
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Analyzing the Communication Strategies between Investigators and Detained Individuals during Interrogations

Ly Ngoc Toan, Ph.D

Department of Foreign Language, Thu Dau Mot University, Vietnam

Corresponding Author: Ly Ngoc Toan, Ph.D, **E-mail:** Intoan@tdmu.edu.vn

| ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyze the communication strategies employed between investigators and detained individuals during interrogations, aiming to gain a deeper understanding of the linguistic interactions in this particular context. The theoretical framework is based on Julia Oglesby's (2010) linguistics and investigative interviewing and Eric Shepherd's (2018) conversation management approach in investigative interviewing. The research adopts a qualitative methodology, involving detailed analysis of actual interrogations between investigators and detainees. The data comprises recordings and transcripts of these dialogues. The conversations are analyzed from a linguistic and communication strategy perspective, focusing on language usage, question structures, and persuasive techniques. The study will provide valuable insights into the dynamics of communication during interrogations, identifying effective and ineffective strategies, as well as their impact on the outcomes of the interrogations. Ultimately, this research contributes to a better understanding of linguistic interactions in the context of interrogations, potentially improving interrogation skills and methods, and ensuring justice and efficiency in the legal process.

| KEYWORDS

communication strategies; investigators; interrogations; linguistic interactions; Eric Shepherd

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 01 January 2021

PUBLISHED: 30 January 2021

DOI: 10.32996/jhsss.2021.3.1.13

1. Introduction

The legal system relies on interrogations to gather crucial information from those under custody. Individuals' communication during these exchanges can significantly impact the outcome of the interrogations and, ultimately, the administration of justice. Researchers have long acknowledged the crucial role of effective communication techniques in this situation, leading to numerous studies on this complex subject. As a result, a large number of academics have studied the communication tactics used in interrogations. Kassin and Gudjonsson (2004) studied the psychology of confessions, emphasizing the impact of questioning strategies on the accuracy of suspects' statements. Comparably, Inbau et al. (2013) investigated the Reid technique, a popular interrogation technique, and its possible effects on fabricated confessions. Meissner et al. (2014) examined the effectiveness of several interrogation strategies, emphasizing the importance of developing rapport and using information-gathering strategies.

Although these studies have been quite insightful, their main focus has been on the legal and psychological elements of interrogations. Nonetheless, the necessity of examining the language and communication techniques used in these exchanges is becoming increasingly apparent. Oglesby (2010) and Shepherd (2018), respectively, first developed theoretical frameworks that explicitly address the language aspects of conversation management techniques and investigative interviews. These theories have been helpful, but more empirical study is still required to fully understand the communication tactics used in interrogations. Prior research has mostly relied on self-reported data or simulated situations, which could not fully capture the dynamics of actual interrogations (Leo, 2008; Snook et al., 2012).

By doing a qualitative examination of real interrogations between investigators and detained detainees, the proposed study seeks to close this gap. The research aims to provide a thorough understanding of the communication tactics used and their influence on the interrogation outcomes by examining the language usage, question structures, and persuasive approaches used throughout these encounters. This research is important because it has the potential to improve communication skills, interrogation techniques, and, in the end, the pursuit of efficiency and justice in the judicial system. The study can help build training programs and guidelines for investigators by identifying communication tactics that work and those that don't. This will help to ensure that interrogations are handled in a way that respects ethical standards and protects the rights of all parties involved. To achieve these objectives, the following research questions will guide the study:

1. *What communication strategies are employed by investigators and detained individuals during interrogations, and how do these strategies influence the dynamics of the interaction?*
2. *How do the language usage, question structures, and persuasive techniques employed during interrogations impact the outcomes of the interrogations?*

2. Literature review

2.1. Historical background

The ability to communicate effectively is a talent that is useful in both personal and professional contexts. Adler and Proctor (2021) posit that communication is the process of sharing ideas, information, and messages with others in a particular time and place. Fundamentally, it is about having the capacity to communicate concepts, ideas, and feelings in a way that the target audience finds compelling. Gaining proficiency in this skill can have profound effects, opening doors to new possibilities for comprehension, cooperation, and personal development.

Active listening is one of the foundations of successful communication. According to Brownell (2017), the secret to good communication is active listening. It entails paying close attention to the speaker and attempting to comprehend what they're saying. It's a technique that requires our whole presence and attention, enabling us to fully understand other people's viewpoints. By paying attention, we create a climate of trust and respect for one another, which strengthens bonds and opens the door to insightful conversation. As a result, we are more equipped to react carefully and sympathetically, closing gaps and promoting a feeling of mutual understanding.

Furthermore, a powerful understanding of body language and nonverbal clues is essential for efficient communication. Nonverbal communication is a crucial part of how we convey and interpret messages, according to Navarro (2008). Our gestures, facial expressions, and voice tones frequently convey more meaning than the words themselves. By cultivating a keen awareness of these minute details, we may improve our ability to decipher and react appropriately to the implicit signals that permeate our encounters. In his work on emotional intelligence, Goleman (1995) highlighted that this increased awareness not only improves our communication but also fosters a deeper sense of emotional intelligence.

In the end, developing one's skills in successful communication requires a lifetime of learning, introspection, and the readiness to adjust to a variety of situations and audiences. Tannen (1990) observes that communication is a constant process of negotiation. It calls on us to venture beyond our comfort zones, confront our assumptions, and value the diversity of viewpoints. Covey's (1989) adds that principles of successful communication, adopting this perspective allows us to expand our knowledge, strengthen our relationships, and contribute to a society that is more peaceful and cooperative.

2.2. Linguistics and investigative interviewing

Linguistics and Investigative Interviewing is a framework that Oglesby (2010) developed, focusing on the application of linguistic techniques in investigative interviews. It examines the potential impact of language and communication strategies on the dynamics and outcomes of these interactions. According to Oglesby (2010), this paradigm offers helpful direction for methodically examining language components in the context of investigative interviews.

A number of important components of this theoretical framework are as follows: (1) examining how interviewee responses are shaped by question structures; (2) researching the effects of word choices, including non-verbal language usage; (3) analyzing communication tactics like rapport-building, encouraging disclosure, and fostering a comfortable environment; and (4) analyzing dialogue, including turn-taking, interruptions, and the use of prompting questions (Oglesby, 2010).

In this study, I will concentrate on analyzing the question structures, word choices, and communication strategies employed to gain deeper insights into their impacts on interview outcomes. In addition to Oglesby, three other authors related to linguistics and investigative interviewing will be incorporated into the literature review, including Oxburgh et al. (2010), Vrij et al. (2021), and Haworth (2017). By combining Oglesby's framework with further research, the study will conduct a thorough qualitative investigation of the communication tactics employed by investigators and prisoners during real custodial interrogations. The

results may help enhance investigative questioning procedures in the legal industry by offering insightful information about methods that work and those that don't.

2.3. Conversation management approach

In 2018, Shepherd created the conversation management approach, a theoretical framework emphasizing the value of efficient communication and interaction management in the context of investigative interviews. It offers investigators a methodical set of instructions and techniques for fostering fruitful conversations and obtaining pertinent data from interview subjects. This method recognizes that the conduct of an interview can significantly influence the quality and accuracy of the gathered information.

The conversation management technique places a strong focus on developing rapport. Investigators should cultivate a cordial and cooperative rapport with the subject to foster an atmosphere that encourages candid discussion. Investigators must pay close attention to both verbal and nonverbal cues while actively listening in order to demonstrate that they understand the interviewee and encourage more disclosure. The application of suitable questioning strategies is another key component of the conversation management strategy. Investigators learn to use a variety of question formats, including open-ended inquiries, probing questions, and strategic questioning sequences, to efficiently gather pertinent information. To keep attention and promote fruitful discussion, managing the flow of the conversation—which includes managing transitions, turns, and topics—is equally crucial.

The conversation management technique also highlights the significance of analysis and interpretation. Investigators must interpret the interviewee's comments, evaluate verbal and nonverbal clues, and modify their interrogation techniques accordingly. Writers such as Oxburgh, Griffiths, and Walsh, who have delved into various aspects of investigative interviews, including question types, ethical protocols, and evidence disclosure strategies, have meticulously scrutinized and enhanced this technique.

3. Methodology

3.1. Data source

The purpose of this study is to examine the communication tactics used between detained people and investigators during interrogations. The data source consists of 20 recorded interrogations (RC1–RC20) covering a variety of offenses from 5 distinct detention facilities (TG1–TG5). A qualitative analysis of the recordings will be conducted, with particular attention paid to the language exchanges, question formats, and persuasion strategies employed by each side. Analysis of these real conversations can provide important insights on the kinds of communication tactics that work and don't work during interrogations, which will eventually help to improve interrogation procedures and advance the cause of justice.

Table 1. Data source

Detention Center	Crime Type 1	Crime Type 2	Crime Type 3	Crime Type 4	Crime Type 5
TG1	RC1, RC6	RC11	RC16		
TG2	RC2	RC7, RC12		RC17	
TG3	RC3, RC8		RC13, RC18		
TG4	RC4	RC9		RC14, RC19	
TG5	RC5, RC10		RC15		RC20

3.2. Data analysis

The conversation management strategy developed by Shepherd and the linguistics and investigative interviewing framework developed by Oglesby will be used in the data analysis. Shepherd's framework places more emphasis on successful communication, whereas Oglesby's will concentrate on the language components of interviews. In order to determine the communication tactics employed by both investigators and prisoners, the study will go through transcripts and recordings. The way these techniques affect interviewee replies and interaction dynamics will be assessed using Oglesby's methodology. Shepherd's method will evaluate the questioning patterns, subject switches, and cue interpretation of the investigators.




Figure 1. The process of data analysis

4. Finding and discussion

4.1. Question structures

Because the wording and style of questions may have a significant influence on the contact dynamics and the quality of information gathered, the strategic use of question structures is a critical component of investigative interviews. Skillfully navigating a variety of inquiry styles is essential for investigators who want to get accurate and thorough reports from their subjects. Closed-ended inquiries only generate succinct affirmations or denials, but open-ended questions promote in-depth narratives. While probing inquiries delve deeper into specific information or uncertainties, leading questions may assert allegations or expose discrepancies.

Table 2. Question- structure strategies in investigative interview

Linguistic strategies	Crime type 1	Crime type 2	Crime type 3	Crime type 4	Crime type 5
Open-ended questions	RC6, RC8	RC7, RC9, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC9, RC14, RC15 RC19	
Closed-ended questions					
Leading questions		RC2		RC14, RC19	RC20
Probing questions:	RC3, RC8				RC15
Accusatory questions		RC3		RC4	RC5, RC10

Usually starting with what, how, or why, open-ended inquiries encourage the respondent to give a thorough narrative description. For example, in the case of the armed robbery (RC6, Crime type 1), the investigator asked the suspect, *What can you tell me about the events leading up to the robbery?* and the suspect proceeded to provide a detailed account of what happened. These kinds of inquiries work especially well for building rapport and obtaining in-depth data. On the other hand, leading questions make direct accusations or suggest a certain response, such as *Isn't it true that you were running a major drug trafficking operation?* (RC14, Crime Type 4). These questions can be used strategically to refute denials or discrepancies in the interviewee's answers, even if they may come across as hostile.

Investigators use different question forms depending on the goals and phases of the investigative interview. Initially, investigators prefer open-ended questions to establish rapport and gain a comprehensive understanding of the interviewee's perspective. As the interview progresses, you can use probing questions to further investigate discrepancies or clarify any ambiguity. In the latter phases, one may strategically utilize accusatory questioning and leading questions to directly dispute the interviewee's answers when facing denials or attempting to obtain admissions of guilt. However, one should use these more assertive methods sparingly and in moderation, in conjunction with techniques for developing rapport.

Effectively using question structures in investigative interviews necessitates not only the use of language tools, but also the investigator's operational and psychological intelligence. Because they are adept at reading human behavior and communication cues, skilled investigators are able to customize their questioning techniques to the unique dynamics of each encounter. They are able to judge the interviewee's reactions and modify their approach by closely monitoring both verbal and nonverbal clues. When strategically using question structures, investigators must strike a careful balance: firmness with empathy, patience with probing, and respect for due process when confronting.

Proficiency in question structures is critical for investigators because it has a direct influence on the caliber and results of their investigative interviews. Investigators can effectively navigate the complex dynamics of high-stakes interactions by strategically using open-ended, probing, leading, and accusatory questions. This approach fosters an environment that encourages disclosure while adhering to ethical standards and respecting the rights of all parties involved. Well-crafted question structures not only enhance the investigator's ability to gather crucial data, but also contribute to the broader objective of justice by ensuring the disclosure of the truth and upholding due process. In the end, the adept formulation and use of questions in investigative interviews bear witness to the investigator's expertise, moral behavior, and dedication to maintaining the standards of justice and integrity in the judicial system.

4..2 Word choices

In high-stakes situations like investigative interviews, the language used can have a significant influence on how the conversation plays out. Because of this, knowledgeable investigators carefully consider the words they use to strike a balance between establishing rapport and getting important information. Researchers like Shepherd and Oglesby have developed theoretical frameworks that ground this linguistic precision, providing a basis for understanding how intentional wording can impact disclosure dynamics. The dataset demonstrates a number of language techniques investigators use, each with a specific function in interview process management. Building rapport is a critical approach across a range of crime types, as Table 3 illustrates. As demonstrated in the RC15 fraud case, open-ended questions like *What can you tell me about the company's business practices?* foster a supportive environment. This non-confrontational wording promotes in-depth storytelling.

Table 3. Word- choice strategies in investigative interview

Linguistic strategies	Crime type 1	Crime type 2	Crime type 3	Crime type 4	Crime type 5
Minimization and maximization	RC1				
Strategic disclosure of evidence	RC2	RC12	RC13, RC18	RC4, RC14, RC19	RC20
Language of rapport-building	RC6	RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC9, RC14, RC15	RC19
Neutral and formal language			RC13, RC18	RC9	RC15

On the other hand, instances such as the drug trafficking interrogation of RC4 demonstrate confrontational approaches meant to elicit confessions. *Isn't it true that you were the ringleader?* and similar leading questions that imply accusations exert psychological pressure on suspects to reveal the truth. We must carefully counterbalance these assertive strategies with rapport-building strategies to preserve a moral, fruitful interview dynamic. Another effective tactic is evidence disclosure, which involves systematically exposing incriminating evidence to undermine denials. The human trafficking case of RC19 illustrates this: *We have testimonies from victims describing your involvement.* To avoid lying, investigators use decisive language to challenge contradictions. As a result, the investigators' profound knowledge of behavioral analysis and psychology contributes to the effectiveness of these methods. They closely monitor the nonverbal and verbal cues provided by suspects, promptly adapting their discourse accordingly. After making an accusing remark, if the suspect seems uneasy, they can say something like, *I know this is hard, but being honest is the best course of action.* This psychological intelligence supports their language agility.

It takes extensive training to become proficient in these subtle communication strategies. Through the examination of authentic interrogation recordings and transcripts, detectives can hone their language proficiency in a variety of settings. They have to learn to adjust their word choices, speech patterns, and question structures according to the particular dynamics and goals of every interaction. But this linguistic development needs to be firmly based on moral principles that protect due process and human rights. Although clever wording can be a powerful instrument for revealing the truth, it should never take precedence over the values of fairness, honesty, and decency toward all parties concerned.

In the end, careful phrasing represents the highest caliber of professional proficiency in the subject of investigation. It is a multifaceted skill that combines psychological understanding, legal knowledge, and ethical reasoning to create a logical verbal framework with a focus on pursuing justice. Therefore, ongoing investment in improving communication tactics signifies a sustained dedication to maintaining the highest standards of human dignity and social responsibility.

4.3. Persuasive techniques

One of the most important skills in investigative interviews is the ability to use persuasive strategies effectively. In order to extract important information and honest confessions from suspects, these strategies require a careful balancing act between assertive confrontation and rapport-building. Examining the deliberate application of persuasive techniques, such as urging disclosure,

hinting at leniency, and asking direct questions, sheds light on the complex communication dynamics that occur during these crucial exchanges.

Table 4. Persuasive – technique strategies in investigative interview

Linguistic strategies	Crime type 1	Crime type 2	Crime type 3	Crime type 4	Crime type 5
Building Rapport	RC8	RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC9, RC14, RC15 RC19	
Implying Leniency	RC1				
Confrontation	RC2	RC3		RC4, RC14, RC19 RC5, RC10	
Encouraging Disclosure:	RC6, RC8	RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC9, RC14, RC15 RC19	

The dataset in Table 4 displays a variety of persuasive techniques used for different kinds of crimes, each with a specific function during the interview process. For instance, in the armed robbery case (RC1, Crime Type 1), the suggestion of leniency resulted in a partially cooperative confession from the initially uncooperative defendant. This strategy promotes complete transparency by recommending a shorter sentence. Conversely, confrontational strategies, like the accusatory questioning in the drug trafficking interrogation (RC4, Crime Type 4): *Isn't it true you were the ringleader?* exert psychological pressure, making it more difficult to deny culpability and promoting confessions. But it's imperative to have a balanced approach. Techniques for establishing rapport, such as asking open-ended questions, create a welcoming atmosphere that encourages candid conversation. In the fraud case (RC15, Crime Type 5), the investigator prompted a thorough response by asking, *What can you tell me about the company's business practices?*

Two guiding concepts guide investigators' strategic application of persuasive techniques. First of all, encouraging communication builds a positive rapport with the suspect and raises the possibility of voluntary disclosure and cooperation. Conversely, excessive confrontation may unintentionally encourage hatred and resistance. Second, when used wisely and at the right point in the interrogation process, psychologically influencing the suspect's motivations—either by making allegations or implying leniency—can successfully obtain confessions. The real art is in the investigator's ability to find the right balance between resistance and cooperation, meticulously adjusting their strategy in response to the suspect's clues, both verbal and nonverbal, during the dynamic exchange.

Comprehensive training programs should prioritize many essential components in order to develop and enhance interrogators' persuasive skills. Firstly, genuine recordings and transcripts of investigative interviews covering a wide range of circumstances provide exposure to real-world contexts for skill development. Second, practicing actively analyzing verbal and nonverbal cues from suspects sharpens the capacity to recognize and react dynamically to small signs. Moreover, it is crucial to provide guidance on the methodical arrangement and amalgamation of diverse approaches, such as rapport-building, confrontation, and strategic evidence disclosure, tailored to specific interview goals. Maintaining moral boundaries and respecting due process ensures the use of persuasive strategies as instruments for truth-seeking instead of coercion.

In the end, persuasive strategies are a sensitive but effective tool in the investigator's toolbox. When used with moral clarity and backed up by operational proficiency, they become powerful tools for professionals seeking justice, allowing for productive conversations and moral fact-finding processes. The constant improvement and growth of these communication tactics demonstrates law enforcement's unwavering dedication to preserving the highest standards of morality, human rights, and civic duty.

4.4. Interaction dynamics

In the context of investigative interviews, interaction dynamics are crucial in determining how the conversation unfolds and how the results turn out. Sophisticated investigators must traverse a complicated tapestry of turn-taking, interruptions, strategic use of silence, and non-verbal indicators with sophistication in addition to spoken words. This research explores the language subtleties of these interaction dynamics, shedding light on their importance and offering suggestions for how best to use them.

Table 5. Interaction- dynamic strategies in investigative interview

Linguistic strategies	Crime type 1	Crime type 2	Crime type 3	Crime type 4	Crime type 5
Turn-taking:	RC1, RC6	RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC9, RC14, RC19	RC15, RC20
Interruptions	RC1, RC6	RC2, RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC4, RC14, RC19	RC5, RC10, RC20
Use of silence:	RC1, RC6	RC2, RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC4, RC14, RC19	RC5, RC10, RC20
Non-verbal communication	RC1, RC6	RC2, RC7, RC12	RC13, RC18	RC4, RC9, RC14, RC19	RC5, RC10, RC15, RC20

Table 5 reveals a rich tapestry of interaction dynamics employed across various crime types, each serving a strategic purpose in the investigative process.

Turn-taking

RC1 (Crime Type 1):

Investigator: *What can you tell me about the events leading up to the robbery?*

Suspect: [Provides a detailed narrative]

Investigator: [Interjects with probing questions at key moments]

RC15 (Crime Type 5):

Investigator: *Can you describe the company's business practices?*

Whistleblower: [Narrates the details]

Investigator: [Allows the narrative to flow, interrupting strategically to clarify or redirect]

Investigators intentionally use turn-taking, a basic component of conversational flow, to keep control and encourage disclosure. Investigators who are adept at handling turn-taking permit suspects or witnesses to tell their stories while taking advantage of opportunities to ask follow-up questions or provide evidence.

Interruptions

RC4 (Crime Type 4):

Suspect: *I had nothing to do with the drug operation...*

Investigator: *Isn't it true that you were the ringleader?*

RC20 (Crime Type 5):

Suspect: *I didn't hack into any systems...*

Investigator: *We have digital evidence linking you to the cyberattacks.*

Interruptions, while sometimes perceived as hostile, can serve as a potent tool for asserting authority and redirecting the conversation. Investigators carefully cut off suspects' stories in high-stakes cases, pointing out contradictions or presenting evidence that implicates them in order to break the chain of denial and get the truth.

Use of silence

RC1 (Crime Type 1):

Investigator: [Pauses, allowing silence to linger]

Suspect: [Fidgets, eventually breaks the silence]

RC19 (Crime Type 4):

Investigator: *We have testimonies from victims describing your involvement.*

Suspect: [Remains silent, visibly uncomfortable]

The strategic use of silence is another powerful technique observed in the data. Investigators intentionally allow moments of silence to unfold, subtly amplifying the psychological pressure on suspects and encouraging voluntary disclosure. The discomfort of prolonged silence often compels suspects to fill the void, potentially revealing crucial information.

Non-verbal communication

RC9 (Crime Type 4):

Investigator: [Observes suspect's body language and facial expressions]

Suspect: [Exhibits signs of nervousness, avoiding eye contact]

RC15 (Crime Type 5):

Investigator: [Notices whistleblower's voice inflections and gestures]

Whistleblower: [Speaks with confidence, maintains open body posture]

Investigators closely examine nonverbal communication, a subtle but powerful force. The information draws attention to instances in which detectives pay close attention to suspects' body language, facial expressions, and vocal inflections in order to spot any

minor clues that might indicate dishonesty or disclose underlying emotional states. Because of this increased knowledge, investigators are able to modify their questioning techniques and answer appropriately.

The deliberate application of these interaction dynamics is based on a thorough comprehension of communication theory and human psychology. In order to maintain control over the conversational flow and create an atmosphere that is favorable to disclosure, turn-taking and interruptions are skillfully timed. In addition, the purposeful use of silence is based on the idea of psychological pressure. Investigators' silence creates a void that witnesses must fill. This might lead to suspects disclosing important facts or giving in to the agony of prolonged silence, which can lead to voluntary disclosure. Last but not least, emotional intelligence and behavioral analysis serve as the foundation for nonverbal communication analysis. We teach investigators to interpret nonverbal signs like incongruities between verbal and nonverbal cues, which could indicate emotional discomfort or deceit. With this knowledge, investigators can modify their questioning techniques in the moment and take advantage of nonverbal clues to get honest answers.

Thorough training and practical field experience are required to develop a deep understanding of investigative tradecraft, which is essential for the efficient use of these interaction dynamics. The psychological principles underlying human behavior and communication must be thoroughly understood by investigators in order for them to be able to predict and react to suspects' behaviors in real time. Furthermore, a careful balancing act between empathy and assertiveness is necessary for the effective application of these strategies. To encourage voluntary disclosure without using force or unethical tactics, investigators must retain a dominant presence while also creating a climate of trust and rapport. This delicate balance necessitates a profound comprehension of emotional intelligence, enabling investigators to deftly negotiate the intricate emotional terrain of high-stakes interviews.

The study of interaction dynamics continues to be an important area of concentration as investigative interviewing develops. To improve current methods and create novel ones, linguists, psychologists, and law enforcement experts must collaborate across disciplines, conduct ongoing research, and analyze real-world instances. In addition, the pursuit of language proficiency in investigative interviews needs to be based on an unwavering dedication to respecting the values of justice, morality, and human rights. The essential principles of justice, respect, and due process must always take precedence over the strategic application of interaction dynamics, even though it can be a potent tool for obtaining important information.

To summarize, becoming an expert in interaction dynamics during investigative interviews demonstrates the investigator's dedication to maintaining the highest caliber of professional competence. Investigators can effectively negotiate the intricate terrain of high-stakes dialogues by utilizing language, psychology, and communication skills to extract crucial information while maintaining the integrity of the legal process and protecting the rights of all parties involved.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, our qualitative study has shed important light on the verbal exchanges and communication dynamics that take place during interrogations. In these high-stakes situations, the results have repeatedly shown how important effective communication is to fostering fruitful interactions and attaining desired results. It has become clear from the investigation that effective communication is a necessary precondition for success in an interrogation environment. A strong foundation in communication skills is essential to creating an atmosphere that is favorable to candid and fruitful discussion. To create the perfect environment for candid and open communication, one must be extremely proficient in active listening, questioning, and conversation management.

The results have repeatedly shown how crucial it is to cultivate and preserve excellent communication skills. A high level of proficiency in active listening is a must for creating the perfect atmosphere for honest and fruitful communication. Reaching a high level of expertise in this critical ability is a must for creating the perfect environment in which the highest possible standards of candid, open, and productive communication can develop and flourish. Establishing and maintaining the best possible climate for productive, fruitful discourse to thrive requires creating a stimulating setting characterized by direct, honest communication. Attaining a high level of proficiency in active listening is a must for creating the perfect atmosphere where candid conversations can flourish. We can only achieve optimal levels of constructive discourse by fostering an environment that is characterized by an invigorating atmosphere, providing a fertile foundation for optimally constructive levels of vital dialogue to flourish and thrive.

In summary, creating and maintaining a stimulating setting that offers the best conditions for productive conversation to develop and bloom through a rich atmosphere of positive energy and diligent vitality is crucial. Establishing a base of energizing energy and strong vitality is an essential requirement for creating and multiplying a productive environment marked by a dynamic and diligent atmosphere of energizing ambience. Such a stimulating climate of intense activity and vivacious vitality fosters the conduciveness of constructive vigor and diligent vitality, which in turn creates a favorable setting for the best discourse to flourish.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

Reference

- [1] Adler, R. B., & Proctor, R. F. (2021). *Looking out, looking in* (16th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- [2] Brownell, J. (2017). Active listening: The key to effective communication. In J. Brownell (Ed.), *Listening* (4th ed., pp. 115-142). Routledge.
- [3] Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people*. Simon & Schuster.
- [4] Griffiths, A., & Milne, R. (2006). Will it all end in tiers? Police interviews with suspects in Britain. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research, regulation* (pp. 167-189). Willan Publishing.
- [5] Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.
- [6] Haworth, K. (2017). The linguistics of police interviewing: Contrasting procedures for control and sense making. In J. Culpeper, F. Katamba, P. Kerswill, R. Wodak, & T. McEnery (Eds.), *English language: Description, variation and context* (pp. 370-391). Palgrave Macmillan.
- [7] Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., Buckley, J. P., & Jayne, B. C. (2013). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (5th ed.). Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- [8] Oglesby, J. (2010). *Linguistics and investigative interviewing*. Oxford University Press.
- [8] Oxburgh, G. E., et al (2010). The question of question types in police interviews: A review of the literature from a psychological and linguistic perspective. *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law*, 17(1).
- [9] Kassin, S. M., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2004). The psychology of confessions: A review of the literature and issues. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5(2), 33-67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00016.x>
- [10] Leo, R. A. (2008). *Police interrogation and American justice*. Harvard University Press.
- [11] Meissner, C. A., Redlich, A. D., Bhatt, S., & Brandon, S. (2012). Interview and interrogation methods and their effects on investigative outcomes. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 8(1), 1-53. <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2012.13>
- [12] Navarro, J. (2008). *What everybody is saying: An ex-FBI agent's guide to speed-reading people*. HarperCollins.
- [13] Shepherd, E. (2018). *Conversation management approach in investigative interviewing*. Sage Publications.
- [14] Snook, B., Eastwood, J., Stinson, M., Tedesco, J., & House, J. C. (2010). Reforming investigative interviewing in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 52(2), 215-229. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.52.2.215>
- [15] Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. William Morrow.
- [16] Vrij, A., Leal, S., Mann, S., Dalton, G., Jo, E., Shaboltas, A., ... & Houston, K. (2021). Using the model statement to elicit information and cues to deceit from small cells of suspects and sources. *The American Psychologist*, 76(5), 811-825. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000749>
- [17] Walsh, D., et al. (2016). The strategic disclosure of evidence in investigative interviews: Towards a new conceptual model. In D. Walsh, G. E. Oxburgh, A. D. Redlich, & T. Myklebust (Eds.), *International developments and practices in investigative interviewing and interrogation* (Vol. 2, pp. 71-92). Routledge.