Erring In Suspect Interviews: The Effects of Multiple Errors on Rapport, Trust, Perceived Communication Competence, and Willingness to Provide Information

Jana Louisa Schulte

s2279282

University of Twente

Faculty of Behavioural and Social Sciences

Section of Conflict, Risk, and Safety

Date: 01/07/2022

1st Supervisor: Dr Miriam S.D. Oostinga

2nd Supervisor: Dr Lynn Weiher

Abstract

Interviewing suspects is one of the most used methods in law enforcement to solve crimes. While communication errors by the suspect interviewers during interviews are almost inevitable, many professionals are not adequately trained for dealing with such errors, which is why they may significantly decrease an interview's effectiveness. While previous research has focused on the effects of one error on the interview's effectiveness, we added multiple errors and tested whether multiple errors decrease the effectiveness to a greater extent than one error. Therefore, this study focuses on the effects that one, as well as multiple errors, have on rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and a suspect's willingness to provide information. In this study, a between-group experiment was employed to test the effects of errors on the variables. In the experiment, the participants ($N = 92$) were given a scenario in which they were asked to imagine they had committed exam fraud and were interviewed about it. Afterwards, they were randomly allocated to one of three conditions (control, one error, and five errors) and were shown an interview video with an Examination Board member. The results showed that compared to the control condition, rapport, trust, and perceived communication competence significantly decreased in the five-error condition. Against our expectations, there were no significant differences between making zero or one error. Additionally, there were no effects found of errors on the participant's willingness to provide information. In praxis, these findings might be interesting for law enforcement officers to be better able to estimate the potential consequences of making a single error or multiple errors.

Keywords: investigative suspect interviews, suspect, rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, willingness to provide information, communication errors

Introduction

In criminal investigations, interviewing suspects is one of the most used methods by law enforcement to solve a crime. To do so, interviewers use different methods of gathering information, whereas the ultimate goals are usually a mere collection of information or obtaining confessions from suspects (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; Yarbrough, Hervé, & Harms, 2013). For an interview to be effective, there are several factors that need to be considered because they can determine how well a suspect interview goes. Crucial components that can make an interview effective are a good relationship and trust between the suspect and interviewer. Additionally, interview effectiveness can be seen by how competent in communication the suspect perceives the interviewer as well as the suspect's ultimate willingness to provide relevant information (Yarbrough et al., 2013). Naturally, there are factors that may undermine the effectiveness of interviews and can potentially decrease a good relationship, trust, perceived communication competence, or willingness to provide information. One of those factors may be communication errors made by the suspect interviewer during an interview (Yarbrough et al., 2013). Such errors are normal and almost inevitable but may prevent smooth communication between conversation partners (Clarke et al., 2011). Therefore, communication errors must be considered in suspect interviewing as well.

Communication errors may influence the relationship between the interviewer and suspect, yet many professionals are not adequately trained for the number of errors that might occur (Yarbrough et al., 2013). Refraining from interviewer bias or attentively listening to what the suspect has to say are examples of skills that suspect interviewers should possess to get the most out of an interview (Yarbrough et al., 2013). However, when suspect interviewers do not make use of these skills adequately, errors might happen. Although errors potentially have tremendous consequences, there has only been little research on communication errors in suspect interviewing. So far, there has been some research indicating that single errors already decrease a good relationship and trust between the suspect and suspect interviewer compared to when no error is made (Oostinga et al., 2018b; Yarbrough et al., 2013). Nevertheless, communication errors are not necessarily irreversible but can be repaired by using appropriate responses (e.g., accepting that an error was made or apologizing) (Oostinga et al., 2018b). While previous studies have focused on single errors, there is nothing known about how multiple errors affect an interview's effectiveness, yet. Therefore, this paper will focus on the effects that multiple errors have on the effectiveness of suspect interviews. In turn, this study might reveal whether there is an optimal number of

communication errors that can be made by the suspect interviewer during investigative suspect interviews without decreasing the interview's effectiveness, or whether there is a number of errors that should not be exceeded. The findings might be important for law enforcement officers to be better able to estimate the effects their errors have and how to counteract negative consequences.

In the upcoming sections, I will start to introduce the main technique of investigative suspect interviewing in Europe. Afterwards, I will clarify what communication errors in suspect interviews are, what variables can influence an interview's effectiveness, and how communication errors affect these variables (rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, willingness to provide information).

Investigative Suspect Interviews

Generally, suspect interviewing is a highly dynamic social interaction and comprises various interviewing techniques (Gudjonsson et al., 2011). One of the most commonly used techniques of investigative suspect interviewing in Europe is the PEACE model (Preparation and Planning, Engage and Explain, Account and Clarification, Closure, and Evaluation) which primarily focuses on gathering as much information as possible. To obtain as much and as reliable information as possible, investigative interviewers prepare before the interview and make themselves acquainted with all known information, while techniques like deceiving are not allowed (Gudjonsson et al., 2011). Additionally, suspect interviewers begin the interview without assuming the suspect's guilt (Miller et al., 2018). That is because one of the main goals of investigative suspect interviews is to establish a good and trusting relationship with the suspect and to be open to what the suspect has to say (Miller et al., 2018). According to Vanderhallen et al. (2011), a good relationship is one of the prime components of an interview that can determine the effectiveness of an interview to a great extent. Only when investigative interviewers evaluated all relevant information, they will decide whether a suspect is guilty or not (Snook et al., 2014). Unfortunately, there has not been a lot of research regarding the false confession rate of investigative suspect interviews using the PEACE model, however, it is assumed that false confessions occur less frequently compared to other types of suspect interviewing (Gudjonsson et al., 2011). That assumption is based on the fact that the PEACE model does not presume guilt nor is it overly confrontational and does not pressure suspects into confessing like it might be done in other types of suspect interviewing (e.g., interrogations) (Gudjonsson et al., 2011).

Especially since suspect interviews are highly dynamic, there are various interpersonal factors that might influence the course of the interview (Gudjonsson et al., 2011; Bruijnes et

al., 2015). In investigative suspect interviews, the relationship between the suspect and the suspect interviewer can influence the accuracy and amount of information that a suspect is willing to provide (Vanderhallen. Verveake, & Holmberg, 2011). Furthermore, trust, as well as the perceived competence of the interviewer, are factors that might influence the effectiveness of an interview. Ultimately, an interview's effectiveness is largely dependent on the suspect's willingness to provide information on the suspected crime. Even though suspect interviewers are usually trained in making an investigative suspect interview successful, there are frequent mistakes that might lead to communication errors (Yarbrough et al., 2013) and consequently jeopardize the effectiveness of the interview.

Communication Errors in Investigative Suspect Interviews

While suspect interviewers aim for an effective interview, communication errors might undermine the relationship between the suspect and interviewer, trust, perceived communication competence, and the suspect's willingness to provide information. As for now, there has not been extensive research on communication errors in investigative suspect interviews. Nevertheless, Oostinga et al. (2018a) identified three different categories of errors, namely (1) contextual errors, (2) factual errors, and (3) judgment errors. Contextual errors include errors in the setting and the procedures of the interview. That could be, e.g., the use of police jargon when talking to the suspect, or when the police officer mentions details that the suspect was not supposed to know. Furthermore, factual errors are objectively false information that the police officer provides during the interview. An example of that is stating the wrong name for one of the involved people or when the interviewer mixed up the dates of specific events. Lastly, judgment errors are subjective and involve inaccurate interpretations of feelings and thoughts. Examples of such are turning down the suspect's too directly or telling the suspect "I understand how you feel" when the interviewer cannot actually know what the situation is like for the suspect.

These categories of errors were studied by Oostinga et al. (2018a) in the context of crisis negotiation and suspect interviews. In their study, it was found that judgment errors seem to negatively influence the relationship and, more specifically, the amount of trust the suspect has in the interviewer. Additionally, Vignovic and Thompson (2010) presented that when errors were made, the error receiver perceives less competence in their communication partner. Since a good relationship is one of the prime goals of investigative suspect interviews (Miller et al., 2018), errors can, thereby, undermine the effectiveness of the interview. In this study, I will make use of the factual as well as judgment errors.

Rapport

As previously mentioned, the accuracy and reliability of information are largely dependent on the relationship between suspect and interviewer. The good relationship between both is commonly referred to as rapport, while rapport can have different meanings in different parts of the world and in different settings, it has no universal definition (Abbe & Brandon, 2014; Vallano & Compo, 2011). However, in the domain of suspect interviewing, rapport is often referred to as "a relationship […] that provides participants with a warm feeling" (Vanderhallen et al., 2011, p.112) and "a positive attitude toward the suspect and conveying genuine respect" (Hartwig, Granhag, & Vrij, 2005, p. 390). For the scope of this research, I will refer to rapport as a friendly, genuine relationship with mutual understanding.

Generally, it can be said that rapport is more easily established and maintained when the interviewer approaches the suspect in a friendly and warm manner (Vrij et al., 2014). That might be done by giving verbal or nonverbal feedback, such as nodding, mimicking, or active listening (Vrij et al., 2014). Moreover, with increasing rapport suspects perceive the suspect interviewer as more cooperative, empathic, and accommodating which can result in more accurate and detailed remembering of information (Vanderhallen et al., 2011). However, when errors are made Thoroughgood et al. (2013) have found that especially judgment errors can reduce rapport among a leader and their employees. That is also in line with what Oostinga et al. (2018a) have found, that judgment errors can significantly damage the relationship between suspects and interviewers, and therefore the outcome of the interview. According to Vignovic and Thompson (2010), making judgment errors decreases the amount of empathy of the interviewer that is perceived by the suspects, which might be why rapport decreases when errors are made. That makes sense, considering judgment errors are often a misinterpretation of feelings and thoughts (Oostinga et al., 2018a) but rapport in interviewing situations relies on providing interviewees with a 'warm feeling' and empathy (Vanderhallen et al., 2011). Going from there, it can be argued that the more judgment errors are made, the less empathy is attributed to the interviewer. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

> **H1a**: In a suspect interview where no communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect experiences more rapport in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes one or five communication errors.
>
> **H1b**: In a suspect interview where five communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect experiences less rapport in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes no or one communication error.

Trust

Next to rapport, trust plays a crucial role in the effectiveness of suspect interviews. Mayer et al., (1995) defined trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions

of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (p. 712). In the setting of investigative suspect interviews, the trustor can be the suspect interviewer who trusts the suspect to truthfully answer the questions, but also the suspect who trusts the interviewer to behave a certain way. The suspect will have these expectations regardless of how the suspect interviewer will actually behave and, thereby, sets the initial willingness to trust.

Even when every suspect has a different initial willingness to trust, the interviewer can influence willingness as well. During the interview, the interviewer can take action to give the suspect a reason to trust, e.g., by offering some water or providing information to the suspect (Brimbal et al., 2021). While those are some ways to increase a suspect's willingness to trust, there are factors such as communication errors, to diminish it. Generally, errors evoke negative emotions and since trusting behaviour is influenced by the emotions of the trustor, errors might diminish the amount of trust in the error-maker (Mayer et al., 1995). Moreover, judgment errors from the interviewer's side have a negative effect on the trust that is built during an interview (Oostinga et al., 2018b). As stated before, the suspect has expectations of the interviewer's behaviour. Therefore, when the interviewer makes an error, these expectations are either confirmed or undermined. That means, that when a suspect has low trust in the interviewer to begin with, an error will confirm the low expectation. However, when the initial trust was high, an error counteracts the suspect's expectation and trust might decrease as well. Furthermore, it can be argued that the more errors are made, the less trust there will be because negative expectations of the suspect will be further confirmed with each error made. Therefore, it is expected that:

H2a: In a suspect interview where no communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect experiences more trust in the interviewer in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes one or five communication errors.

H2b: In a suspect interview where five communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect experiences less trust in the interviewer in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes no or one communication error.

Perceived Communication Competence

Another crucial factor in interviewing is an interviewer's communication competence. More specifically, it is important how a suspect perceives the interviewer's communication competence because good communication skills majorly influence the suspect's willingness to actively participate in the interview (Clarke, Milne, & Bull, 2011). Wiemann (1997) described being competent in communication as "having the ability to choose among

available communicative behaviors to accomplish one's own interpersonal goals during an encounter while maintaining the face and line of fellow interactants within the constraints of the situation" (p.198). According to this definition, a person is communicative competent when they know when to apply appropriate communication skills depending on the communication partner and the situation. Additionally, an interviewer that possesses good communication skills shows that by, e.g., structuring the interview logically and easily for the suspect to follow. Moreover, it was found that skills like listening and openness to what the suspect has to say resulted in more reliable and comprehensive information important for a true confession (Clarke et al., 2011).

Communication errors, on the other hand, may reduce the perceived communication competence of the interviewer. That might be because errors increase the error-maker's stress levels, leading them to potentially get distracted by their own error (Oostinga et al., 2020). In turn, error receivers perceive the error-maker as less skilled for their job because they seem less competent and less professional (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). As mentioned before, good communication skills often show in good interview structures, whereas errors disrupt a nice communication flow (Clarke et al., 2011) and make it harder for the interviewee to understand (Moston, Stephenson, & Williamson, 1992). Based on this information it can be argued that the more errors occur, the more often there will be disruptions in communication and perceived communication decreases. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

> **H3a**: In a suspect interview where no communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect perceives the interviewer as more competent in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes one or five communication errors.
>
> **H3b**: In a suspect interview where five communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect perceives the interviewer as less competent in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes zero or one communication error.

Willingness to provide information

Lastly, an investigative suspect interview is considered effective when a suspect provides much relevant information. Therefore, suspect interviewers aim to gather as much information as possible and try to increase the suspect's willingness to do so. Generally, a suspect's willingness to provide information is dependent on the individual's characteristics, but also on the crime that was committed and on contextual factors (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004). Moreover, the interviewer has an influence on the willingness to provide information as well, either positively by being kind and carefully listening to the suspect (Beune et al., 2009), or negatively by making communication errors (Gudjonsson et al., 2003).

However, there might be a difference between the suspect's willingness to provide information and the information they actually provide. It can be argued that when the suspect is not willing to provide information, they might still provide information to clarify the situation when they feel misunderstood. This argumentation is based on findings by Oostinga et al. (2018b) that judgment errors led to a greater information provision. In their paper, they explained these findings that suspects might be more inclined to provide information to prove that they are correct in what they said. Also, during interviews by Oostinga et al. (2018a), some interviewees indicated that an error is not universally bad but could also be used to establish a better conversation, while it was also mentioned that judgment errors are perceived as more detrimental than factual errors. On the other hand, Gudjonsson et al. (2003) have found that communication errors such as inadequate questioning or errors in judgment, decrease a suspect's willingness to provide information or lower the reliability of provided information because errors can decrease the information's quality (Vallano et al., 2015). Based on these arguments, it is assumed that, even when there is greater information provision, the initial willingness is not increased but rather decreased. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H4a: In a suspect interview where no communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect is more willing to provide information in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes one or five communication errors.

H4b: In a suspect interview where five communication errors are made by the suspect interviewer, the suspect is less willing to provide information in comparison to interviews where the interviewer makes no or one communication error.

Methods

Design

To test the hypotheses, a between-groups design was employed. The independent variable is the number of errors (i.e., zero, one and five), where the one-error and five-error conditions are compared to the control condition. The dependent variables are rapport between the suspect and interviewer, the perceived trust in the interviewer, the perceived competence of the interviewer, and the suspect's willingness to provide information. In this study, participants received a scenario of exam fraud in which they had to imagine being the student who cheated in an exam. Afterwards, the participants were presented with a video interview in which 'they' were interviewed by an Examination Board member about the exam fraud.

This study was researched by two researchers. While this paper investigated rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and willingness to provide information, the other

researcher focussed on rapport, trust, perceived humaneness, and willingness to provide information. The same data were used by both researchers, however, both worked independently on their own projects.

Participants

The participants were collected with the help of convenience sampling and were invited to participate via Qualtrics after they received an invitation link. In case the students were enrolled at the University of Twente, they received SONA credits if they participated via SONA Systems (an online survey platform of the University of Twente). It was aimed for at least 90 participants, so approximately 30 students participated in each condition (control, one-error, and five-error group). Initially, the sample consisted of 146 people, but 54 participants needed to be excluded because they indicated they were not university students ($n = 4$), did not adequately understand English ($n = 28$), did not finish the survey ($n = 22$), or did not allow their data to be used ($n = 3$), whereas three participants indicated to neither be a student nor adequately understand English. Therefore, 92 university students were ultimately considered in the analysis of this thesis. Ultimately, there were 28 participants in the control condition, 33 participants in the one-error condition, and 31 participants in the five-error condition. The participants were between 17 and 44 years of age, while the mean age was at about 22 years. Of the participants 24 (26.1%) indicated to be male, 66 (71.7%) to be female, 1 (1.1%) to be non-binary, and 1 (1.1%) preferred not to answer. Furthermore, the participants mainly came from the Netherlands and Germany. In total, 11 participants (12%) were Dutch, 73 (79.3%) were German, and 8 (8.7%) were Salvadoran, Irish, Indian, Norwegian, Spanish, Italian, and English.

Measures

Rapport

The Rs3i scale was used to measure rapport between the student and Examination Board member after the interview was conducted. The scale was developed by Duke et al. (2018) and consists of 21 items that are answered using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). For this study, three items were left out because culture was not relevant in this context. The items that were left out are 'The interviewer and I have our culture in common', 'The interviewer and I probably share the same ethnicity', and 'The interviewer probably shares my culture'. All other items were taken over from the original questionnaire. Examples of used items are 'The interviewer acted like a professional' and 'The interviewer was attentive to me'. The item scores were averaged, in which a higher

score indicated higher rapport with the interviewer. The estimated internal consistency was .95, which is considered excellent (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Trust

The performance appraisal system was used to measure the trust of the suspect in the Examination Board member. The scale was developed by Mayer and Davis (1999) and consists of 40 items in total that are answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The scale integrates seven subscales, of which we utilized Ability (6 items), Benevolence (4 items), and Integrity (6 items), resulting in 16 items in total. The items were adjusted to fit the environment of the interview between a student and Examination Board member, whereas the questions per se stayed the same as in the original questionnaire. Examples of the items are 'The Examination Board member is very capable of performing her job' and 'The Examination Board member has a strong sense of justice'. The items' scores were averaged, whereas a higher score indicated higher trust in the interviewer. The estimated internal consistency was .93, which is considered excellent (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Perceived communication competence

The scale of Wiemann (1997) was used to measure the perceived communication competence of the Examination Board member. In total, the scale consists of 35 items that are answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). For this study, 9 items were removed from the scale since they were not applicable for the suspect-interviewer relationship in this setting because they were referring to a longer-term relationship. An example of the deleted items is 'S's personal relations are cold and distant'. Examples of the remaining 26 items are 'The interviewer can adapt to changing situations' and 'The interviewer is easy to talk to'. Some of the items were reversed and accordingly re-coded when averaging the scores of the items. A higher average score indicated higher perceived communication competence in the Examination Board member. The estimated internal consistency was .95, which is considered excellent (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Willingness to provide information

The participant's willingness to provide information was measured following Beune et al. (2011), asking the extent to which participants view the items as true on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The items were adjusted to the scenario used in this study (i.e., naming the Examination Board member) whereas the question content stayed the same. The scale consists of three items, 'I would tell the Examination Board member everything'; 'I would provide a lot of information to the

Examination Board member; 'I would give truthful information to the Examination Board member. The items' scores were averaged, whereas a higher score indicated a higher willingness to provide information. The estimated internal consistency was .79, which is considered acceptable (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Manipulation check

To check whether the participants noticed if errors were made, a manipulation check was included. At the end of the questionnaire, there was a question about whether errors were noticed and if the participant indicated that they did, the next question asked how many errors were noticed, ranging from one error to five errors. If participants correctly indicate how many errors were made that can be used as a confirmation that participants were aware of errors.

Procedure

Participants received an invitation link that led them to the survey that would take approximately 15 minutes to complete. First, the participants were presented with a welcome screen and the informed consent to which they had to sign digitally, otherwise, they were transferred to the end of the survey and thanked for their participation. The actual goal of the study was not described, yet. The participants were informed that this study was about different styles of interviewing, not about errors made by the interviewer. After signing the informed consent form, the participant was forwarded to a scenario in which they had to imagine themselves (see Appendix A). The participant needed to imagine the be a second-year psychology student that was suspected of exam fraud and was, therefore, invited to an interview with an Examination Board member. To the Examination Board members, it was known that a picture with the answers to the test was sent to some students. Since this student's previous grades were not too good, but this exam stood out with high scores, he/she was suspected of fraud and invited to an interview for an evaluation of the situation (see Appendix B for interview scripts). The scenario was based on the study of Oostinga et al. (2018b), who successfully used this method of investigating communication errors, which is why we decided to use a similar scenario as well.

Afterwards, participants were presented with a pre-recorded interview. In total, there were three different interview recordings (control-, one-error-, and five-error condition) whereas each participant was randomly allocated to one of them. Following the example of previous research (Koudenburg et al., 2011; Oostinga et al., 2018b), the video was filmed from the back of the student, while the Examination Board member sits in front of the student to make it easier for the participant to imagine the interview was from their perspective. The

use of pre-recorded interviewing scenarios offered the opportunity to standardize all three conditions and to reduce biases toward the interviewer as well as toward the interviewee. Additionally, in the videos verbal and non-verbal characteristics were the same, so each participant in one condition is presented with the same information.

In Table 1, the questions and comments made by the interviewer are presented with the answers that the student gave. The table shows that in condition 1, there are no errors made and the conversation went smoothly, and the student answers the Examination Board member's questions (interviewer questions 1-7). In the second condition, one judgment error was made in the middle of the interview where the interviewer accused the student of not having studied for previous exams (judgment 2) whereas the student answers that the interviewer is mistaken, they studied a lot but the questions in previous exams were more difficult. Lastly, the third condition contained two factual errors and three judgment errors. In the beginning, the interviewer confused the student with a communication science student (factual 1), whereupon the student corrects her. Afterwards, the interviewer accused the students of fraud (judgment 1) and continues with the same error as in condition 2 (judgment 2). Next, the interviewer ignores the student's personal circumstances but sarcastically implies that it is too much of a coincidence that the student scored well on this exam (judgment 3). Ultimately, the Examination Board member ends the interview by stating the wrong name (factual 2) (see Appendix B for complete scripts).

Table 1

Interview Questions, Error Messages, and Student Answers in the Interviews

	Messages
Interviewer questions/ comments	1. How are you doing?
	2. What do you think: why are you here today?
	3. Did you have the questions beforehand?
	4. Can you describe the situation from your perspective?
	5. Did you feel prepared for the exam?
	6. I am sorry to hear, my condolences. Nevertheless, we saw that you did much better on this exam than usual.
	7. Are you okay with that or do you have any remarks or questions?
Communication error in one-error condition	1. Judgment 2: You also were not prepared for the last exams.
Communication errors in five-error condition	1. Factual 1: you do not look like a good communication science student.

2. Judgment 1: we took a look at your records, and since this exam
   was better, we think you cheated.

3. Judgment 2: You also were not prepared for the last exams.

4. Judgment 3: how fortunate that particularly this exam was so
   easy. Seems a little coincidental.

5. Factual 2: thank you for taking your time, Tony.

When the participant finished watching one of the pre-recorded interviews, they were forwarded to multiple questionnaires measuring (1) rapport between the suspect and interviewer, (2) trust in the interviewer, (3) the perceived communication competence of the interviewer, and (4) the student's willingness to provide information (see Appendix C). Next, there was a manipulation check included, where the participant indicated whether they noticed communication errors of the interviewer. When there were errors noticed, the next question was how many errors were noticed. If no errors were noticed, the participant was directly led to insert their demographics, namely, age, nationality, and gender.

Subsequently, the participant was debriefed about the real purpose of this study: the effects of errors on the effectiveness of an interview. Additionally, the reason for the deception was explained, and the participant was asked whether their data was still to be used for this study. Ultimately, the respondent was thanked for their participation.

Results

Scale reliability

In Table 2, the means, standard deviations (SDs), Cronbach Alphas, and correlations between the study variables are presented. The table shows good to excellent internal reliability of the measures and positive correlations between the dependent variables. Positive correlations between the variables were expected because when suspects experience higher rapport, they are usually also more trusting toward the interviewer.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Reliability, and Inter-Correlations Among Study Variables

Variables	*M*	*SD*	α	1	2	3
1. Rapport	3.37	.82	.95			
2. Trust	3.06	.66	.93	.87**		
3. Perceived communication competence	2.96	.65	.95	.81**	.84**	
4. Willingness to provide information	2.40	.98	.79	.41**	.36**	.35**

Note. N = 92

**p* < .001

Manipulation check

      To see whether the manipulation check (whether the number of errors were correctly identified) was successful, an ANOVA was run. The condition group (control condition, one-error condition, and five-error condition) functioned as the independent variable and the number of errors that were noticed by the participant functioned as the dependent variable. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of the condition groups on the number of errors noticed by the participant.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Error Conditions on Errors Noticed by Participant

	Communication Error					
	Control ($n = 28$)		One-Error ($n = 33$)		Five-Error ($n = 31$)	
Manipulation Check	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Errors noticed	1.82	1.16	2.21	1.22	3.16	1.13

      The ANOVA revealed that there are significant differences between the group conditions $F(2,89) = 10.41$, $p < .001$. A Tukey HSD test showed that there is no significant difference between the control condition and the one-error condition, $p = .39$, 95% CI = [-1.11, .33]. There were significant differences found between the control condition and five-error condition, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [-2.07, -.61], as well as between the one-error condition and five-error condition, $p = .005$, 95% CI = [.25, 1.65]. That means, that the manipulation check was only partly successful because participants correctly indicated to have seen more than one error but were less able to correctly see whether no or one error were made. The number of errors that were identified by participants of each condition can be found in Table 4. Even though the manipulation check was not entirely successful, we decided to still work with the participants in the original groups. That is because we were interested in whether there were effects regardless of the number of errors that the participant consciously perceived.

Table 4

Numbers of Errors Perceived by Participants in Error Conditions

Number of Errors	Error Condition			
	Control ($n = 28$)	One-Error ($n = 33$)	Five-Error ($n = 31$)	Total
0	17	14	4	35
1	3	5	2	19

2	4	7	13	24
3	4	7	9	20
4	0	0	3	3
Total	28	33	31	92

Hypothesis testing

To test the hypotheses, a one-way between-subjects ANOVA was employed. Here, communication errors functioned as the independent variable with three conditions, the control condition, one-error condition, and five-error condition. The dependent variables were rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and the suspect's willingness to provide information. It was hypothesized that zero errors in a suspect interview show higher levels of rapport (H1a), trust (H2a), perceived communication competence (H3a), and willingness to provide information (H4a) in comparison to interviews where one or five errors are made. Additionally, it was predicted that interviews where five errors were made, rapport (H1b), trust (H2b), perceived communication competence (H3b), and willingness to provide information (H4b) are lower compared to interviews where one error is made. Therefore, I looked at the main effects that the different error conditions have on the dependent variables.

Error effects on dependent variables

In Table 5 the means and standard deviations of each of the dependent variables, rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and willingness to provide information can be found. The results of the ANOVA showed significant effects of error conditions on rapport, $F(2,89) = 15.34$, $p < .001$, on trust, $F(2,89) = 15.30$, $p < .001$, and on perceived communication competence, $F(2,89) = 8.82$, $p < .001$. The results for willingness to provide information, however, did not show an effect of the error condition on willingness to provide information, $F(2,89) = .24$, $p = .78$. That means that with these findings, the hypotheses H4a, and H4b cannot be supported because no significant differences between the error conditions were found at the .05 significance level.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Errors on Effectiveness Measures in Interviews

	Communication Error					
	Control (n = 28)		One-Error (n = 33)		Five-Error (n = 31)	
Effectiveness measures	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
1. Rapport	3.74	0.72	3.59[b]	0.69	2.80[a,b]	0.73

2. Trust	3.27	0.58	3.32[b]	0.51	2.59[a,b]	0.63
3. Perceived communication competence	3.22	0.63	3.07[b]	0.57	2.59[a,b]	0.60
4. Willingness to provide information	2.50	0.91	2.39	0.95	2.32	1.07

[a] Differs significantly from control, $p < .05$

[b] Differs significantly from the other communication error, $p < .05$

Rapport

A Tukey HSD test revealed that the mean value of rapport was significantly different between the control condition and the five-error condition, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [.49, 1.38], as well as between the one-error and five-error condition, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [.37, 1.22]. However, there were no significant differences between the control and one-error condition, $p = .73$, 95% CI = [-.29, .58]. That could mean, that in interviews where no errors were made, the participants reported significantly more rapport compared to those where five errors were made. However, compared to only one error, there were no significant differences found. Therefore, H1a can only partly be accepted. Also, in interviews where five errors were made, participants experience significantly less rapport compared to one error, which is why H1b can be accepted.

Trust

For trust, the Tukey test showed significant differences between the control and five-error condition, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [-.32, 1.03], as well as for the one-error and five-error condition, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [.32, 1.03]. The differences between the control and one-error condition were not significant at the .05 significance level, $p = .95$, 95% CI [-.39, .31]. That could mean, that when there were no errors in an interview, participants generally indicated to have more trust in the interviewer compared to when five errors were made. However, when only one error was made, there were no significant differences in the amount of trust found. Therefore, H2a can only partly be accepted. Moreover, participants reported significantly less trust in the interviewer that made five errors compared to where only one error was made. Therefore, H2b can be accepted.

Perceived Communication Competence

For perceived communication competence, the Tukey test revealed significant differences between the control and five-error condition, $p < .001$, 95% CI = [.25, .99], and between the one and five-error condition, $p = .006$, 95% CI [.12, .83]. There were no significant differences between the control and one-error condition, $p = .61$, 95% CI [-.22, .51]. That could mean, that interviewers that made no errors during an interview were perceived to have significantly higher communication competence compared to interviewers

that made five errors. Nevertheless, participants perceived the interviewer as similarly communicative competent when no and one error was made. Therefore, H3a can only partly be accepted. Also, in interviews where five errors were made, the participants perceived less communication competence of the interviewer compared to interviews where one error was made. Therefore, H3b can be accepted.

Additional Explorative Analysis

To explore further effects between errors and the dependent variables, a second ANOVA was performed with rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and willingness to provide information as dependent variables and the number of errors that the participants noticed as independent variables. Therefore, the control condition consisted of people that noticed zero errors, the second condition consisted of people who noticed one error, and the third condition consisted of every participant that noticed two errors or more. The results showed the same patters between the errors and independent variables for the original condition groups and the groups of how many errors were noticed by the participant: There were significant effects on rapport, $F(2,89) = 18.06$, $p < .001$, on trust $F(2,89) = 16.49$, $p < .001$, and on perceived communication competence, $F(2,89) = 22.28$, $p < .001$, while there were no effects on willingness to provide information, $F(2,89) = 1.09$, $p = .341$ (for means and standard deviations see Table D1).

Discussion

This study explored the effects of (multiple) errors in investigative suspect interviews on the interview's effectiveness. Interview effectiveness was here measured by the amount of rapport that was perceived by the suspect, the trust that the suspect has in the interviewer, the perceived communication competence that the suspect has in the interviewer, and the suspect's willingness to provide information. The effects were tested by exposing study participants to interviews containing a different number of errors and assessing their rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and willingness to provide information based on experience in the interview. The findings suggest that five errors negatively influence the interview's effectiveness, while one error seems to not affect effectiveness significantly. However, a participant's willingness to provide information seems to not have been affected by the number of errors that were made.

Communication errors

Contrary to our expectations, a single error did not significantly decrease rapport, trust, and perceived communication competence. We expected there to be differences because previous research found that an error can undermine the relationship between a suspect and

suspect interviewer, and decrease rapport and trust (Oostinga et al., 2018b; Thoroughgood et al., 2013). Oostinga et al. (2018b) have also found that judgment errors are more detrimental than factual errors, which is why our non-significant findings are even more surprising. Nevertheless, the judgment error in our scenario ('You also were not prepared for the last exams.') might have been too subtle for the participant to clearly identify it as an error. When we look back at Table 4, we can see that participants in condition 1 (control) and condition 2 (one error) noticed approximately the same number of errors with only a slightly higher error observation in condition 2, leading us to conclude that the error was too subtle. In comparison, Oostinga et al. (2018b) did a similar study, investigating the effects of single errors on trust, rapport, and the quality of information provided by the suspect. In their experiment, participants were presented with an exam fraud scenario and were afterwards interviewed by an examination board member. Instead of watching a pre-recorded video interview, the participants in Oostinga et al.'s (2018b) study were interviewed in an online environment. The judgement error that Oostinga et al., (2018b) included was worded more directly and personal and might have been more easily noticed as a communication error by the participants ('Ok. So you are a rather unmotivated student.'), which might be why they have found significant effects of single judgement errors on trust and rapport while we did not. Furthermore, perceived communication competence was expected to decrease after a judgment error was made because errors disrupt a good communication flow and might increase the confusion of the suspect (Clarke et al., 2011). We also did not find any effects on perceived communication competence, which might also be explained by the error being too subtle.

On the other hand, as hypothesized, we did find significant results for five errors on rapport, trust, as well as perceived communication competence compared to when no errors were made. In the five-error condition, there were three judgment errors and two factual errors included because it would have been unrealistic to make five judgment errors during one short interview. Most participants remembered three to four errors, leading us to suggest that some errors might have been too subtle for the participant to clearly identify the error as such. To give an example, the first judgment error in the five-error condition ('We took a look at your records, and since this exam was way better, we think you cheated.') might have also been perceived as an observation instead of an error, because there was no obvious judgment in there, but it was rather a logical conclusion based on previous observations. Additionally, factual errors seem to not have the same effects as judgment errors (Oostinga et al., 2018b). However, as there were five errors included, participants might have felt that overall, the

interviewer was not on the same page as them, even when not every error was perceived as such, which might be why we did find significant results. As expected, five errors decreased the levels of rapport between the participant and the interviewer. That is consistent with previous research on which we based our hypothesis. For example, Vignovic and Thompson (2010) indicated that errors undermine empathy, which again is an important factor influencing rapport (Vanderhallen et al., 2011) and, therefore, an explanation for why rapport decreases the more errors are made. Furthermore, existing literature led us to hypothesize that multiple errors lowered the levels of trust between the suspect and the suspect interviewer. Mayer et al. (1995) introduced that emotions have an impact on trust, while emotions are negatively influenced by communication errors. These expectations were ultimately confirmed by this study when multiple errors reduced trust compared to zero and one error. Additionally, our findings suggest that multiple errors negatively affect perceived communication competence. It was found that by making errors, the error maker is perceived as less skilled and less professional in what they are doing (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). That can be confirmed by this study because multiple errors did decrease the perceived communication competence of the suspect interviewer.

Lastly, we were not able to confirm any effects of communication errors on the participant's willingness to provide information. Since Oostinga et al. (2018b) were not able to find significant effects of communication errors on the suspect's willingness to provide information either, it might be that there is no relation between communication errors and the willingness to provide information. Alternatively, the results of this study might have been skewed because we noticed a possible bias for the willingness to provide information. As mentioned before, in the scenario, participants were informed that they were suspected of exam fraud and that they did not want to admit their guilt to the interviewer. Since the questionnaire for willingness to provide information included two items that asked the extent to which the participant would be truthful as well as the extent to which they would tell the interviewer everything, the answers might be biased to neither tell the interviewer the truth, nor everything. While the scale consisted of only three items in total, this bias potentially skewed the results to a great extent. Therefore, for further research, it is recommended to either not tell participants to hide the truth, or to use a different questionnaire measuring willingness to provide information.

Limitations and Recommendations

Further, there are some limitations to this study. To begin with, the instruments used for the data collection of our study might not have been the best choice and should be used

differently in further research. For the scope of this study, we decided to use pre-recorded video interviews and to ask the participants to imagine being in that situation because that was the most feasible option to go with considering the time frame, the number of participants, and the current COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, this option was successfully used in previous research as well and seemed to be a good alternative to face-to-face interviews (Koudenburg et al., 2011; Oostinga et al., 2018b). Nevertheless, there were disadvantages because participants did not actively engage in the interview and might have missed the personal connection to the scenario and the interviewer (McGinn & Croson, 2004), and therefore, would not have perceived the errors as serious as they might have in a face-to-face interview. Moreover, there are doubts to which degree it is possible to establish a connection with someone you have never seen before (McGinn & Croson, 2004), which is why the findings of this research need to be handled with caution since we do not know the extent to which they are generalizable to real-life situations. There is always the risk that experiments seem artificial and that participants behave not exactly as they would in real life where the stakes are higher (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011). However, to minimize that risk it is recommended that face-to-face interviews are conducted for future research to ensure that participants actively engage in the interview. As mentioned before, online settings have been successfully applied before, therefore, I argue that the patterns might not completely change but would perhaps be strengthened in face-to-face interviews.

Furthermore, the manipulation check was not entirely successful. Although most of the participants successfully indicated whether they were in the error or no-error condition, most were not able to tell how many errors were made. That is a problem because all participants who indicated to have noticed errors reported to have noticed a similar number of errors despite being in different error conditions. The results showed that especially in the control and one-error conditions, approximately the same number of errors were reported (see Table 3). Interestingly, even when participants in the five-error condition did not observe all errors and reported a similar number of errors as some participants in the other conditions, they seemed to still perceive there to be significantly less rapport, trust, and perceived communication competence. Therefore, despite the number of errors the participants consciously remembered, the results showed that participants still felt differently about the interviewer. That could be the case, because as Koudenburg et al. (2011) have found that even minor pauses during conversations can evoke negative feelings. Importantly, they have found that such pauses elicit negative emotions even when the disruption was not consciously noticed by the participant. Subsequently, that leads us to suggest that while in our study not

all errors were noticed, they could still have the same effects compared to when all errors were noticed.

Additionally, the sample might restrict us from generalizing the findings to a broader population. For this study, we used convenience sampling for finding participants, wherefore the sample was not randomly chosen but consisted mainly of German and Dutch university students. According to Lucas et al. (2018), culture might also affect the way individuals perceive errors and since German and Dutch culture is very similar, these findings are not necessarily transferrable to different cultures. That is because between cultures there are usually differences in rules and norms (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). An example is that errors had different impacts on Japanese and American participants depending on whether social dialogue was implemented or not (Lucas et al., 2018). The results showed that for Japanese participants, errors were perceived as less harsh when social dialogue was used. For American participants, however, errors were more detrimental because, after initial good communication, errors were perceived as a huge contrast and had more serious consequences for rapport (Lucas et al., 2018). That might be because Asians usually live in a collectivistic culture and tend to be more focused on situational cues while Americans usually live in an individualistic culture and tend to be more focused on the content of a message (Schouten & Meeuwesen, 2006). Based on that, it can be assumed that if the sample predominantly consisted of Asian participants, the errors might have been less detrimental, depending on the social context. Therefore, future researchers should focus on random sampling within a population and perhaps also comparing different populations (e.g., from different cultures) with one another to see whether there will be differences in how suspect interviewing in different cultures should be improved.

Lastly, the participants we sampled were not criminals which is also why we did not conduct an actual suspect interview but chose an exam fraud scenario which is likely easier accessible for students so that they can better emphasize the role they are given. The problem with artificially created situations is that generally the stakes are not as high as in real life and, therefore, participants might not react the same as they would in real life (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011). However, using criminals – or people who have been in suspect interviews before – as participants would have the advantage of implementing a scenario closer to a real-life suspect interview than an exam fraud scenario. The participants would probably more easily emphasize the role they are given when they have been in such a situation before. While I would not expect the results to entirely change using criminals instead of students, I expect there might be some differences in the participant's willingness to provide information.

That can be reasoned by considering that a suspect's willingness to provide information depends on the crime they have committed (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004), and exam fraud is usually less tremendous than a crime investigated by police officers. Considering this, the results would, therefore, be more accurate to real-life using criminals as participants.

Conclusion

This study investigated a, so far, barely researched topic in investigative suspect interviewing. The aim was to examine the effects of communication errors on rapport, trust, perceived communication competence, and the suspect's willingness to provide information. Compared to the control condition, five errors significantly decrease rapport, trust, and perceived communication competence. Not expected was that there were neither significant differences between the control and one-error condition for rapport, trust, and perceived communication competence nor differences between either of the conditions for willingness to provide information.

Although this study exhibits some limitations, it adds some knowledge to this rather unexplored field of suspect interviewing and replicates some previous findings; thereby increasing its reliability. However, since we did not find significant differences between the control and one-error condition, we suspect the judgment error we used was too subtle. Therefore, we suggest using an error that is clearly identifiable as such in future studies. For the five-error condition, it seemed to be no problem when there were some subtle errors in there because overall the participants seemed to have noticed something wrong with the communication. Previous research has found significant results for making one error; therefore, it might be still relevant to know how much of a difference there is between making one error or multiple errors and should be further investigated. The distinction between one or multiple errors might be relevant for law enforcement officers to know because making errors seem to be almost inevitable. Therefore, when a single error has a less negative impact than multiple errors, the suspect interviewer might be better able to estimate the consequences of the number of errors they made and can act accordingly.

References

Abbe, A., & Brandon, S. E. (2014). Building and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews. *Police Practice and Research*, *15*(3), 207-220. https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.1080/15614263.2013.827835

Beune, K., Giebels, E., Adair, W. L., Fennis, B. M., & Van Der Zee, K. I. (2011). Strategic Sequences in Police Interviews and the Importance of Order and Cultural Fit. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *38*(9), 934-954. https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.1177/0093854811412170

Beune, K., Giebels, E., & Sanders, K. (2009). Are you talking to me? Influencing behaviour and culture in police interviews. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *15*(7), 597-617. https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802442835

Brimbal, L., Meissner, C. A., Kleinman, S. M., Phillips, E. L., Atkinson, D. J., Dianiska, R. E., ... & Jones, M. S. (2021). Evaluating the benefits of a rapport-based approach to investigative interviews: A training study with law enforcement investigators. *Law and Human Behavior*, *45*(1), 55. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000437

Bruijnes, M., Linssen, J., Theune, M., Wapperom, S., Broekema, C., & Heylen, D. (2015). Social Behaviour in Police Interviews: Relating Data to Theories. In *Conflict and Multimodal Communication* (pp. 317-347). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14081-0_16

Clarke, C., Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2011). Interviewing Suspects of Crime: The Impact of PEACE Training, Supervision and the Presence of a Legal Advisor. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *8*(2), 149-162. https://doi-org/10.1002/jip.144

Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient For Likert-Type Scales. Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education. https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/344

Duke, M. C., Wood, J. M., Bollin, B., Scullin, M., & LaBianca, J. (2018). Development of the Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations (RS3i), Interviewee Version. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *24*(1), 64. https://doi-org /10.1037/law0000147

Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The Psychology of Interrogations and Confessions: A Handbook*. John Wiley & Sons. https://books.google.de/books?hl=en&lr=&id=GtB65IADRjIC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq

=Gudjonsson,+G.+H.+(2003).+The+psychology+of+interrogations+and+confessions:
+A+handbook.+John+Wiley+%26+Sons.+&ots=85eaN5E5BP&sig=STu2SQU8GJvb
K86FmwU307Mi4RY#v=onepage&q=Gudjonsson%2C%20G.%20H.%20(2003).%20
The%20psychology%20of%20interrogations%20and%20confessions%3A%20A%20h
andbook.%20John%20Wiley%20%26%20Sons.&f=false

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Pearse, J. (2011). Suspect Interviews and False Confessions. *Current
Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(1), 33-37. https://doi-
org/10.1177/0963721410396824

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., & Sigfusdottir, I. D. (2009). Interrogation and false
confessions among adolescents in seven European countries. What background and
psychological variables best discriminate between false confessors and non-false
confessors? *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *15*(8), 711-728.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802516257

Hartwig, M., Anders Granhag, P., & Vrij, A. (2005). Police Interrogation from a Social
Psychology Perspective. *Policing & Society*, *15*(4), 379-399. https://doi-
org/10.1080/10439460500309956

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%2Fj.1529-1006.2004.00016.x

Koudenburg, N., Postmes, T., & Gordijn, E. H. (2011). Disrupting the flow: How brief
silences in group conversations affect social needs. *Journal of Experimental Social
Psychology*, *47*(2), 512-515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.12.006

Lucas, G. M., Boberg, J., Traum, D., Artstein, R., Gratch, J., Gainer, A., ... & Nakano, M.
(2018, November). Culture, Errors, and Rapport-building Dialogue in Social Agents.
In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on intelligent virtual agents* (pp.
51-58). https://doi.org/10.1145/3267851.3267887

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of
Organizational Trust. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 709-734.
https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust
for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *84*(1),
123. https://psycnet-apa-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/buy/1999-10108-010

McGinn, K. L., & Croson, R. (2004). What Do Communication Media Mean for
Negotiations? A Question of Social Awareness. *The Handbook of Negotiation and*

Culture, 334-349.

http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.250.89
53&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Moston, S., Stephenson, G. M., & Williamson, T. M. (1992). The Effects of Case
Characteristics on Suspect Behaviour During Police Questioning. *The British Journal
of Criminology*, *32*(1), 23-40. https://doi-org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a048178

Miller, J. C., Redlich, A. D., & Kelly, C. E. (2018). Accusatorial and information-gathering
interview and interrogation methods: a multi-country comparison. *Psychology, Crime
& Law*, *24*(9), 935-956. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2018.1467909

Milne, B., Shaw, G., & Bull, R. (2007). Investigative Interviewing: The Role of
Research. *Applying Psychology to Criminal Justice*, 65-80.
https://books.google.de/books?hl=en&lr=&id=yp739qX3XCkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA65&
dq=Milne,+B.,+Shaw,+G.,+%26+Bull,+R.+(2007).+Investigative+interviewing:+The
+role+of++research.+Applying+psychology+to+criminal+justice,+65-
80.&ots=FonGOPXunk&sig=EQqL8OKPfmhOrCjNR6dyEzFdtH0#v=onepage&q&f
=false

Oostinga, M. S., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2018a). 'An error is feedback': the experience of
communication error management in crisis negotiations. *Police Practice and
Research*, *19*(1), 17-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2017.1326007

Oostinga, M. S., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2018b). Communication error management in
law enforcement interactions: a receiver's perspective. *Psychology, Crime &
Law*, *24*(2), 134-155. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2017.1390112

Oostinga, M. S., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2020). Communication Error Management in
Law Enforcement Interactions: A Sender's Perspective. *Criminal Justice and
Behavior*, *47*(1), 39-60. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093854819870856

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of
organizational trust: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Management review*, *32*(2),
344-354. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24348410

Schouten, B. C., & Meeuwesen, L. (2006). Cultural differences in medical communication: a
review of the literature. *Patient Education and Counseling*, *64*(1-3), 21-34.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2005.11.014

Snook, B., Eastwood, J., & Barron, W. T. (2014). The Next Stage in the Evolution of
Interrogations: The PEACE Model. *Canadian Criminal Law Review*, *18*(2), 219.

https://www.mun.ca/psychology/media/production/memorial/academic/faculty-of-science/psychology/media-library/research/brl/Snook_et_al_2014_CCLR.pdf

Thoroughgood, C. N., Sawyer, K. B., & Hunter, S. T. (2013). Real Men Don't Make Mistakes: Investigating the Effects of Leader Gender, Error Type, and the Occupational Context on Leader Error Perceptions. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *28*(1), 31-48. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9263-8

van Dyck, C., Frese, M., Baer, M., & Sonnentag, S. (2005). Organizational Error Management Culture and Its Impact on Performance: A Two-Study Replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(6), 1228. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1228

Vallano, J. P., & Compo, N. S. (2011). A comfortable witness is a good witness: Rapport-building and susceptibility to misinformation in an investigative mock-crime interview. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *25*(6), 960-970. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1789

Vallano, J. P., Evans, J. R., Schreiber Compo, N., & Kieckhaefer, J. M. (2015). Rapport-Building During Witness and Suspect Interviews: A Survey of Law Enforcement. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *29*(3), 369-380. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3115

Vanderhallen, M., Vervaeke, G., & Holmberg, U. (2011). Witness and Suspect Perceptions of Working Alliance and Interviewing Style. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *8*(2), 110-130. https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.138

Vignovic, J. A., & Thompson, L. F. (2010). Computer-mediated cross-cultural collaboration: Attributing communication errors to the person versus the situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *95*(2), 265. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018628

Vrij, A., Hope, L., & Fisher, R. P. (2014). Eliciting Reliable Information in Investigative Interviews. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *1*(1), 129-136. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2372732214548592

Yarbrough, J., Hervé, H. F., & Harms, R. (2013). The Sins of Interviewing: Errors Made by Investigative Interviewers and Suggestions for Redress. In *Applied Issues in Investigative Interviewing, Eyewitness Memory, and Credibility Assessment* (pp. 59-95). Springer, New York, NY.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and Test of a Model of Communicative Competence. *Human Communication Research*, *3*(3), 195-213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1977.tb00518.x

Appendix A

Exam Fraud Scenario

Imagine you are a second-year psychology student named Luca. A week ago, you took part in an exam about physical safety but due to personal circumstances, you were not able to study properly. Two weeks before the exam, your grandmother passed away and it affected you a lot so that you were not able to concentrate on the test. Shortly before the exam, a friend of yours told you that he was able to take a picture of the answers to the test questions. Since your previous grades were not too good and you needed to pass this exam, you were relieved to have this opportunity and asked your friend to send you the answers. When you took the test, you knew most of the answers and had a very good feeling about passing.

A few days after the exam, you received an email from the Examination Board that said you were suspected of exam fraud. The Board members heard that someone took a picture of the correct answers to the test, and they approached all students that seemed to have an unusually high grade. The Examination Board invited you to a meeting to talk about the exam to find out whether you were one of those students who cheated. When you received that email, you felt guilty but at the same time, you knew that you really need the high grade and thought it was unfair that you would not pass because of your circumstances. Therefore, you did not want to admit that you cheated on the test.

You are now about to meet one of the Examination Board members, imagine you are the student that sits in front of the Board member.

Appendix B

Interview Scripts for each Error Condition

Script n condition

Member examination board (M): Hello Luca, how are you doing?

Student (S): Yeah, I am fine, just a bit nervous. I am not really sure what to expect from this interview.

M: Don't worry, we just want to start by clarifying what happened. What do you think: why are you here today?

S: I am here because of the email I got from the Examination Board where I was accused of exam fraud. The email said that I had the questions and answers to the exam even before I took the test.

M: Did you have the questions beforehand?

S: No, I did not cheat.

M: Can you describe the situation from your perspective?

S: Yes, I went to Uni a bit earlier that day to discuss some last things about the exam with my friends and we had lunch together on campus. Then we went to the room where the exam took place and met a few other people before the test started. After the exam, I went to the bathroom and then immediately went home.

M: Did you feel prepared for the exam?

S: No because I have some personal stuff going on that restricted me from studying. My grandmother passed away two weeks ago and therefore I also had a lot of other things on my mind. Due to the situation, I was not able to prepare as much as I would have otherwise. Nevertheless, I tried my best to prepare as much as I could and luckily, I found out during the test that the questions were not too difficult.

M: Oh, I am sorry to hear. My condolences. Nevertheless, we saw that you did much better on this exam than usual.

S: Like I said before, the exam was just not as difficult as the last ones.

M: Still, we will discuss in the next few days how to proceed from here and will inform you about the outcomes via email. Usually, we propose an oral examination to give you the chance to prove that you were able to answer the questions yourself. Are you okay with that or do you have any other remarks or questions?

S: No, that's alright with me. When would this examination take place?

M: We would like to discuss this with your examiner and let you know as soon as we find a date.

S: Alright, thank you.

M: That would be it for now, thank you for taking your time, Luca. Have a nice day.

Script one-error condition

Member examination board (M): Hello Luca, how are you doing?

Student (S): Yeah, I am fine, just a bit nervous. I am not really sure what to expect from this interview.

M: Don't worry, we just want to start by clarifying what happened. What do you think: why are you here today?

S: I am here because of the email I got from the Examination Board where I was accused of exam fraud. The email said that I had the questions and answers to the exam even before I took the test.

M: Did you have the questions beforehand?

S: No, I did not cheat.

M: Can you describe the situation from your perspective?

S: Yes, I went to Uni a bit earlier that day to discuss some last things about the exam with my friends and we had lunch together on campus. Then we went to the room where the exam took place and met a few other people before the test started. After the exam, I went to the bathroom and then immediately went home.

M: Did you feel prepared for the exam?

S: No because I have some personal stuff going on that restricted me from studying. My grandmother passed away two weeks ago and therefore I also had a lot of other things on my mind. Due to the situation, I was not able to prepare as much as I would have otherwise. Nevertheless, I tried my best to prepare as much as I could and luckily, I found out during the test that the questions were not too difficult.

M: Well, you also were not prepared for the last exams. We saw you barely passed your last exams and on this one you scored rather good.

S: No, you're mistaken. I studied a lot but the last times, the exams were just more difficult. Like I said before, this time was just easier as the last ones.

M: Still, we will discuss in the next few days how to proceed from here and will inform you about the outcomes via email. Usually, we propose an oral examination to give you the chance to prove that you were able to answer the questions yourself. Are you okay with that or do you have any other remarks or questions?

S: No, that's alright with me. When would this examination take place?

M: We would like to discuss this with your examiner and let you know as soon as we find a date.

S: Alright, thank you.

M: That would be it for now, thank you for taking your time, Luca. Have a nice day.

Script five-error condition

Member examination board (M): Hello Luca, how are you doing?

Student (S): Yeah, I am fine, just a bit nervous. I am not really sure what to expect from this interview.

M: Don't worry, we just want to start by clarifying what happened. What do you think: why are you here today?

S: I am here because of the email I got from the Examination Board where I was accused of exam fraud. The email said that I had the questions and answers to the exam even before I took the test.

M: Did you have the questions beforehand?

S: No, I did not cheat.

M: So far, you did not look like a very motivated communication science student. We took a look at your records and since this exam was way better than your previous grades, therefore, we think you cheated.

S (five error and three error condition): Huh? I'm a Psychology student, not communication science student. Also, I'm a very motivated student, study a lot and no, I did not cheat.

M: Can you describe the situation from your perspective?

S: Yes, I went to uni a bit earlier that day to discuss some last things about the exam with my friends and we had lunch together on campus. Then we went to the room where the exam took place and met a few other people before the test started. After the exam, I went to the bathroom and then immediately went home.

M: Did you feel prepared for the exam?

S: No because I have some personal stuff going on that restricted me from studying. My grandmother passed away two weeks ago and therefore I also had a lot of other things on my mind. Due to the situation, I was not able to prepare as much as I would have otherwise. Nevertheless, I tried my best to prepare as much as I could and, in the end, the questions were not too difficult.

M: Well, you also were not prepared for the last exams. We saw you barely passed your last exams and on this one you scored rather good.

S: No, you're mistaken. I studied a lot but the last times, the exams were just more difficult. Like I said before, this time was just easier as the last ones.

M: Oh, how fortunate that particularly this exam was so easy. Seems a little too coincidental.

S: What do you expect me to answer to that?

M: I just wanted to point that out. Still, we will discuss in the next few days how to proceed from here and will inform you about the outcomes via email. Usually, we propose an oral examination to give you the chance to prove that you were able to answer the questions yourself. Are you okay with that or do you have any other remarks or questions?

S: No, that's alright with me. When would this examination take place?

M: We would like to discuss this with your examiner and let you know as soon as we find a date.

S: Alright, thank you.

M: That would be it for now, thank you for taking your time, Tony. Have a nice day.

S: My name is Luca. But thanks, have a nice day as well.

M: Oh yes, Luca.

Appendix C

Questionnaires

Scale One (Rapport) (Imagine you are the student you just saw in the video, and you are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in the context of this interview; you can respond on a scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5))

1. I think the interviewer is generally honest with me.
2. The interviewer did their job with skill during this interview.
3. The interviewer respects my knowledge.
4. The interviewer performed expertly during the interview.
5. I think that the interviewer can generally be trusted with their word.
6. The interviewer really listened to what I had to say.
7. I was motivated to perform well during the interview.
8. I feel I can trust the interviewer to keep their word to me.
9. The interviewer made an effort to do a good job.
10. The interviewer acted like a professional.
11. The interviewer paid careful attention to my opinion.
12. The interviewer and I got along well during the interview.
13. The interviewer and I worked together well as a team.
14. I wanted to do a good job during the interview.
15. The interviewer was attentive to me.
16. Communication went smoothly between the interviewer and me.
17. The interviewer was interested in my point of view.
18. I felt committed to accomplishing the goals of the interview in the video.

Scale Two (Trust) (The next few questions are about the examination board member, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5))

1. The Examination Board member is very capable of performing its job.
2. The Examination Board member is known to be successful at the things they try to do.
3. The Examination Board member has much knowledge about the work that needs done.
4. I feel very confident about the skills of the Examination Board member.
5. The Examination Board member has specialised capabilities that will help the case to be solved.

6. The Examination Board member is well qualified.

7. The Examination Board member is very concerned about my welfare.

8. My needs and desires are very important to the Examination Board member.

9. The Examination Board member really looks out for what is important to me.

10. The Examination Board member will go out of its way to help me.

11. The Examination Board member has a strong sense of justice.

12. I never have to wonder whether the Examination Board member will stick to their word.

13. The Examination Board member tries hard to be fair in dealings with others.

14. The actions and behaviours of the Examination Board member are not very consistent. *

15. I like the values of The Examination Board member.

16. Sound principles seem to guide the behaviour of the Examination Board member.

Scale Three (Perceived Humaneness) Imagine you are the student you just saw in the video, and you are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in the context of this interview; you can respond on a scale from "not at all" (1) to "very much so" (7))

1. I think the Examination Board member had interpersonal warmth.

2. I think the Examination Board member was open-minded, she could think clearly.

3. I think the Examination Board member was emotional like she was responsive and warm.

4. I perceived the Examination Board member as superficial as if she had no depth.

5. The Examination Board member acted like an object, not a human.

6. I perceived the Examination Board member as mechanical and cold like a robot.

Scale Four (Perceived Communication Competence) (Imagine you are the student you just saw in the video, and you are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in the context of this interview; you can respond on a scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5))

1. The interviewer can adapt to changing situations.

2. The interviewer treated me as an individual.

3. The interviewer interrupted me too much. *

4. The interviewer is "rewarding" to talk to.

5. The interviewer can deal with others effectively.

6. The interviewer is a good listener.

7. The interviewer is easy to talk to.

8. The interviewer wouldn't argue with someone just to prove she is right.

9. The interviewer's conversation behaviour is not "smooth". *

10. The interviewer ignored my feelings. *

11. The interviewer let me know he/she understands me.

12. The interviewer is relaxed and comfortable when speaking.

13. The interviewer listens to what I say to her.

14. The interviewer generally knows what type of behaviour is appropriate in any given situation.

15. The interviewer was an effective conversationalist.

16. The interviewer was supportive of me.

17. The interviewer can easily put herself in another person's shoes.

18. The interviewer paid attention to the conversation.

19. the interviewer was interested in what I had to say.

20. The interviewer did not follow the conversation very well. *

21. The interviewer is a likeable person.

22. The interviewer is flexible.

23. The interviewer is not afraid to speak with people in authority.

24. The interviewer generally says the right thing at the right time.

25. The interviewer likes to use his/her voice and body expressively.

26. The interviewer was sensitive to my needs at the moment.

Scale five (Willingness to Provide Information) (Imagine you are the student you just saw in the video, and you are asked to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in the context of this interview; you can respond on a scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5))

1. I would tell the interviewer everything

2. I would provide a lot of information to the interviewer.

3. I would give truthful information to the interviewer'

Appendix D

Table D1

Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Errors on Effectiveness Measures in Interviews

	Communication Error					
	Control (*n* = 35)		One-Error (*n* = 10)		Multiple-Error (*n* = 47)	
Effectiveness measures	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
1. Rapport	3.85	0.68	3.69	0.61	2.95[a]	0.73
2. Trust	3.42	0.54	3.36	0.42	2.73[a]	0.61
3. Perceived communication competence	3.37	0.58	3.19[b]	0.45	2.59[a,b]	0.55
4. Willingness to provide information	2.59	0.99	2.37	0.82	2.27	0.99

[a] Differs significantly from control, $p < .05$

[b] Differs significantly from the other communication error, $p < .05$