, R. A., Meissner, C. A., Richman, K. D., Collwell, L. H., Leach, A. M., et al. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: A self-report survey of police practices and beliefs. *Law and human behavior, 31*, 381-400.

Kelley, H. H. (1997). Expanding the analysis of social orientations by reference to the sequential-temporal structure of situations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 27*, 373-404.

King, L., & Snook, B. (2009). Peering inside the Canadian interrogation room: An examination of the Reid model of interrogation, influence tactics, and coercive strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*, 674-694.

Krull, D. S., Hui-Min Loy, M., Lin, J., Wang, C.-F., Chen, S., & Zhao, X. (1999). The fundamental attribution error: Correspondence bias in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*, 1208-1219.

Lalwani, A. K., Shavitt, S., & Johnson, T. (2006). What is the relation between cultural orientation and socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 165-178.

Lee, F., Hallahan, M., & Herzog, T. (1996). Explaining real-life events: How culture and domain shape attributions. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 732-741.

Leo, R. A. (1996). Inside the interrogation room. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 86*, 266-302.

Mann, S., Vrij, A., Fisher, R. P., & Robinson, M. (2008). See no lies, hear no lies: Differences in discrimination accuracy and response bias when watching or listening to police suspect interviews [Electronic Version]. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*,

McConville, M., & Baldwin, J. (1982). The role of interrogation in crime discovery and conviction. *British Journal of Criminology, 22*, 165-175.

McConville, M., Sanders, A., & Leng, R. (1991). *The case for the prosecution*. London: Routledge.

Miller, J. G. (1984). Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 961-978.

Milne, R., & Bull, R. (1999). *Investigative interviewing: Psychology and practice*. Chichester: Wiley.

Modecki, K. L. (2008). Addressing gaps in the maturity of judgment literature: Age differences and delinquency. *Law and human behavior, 32*, 78-91.

Montoya, R. M., & Insko, C. A. (2008). Toward a more complete understanding of the reciprocity of liking effect. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 477-498.

Morris, M. W., & Peng, K. (1994). Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 949-971.

Moston, S., & Engelberg, T. (1993). Police questioning techniques in tape recorded interviews with criminal suspects. *Policing and Society, 6*, 61-75.

Nierop, N. M. (2005). Het verdachtenverhoor in Nederland: wat wordt verhoorders geleerd? *Nederlands Juristenblad, 17*, 887-890.

Norenzayan, A., Choi, I., & Nisbett, R. E. (2002). Cultural similarities and differences in social inference: Evidence from behavioral predictions and lay theories of behavior. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 109-120.

Olekalns, M., & Smith, P. L. (2007). Loose with the truth: Predicting deception in negotiation. *Journal of Business Ethics, 76*, 225-238.

Olekalns, M., & Weingart, L. R. (2008). Emergent Negotiations: Stability and shifts in negotiation dynamics. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 1*, 135-160.

Onkvisit, S., & Shaw, J. J. (1993). *International marketing: Analysis and strategy* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Park, H. S., Levine, T. R., McCornack, S. A., Morrison, K., & Ferrara, M. (2002). How people really detect lies. *Communication Monographs, 69*, 144-157.

Roger, D. B., & Schumacher, A. (1983). Effects of individual differences in dyadic conversational strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*, 247-255.

Shepherd, E. (1991). Ethical interviewing. *Policing, 7*, 42-60.

Shepherd, E. (1993). Resistance in interviews: The contribution of police perceptions and behavior. In E. Shepherd (Ed.), *Aspects of police interviewing*. Issues in Criminological and Legal Psychology, No. 18. Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Shepherd, E., & Kite, F. (1988). Training to interview. *Policing, 4*, 264-280.

Shomer, R. W., Davis, A. H., & Kelley, H. H. (1966). Threats and the development of coordination: further studies of the Deutsch and Krauss trucking game. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 119-126.

Sinaceur, M., & Neale, M. A. (2005). Not all threats are created equal: How implicitness and timing affect the effectiveness of threats in negotiations. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 14*, 63-85.

Snook, B., Eastwood, J., Stinson, M., Tedeschini, J., & House, J. C. (in press). Reforming investigative interviewing in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.

Soukara, S., Bull, R., Vrij, A., Turner, M., & Cherryman, J. (2009). What really happens in police interviews of suspects? Tactics and confessions. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15*, 493-506.

Switzer, F. S., Paese, P. W., & Fritz, D. (1992). Bootstrap estimates of standard errors in validity generalization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 123-129.

Taylor, P. J. (2002). A cylindrical model of communication behavior in crisis negotiations. *Human Communication Research, 28*, 7-48.

Taylor, P. J. (2006). Proximity coefficients as a measure of interrelationships in sequences of behavior. *Behavior Research Methods, 38*, 32-50.

Taylor, P. J., & Donald, I. J. (2003). Foundations and evidence for an interaction based approach to conflict. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 14*, 213-232.

Taylor, P. J., & Donald, I. J. (2004). The structure of communication behavior in simulated and actual crisis negotiations. *Human Communication Research, 30*, 443-478.

Taylor, P. J., & Donald, I. J. (2007). Testing the relationship between local cue-response patterns and the global structure of communication behavior. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46*, 273-298.

Taylor, P. J., Jacques, K., Giebels, E., Levine, M., Best, R., Winter, J., et al. (2008). Analyzing forensic processes: Taking time into account. *Issues in Forensic Psychology, 8*, 45-57.

Taylor, P. J., & Thomas, S. (2008). Linguistic style matching and negotiation outcome. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 1*, 263-281.

Thomas, A. P. (1985). Conversational routines: A Markov chain analysis. *Language and Communication, 5*, 287-296.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Face work competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22*, 187-225.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Triandis, H. C., Carnevale, P. J., Gelfand, M. J., Robert, C., Wasti, A., Probst, T., et al. (2001). Culture and deception in business negotiations: A multilevel analysis. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural management, 1*, 73-90.

Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural Influences on Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 133-160.

Tse, D. K., Lee, K., Vertinsky, I., & Wehrung, D. A. (1988). Does culture matter? A cross-cultural study of executives' choice, decisiveness, and risk adjustment in international marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 52*, 81-95.

Van Amelsfoort, A., Rispens, I., & Grolman, H. (2005). *Handleiding verhoor*. 's-Gravenhage: Elsevier Overheid.

Van de Vliert, E. (in press). Climato-economic origins of variation in in-group favoritism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*.

Van de Vliert, E., Nauta, A., Giebels, E., & Janssen, O. (1999). Constructive conflict at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 475-491.

Victor, D. A. (1992). *International Business Communication*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.

Vrij, A. (2004). Cooperation of liars and truth tellers. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 19*, 39-50.

Vrij, A., Mann, S., & Fisher, R. P. (2006). Information-gathering vs. accusatory interview style: Individual differences in respondents' experiences. *Personality & Individual Differences, 41*, 589-599.

Vrij, A., Mann, S. A., Fisher, R. P., Leal, S., Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2008). Increasing cognitive load to facilitate lie detection: The benefit of recalling an event in reverse order. *Law and human behavior, 32*, 253-265.

Walkley, J. (1987). *Police interrogation*. London: Police Review Publishing.

Walton, D. (2003). The interrogation as a type of dialogue. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1771-1802.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1968). *Pragmatics of human communication: A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes*. London: Faber.

Williamson, T. M. (1993). From interrogation to investigative interviewing: Strategy trends in police questioning. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 3*, 89-99.

Table 1

Descriptions and Examples of Coded Behaviors

Code	Description of Behavior	Example
Rational arguments	Use of arguments based on logic and/or facts	"You said you haven't been in that book store, so how do you explain that we have a witness who saw you there?"
Being kind	All active listening behaviors to show empathy and friendliness	"So if I understood it correctly, you spent most of your youth in foster homes? That must have been really hard for you."
Intimidating the individual	Behaviors that intimidate, warn or accuse the suspect personally	"I think you're lying right now!"
Intimidating the context	Behaviors that intimidate, warn or accuse the suspect's family and/or friends	"Your brother should stay out of trouble, or next time we'll bring him in for an interview too."
Case-related personal information	Information about the suspect's motivation, feelings, thoughts or background	"I took the money because I have a lot of debts."
Case-related contextual information	Information about the criminal event and/or the involvement of others	"I took the money while the attendant was smoking a cigarette."
Refusing to give information	Being silent or refusing to answer	"No comment."

Table 2

An Example of an Investigative Interview Sequence and the Resulting Proximity Coefficient Matrix

Behavior Sequence

…

PO Rational arguments
SU Refusing information
PO Rational arguments
SU Other
PO Rational arguments
SU Refusing information
PO Being kind
SU Contextual information
PO Intimidating the individual
SU Refusing information
PO Rational arguments
SU Contextual information
PO Being kind
SU Contextual information
PO Being kind
SU Contextual information
PO Being kind
SU Other
PO Intimidating the context
SU Personal information

Resulting Proximity Coefficient Matrix

	Suspect's Response			
Police Officer's Cue	Contextual information	Personal information	Refusing information	Other
Rational arguments	.833	.222	.963	.722
Being kind	1.00	. 667	.889	.778
Intimidating the context	--	1.00	--	--
Intimidating the individual	.889	. 444	1.00	.556

Table 3

Frequencies of Occurrence for the Police Officers' Cues and Suspect's Responses as a Function of Suspect Culture

		Frequencies (%)	
Speaker	Tactic	*Low Context*	*High Context*
Police officer's cue	Rational arguments	304 (7.3%)	342 (7.8%)
	Being kind	395 (9.5)	417 (9.5%)
	Intimidating the individual	247 (5.9%)	119 (2.7%)
	Intimidating the context	18 (0.4%)	10 (0.2%)
Suspect's response	Case-related personal information	2635 (63.3%)	2267 (51.9%)
	Case-related contextual information	765 (18.4%)	830 (19.0%)
	Refusing to give information	129 (3.1%)	193 (4.4%)

Table 4

Mean Proximity Coefficients for the Police Officers' Cues and the Suspects' Responses as a Function of Suspects' Culture

Police officer's cue	*Case-related personal information*	*Case-related contextual information*	*Refusing to give information*
	Suspect's response (Low Context)		
Rational arguments	0.994	0.908	0.878
Being kind	0.986	0.943	0.759
Intimidating the individual	0.988	0.910	0.837
Intimidating the context	0.989	0.903	0.912
	Suspect's response (High Context)		
Rational arguments	0.985	0.931	0.860
Being kind	0.975	0.936	0.839
Intimidating the individual	0.974	0.907	0.881
Intimidating the context	0.984	0.956	0.815

Biographical Sketch

Karlijn Beune is a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Twente, The Netherlands. She obtained her Ph.D. on the interviewing of suspects from different cultural backgrounds in 2009, and continues her post-doctoral research within the National Police Agency of the Netherlands. Her research interests include police investigations, such as police interviews, (cultural) communication differences, conflict management and social influence in interdependent settings.

Ellen Giebels is an associate professor of psychology and head of the Conflict, Risk, and Safety research group at the University of Twente, The Netherlands. Her research interests concentrate on conflict in general, and conflict escalation and conflict management (e.g. third-party intervention) in particular. Much of her research is within the field of policing, focusing on the interaction between the police and civilians, such as in hostage/crisis incidents, police interviews and escalated situations in problematic neighborhoods.

Paul Taylor is senior lecturer (associate professor) in the Department of Psychology at Lancaster University, UK, where he coordinates the Investigative Expertise Unit and is course tutor for the Department's MSc in Investigative Expertise. He has published extensively on how people make sense of, and strategically respond to, the behavior of others within forensic contexts. More information is available at http://www.lancs.ac.uk/people/taylorpj