

**UNIVERSITY
OF TWENTE.**

**The Extent to which Procedural Information can Predict Vulnerable Individuals' Level
of Rapport and Shared Truthful Information within Investigative Interviews**

by

Pia Lauber

1st supervisor: Dr Lynn Weiher

2nd supervisor: Dr Miriam S.D. Oostinga

Conflict, Risk, and Safety (CRS)

Faculty of Behavioural, Management, and Social Sciences

BSc. Psychology

July 3, 2022

Abstract

The police must solve a variety of cases daily and depend on effective work with victims, witnesses, and suspects to gather information. Therefore, conducting investigative interviews is crucial (Clarke & Milne, 2017). Vulnerable individuals experience a great disadvantage in such social interactions, and issues like higher suggestibility, lack of understanding, and vagueness in answers may occur (Gudjonsson, 2010; Gudjonsson, 2018; Herrington & Roberts, 2012). Providing procedural information about the nature of the interview, a definition of interrogations, understandable legal rights, and simplifying the language of communicating legal rights in the interview can counteract issues vulnerable individuals experience and therefore decrease situational stress (Eastwood et al., 2014; Green et al., 2008; Newburn et al., 2012). This study examined the effects of providing procedural information on rapport as well as on information provision. The relationship between rapport and truthful information will be additionally tested for. A between-subject-design with two conditions (receiving procedural information versus not receiving procedural information) was used. 62 participants conducted re-enacted investigative interviews followed by a questionnaire measuring rapport. The findings suggest that procedural information do not impact the level of rapport and the shared truthful information. Also, scores of rapport are in no correlation with information provision. Tendencies were found in neurotypicals having higher scores of rapport when not receiving procedural information and neurodiverse scoring higher on rapport when receiving procedural information. Also, neurodiverse individuals tend to share more true information than neurotypical individuals when receiving procedural information. This suggests that neurodiverse individuals might benefit more from receiving procedural information than neurotypicals do.

Criminal offenses happen daily – from mild to major incidences. Which may not be visible or obvious for ordinary individuals is daily business for police officers. Looking for and interviewing victims, witnesses and suspects is therefore a necessary quest for clarification of those cases. In this process, police officers are confronted with a diversity of individuals, who can differ in their personality, mental state, or intellectuality. Especially for vulnerable individuals these encounters oftentimes cause stress and anxiety as currently used investigation methods can be hard to cope with. It should be in general interest to ensure the same fairness and quality of policing for vulnerable as for non-vulnerable individuals. The police can benefit from enhancing the interrogations for vulnerable victims, witnesses and suspects as more reliable information could probably be collected and available to help solving cases more effectively. Furthermore, making this process more inclusive will support individuals with their vulnerabilities which lead towards an equal treatment.

The importance of investigative interviews

The intended goal of investigative interviews is to gather as many true and reliable information as possible by proposing questions to the interviewed victim, witness, or suspect (Clarke & Milne, 2017). Further investigations may be based on the given statements which makes obtaining details and accuracy more crucial. For the sake of fairness and justice, the quality of the interview and neutrality of police officers is important, which means not having pre-judgements about possible suspects nor their guilt or innocence (Gudjonsson, 2010). Multiple models and theories exist nowadays which all treat the nature of investigative interviews. In the following, the focus lays on the PEACE model which was introduced by Newburn et al. (2012).

The PEACE framework is the most frequently used interviewing method in England and Wales. The model consists of five stages of managing the interview process: (1) Planning and Preparation, (2) Engage and Explain, (3) Account and Clarification, (4) Closure, and (5)

Evaluation (Newburn et al., 2012). The aim of the framework is to receive truthful information from interviewees by using a non-confrontational and humanitarian approach as it was recognised that rather aggressive interview techniques did not have successful outcomes in terms of not getting relevant information from interviewees to solve the case (Snook et al., 2014). It was demonstrated that the model indeed complies this aim in interaction with victims, witnesses, and suspects (Howes, 2019). Especially in the Explain and Engage phase the model stresses the importance of rapport building since it leads to receiving the most reliable testimonies of interviewees (Newburn et al., 2012). By sticking to the rules of the Explain and Engage stage, it is additionally possible to provide interviewees procedural information, so the same information but prior the intended interview. Providing such information could help neurotypical individuals but especially a more diverse set of vulnerable individuals since it gives more time to deal with information and prepare for the interview.

Investigative interviews with vulnerable individuals

Throughout existing literature there seems to be a discrepancy about an official definition of vulnerable individuals within the judicial system (e.g., Bull, 2010; Gudjonsson, 2006). While Bull (2010) argues that there is no dominant internationally used definition of the term, Gudjonsson (2006) defines the concept vulnerability as a “psychological characteristics or mental state which renders an [individual] prone, in certain circumstances, to providing information which is inaccurate, unreliable, or misleading” (p.68). The latter also includes mental health disorders such as mood disorders, psychosis, or personality disorders (Farrugia & Gabbert, 2020).

Generally speaking, a vulnerable individual has significant disadvantages in social interactions, which concludingly also applies to cooperating in investigative interviews (Herrington & Roberts, 2012). Gudjonsson (2006) distinguishes four types of typical

psychological vulnerabilities which are important to evaluate victims, suspects, and witnesses in criminal cases: First, 'mental disorders' such as mental illnesses, learning disabilities, or personality disorders. The second type describes 'abnormal mental states' like anxieties, mood disturbances, or phobias. Third, 'intellectual functioning' including borderline and certain IQ scores. Fourth and last, the 'personality' type of vulnerability includes suggestibility, compliance, or acquiescence and is described as the most controversial and complex type out of all four cases (Gudjonsson, 2006).

Moreover, it is important to consider psychological vulnerabilities as potential risk factors and not as immediate assumptions of unreliability (Gudjonsson, 2010). Rejecting vulnerabilities as risk factors could possibly lead to place victims, witnesses, and suspects at a disadvantage in the investigative interview, since it is important to recognise and consider the vulnerability and assist it but not to doubt everything the interviewee recalls. Therefore, the identification of vulnerable individuals in criminal cases is crucial, although this is only poorly successful nowadays (Gudjonsson, 2010). This study will specifically focus on the vulnerabilities of neurodiverse individuals, which spectrum includes for instance autism spectrum disorder (ASD), ADHD or dyslexia.

Conducting investigative interviews with neurodiverse suspects may create several difficulties for police officers to receive accurate testifies when sticking to current interviewing practices. These practices include only informing interviewees about their legal rights, being harsh and being strictly case-solving oriented (Gorby, 2013). Applying these intimidating and coercion methods can most likely trigger suspects yielding false information (Goodman-Delahunty & Martschuk, 2018).

Within each investigative interview, it is advantageous to establish rapport between the interviewer and interviewee. Rapport is a concept similar to trust where a connecting and trustworthy relationship is built, which is said to encourage especially neurodiverse

individuals to share a greater information yield (Aldridge, 2010). The information yield is determined by the amount of true information an individual shares about the case under discussion in an interview.

Each individual may need another form of assistance to be able to build rapport and to conduct the interview successfully (Gudjonsson, 2018). For instance, neurodiverse suspects may not respond well to current methods of interviewing caused by a lack of understanding of the influence of their answers and the importance of reliability (Gudjonsson, 2018). Gudjonsson (2010) draws the attention to suspects with mental health disorders and their higher levels of suggestibility, compliance, and acquiescence. Also, suspects with mental or intellectual disabilities have difficulties remembering specific information and to focus their attention whilst being confronted with current policing methods (Bartels, 2011). For example, individuals with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) may fail to hold eye-to-eye contact which may lead the interviewer to believe that the individual is lying (Ochoa & Rome, 2009). Individuals with ADHD may seem to be vague in their answers which could both seem suspicious to a police officer who follows current policing methods and was taught that these are common attributes of a liars (Bartels, 2011; Gudjonsson, 2010).

Throughout existing literature, it is recognisable that the nature of questions as well as the environment of the interview are important factors for enhancing the quality of interviews for neurodiverse individuals. Proposing open question is advantageous over closed questions as it prompts interviewees to talk freely about everything what comes to their minds (Bearman et al., 2021). Additional support to structure answers can also be given for instance by asking sub-questions. This in turn increases the information neurodiverse individuals share by maintaining accuracy (Bearman et al., 2021). Especially when conducting an investigative interview with a neurodiverse suspect it is important to create a comfortable environment given their low resilience to any stressors which can lead to fear and anxiety and therefore

unreliability. This can be bypassed by creating good rapport. Having a good relationship with the interviewed suspect creates a more comfortable space to share accurate information (Herrington & Roberts, 2012).

Therefore, having specific guidelines is an essential tool for assisting neurodiverse individuals in the investigative interview to provide consistency and to not misjudge behaviours or testimonies within the interview (Bearman et al., 2021). One guideline is the ‘Achieving Best Evidence in Criminal Proceedings’ (ABE) which is a practice guide used for investigative interviews. This approach emphasises the uniqueness of each case and support officers to tailor the specific needs and circumstances individuals need to give their best evidence. It gives police officers an overview of how to assist vulnerable victims and witnesses during the interview with several special measurements. For instance, the guideline considers decisions concerning whether an interview should be conducted or whether an interview should be video recorded (Ministry of Justice, 2022). These special measures, such as using pre-trial audio recordings of evidence, can minimise the associated stress by decreasing the number of interviews conducted and help vulnerable individuals giving testifies as effective as possible (Gudjonsson, 2010; Bearman et al., 2021). Since the ABE was first published in 2002, the approach has been revised and more precisely adapted throughout the years towards the needs of vulnerable victims and suspects to ensure fair and effective investigative processes (Ministry of Justice, 2022). With this study, I want to investigate whether providing procedural information can increase rapport and therefore information provision.

Procedural information

Confronting neurodiverse individuals with current interview practices does oftentimes not meet their special communicative needs which would include mentioning legal rights in a slower and more understandable manner (Eastwood et al. 2014; Ellison, 2001). Therefore,

providing procedural information to neurodiverse suspects could enhance the outcome and the quality of investigative interviews. This is equivalent to the second step of the PEACE model engage and explain. In this case, issues like how much time is needed to conduct the interview, what is expected, and who will be there during the interview can be discussed (Newburn et al., 2012). Also, interviewers should minimise concerns, and create an unthreatening environment to decrease situational stress (Green et al., 2008). This stage of the model is additionally known to be the most influential when it comes to rapport building with the interviewee (Newburn et al., 2012). Moreover, general interview settings can be explained, including for instance if the interview will be video, or audio recorded.

Next to the interrogative technique of providing a detailed guideline for vulnerable individuals, legal rights should be communicated. In fact, Eastwood et al. (2014) criticise that interrogation rights are delivered in a too complicated way to interviewees, as these rights are presented in a fast and complex manner which can hardly be processed by vulnerable individuals. To improve this process, language presenting legal rights should be simplified and use pauses for interviewees to hear and process all parts. Also, asking interviewees to recall legal rights in their own words to ensure understanding is crucial. Pre-information should additionally be communicated in a standardised form by avoiding variations. These recommendations may lead to a better comprehension of procedural rights to ensure and to protect the rights of everyone. Sticking to these guidelines will increase preparedness especially for neurodiverse individuals in interviews and may decrease stress and anxiety. In turn, this would improve outcomes and reliability of investigative interviews (Eastwood et al., 2014). Implementing these recommendations into a new interrogative technique could enhance the perception of neurodiverse interviewees on investigative interviews. Therefore, the effects of providing procedural information will be tested on rapport building and the information yield. Next to incorporating the recommendations of Eastwood et al. (2014) in

the interview and pre-information, additional procedural information concerning the nature and process of the interview will be handed to interviewees.

The present study

Within this study, I aim to test how the delivery of pre-interview information (legal rights and procedural information) impacts on rapport and information yield. Out of this the research question is formed, to what extent does providing procedural information influence the rapport building and the amount of accurate information suspects share.

As it is described in the PEACE model, the phase of engaging and explaining serves as the phase of rapport building. This stage is particularly in focus and an environment is created in which suspects feel comfortable to talk (Eastwood et al. 2014; Newburn et al., 2012). I will create this environment by providing participants pre-information about the interview to give them time to prepare. During the interview, I will adapt the interview introduction based on the Explain and Engage phase of the PEACE framework towards the needs of neurodiverse individuals, by using understandable language, explaining what we are going to do, and asking multiple times if everything is understood (Newburn et al., 2012). Based on this I firstly assume that receiving procedural information will result in a better rapport between interviewer and suspect than when suspects do not receive procedural information. Next, since existing literature shows that having a good rapport leads to an increase in the amount of information shared, it is expected that by increasing rapport the amount of information will additionally be increased as well (Abbe & Brandon, 2013). A study by Kim et al. (2020) shows that using a humanitarian approach, like the PEACE approach, can increase the information yield during an interview. This leads to the second hypothesis, that providing procedural information is expected to result in a higher amount of accurate information shared by the suspect than under the condition when suspects do not receive procedural information. Since an increase in rapport alone can increase the

information yield (Abbe & Brandon, 2013), the third and last hypothesis is shapes, which assumes that higher scores of rapport lead to an increase in truthful information. This study will not be conducted with only neurodiverse individuals, but also with neurotypical individuals. Nevertheless, it is assumed that if procedural information increase the amount of correct information and rapport in neurotypical individuals, it will also be the case for neurodiverse individuals.

To conclude, this particular study will aim to further research on the topic of improving investigative interviews with the aim to create a more inclusive interview technique. The focus of this study is to highlight the importance of procedural information and its influence on several factors, namely amount of accurate information as well as rapport. None of the existing research has focused on the combination of these specific determinants and the influence of procedural information.

Methods

Design

The study was conducted using a between-subject-design with two conditions (no procedural information vs. procedural information). In the no procedural information condition, the interview was conducted similar to currently applied policing methods. Contrary, in the procedural information condition participants received more information concerning the implementation of the interview beforehand. The independent variable was procedural information, and the dependent variables were rapport and truthful information. This research paper is part of a larger study in which two other depended variables were utilised which are not included in this paper. These two variables were measures using the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) scale measuring anxiety level after the interview (see Appendix A) (Spielberger, 1983) and the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI) scale measuring the level of working alliance of participants (see Appendix B) (Vanderhallen et al., 2011).

Participants

This study was distributed using a convenience sampling method by advertising the study among multiple social media platforms (e.g., WhatsApp, Facebook, Instagram) as well as by publishing it over SONA system which is a participant tool accessible for University of Twente students. The study was solely available in English. The inclusion criteria comprise owning or having access to a digital device with an audio output, being at least 18 years old and possessing good understanding of the English language which had to be estimated by the participants themselves. This study was approved by the BMS ethics committee of the University of Twente.

Participants of the study were a convenient sample of 64 adults. I excluded two participants since one participant did not fill out the survey, and another participant did not take part in the interview. This led to a final sample of 62 participants (24 male $M_{Age} = 23.71$, $SD = 5.20$, 37 female $M_{Age} = 21.73$, $SD = 1.69$ and one participant preferred not to answer). From all participants, seven indicated to be (self-)diagnosed neurodiverse (two with dyslexia and two with ADHD in the no procedural information condition; one with dyslexia and two with ADHD in the procedural information condition).

Materials

Case vignette

A case vignette was handed to the participants in written form via email prior the interview. The aim of giving out the case vignette was to give participants an experience to talk about and to load them with guilt. The case vignette described a scenario in which one works as a driver to supply the military base with food and equipment from the local airport. They get approached by a friend with the request to smuggle equipment out of the base. Out of many smuggle options (e.g., with donkeys or lorries) they choose to use the vehicles.

(see Appendix C). Participants were instructed to get into the perspective of smuggling the equipment. Then, participants needed to consider the amount of information they want to share within the investigative interview to not recriminate themselves nor their friend by still being cooperative. The case vignette was utilised as it was prior used in another similar research by Weiher (2020).

Rapport scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations (RS3i)

For measuring the interviewees experience of rapport during the interview with the police officer the multidimensional questionnaire for interrogations and investigative interviews (RS3i) was utilised (Duke et al. 2018). It encompasses five different domains of measuring rapport including attentiveness, trust/respect, expertise, cultural similarity, and connected flow as well as one scale dealing with commitment to communication. For instance, the item “The interviewer really listened to what I had to say” is an indicator for attentiveness (Magee, 2020). The questionnaire shows a good internal reliability as well as a good construct validity. Moreover, the scale consists of a total of 21 items, which are measured on a 5-point-Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree” to 5 = “strongly agree”; see Appendix D). The mean scores of participants were used for further research whereas higher scores indicate higher levels of rapport. In this study a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .92$ was detected. This can be labelled as indicating strong internal consistency (Taber, 2018).

Truthful information

In order to analyse the amount of truthful information participants were sharing during the interview, the interviews were transcribed. After that, a word checklist was used which contains keywords of all the true information which can be found in the case vignette (for instance “Logistics/Logistical support” or “fix/fixing”; see Appendix E for the full checklist) (Weiher, 2020). By comparing the transcribed interviews with this checklist, I

detected how many truthful information the participants shared. The sum scores of the true information were used for the analysis.

In this study, 20% of the transcripts were coded by two coders (12 out of 62). The total number of truthful information per transcript were compared. The coding between the first coder ($M = 11.33$, $SD = 2.39$) and the second coder ($M = 11.42$, $SD = 2.23$) was reliable. An excellent interclass correlation coefficient was found, $ICC = .98$, (95% CI [.932, .994], $F(11, 1) = 0.19$, $p < .001$).

Additional questions

Several additional questions were proposed to the participants to get more information for data analysis. It was asked if they would return to a second voluntary interview and, if so, require legal representation. This showed the willingness of participants to return and therefore how cooperative they would be. Also, participants had to indicate their motivation to participate in the interview on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “not motivated at all” to 5 = “very motivated”; see Appendix F: Weiher, 2020).

Procedure

The study consists of three parts: pre-interview phase, interview phase, and post-interview phase. First participants received information before the interview, followed by the interview and finished by answering the questionnaire. The participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions. To ensure random selection, the conditions alternated per day and participants were not aware of that. By signing up to the study, participants thought the research investigates the topic of lie detection within police interviews. All participants were debriefed after having finished all three parts.

Pre-interview phase

All participants received an informed consent and the case vignette in written form about 24 hours before the interview was conducted. It gave participants the necessary time to

get familiar with the mock crime. The task of the investigative interview was to protect both their friend and them from getting suspected while remaining cooperative with the police.

Participants in the second condition received the same information but additionally a flyer containing procedural information prior the interview. The flyer included legal rights, a definition of voluntary police interviews, and general information of the characteristics and environmental factors of the interview (for the procedural information flyer see Appendix G). For all the information which can vary between interviews (e.g., how long the interview will take or who will be there) it was indicated that the information will be communicated in the beginning of the interview as it is advised from the PEACE framework (Howes, 2018).

Interview phase

The interviews were conducted online via MS Teams using a computer, tablet, or any other electronic device, with stable internet connection. Participation in this study was anonymous.

In the first condition, the interviewer orally explained the legal rights and some ground rules for the interview in the beginning. By use of these ground rules the participants can speak freely without interruption by the interviewer and questions can be asked by participants. Afterwards, the standardised investigative questions about the incident described in the case vignette were asked, for instance “Please tell me what you normally do at the base” or “What can you tell me about who is involved” (for the full interview transcript of condition one see Appendix H).

At the beginning of the interviews in the procedural information condition, the interviewer again vocally explained the legal rights and ground rules, but also highlighted the procedural information shown on the flyer again (e.g., that the interview will take ten minutes and that only the researcher will be present). After that, the standardised questions followed (for the full interview transcript of condition two see Appendix I). Both and especially in the

procedural information condition, the interview introduction was inspired by the Engage and Explain phase from the PEACE framework. This phase highlights the importance of creating a pleasant environment through mentioning information as it was done in our interview introduction (Green et al., 2008).

The average duration of the interview in the no procedural information condition was 5 minutes and 45 seconds ($Min = 3.31$ Min, $Max = 11$ Min), and in the procedural information condition 5 minutes and 59 seconds ($Min = 4.28$ Min, $Max = 9.56$ Min).

Post-interview phase

All participants were asked to complete an online questionnaire via Qualtrics after the interview was conducted. First, participants had to accept the informed consent in order to continue with the survey. The measures were presented in the order of 1) STAI (Spielberger, 1983), 2) RS3i (Duke et al. 2018), 3) WAI (Vanderhallen et al., 2011), 4) Willingness to return, and 5) Question if a lawyer would be consulted. In the end, subjects received a debrief about the study purpose. The average duration the participants needed to complete the survey was 26 minutes and 30 seconds ($SD = 91.27$ $Min = 3.3$ Min, $Max = 525.3$ Min) in the first condition and ten minutes and 40 seconds ($SD = 5.74$, $Min = 4.2$ Min, $Max = 31.4$ Min) for the second condition.

Results

Descriptive statistics

In Table 1, the separate means and standard deviations of the no procedural information condition and the procedural information condition are displayed by use of the demographic data age and neurodiversity as well as the variables of the RS3i scale and the truthful information. The displayed demographic data makes it obvious that my sample consisted mostly of young neurotypical university students, as the average age was relatively low and neurodiverse individuals were rarely present. For the RS3i scale, the mean score was

lower in the procedural information condition, which is against expectation. The truthful information were slightly higher in the procedural information condition which is so far in line with our assumption that receiving procedural information lead towards higher density of true information.

Table 1

Descriptive statistics of Age, Neurodiversity (coded as 0 = none, 1 = having at least one neurodiversity), RS3i survey, and Truthful information from the interview

	<i>M (SD)</i>	
	No procedural information (N = 32)	Procedural information (N = 30)
Age	23.34 (4.54)	21.47 (1.87)
Neurodiversity	0.13 (0.34)	0.11 (0.32)
RS3i	3.99 (0.61)	3.86 (0.52)
Truthful information	11.59 (2.71)	12.23 (2.47)

N = 62

H1: Procedural information led to higher scores of rapport

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare scores of rapport for the no procedural information condition and procedural information condition. For the RS3i questionnaire, there was no significant difference between the no procedural information condition ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 0.61$) and the procedural information condition ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 0.52$), $t(60) = 0.91$, $p = .365$, $d = 0.23$. The results suggested that receiving procedural information might not influence rapport, but rather that rapport scores seem slightly higher in the no procedural information condition. The findings allow for rejection of the hypothesis, that procedural information led to higher scores of rapport.

H2: Procedural information led to higher amount of truthful information

To analyse if participants in the procedural information condition gave more truthful information than in the no procedural information condition, an independent-samples t-test was utilised. It was detected that there is no significant difference between the no procedural

information condition ($M = 11.53$, $SD = 2.75$) and the procedural information condition ($M = 12.33$, $SD = 2.47$), $t(60) = -1.12$, $p = .267$, $d = -0.31$. Nevertheless, there is a slightly higher number of true information shared in the procedural information condition. Since non-significant results were detected, the hypothesis of procedural information leading towards a higher amount of truthful information can be rejected.

H3: Higher scores of rapport lead to higher amount of truthful information

First, a regression analysis was performed to estimate the relationship between truthful information and the level of rapport. Results showed that scores of rapport cannot significantly predict the amount of true information, $R^2 = .05$, $F(1, 60) = 1.45$, $p = .234$. The regression coefficient, $B = -.04$, 95% CI $[-.10, .02]$ indicated that an increase of rapport scores slightly triggered a decrease in true information.

Second, a bivariate correlation analysis was used to predict the correlation of the survey measuring rapport (RS3i) and the truthful information participants shared within the interview. The results show non-significant outcomes for the rapport questionnaire and the truthful information given by the participants, $r(60) = -.15$, $p = .23$. This indicates that higher scores of rapport are not correlated with higher amounts of accurate information, but rather that an increase in rapport triggers a decrease in truthful information. Based on the result of the regression analysis and the bivariate correlation analysis the hypothesis can be rejected.

Explorative analysis

All the following analyses were only conducted with the seven participants being (self-)diagnosed neurodiverse. Although the sample size is too small to make any statistical assessments, I wanted to check whether the results of the neurotypicals tend to be in line when checking for the results of only the neurodiverse participants. This could give impulses for future implications. An independent sampled t-test was utilised to analyse whether scores of neurodiverse participants change depending on the assigned condition. It was detected that

there is no significant difference in the RS3i questionnaire scores of the no procedural information condition ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.88$) and the procedural information condition ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.99$), $t(5) = 0.20$, $p = .83$, $d = -0.68$. Although there are no significant results, a tendency towards higher mean scores in the procedural information condition than in the no procedural information condition can be detected. This would therefore mean that neurodiverse participants tend to experience a slightly higher level of rapport when receiving procedural information.

Another independent sampled t-test was used to check for the difference in the amount of truthful information of neurodiverse participants between the two conditions. The results show that there is no significant difference between the no procedural information condition ($M = 10.75$, $SD = 2.75$) and the procedural information condition ($M = 13.33$, $SD = 0.58$). A tendency of sharing more true information was found in the procedural information condition.

Discussion

Within this study, the purpose was to test new investigative interview techniques to make the interrogation process more inclusive for all, but especially for those who identify as neurodivergent. It was one of the first studies to test whether receiving procedural interview information before the interview does lead to an increase in rapport as well as in truthful information especially for neurodiverse individuals. Furthermore, it was tested whether high rapport provokes an increase in truthful information.

My findings do not seem to suggest that receiving procedural information in addition to legal rights lead to an increase in rapport for neurotypical individuals. Contrary to what we predicted, slightly higher scores of rapport were detected in the no procedural information condition. This seems to suggest that receiving procedural information is not beneficial for neurotypical individuals, as there is even a tendency that rapport decreases when participants

received procedural information. A possible reason for this tendency could be that neurotypical individuals feel overloaded and stressed when being confronted with the amount of pre-interview information (Ashford, 1988). Neurotypicals may not even need more information to feel comfortable and more prepared for the interview. Contrary, when directly comparing the scores of neurodiverse participants in both conditions, the findings suggest a tendency towards higher scores of rapport in the procedural information condition. This trend of results is consistent with Eastwood et al. (2014) findings that altering the interview process through for instance simplifying the language and providing pre-information will increase preparedness and decrease stress and anxiety for especially neurotypical individuals. So, unlike neurotypical individuals, neurodiverse individuals may benefit from receiving procedural information. This would in turn mean that neurodiverse individuals benefit from a higher quantity of information when it comes to investigative interviews, while neurotypical individuals do not. Prior we assumed that our sample, which is a mix of neurotypical and neurodiverse individuals, will give us accurate results, as we thought that when neurotypicals experience more rapport when receiving procedural information, it should be the same for neurodiverse individuals. Based on my results this assumption might be wrong since tendencies of scores from neurotypicals and neurodiverse go in opposite directions with neurotypical individuals indicated lower rapport when receiving procedural information and neurodiverse individuals scoring higher on rapport when receiving procedural information. It also needs to be stated that the pre-interview information (flyer and interview introduction) were based on needs of neurodiverse individuals (Newburn, 2012; Eastwood et al., 2014), although the sample consisted mostly of neurotypical individuals. Therefore and based on my findings, it can be assumed that the selected altering of current policing methods to cover mainly the needs of neurodiverse individuals, only help neurodiverse and not neurotypical individuals. It may be the case that neurotypicals experience more rapport towards police

officers whilst being confronted with current policing methods, in contrary neurodiverse experience more rapport when receiving additional pre-interview information.

According to the results of the study, receiving procedural information does not lead to a higher amount of truthful information. A tendency was identified that participants in the procedural information condition shared slightly more true information. Checking the difference of shared true information of only the neurodiverse participants, more information were also shared in the procedural information condition. Interestingly, the analysis with neurotypical individuals showed that approximately one information was shared more in the procedural information condition than in the no procedural information condition. In contrast, in the analysis with only neurodiverse individuals this discrepancy expanded to about three words. Potential interpretation of these findings is that procedural information may encourage neurotypicals when it comes to sharing true information but neurodiverse individuals may be even more reinforced to provide true information.

The nature of selected question also plays a role when it comes to the amount of shared information. Bearman et al. (2021) stated the importance of proposing open questions to give interviewees the chance to talk freely, which we did. This is in line with Phillips et al. (2012) study where more investigative relevant information were elicited when proposing open, encourages, and probing questions than closed, forced, and leading questions. In fact, the same standardised open questions were utilised in both conditions, which may be the reason why scores of truthful information did not differ much. To check whether providing procedural information or the nature of interview questions accounts for the information yield, it is recommended for future research to propose different type of question between conditions while providing procedural information to all.

It can be rejected that higher scores of rapport lead to a higher density of truthful information. It was assumed that a good relationship with the interviewer creates a

comfortable space to share truthful information (Herrington & Roberts, 2012). The present trend of results is not consistent with Collins and Cathy's (2018) research which found out that two rapport components, coordination and attention, are positively correlated with the amount of true information shared by suspects. Also, the findings are not in accordance with the outcome of Holmberg and Madsen's (2014) study, which stated that using a humanitarian rapport interview leads towards having a higher density of true information. I did use a humanitarian approach by implementing the Explain and Engage phase from the PEACE framework in the interview structure. It could not significantly increase rapport in the which therefore may did not trigger sharing a greater amount of true information. It therefore seems like rapport was not enhanced enough to generate for more shared true information. A possible reason for this is that the time in which an interview was conducted was too short to build rapport (mean of 5 min and 59 sec in the procedural information condition). An interview oftentimes must be time consuming for interviewees to build rapport and to come to the point where multiple true information are shared (Collins et al., 2002; Holmberg & Madsen, 2014). Therefore, it is advised for future research to expand the time of interviews to enhance rapport more.

Limitations and strengths

One limitation of the study is that only seven out of 62 participants indicated to be (self-) diagnosed neurodiverse. Although we assumed that overall scores could be transferred to a diverse population, having a higher sample of neurodiverse individuals would have resulted in higher precision. Nevertheless and due to the sample of interviewees, it is valid to make assumptions about neurotypical individuals, as they seem to not benefit from receiving procedural information when looking at the rapport level and only slightly for the information yield. Even though the number of neurodiverse participants was small, including neurodiverse participants in the study is a strong benefit, as I directly tested suggestions for

improvement in investigative interviews for vulnerable individuals on neurodiverse participants. It is advised for future research to implement a mental health screening before conducting the study, which may then result in a more sophisticated sample (Waite, 2007). Nevertheless, it will take a lot of time and effort to carefully screen each participant for vulnerabilities, and ethical concerns will occur as for instance undetected vulnerabilities could appear within a study. To bypass this, a sample of throughout neurodiverse participants could be aimed for. It was not done in this study, since we wanted to test whether receiving procedural information works for everyone but having a sample of neurodiverse individuals could be strived for in future research. Based on this, special treatments, as for instance receiving procedural information, could be handed to individuals who benefit from it.

Another point to consider when interpreting the results for rapport is that conducting investigative interviews with neurodiverse individuals has the particular importance of avoiding fear and anxiety by creating a comfortable environment, which may not be given in this study (Herrington & Roberts, 2012). Participants were free to choose where to conduct the study, and the circumstances of the environment were therefore in no control. Moreover, nonverbal behaviours are essential parts of rapport building as it creates a more comfortable and safer environment for interviewees (Meijer et al., 2021). Not being able to implement all elements of nonverbal behaviour caused by an online environment, as we had, can lead to hesitation and distrust in the professionalism (Meijer et al., 2021). Through the video conference it was possible to transmit facial expressions and eye messages but not for instance body movement or type of clothing which are all considered as important in rapport building (Phutela, 2015). As research shows, using mimicry in a face-to-face interaction can increase rapport, trust and the amount of information shared (Muniak, 2021). It can be argued that mimicry is also communicable in an online setting, but still different scores would likely have been detected if the study would have consisted of face-to-face interactions. Also,

conducting the study in person would come closer to a real life setting of investigative interviews. As rapport of neurodiverse was slightly higher in the procedural information condition, it is likely that nonverbal behaviour in a face-to-face interaction would have strengthened these results. Next to the limitation of the difficulty of implementing non-verbal behaviour in the online environment, I assume that the core element of the study, the procedural information in form of a flyer was not harmed by the online environment. The procedural information flyer I used to prepare participants for the upcoming interview would be an easy and cheap to implement method in real police settings. Such flyer could for instance be placed in police stations or send by post when inviting individuals for interview appointments. However, as I found out that neurotypicals could also be harmed in their experienced level of rapport towards the interviewer such flyer should be improved in future research to further cover the needs of neurodiverse individuals and not harm neurotypical individuals in any sense.

Lastly, this study took a strong position by combining the methodologies of a qualitative interview approach and a quantitative questionnaire approach. Using mixed models hold the benefit of receiving more insightful information when compared to single method approaches (Almalki, 2016).

Conclusion

This study did not show that procedural information have increasing effects on rapport and truthful information shared by interviewees. Nevertheless, I found out that neurotypical individuals tend to cope better with current policing methods while neurodiverse individuals seem to cope better with my modified method. This was noticed as a trend of higher rapport scores was found in the no procedural information condition in our sample, which mostly consisted of neurotypical individuals, while neurodiverse participants revealed a trend of higher rapport scores in the procedural information condition. Neurotypical and

neurodiverse individuals seem to need different approaches when it comes to investigative interviews and rapport building. For neurodiverse individuals it is more beneficial to receive more information about the nature of the upcoming interview in contrary to neurotypical individuals. The results emphasised the importance of tailoring the needs of individual cases, as there may not be one approach which is beneficial to all. It is recommended to test this discrepancy in future research to be able to provide an equally fair investigation at the end. Furthermore, the extent of benefit by providing information prior the interview in comparison to improving the interview itself should be analysed. It could reveal whether the tendencies in this study are more unambiguous by using a sample of solely neurodiverse participants.

Reference List

- Abbe, A., & Brandon, S. E. (2014). Building and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews. *Police practice and research*, 15(3), 207-220.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2013.827835>
- Aldridge, M. (2010). Vulnerable witnesses. *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*, 296.
https://books.google.nl/books?hl=de&lr=&id=wATgCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA296&dq=rapport+AND+vulnerable+witness&ots=OOwhVYSZSD&sig=2WDwEiPE0CkErIVZ_AcEfPkUrKM&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=rapport%20AND%20vulnerable%20witness&f=false
- Almalki, S. (2016). Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Data in Mixed Methods Research--Challenges and Benefits. *Journal of education and learning*, 5(3), 288-296.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1110464>
- Ashford, S. J. (1988). Individual strategies for coping with stress during organizational transitions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 24(1), 19-36.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886388241005>
- Bartels, L. (2011). Police interviews with vulnerable adult suspects. *Australian institute of Criminology*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2188699
- Bearman, M., Earhart, B., Timms, L., & Powell, M. (2021). Professionals' views on how to conduct investigative interviews with adults with limited expressive language. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 28(1), 104-119.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2020.1767713>
- Bull, R. (2010). The investigative interviewing of children and other vulnerable witnesses: Psychological research and working/professional practice. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 15(1), 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466509X440160>
- Clarke, C., & Milne, R. (2017). Interviewing suspects in England and Wales. In *International developments and practices in investigative interviewing and interrogation*. 133-150.
<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315769677-20/interviewing-suspects-england-wales-colin-clarke-rebecca-milne>
- Collins, K., & Carthy, N. (2019). No rapport, no comment: The relationship between rapport and communication during investigative interviews with suspects. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 16(1), 18-31.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1517>
- Collins, R., Lincoln, R., & Frank, M. G. (2002). The effect of rapport in forensic

- interviewing. *Psychiatry, psychology and law*, 9(1), 69-78.
<https://doi.org/10.1375/pplt.2002.9.1.69>
- 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>
- Eastwood, J., Snook, B., & Luther, K. (2014). On the need to ensure better comprehension of interrogation rights. *Canadian Criminal Law Review*, 18(2), 171.
https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/43116415/On_The_Need_to_Ensure_Better_Co_mprehensi20160226-11685-1utndrx-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1656669630&Signature=KYhrIL4HZV8FK7DA3-3sHG27CcM8o~0oQd2dzpP9vdNB00135RUW4zoV-vxXLU4BO-JQ3Ni5XBns0jmZigdI4A6-6BxJ1RPa3-jbx97IOHKxR9EM9D6hZ7dF8eW3gYgQ5um8mhEx0PvXuYTW1bVjYj35ZEsJZ0N5avliSHICrXShbcQ3TansVafY6kHAjoB6PBEoofENGh9KkxTAGEuyDUR17HFF5qjpcI2BuphqpX7KupoCjZ4acCUqV8AErTH8LdZpP2PIWRiLliFeA8HjQi5jNhEtA9B6B7tEs1THDoqlj2vuxZZj1-8SEhUOp-iGyXr8A2Cr1VnE~rLBPkMFiw__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA
- Ellison, L. (2001). The mosaic art?: cross-examination and the vulnerable witness 1. *Legal Studies*, 21(3), 353-375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-121X.2001.tb00172.x>
- Farrugia, L., & Gabbert, F. (2020). Vulnerable suspects in police interviews: Exploring current practice in England and Wales. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 17(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1537>
- Green, T., Ord, B., & Shaw, G. (2008). *Investigative interviewing explained*. LexisNexis Butterworths. <https://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/en/publications/investigative-interviewing-explained-4>
- Goodman-Delahunty, J., & Martschuk, N. (2020). Securing reliable information in investigative interviews: Coercive and noncoercive strategies preceding turning points. *Police Practice and Research*, 21(2), 152-171.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2018.1531752>
- Gorby, D. M. (2013). The failure of traditional measures of police performance and the rise of broader measures of performance. *Policing: A Journal of policy and practice*, 7(4), 392-400. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pat023>
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (2006). The psychological vulnerabilities of witnesses and the risk of false

- accusations and false confessions Heaton-Armstrong, A. Shepherd, E. Gudjonsson, G. Wolchover, D. *Witness testimony. Psychological, investigative and evidential perspectives* 61-75 Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.674>
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (2010). Psychological vulnerabilities during police interviews. Why are they important?. *Legal and criminological Psychology*, 15(2), 161-175. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135532510X500064>
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (2018). *The psychology of false confessions: Forty years of science and practice*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119315636>
- Gudjonsson, G. H., & MacKeith, J. (1997). *Disputed confessions and the criminal justice system*. London: Institute of Psychiatry.
- Herrington, V., & Roberts, K. (2012). Addressing psychological vulnerability in the police suspect interview. *Policing: a journal of policy and practice*, 6(2), 177-186. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/par057>
- Holmberg, U., & Madsen, K. (2014). Rapport operationalized as a humanitarian interview in investigative interview settings. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 21(4), 591-610. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2013.873975>
- Home Office *Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, Codes of Practice – Code C detention, treatment and questioning of persons by police* London Author 2008b.
- Howes, L. M. (2020). Interpreted investigative interviews under the PEACE interview model: Police interviewers' perceptions of challenges and suggested solutions. *Police Practice and Research*, 21(4), 333-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2019.1617145>
- Kim, S., Alison, L., & Christiansen, P. (2020). Observing rapport-based interpersonal techniques to gather information from victims. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26(2), 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000222>
- Magee, J. L. (2020). *The Development of the Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations, Observer Version (RS3i-O)* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at El Paso).
- Meijer, E., Hoogesteyn, K., Verigin, B., & Finnick, D. (2021). Rapport building: online vs in person interviews. *Report, March*.
- Ministry of Justice. (2022, January). *Achieving Best Evidence in Criminal Proceedings: Guidance on Interviewing Victims and Witnesses, and Guidance on Using Special Measures*. National Police Chiefs' Council.

- https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1051269/achieving-best-evidence-criminal-proceedings.pdf
- Muniak, P., Dolinski, D., Grzyb, T., Cantarero, K., & Kulesza, W. (2021). You want to know the truth? Then don't mimic! The link between mimicry and lying. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 229(3), 185-190. <https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000451>
- Newburn, T., Williamson, T., & Wright, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of criminal investigation*. Routledge.
- Ochoa, T. A., Education, S., & Rome, J. (2009). Considerations for arrests and interrogations of suspects with hearing, cognitive, and behavioral disorders. *Financial Crisis and Law Enforcement*, 9(5), 131-141.
<https://iletsbeiforumjournal.com/images/Issues/FreeIssues/ILEEF%202009-9.5.pdf#page=138>
- 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
- Spielberger, C. D. (1983). State-trait anxiety inventory for adults. *APA PsycNet*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/t06496-000>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in science education*, 48(6), 1273-1296.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Phutela, D. (2015). The importance of non-verbal communication. *IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, 9(4), 43.
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/52442af596bbd7cc0220950cc1a9a3f2/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2029989>
- Phillips, E., Oxburgh, G., Gavin, A., & Myklebust, T. (2012). Investigative interviews with victims of child sexual abuse: The relationship between question type and investigation relevant information. *Journal of police and criminal psychology*, 27(1), 45-54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-011-9093-z>
- 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>
- Waite, R. (2007). Women and attention deficit disorders: A great burden overlooked. *Journal*

of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, 19(3), 116-125.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-7599.2006.00203.x>

Weiher, L. (2020). The impact of interview style on the development, maintenance, and transfer of rapport (Dissertation, Lancaster University).

<https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/id/eprint/149132/1/2020weiherphd.pdf>

Appendix A

Anxiety scale (STAI)

This is a scale that measures your feelings on a scale from 1 = "Not at all" to 4 = "Very much so". Please indicate how you feel right now, that is, at this moment. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe your present feeling best.

	1 (Not at all)	2 (Somewhat)	3 (Moderately so)	4 (Very much so)
I feel calm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel secure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel tense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel strained	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel at ease	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel upset	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	1 (Not at all)	2 (Somewhat)	3 (Moderately so)	4 (Very much so)
I feel satisfied	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel frightened	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel comfortable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel self-confident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel nervous	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel jittery	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel indecisive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	1 (Not at all)	2 (Somewhat)	3 (Moderately so)	4 (Very much so)
I am relaxed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel content	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am worried	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am confused	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel steady	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel pleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix B

Working alliance inventory (WAI)

Below, you will find statements describing different ways a person might think or feel about the relationship between yourself and the police officer on a scale from 1 = "Strongly disagree" to 5 = "Strongly agree". Please tick the number that best describes the way you feel.

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
I felt uncomfortable with the police officer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I was worried about the outcome of the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I found the things I did during the interview confusing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe the police officer liked me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It was clear to me what my responsibilities were during the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The goals of the interview were important for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
I believe the police officer was genuinely concerned about my welfare.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It was clear to me what the police officer wanted me to do during the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I respected each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I worked toward mutually agreed goals during the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I agreed on what was important to discuss during the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I trusted each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

My relationship with the police officer during the interview was important for me.

I had feelings that the police officer would get angry if I said or did something wrong.

The police officer and I worked together to set the goals for the interview.

The things that the police officer asked me to do during the interview did not make sense.

I did not know what outcome to expect of the interview.

I felt that the police officer respected me, even when I said things that he/she does not approve of.

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
My relationship with the police officer during the interview was important for me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I had feelings that the police officer would get angry if I said or did something wrong.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I worked together to set the goals for the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The things that the police officer asked me to do during the interview did not make sense.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I did not know what outcome to expect of the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I felt that the police officer respected me, even when I said things that he/she does not approve of.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I did not understand what the police officer and I tried to accomplish during the interview.

The police officer and I found that the interview proceeded fairly.

The police officer and I agreed on what we had to do during the interview.

The police officer and I did not agree on what the interview should deliver.

The police officer and I shared the same goals.

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
I did not understand what the police officer and I tried to accomplish during the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I found that the interview proceeded fairly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I agreed on what we had to do during the interview.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I did not agree on what the interview should deliver.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and I shared the same goals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix C

Case vignette

Your case

Please imagine yourself in the following situation:

You work on a military base as a local contractor. You are not part of the army but help out with logistical support delivering food and equipment from the local airport. The base has recently been experiencing a lot of theft of equipment, such as engine parts for vehicles.

A couple of days ago, a close friend of yours told you that he is part of the smuggling ring, and that they are short on drivers at the moment. He asked you to smuggle equipment out of the base. As you could really use that extra money, you agreed to help smuggle equipment.

As a driver you know of various ways you could smuggle parts. The easiest way would be to hide the parts in with the rest of the stock on a lorry. Other ways are to break the parts down so they can be hidden in much smaller and less conspicuous vehicles like the small rickshaws many of the locals use to drive on and off base, or even hidden in donkey packs.

Your friend told you that the smugglers are breaking down the parts and hiding them in the rickshaw engines. You do not know who is else is part of the smuggling ring, only that you have heard the other drivers talking about how people are smuggling parts out of the base:

The lorries are too risky because of the number of times they will be checked, and the donkeys usually bring food supplies so metal parts would gather too much attention. Using the army's own vehicles would be the safest way to bypass the checkpoints but the army usually uses its own engineers to fix them when they break so opportunities to get the parts on board would be limited and very risky. On the other hand, few of the soldiers at the checkpoints have the mechanical knowledge to be able to spot the extra parts fitted to the rickshaw engines.

However, you decide for the following strategy to smuggle the parts: You break down the parts, put them in the military vehicle. Then you avoid the checks at the base checkpoint, and then take the parts out at the other end. It is the riskiest thing to do, but also the least likely to be discovered.

You are worried about what might happen to you or your family if anyone found out you helped with the investigation. Be wary: you need to give the interviewer enough information that you remain a source and therefore under the protection of the police. On the other hand, try to avoid giving them any information that might incriminate you or your friends.

Appendix D

Rapport scale (RS3i)

Below, you will find statements describing different ways a person might think or feel about the relationship between yourself and the police officer on a scale from 1 = "Strongly disagree" to 5 = "Strongly agree". *Please pick the answer that best describes the way you feel.*

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
I think the police officer was generally honest with me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer was skillful during the interaction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer seemed to respect each other's knowledge.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer seemed to have their culture in common.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer performed expertly during the interaction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think that the police officer can generally be trusted to keep their word.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
Communication went smoothly between the police officer and me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The interaction partners were interested in each other's point of view.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and me seemed to feel committed to accomplishing the goals of the interaction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
The police officer paid careful attention to my opinion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and me got along well during the interaction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and me worked well together as a team.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and me probably share the same culture.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer wanted to do a good job during the interaction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer and me were attentive towards each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	1 (strongly disagree)	2 (disagree)	3 (neither agree nor disagree)	4 (agree)	5 (strongly agree)
The police officer shares the same ethnicity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer really listened to each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer was motivated to perform well during the interaction.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel the police officer can be trusted to keep their word to each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer made an effort to do a good job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The police officer acted like a professionals.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix E

Truthful information checklist

The following truthful details were coded as 1 = mentioned, 0 = missing. Additional information is given in parentheses or information in quotation marks have to be named together. Synonyms or related words that are coded as well are separated with a back slash “/”. The details are based on the case vignette (Appendix A).

Truthful information:

Work, Military, Base, Contractor, Logistics/ Logistical support, Delivering/ deliver/ transport, Food, Equipment, Airport, “Engine parts”, Vehicle/ Vehicles, Friend, Smuggling ring/ smuggler ring, Smuggle, Money, Driver, Hide/ Can be hidden, Parts/ Pieces, Stock, Lorry/ Truck, Break down, Smaller, Rickshaw/ Rickshaws, Donkey, Packs, “Rickshaw engine”/ “Rickshaw engines”, “Metal parts”, “Army vehicle”/ Army’s own vehicle”, Checks/ Checkpoint/ Checkpoints, Engineer/ Engineers, Fix/ Fixing, “Military vehicle”/ “Military vehicles”

Appendix F

Additional questions

Below you find two statements concerning a follow-up interview. Please tick the answer that best describes the way you feel.

	Yes	No
Would you be willing to return to a more in depth interview?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Would you want legal representation during any such interview?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How motivated were you to take part in this interview?

	1 (not motivated at all)	2	3	4	5 (very motivated)
Motivation:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix G

Flyer with procedural information

Voluntary Police Interview What You Need to Know

You have been asked to attend a voluntary interview with the police or another law enforcement agency: This flyer will provide you with information about the voluntary police interview including what you can expect, and what your rights are.

What is a voluntary police interview?

A voluntary police interview or interview under caution is a formal conversation with police.

The interview aims to gather as many information about a specific incident as possible.

You do not have to attend, and you can leave at any time once the interview has begun.

While a voluntary interview might be conducted in a less formal way than an interview under arrest, the **conversation will still be recorded** and anything you say can potentially be used against you in any subsequent criminal proceedings.

The Interview

Before the interview, you are formally cautioned. Your legal rights are:

Right to hire your own lawyer

If you do not have a lawyer, you can apply for a free lawyer, we will provide you with a phone number

Right to remain silent (you do not have to answer questions if you do not want to)

Everything you say can be used against you in front of a court of law

At the start of the interview, your interviewer will tell you:

The names of all people in attendance

The purpose of the interview – including the incident under investigation

That you can choose to end the interview at any time

That you do not have to say anything

That anything you do say can be used against you in a court of law

During the interview, the police officer will ask you questions which can cover issues such as:

Your whereabouts at certain times

Whether you know certain people

Your knowledge of specific events

You have the right to breaks (normally 15 minutes every two hours) if the interview goes on for this long.

Appendix H

Condition 1: Interview guideline

Hello, I will talk with you today about the equipment theft at the military base.

I need to establish whether you know anything about the incidents. But, before we start, I just want to go over some ground rules for today, alright?

You have the right to hire and talk to your own lawyer right away. You have the right to free legal advice from a government lawyer right away. If you want this free legal advice, I will give you a telephone number to call. If you are charged with a crime, you can apply for a free lawyer to help you with your case.

For your protection and for mine I will record this, so we get a full account of what was said today, OK? Also, when you're talking, I'm not going to interrupt you and I hope you can do the same for me. If you have any questions, please ask me. I might ask you to repeat some things because I want to make sure I understand everything. The main purpose here is to get as much information as possible. So, it is important that you tell me everything in as much detail as possible without leaving things out. This is important because I wasn't there, so I don't know what happened.

OK, so we'll begin the interview now.

- Please tell me what you normally do at the base.
- Please tell me in as much detail as possible everything that you know about the smuggling.
- Please tell me more about the smuggling.
- How would you smuggle equipment out the military base?
- Which part would you find most challenging of smuggling equipment?
- What can you tell me about who is involved?
- What else can you tell me about the smuggling?

Appendix I

Condition 2: Interview guideline

Hello, my name is Pia Lauber and I am the responsible police officer for this case. I will talk with you today about the equipment theft at the military base. This voluntary first interview is for us to collect as many information as possible to get the full picture of this case.

I need to establish whether you know anything about the incidents. But, before we start, I just want to go over some ground rules for today, alright?

You have the right to hire and talk to your own lawyer right away. You have the right to free legal advice from a government lawyer right away. If you want this free legal advice, I will help and give you a telephone number to call. Meaning, If you are charged with a crime, you can apply for a free lawyer to help you with your case. Furthermore, you have the right to remain silence and I also want to make sure that you understand that everything you say can be used against you in front of court. Also, you are allowed to choose to end this interview at any time.

Do you have any questions about your legal rights?

For your protection and for mine I will record this, so we get a full account of what was said today, OK?

The interview will take up to 10 minutes. Only the both of us will be present and when you're talking, I'm not going to interrupt you and I hope you can do the same for me.

If you have any questions, please ask me. I might ask you to repeat some things because I want to make sure I understand everything. The main purpose here is to get as much information as possible. So, it is important that you tell me everything in as much detail as possible without leaving things out. This is important because I wasn't there, so I don't know what happened.

OK, so we'll begin the interview now.

- Please tell me what you normally do at the base.
- Please tell me in as much detail as possible everything that you know about the smuggling.
- Please tell me more about the smuggling.
- How would you smuggle equipment out the military base?
- Which part would you find most challenging of smuggling equipment?
- What can you tell me about who is involved?
- What else can you tell me about the smuggling?