

PRAGMATIC STRATEGIES IN POLICE INTERROGATION OF ACCUSED PERSONS

Bamigbola Esther Olayinka¹

¹Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria

*Corresponding Email: bamigbolayinka@yahoo.com

Citation: Bamigbola, E.O. (2022). Pragmatic strategies in police interrogation of accused persons. *KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 92-114

ABSTRACT

People of different characters make up the society. As we have the good ones, so also, we have the bad ones. The first category constitutes the good citizens while those in the second group are mostly labelled as accused persons. Under the law, an accused person is not yet a criminal until some facts of allegation have been levelled and proved against such a person. The interrogation techniques police employ to deduce facts from an accused person involve the use of language. In order to encourage professional use of language in crime detection and control, the aim of this study is to explore relevant pragmatic strategies for optimal policing and crime management. Seven recorded interrogations on a single case were sourced from a police station in Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. The recorded interrogations were transcribed into texts. The pragmatic strategies examined include politeness, deixis, face threatening and face-saving acts. This work, being a descriptive study, adopts an eclectic approach. The pragmatic models of Goffman (1967), Searle (1969), Lakoff (1973), Leech (1983), Levinson (1983), Grice (1989) and Yule (1996) form the bases for the analyses. The study observed that the identified pragmatic features are used by the police as basic tools for obtaining the truth during interrogations and recommended the use of modern approaches to enhance police duties of curtailing crime to the lowest ebb in the society. Also, the study sensitizes accused persons on what to expect during police questionings and how

Keywords: Police interrogation, suspect, criminal, communicative strategies, pragmatics

INTRODUCTION

Different people make up the society - the good ones, and the bad ones. The bad ones are usually labelled as "criminals." However, it must be noted that one is not yet a criminal, until some facts of allegation have been levelled and confirmed against him or her. With this, there are criteria for differentiating an accused person from a criminal. The police use special steps, protocols and language tools to deduce facts from accused persons. These strategies are strongly spearheaded by interrogation.

Interrogation is a tool for discovering hidden facts about an incident. It is the main torch used in illuminating hidden truth about any crime. According to Allan (2009), getting especially a confession that will hold up in court is not an easy task. Usually, the accused persons will deny committing the offence. To overcome the propensity of a suspect's in denying guilt, and avoid the intervention of advocate, experts have developed advanced interviewing methods that employ elusive psychological handling and observation of body language to bring out the truth. Having known the penalty attached to the crime, the suspect naturally will attempt to hide away the truth. It is the duty of the interrogator to use every legal means possible to uncover the truth.

There are three methods applied in police interrogation for eliciting responses from accused persons, Orlando, (2014). The first method, the Reid technique, is an interview method which combines both investigative and behaviour-provoking enquiries. Where the investigation shows that the suspect committed the crime, then a nine-step interrogation scheme is employed in persuading the accused to tell the truth. The second is a less hostile routine called Preparation and Planning, Engage and Explain, Account, Closure and Evaluate (PEACE) scheme. Under the PEACE technique, interrogators allow a suspect to recount his story without disturbance, before presenting the accused with any inconsistencies between the story and other evidences. The third, the Kinesic Interview technique, involves analyzing a person's behavior to assess deception. The method is similar to the Reid method in some aspects.

The interrogation methods, especially the Reid technique, presumes that any crime suspect is guilty. Another assumption is that suspects will unilaterally deny any wrong doing. Based on these suppositions, a number of controversies have been canvassed against the use of police interrogation techniques bordering on false confessions, detection of deception and the use of obnoxious tactics, such as confronting the accused with guilt, disallowing denials and questioning them for long periods, while presenting false evidence and minimizing responsibility. According to Redlich & Meissner (2009), a reliance on non-verbal behavioral cues and analyses of linguistic styles in the determination of guilt is believed to be responsible for the deception.

Police interrogation techniques are dependent on verbal communication with the use of a language. As such, professional use of language portends to be a potent tool in police interview and interrogation of people suspected of committing crimes. Therefore, this study is to fill a gap in the professional use of language by means of application of pragmatic strategies in enhancing the art of policing and crime management.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Pragmatics studies language use in human communication in relevance to the socio-cultural background of the people in a society (Mey, 2001). Leech and Short (1987:290) viewed that the pragmatic analysis of language can be broadly understood to be the investigation into that aspect of meaning that is derived not from the formal proper ties of words and constructions, but from the way utterances are used and their relationship to the context in which they are spoken. In explaining context, Yule (1996:129-130) says that there are some words in language that cannot be interpreted at all unless the physical context, especially of the speaker, is known. These are words like here, there, this, that, now, then, yesterday, as well as most pronouns, such as, I, you, him, her, them, etc.

Deixis is one of the ways that reflect the relationship between structures and context in languages. Essentially, deixis concerns the means by which languages encode features of the context of utterance or speech event. Matthew's concise dictionary of linguistics defines deixis as the way in which the reference of certain elements in a sentence is determined in relation to a specific speaker and addressee and a specific time and place of utterance. According to Yule (1996), deixis is one of the most fundamental elements usually discussed in the perspective of contextual interpretation of an utterance. He identified three main types of deixis - person deixis, spatial deixis and temporal deixis. Yule (1996) explained person deixis as a tripartite system: speaker (I), addressee (you), and other (he, she, it). Spatial deixis are used to indicate the relative location of people and things. Examples of spatial deixis are: here, there; come, go; bring, take; this, that etc. Temporal deixis indicate utterance time (Yule, 1996). Examples are: now, then, yesterday, tomorrow, tonight, tomorrow, today. Levinson (1983) gave a more detailed classification of deixis. He categorized deixis into: time deixis, person deixis, discourse deixis, place deixis, and social deixis.

In the words of Leech (1983:131), "politeness concerns a relationship between two participants whom we may call self and other". In conversation, 'self' will normally be identified with S and 'others' with H. According to Green (1996:151), politeness is whatever means one employs to display consideration for an addressee's feelings (or face) regardless of the social distance between the speaker and the recipient. Grundy (2000:164) explains that "politeness is the term used to describe the relationship between how something is said to an addressee and that recipient's judgement as to how it should be said". He further suggests that politeness indicates the power-distance relationship between the interactants and the extent to which a speaker imposes on his addressee". Denham and Lobeck (2013:346) state that politeness causes a person to

express concern for others while also expecting this concern to be reciprocated: we're polite because we want to make others feel at ease, and this in turn makes us more comfortable too.

The traditional approach to examining politeness can be seen in the work of Goffman (1967), when investigating the concept of face in human conversation. He tried to set a universal framework for politeness through face. Goffman defined face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" Goffman (1967: 213). Traditional politeness is largely culture and individual based. In the context of culture for example, the Yorubas are very euphemistic in their language use on issues that border on psycho-social and emotional conditions of co-participants. For instance, a popular Yoruba adage says, "A ki i ti oju olomo ese mesan ka a", which means, "It is wrong to mention the psycho-social problem of an individual right in his presence". Doing this will amount to making mockery of the person. Postmodern politeness involves a relationship of 'self' and 'other' i.e., speaker and hearer respectively. Others include the third party mentioned but who may not be physically present. Postmodern view of politeness is best applicable in a situation of conversation, dialogue or interaction.

Lakoff (1973) gave the politeness theory a new perspective in terms of sociopragmatic investigation. Based on the cooperative principle, she puts politeness within the pragmatic-rule framework, indicating whether it is a pragmatically well-formed utterance or not. Politeness is classified by Leech (1983) as a group of social performance by which respect and appreciation are created. The main function of politeness maxims, according to Leech (1983), is to minimize the degree of rudeness and to maximize the degree of civility. Thus in the Leech's maxims, the well-developed approach are categorised as tact, approbation, modesty, agreement, sympathy and generosity.

Odebunmi (2009:4), writing on the manifestation of tact maxim in hospital interactions declares that "a lot of doctors' utterances revealed that they were considerate to patients and allowed them to gain maximum advantage in hospital interaction". Odebunmi (2009) adapted "tact maxim" to evolve considerate use of language in order not to hurt the feelings of their patients.

Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) are acts that impress on the hearers the need to maintain their self-esteem, and command respect. Thus, politeness strategies are developed for the purpose of dealing with FTAs, which at times are based on the terms of conversation. An FTA inherently damages the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in antagonism to the desires of his or her interactant. Osisanwo (2003) clearly

differentiates between face threatening act and face saving act. According to him, in an interactive situation, one of the actors can say something that intimidates the other person's expectation regarding his public self-image. Such a threat is referred to as a face threatening act. It is possible for the attacker to realize that what he said amounts to an attack on the public self-image of his interlocutor, and may wish to retract the action or statement. Whatever he then says to lessen the possible threat is called a face saving act (Osisanwo, 2003). Goffman (1967) differentiates between defensive and protective image of face. In terms of defensive face, the speaker tries to save his/her own face, while protective image involves saving someone else's face. Hence, these two images are combined at the same time to show respect and 'politeness' in terms of mutual construct.

The concept of FTA is argued by Brown and Levinson (1987) as a social behaviour intimidating speakers' and/or addressees' face desires, either positively or negatively. The interactional activity is appropriate if the face image is given or maintained by one of the partakers. Thus, the relation between the interlocutors can be evaluated as polite if normal behaviour is exhibited. It is evaluated as over polite if more politeness is involved. However, if less or no politeness is given, it would be rated as rudeness. For this, Brown and Levinson (1987) established three scales for measuring the degree of politeness. These are:

- (a) Relative power which refers to the different relation between the speaker and the hearer. The more relative power is possessed by one interlocutor, the more the face threat would be.
- (b) Ranked imposition which refers to the illocutionary act itself. Certain illocutionary acts involve more face threatening potential than others.
- (c) Social distance which refers to the type of relationship between the interlocutors (speaker and hearer).

Deference is displayed when respect is given to others because of their status, age and other qualities. In some languages like Yoruba, honourific pronouns are used as respect markers. In English language, words like 'sir' and 'madam' are used for this purpose. Also, titles such as Doctor, Professor, Engineer, etc. can be used to indicate status. This study adopts an eclectic approach. The pragmatic models of Leech (1983), Levinson (1983) and Yule (1996) form the bases for the analysis.

Police Interrogation Technique

In handling a case of an accused person in police custody, interrogation is carried out to deduce facts from the person. This is because a person is not yet a criminal until some facts of allegation have been confirmed against the person. Allan (2009) makes

reference to Reid as perhaps, the most prominent expert in modern criminal interrogation. According to him, Reid went on to found his own company, John E. Reid and associates, which continues to teach his techniques to police departments throughout North America. He went further to list the nine-step Reid technique to include the following:

1. Direct confrontation: The interrogator lays out the evidence that led to the suspect's arrest and then offers the suspect an early opportunity to confess.
2. Deflection: If the suspect does not immediately confess, the interrogator suggests that some other person or set of circumstances forced the suspect to commit the crime, thus providing the suspect with moral justification for his/her actions. This is called developing a "theme" which may change over the course of the interrogation depending on how the suspect responds.
3. Dominance: The interrogator insists on doing all the talking, laying out various scenarios to explain how the crime may have been committed. By prohibiting the suspect from responding, the interrogator gives the suspect little or no chance to delay guilt (knowing that once denials start, a confession becomes increasingly difficult to obtain) as well as few opportunities to demand an attorney.
4. Turning objections into justification: At this point, the suspect will give some character-based reason why he/she could not have committed the crime (I hate violence), which a trained interrogator can then twist into an acceptable excuse for why the suspect did what he/she is accused of (so you really didn't want to kill him, did you?).
- 5 Expressing Empathy: The interrogator continues to express empathy for the suspect, suggesting that he/she would have reacted just like the suspect did under similar circumstances. Again, the idea is to offer the suspect an opportunity to justify the crime within some socially acceptable framework.
- 6 Offering Alternative Themes: Often, at this point in the interrogation, the suspect becomes quiet and submissive. The interrogator should now offer a number of alternative themes or scenarios – along with possible motives – and observe which gets the most response from the suspect.
7. Posing the Alternative Question: Once a likely scenario has been established, the interrogator offers two scenarios, the major difference being that one has a more socially acceptable motive than the other. (e.g. "you hated her" vs "she gave you no

choice”). At this point, the suspect will usually select the safer option, but either way, guilt has been admitted.

8. Repetitions: The interrogator has the suspect repeat the confession in front of one or more new witnesses, such as other police officers.
9. Documentation: The interrogator orders the confession written up and then signed by the suspect as quickly as possible.

Also, Allan (2009) posits that to make the Reid system work, it is also vital that the interrogator be trained in reading subtle changes in body language, including eye movements, that can be telltale signs of lying, evasion or insincerity.

METHODOLOGY

The data analyzed for this study consist of seven recorded interrogations on a single case from a police station in Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. The recorded interrogations were transcribed into texts and extracts from the text are cited in the analyses. Each extract is labelled as Datum. The pragmatic strategies examined in the data include politeness, deixis and face threatening act. The analyses are guided by the pragmatic models of Goffman (1967), Searle (1969), Lakoff (1973), Leech (1983), Levinson (1983), Grice (1989) and Yule (1996).

Abbreviations used in the analysis include:

IPO: Investigation Police Officer
CEO: Chief Executive Officer

Politeness in the Interrogations

Two types of politeness are examined in the data selected for this study – traditional politeness and postmodern politeness.

Traditional politeness

Expressions which portray the exhibition of traditional politeness in the interrogations are examined below.

Datum 1

IPO: Who among you
in the site where you people work? (*No response from the men*)
Can you not talk? Are you deaf?

THE MEN: (*With trembling voice*). We do not know anything about it sir.

IPO: Now, I want to ask again, do you know anything about what were stolen at your site?

THE MEN: No sir.

In the above interrogation, the three men (Solo, Jide and Raymond) who were involved in the case are being interrogated in the same place, by the same interrogator and at the same time. This makes it difficult for the interrogator to obtain any valuable information from the responses of the men. As long as these men are locked up together in the same cell, their notions and ideas will still be similar. If at all, any of these men knows anything about the issue, especially, what has to do with the image of his co-worker, that person may not want to reveal it in the presence of that co-worker. This is noticeable in the extract below:

Datum 2

IPO: Ok now, cooperate with me because if you do not, you are in trouble.

I believe you know why?

IPO: What is the reason?

SOLO: Because the key was handed over to me.

IPO: Good! Now, who is your prime suspect?

SOLO: Sir, my prime suspect is Raymond.

IPO: You meant Raymond, why him?

SOLO: The whole parts of me chose him. I don't just like his reaction since the night of that match, he has been behaving strangely.

From the above interrogation, it is apparent that Raymond is Solo's prime suspect. Nevertheless, Solo dare not reveal that Raymond is his prime suspect in the presence of Raymond. This is because Raymond will be offended psycho-socially both in and outside the police station. Another instance of traditional politeness is observable in interrogation five when Jide sees Raymond as his prime suspect as well.

Datum 3

IPO: I want to believe you know you are in trouble? Yes, you are in trouble since you went out with the person who held the site key, so, it is observed that you planned it together.

JIDE: Sir, in fact, everybody knows what Solo can do, even the manager knows.

IPO: That shows you did it alone then.

JIDE: No, I did not know anything about it sir.

IPO: What can you say about it then?

JIDE: I suspect Raymond sir. I think he should be able to explain why he came home lately on that night.

IPO: Oh you want to shift it on Raymond so as to get yourself and Solo out of this mess?

JIDE: No sir, not to get myself free. The reason is that Raymond loves food so much. Despite the fact that he spearheaded the cooking of the night of Manchester United versus Real Madrid match, he did not eat the food. In fact, the food nearly ran Solo to something else. And apart from this, he came home lately that night.

In the above dialogue, Jide gives a valuable piece of information which could have illuminated the darkness in the case. He however wisely keeps it to himself until he and the IPO were left alone on the corridor. Had these suspects not been separated, each of them would have kept what he understands about the case to himself. They do things together, so, it will be difficult for them to be revealing each other's secret in such a situation. These suspects withhold the valuable piece of information they have on the issue. This shows the expression of traditional politeness. Hence, face saving act is maintained while in the police custody and will still be maintained outside the police custody by these men who are seen as suspects.

Postmodern politeness

Instances of postmodern politeness are evident in the Data 4 and 5 below.

Datum 4

IPO: Good morning sir

CEO: Good morning officers. How are you doing?

IPO: We are fine, thank you; and you sir?

CEO: I am fine, thank you. Have your seats.

IPO: We got your message sir.

CEO: Yes officer, I indeed sent for you.

IPO: OK, and that is why we are here sir.

CEO: Thank you officers

IPO: No mention

CEO: You see, something happened in my company from which I want you to help me out....as police officers, I believe this will be among one of the simplest cases you can handle. And I will be very much happy if you could do this for me on time. I want to see the face of the criminal, who has done this. Please, I so much rely on you on this matter. So, please help me go there and carry out your investigations. You see, I am begging you as one who can illuminate this black out.

IPO: Sir, is that all you want?

CEO: Ok, plus one more thing, I want the criminal to be uncovered soon. I mean very soon.

IPO: That is no problem, you just trust us. We promise to handle this more than your expectation, and believe us, we shall positively surprise you.

CEO: Thank you officers, I so much respect your confidence.

The above conversation is a dialogue between the IPO and the CEO of the company. It is evident in the dialogue that the CEO was the one who invited the officers. The police officers know the CEO as a rich, noble and high ranked man in the society who they highly respected. On the other hand, the CEO sees the officers as professionals and responsible men who are competent to carry out the duty of revealing the hidden facts about the matter. Thus, a high sense of politeness is displayed from the beginning to the end of the conversation. The CEO and the police officers thus use expressions like 'officers' and 'sir' as respect markers for each other respectively.

Datum 5

IPO: Good afternoon sir.

MANAGER: Good afternoon gentlemen. How may I help you?

IPO: (*He does the introduction*) I am Officer Kingsley and here is my second, Officer Monday (*They shake hands with each other*)

MANAGER: Ok...you are highly welcomed. My boss had called and told me before this time that you would show up any moment from then. Once again, thanks for honouring our call. Sit down.

IPO: You see, whenever we hear this kind of a call, we always feel excited, because, that is what we are being paid for, so, no mention (*He clears his throat with a slight cough*). Now to business, your boss called us yesterday and explained an issue to us. But you see, as the manager of this place, we would like to hear the original side of the story from you.

Datum 5 above is a dialogue between the IPO and the manager of the company. The conversation portrays a good display of postmodern politeness. The speakers are on seat while the conversation was going on. The manager was not by any means embarrassed; rather, he was addressed respectfully by the police officers, though not as highly esteemed as the CEO was. The use of 'sir' is less frequent than in the conversation with the CEO.

Another form of postmodern politeness is noticeable in the dialogue below, when the third party, who was not physically present was mentioned. This is typically seen in where the manager vouches for the trust of Solo, one of the suspects, who was with the site key as at when the act of burglary was carried out. The IPO and manager's conversations are copied out below:

Datum 6

IPO: Who did you ask to collect the key from the security man?

MANAGER: Solo

IPO: What can you say about his sincerity?

MANAGER: I do not need to fight for anybody in this matter though, all I know is that Solo is very sincere. With the situation of things on ground, the manager was still able to defend Solo. This shows the level of respect the manager has for Solo. Despite Solo's absence, the manager still speaks in his favour.

This is a demonstration of postmodern politeness.

Deference

Instances of deferential marking occur in Datum 4 above. The conversation opens with greeting and the use of honorific expressions "sir" and "officer". These terms were repeated from the beginning to the end of the conversation. Datum 5 presents other instances of deferential marking. The participants meet for the first time and display high sense of mutual respect for each other. The IPO greets the manager with "good afternoon sir" and the manager replies with "good afternoon gentlemen". The manager did not downgrade the police officers because he is the manager of the company or older than the officers. Likewise, the officers did not use their position as police personnel to greet him without courtesy. Both parties operated at the level of deference maintenance. The police officers repeatedly addressed the CEO and the manager with the expression 'sir' while the CEO and the manager in turn addressed the police as "officers".

Deixis in the Interrogations

The summary of deictic markers used in the seven interrogations is presented in Tables 1 to 7 below.

Table 1: Summary of Deictic Markers in Dialogue 1

TURN	DEIXIS		
	PERSON	PLACE	TIME
1	Sir (CEO)		Morning
2	You (officers)		
3	We (officers) You (directors)		
4	I (director) You (officer)	Office (CEO's office)	
5	We (officers)		
6	You (officers)		
7	You (officer)		
8	I (director) You (officer) Me(director) Manager He (manager) Police officer	My company (CEO's company) There (the site)	Before this time Yesterday 8am On time
9	You		
10	I (director)		
11	Us (the officers referring to themselves)		
12	You (officer) I (director) Your (officer)		

Table 2: Summary of Deictic Markers in Dialogue 2

	DEIXIS		
	PERSON	PLACE	TIME
1	Sir(manager)		Afternoon
2	Gentlemen (officers) I (manager)	The place (the site)	Afternoon Here
3	I (IPO)		Before this time
4	You (police officers) My boss (director's)		Once again Any moment from

5	You(manager) We (officers) Your boss (director's) Us (officers) You (manager) Manager	Wednesday My office, here	Now Whenever A day before yesterday Before Immediately
6	You (officer) Wednesday I (manager) Mr seriki (gate keeper) His(Mr. seriki) He (Mr. seriki) Me (the manager) Him (manager) Himself(manager) Solo (one of the suspects) He (solo) My (the manager) We (the entire staff of the company)	Our site	Following morning
7	You (manager)		
8	You (manager) People Them		
9	Nobody Mr seriki(security man) Who Our(manager referring to (director's) Security man Me (manager)		
10	Security man	Where	Now
11	He (security man)	Hospital Where	
12	You (manager) Him (security man)		
13	He (security) Us		Past fifteen years
14	Who You(IPO referring to manager) Security man		
15	Solo		
16	You (manager)		
17	I (manager referring to himself) Anybody Solo		

18	You(manager) Them (the suspected man) We(officers) I (IPO) Us (officers)		
19	Gentlemen (suspected guys) I (IPO referring to himself) Officer Kingsley You (the suspected men) Persons Men (the suspected men)		Morning
20	Tunde (officer II) I (officer tuned referring to himself) You (officer tuned referring to the accused men) We (All the participants)		
21	You Your We Them	The station	Immediately Now

Table 3: Summary of Deictic Markers in Dialogue 3

TURNS	PERSON	PLACE	TIME
1	Who You people (IPO referring to the accused men) I (IPO referring to himself)	Site	Once again Recent
2	We (the accused men referring to themselves)		
3	I (IPO referring to himself)	Site	
4	Your (IPO addressing the suspects)		Now
5	I (IPO referring to himself) You people (IPO addressing the accused men)		
6	Sergeant Me (IPO referring to himself) Them (IPO to the accused men)	Cells	

Table 4: Summary of Deictic Markers in Interrogation 4

TURNS	PERSON	PLACE	TIME
1	You people (IPO addressing to accused men)	The site where	After, last Wednesday
2	We (Solo referring to themselves) He (Solo referring to Raymond)	The site home	After When There
3	You (Solo and Jide)		Now
4	You (IPO referring to solo and Jide)	Where	When
5	We (the suspected men) My (Solo) Raymond I (Solo) Him(Raymond) He (Raymond)	Where	immediately
6	We (Solo referring to Jide, Raymond & himself) No one		
7	You (IPO referring to the accused men)		After
8	We, (Jide referring to themselves) Manchester United Real Madrid Me (Jide referring to himself) You (Solo addressing the IPO) Any fan		
9	You (IPO addressing Solo)	View centre	After
10	You	View centre	Around
11	You	Home	Immediately
12	I	Home	
13	Raymond		
14	I		
15	You (Solo) Raymond		Exactly
16	We He	Outside	Immediately After
17	Your		When
18	People I (Solo) He (Raymond)	Another place	

19	Me (IPO) You (Solo) I (IPO)		
20	Sir		
21	Me		
22	Who (the suspects) Your (Solo)		
23	Sir My (Solo himself) Raymond		
24	You (Solo) Raymond Him (Raymond)		
25	Me (Solo) Him (Raymond) I (Solo) His (Raymond) He (Raymond)		

Table 5: Summary of Deictic Markers in Dialogue 5

TURNS	PERSON	PLACE	TIME
1	Jide You (Jide)		
2	I (Jide) You (IPO)		
3	You (Jide) Me (IPO)		
4	You		
5	Sir (IPO) I (Jide)		
6	You (Jide)		
7	I (Jide)		
8	You (the IPO referring to the accused men)		
9	We (the accused)		
10	I (Jide)		That night
11	Manchester united Real. Madrid (team of players)		
12	You (Jide alone)		

13	I (Jide)	Viewing centre junction	First half break
14	You (Jide) Your friends(solo and Raymond)		
15	we (Jide, solo and Raymond) each of us (each of the suspects) him	At home	
16	You (Jide) Your friends(solo and Raymond)	Home	After the match
17	Solo I (Jide)	Home	
18	You (Jide) Man U (term of players) Chelsea (team of players) Someone (indefinite pronoun) Who That person		2009
19	Ramires		
20	Man U (Team of players) Real Madrid (a team of players) Someone (indefinite pronoun who		
21	Nani (one of Man U players) Sergio Ramos (one of Madrid players)	left flank	
22	You (Jide) Me (IPO) You people (the accused men)	Home	
23	You (jide)	Viewing house	Before
24	Solo My (Jide) He (Solo) Himself (Solo) I(Jide) Raymond Him (Raymond)	In the room all around	The night following meaning 5.30 before then an hour

25	He (Raymond) You (Jide)	Where	when
26	He (Raymond)	Toilet	
27	You (Jide) Him (Raymond)		
28	Sir (Raymond) I (Jide)		
29	You (Jide) Him (Raymond)		
30	He (Raymond) I (jide)		Night Once
31	I (IPO) You (Jide) The (Solo)		
32	Sir (IPO) Everybody (indefinite pronoun used for the staff in the site) Solo The manager		
33	You (IPO referring to Jide)		
34	I (Jide referring to himself)		
35	You (Ipo referring to Jide)		
36	I (Jide referring to himself) Raymond He (Raymond)	Home	Lately that night
37	You (Ipo referring to Jide) Raymond Yourself (IPO referring to Jide) Solo (one of the accused men)		
38	Sir (Jide referring to IPO) Myself (Jide referring to himself) Raymond (one of the accused men) He (Raymond) Man U Real Madrid Teams of players Solo (one of the accused men)		Night

From the above table, the time of interaction, participants involved and the places where the interactions took place are clearly expressed.

Face Threatening Acts in the Interrogations

In Datum 1, the IPO interrogated the suspects with a threatening tone. This, without any doubt will reflect in his face. The question “who among you knows anything about the stolen materials in your site?” is not only an insulting question but also a direct attack on the personalities of these men. This approach employed by the IPO makes the interrogation different from the conversation between the IPO and the CEO or the manager. The use of “once again” by the IPO to emphasize his question shows the power he has over the men who are seen as the suspects. Another high display of threat features in the IPO’s utterances when these accused men refused to supply any fact in answer to the question he asks. This leads the IPO to ask them two harsh questions - “Can’t you talk?”; “Are you deaf?” These questions resulted to trembling in the voices of these accused men when answering. The police use strategies to deduce facts from accused persons. One of these strategies was demonstrated when the IPO brought out a broken stick to scare the suspects. He even goes further commanding the suspects to go on their knees. Positive face threatening acts are evident in the utterances of the IPO.

In Datum 3, the first utterance made by the IPO is merely an assumption. But, this assumption constitutes an attack to Jide who is being interrogated. Hence, the IPO wants to use this assumption alongside a threat to deduce facts about the case from the accused person. These utterances convey negative face threatening acts. They cause damage to the hearer (who in this case is Jide). The last utterance “and you had better talk now before I drive the hell from you” signals the professional control the IPO has to impose punishment on Jide who as at then was an accused person in the police custody. ‘Hell’ in the utterance symbolizes threat which the IPO was ready to expose Jide in order to obtain facts needed from him. By ‘hell’, the IPO implies torture, punishment and grievance. In the conversation below, the IPO threatens Raymond to say the truth about the matter.

Datum 7

IPO: Raymond

Raymond: Sir

IPO: Why did you get that question wrong?

Raymond: Actually..., actually...

IPO: Where were you during the second half?

Raymond: I was at the view centre

IPO:
you?

Liar! you bloody

Raymond: I was at the view centre

In Datum 7 above, the IPO speaks with aggressive tone. The utterances of the IPO indicate that he considers Raymond the prime suspect and not Solo who holds the site key. This is evident in the way he carries out his interrogations. He uses coercive power in his interaction with Raymond. This is also obvious in the conversation below.

Datum 8

IPO: ... bloody liar! talk now before I break your head. Where were you?

Raymond: I was at the Vi...

(The IPO strikes the broken stick on Raymond's head and slapped him several times)

IPO: Now, put your legs on this table *(He brought out a bar)* I am going to teach you lesson with this

Raymond: *(Shouted)* let me talk! I can explain!

At this juncture, some damage has been done through negative face threatening act. As a result of Raymond's failure to confess, the IPO commits himself to what he does not want to do by applying torture during the interrogation even though the IPO does not intend to harm any of the suspects.

FINDINGS

Police investigations are often faulted on account of some false premises. The first presumes that any crime suspect is guilty, Inbau et al (2001). Second is that suspects will unilaterally deny any wrong doing, Redlich & Meissner (2009), and third that police officers can never lie, Mince-Didier, A. (2021). As a result of these suppositions, a number of controversies have been canvassed against the police interrogation techniques bordering on false confessions, detection of deception and the use of obnoxious tactics, such as confronting suspects with guilt and disallowing denials, questioning suspects for long periods, presenting false evidence, and minimizing responsibility. Redlich & Meissner (2009), therefore, canvassed for the use of electronic gadgets in the documentation and preservation of interviews and interrogations from start to finish. This is a reform that is relatively simple to implement and can serve to protect both law enforcement and suspects, eliminating some of the problems often

encountered in criminal law and criminology. Other modern interrogation approaches can be found in Allan (2009) and Amanda (2009).

One of the findings of this study is that embedded in the three techniques of police interview of crime suspects is the use pragmatic tools to deduce facts from suspects and other interviewees. Another finding is that there is abundant evidence that many crime suspects are not aware of the motives of police interrogation, and how to protect their rights.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main purpose of any police examination of a crime suspect is to get the correct information about the crime committed. The success of this depends largely on the dexterity of the police officer handling the investigation. Four pragmatic features - politeness, deixis, face threatening and face saving acts - were examined in this study.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that the training of police interrogators include exposure to different pragmatic strategies to enhance their duties of crime investigation. It is also recommended that authorities and professional practitioners in justice administration put in place an enlightenment campaign to educate people, most especially, crime suspects and provide free legal assistance to accused persons who are unable to foot the bills for hiring an advocate. This is in tandem with the views of Inbau (1961) and Mince-Didier, A. (2021).

Future researches are also recommended to explore how preconceived notions work in police interrogation of accused persons and the effects of non-verbal and paraverbal communication on the interrogation of accused persons by the police.

REFERENCES

Allan, B. U. (2009) "Modern Police Interrogation Techniques".

News.everest.edu/post/2009/06

Amanda, K. (2009) Comparing Different Methods of Police Interrogation.

[www.lagalsource360.com>Home>policeand](http://www.lagalsource360.com/Home>policeand) prisons

Brown, P. and Levinson SC. 1987. Politeness: Some universals in language usage.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denham, K., and Lobeck, A. (2013). Linguistics for Everyone. An Introduction.

Wadsworth.

Goffman E. (1967). Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. New York:

Anchor

- Green C. 1996. *Language and address reality*. London: Longman.
- Grice, H. P. (1989) *Studies in the way of Words*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press. <http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/politeness-theory>.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, 2 (01), pp. 45-79.
- Inbau, F. E. (1961). Police Interrogation - A Practical Necessity. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 89(4), 1403-1412.
- Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., Buckley, J. P. & Jayne, B.C. (2001). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (4th ed.). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publishers, Inc
- Leech, G. N. (1983) *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G.N and Short, M.H. (1987) *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Prose*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (2001) *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mince-Didier, A. (2021). Tactics Police Use to Get a Confession. <https://www.criminaldefenselawyer.com/resources/criminal-defense/defendants-rights/tactics-police-use-get-a-confession> (downloaded 10 December, 2021).
- Odebunmi, A. 2009. "Politeness in Print Media Political Interviews in Nigeria". *California Linguistic Notes* . XXXIV (1): 1-26. USA.
- Orlando, J. (2014). *Interrogation Techniques*. <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2014/rpt/2014-R-0071.htm> (Downloaded 10 December, 2021).
- Osisanwo, W. (2003). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics* 1st Edition. Lagos: Femolous-Fetop Publishers.
- Redlich, A. D., & Meissner, C. A. (2009). Techniques and controversies in the interrogation of suspects: The artful practice versus the scientific study. In J. L. Skeem (Ed.) & K. S. Douglas & S. O. Lilienfeld (Ed.), *Psychological science in the courtroom: Consensus and controversy* (pp. 124–148). The Guilford Press.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

John E. Reid and Associates, Inc. website: <http://www.reid.com/>

College of Policing, Authorised Professional Practice, Investigation: Investigative Interviewing, available at [http://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/investigations/investigative-interviewing](http://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/investigations/investigative-interviewing/#peace-framework) /#peace-framework.