A Socio pragmatic Study of Police Power in Selected American Police Interviews

Wasan Hadi Kadhim[1]
University of Kerbala, Faculty of Education,
Department of English language, Iraq

Prof. Muayyad Omran Chiad[2]
Al-Zahraa University for Women, College of
Education, Department of English, Iraq
muyyad.omran@alzahraa.edu.iq

Abstract

The present study examines power as an influential social variable in three selected American police interviews with three suspects: George Huguely, Bryan Greenwell, and Lee Rodarte. The study aims at identifying the most and least exploited power strategies by police interviewers, the statistically significant differences between the various power strategies, and the devices that manifest each power strategy. In association with the aims, the study sets out three hypotheses: (1) recycling topics is the most frequent strategy while minimization is the least utilized by police interviewers, (2) significant differences can be noticed among the various police power strategies, and (3) each power strategy is manifested in discourse by specific devices, such as questions and politeness. To achieve the aims and verify these hypotheses, the study develops a model consisting of two layers for the analysis. The first layer is composed of police power strategies that serve as an umbrella for the model. The second layer is based on N Fairclough (1992) and Heffer models and is composed of the devices that manifest the power strategies in discourse. Based on the findings, the study concludes that: (1) topic control has recorded the highest rank whereas maximization has achieved the lowest in terms of police power strategies, (2) there are no statistically significant differences between police power strategies in impact, which suggests that all power strategies are effectively used, and (5) six devices are utilized by police interviewers to manifest their strategies including questions, politeness, formulation, topic management, interruption, and hedges.

Introduction

The term power is defined differently by various scholars. For Dahl (1957), power correlates with obligation and imposition. His intuitive conception of power is "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do". Similarly, Wang (2006) describes power as "the ability to control and constrain others as the capacity to achieve one's aim as the freedom to achieve one's goals and as the competence to impose one's will on others" (p. 531). Other scholars consider power to be an influential social variable that affects social interaction. Negura et al. (2019, p.1) confirm that "power is omnipresent in social interactions". That is, "there is and can be no interaction without power" (Victoria, 2009, p.131).

Consequently, power plays a significant part in everyday interactions, especially when there is a disparity between the participants. As unique forms of institutional discourse, police interviews represent an excellent example of power asymmetry because the institutional positions of the participants vary significantly. As asserted by Shuy and Shuy (1998), police interviews are characterized by "the inequality of status and power of the police interrogator and the suspect" (p.178). Such asymmetrical power essentially imposes restrictions on the participants' contributions (Drew).

Police interviews involve various strategies that have been studied by different scholars; however, the researcher has not found a clear-cut framework of analysis for the strategies that designate power and resistance. Therefore, she tried her best to gather police power strategies (henceforth PPS) and put them into a framework of analysis. In addition, these strategies represent an upper term that cannot be measured by themselves, so they need tools or devices to be represented and manifested in discourse. The present study seeks to bridge this gap by pinpointing power strategies and recognizing the manifestations of these strategies in discourse, particularly in the selected data.

Review Of Related Literature

Sociopragmatics

Sociopragmatics is an approach to the study of language and discourse (Angermuller, Maingueneau, & Wodak, 2014). Leech (2016) is one of the first linguists to recognize sociopragmatics as a crucial component of general pragmatics. He subdivides general pragmatics into two areas: *pragmalinguistics* and *sociopragmatics*. Richards (2002) assert that pragmalinguistics refers to the interface between linguistics and pragmatics, concentrating on the linguistic means utilized to achieve pragmatic ends, for instance, to ask how to make a compliment in a given language. In contrast, sociopragmatics is concerned with "the relationship between social factors and pragmatics". For example, to recognize the conditions and circumstances appropriate for making compliments in that language, such as "the social relationship between speaker and hearer" (p. 411).

In social interaction, language is determined by the social context in which it is used. In other words, people use language differently in different social situations. Sociopragmatics highlights the interaction between language and its social context. MacKay (2016) states that sociopragmatics denotes "the way conditions on language use derive from the social situation". Swann (2019) suggest another view of sociopragmatics, emphasizing the "social or cultural factors that influence language use", i.e., how language is subjected to social factors such as power, gender, and authority.

A sociopragmatic approach is adopted in the present study rather than pragmatics proper because pragmatics alone is believed to be insufficient for its purpose. Brown and Mey (2009) states that "pragmatics does not suffice to explain the intricate interface of language and the law". He justifies his view by asserting that the relationship between the two disciplines "cannot be reduced to a simple combination of a few pragmatic concepts". Consequently, legal contexts such as courtroom interactions or police interviews (henceforth PIs) require a multidisciplinary and broader approach. He asserts that a sociopragmatic explanation in terms of power is essential in this regard. The relevance of this approach to the data under scrutiny is derived from the fact that the relation between power and language requires a kind of study that accounts for the social

situation (p. 518).

Police Interviews

Forensic linguistics is "the use of linguistic techniques to investigate crimes in which language data form part of the evidence, such as in the use of grammatical or lexical criteria to authenticate police statements" (MacKay, 2016). Scholars focus on many types and forms of forensic or legal texts, whether spoken or written. Johnson and Coulthard (2010) list many kinds of forensic texts: contracts, judgments, jury instructions, product warnings, trademarks, wills, and PIs (pp.7-8). Accordingly, the PI is a well-established area of study within the domain of in forensic linguistics. Tiersma and Solan (2005) states that police interviewing signifies the words or actions uttered or performed by the police interviewer (henceforth POI) that aim at eliciting a response from the suspect to find out the truth about a particular criminal case. Most importantly, the uniqueness of PIs is stressed by Bruijnes et al. (2015) who assert that PIs are a distinctive kind of social encounter, chiefly because of "the role of authority that the police officer has and the often uncooperative stance that a suspect takes". Additionally, PIs, according to Drew are considered "as a form of institutional discourse" where there are "restrictions on the kinds of contributions to the talk that are, or can be, made".

Police Power

PIs provide a rich source of power asymmetry as there are significant differences in the participants' institutional roles or social statuses; Police interviewers (henceforth POIs) have the privilege of legitimate authority and status in contrast to suspects.

The source of power asymmetry in PIs is highlighted by Heydon (2005); she argues that the "inherent asymmetry in power between the police officers and the suspects" stems from the role the POI as an "institutional questioner and information-provider" whereas the suspect is a "respondent" (Heydon, 2005). Similarly, Haworth (2006) states that each participant's role in PIs is strictly outlined and controlled. Nevertheless, particularly in terms of the distribution of power and control, these roles are very unequal, i.e., POIs, have power over the suspects, the subject matter, the time and setting, the progress of the questioning process, and the outcome of the interview meanwhile the suspects "have control over [only] what they say" (p.1). Berk-Seligson (2009) states that the manifestation of power in legal situations often "resides in the right to ask questions and the concomitant right to expect answers" (p.38). In a few words, POIs have both the power and the right to compel suspects to comply.

According to Mulayim, Lai, and Norma (2014), the "imbalance of power manifests itself not only in police authority over managing the whole interview process, but also in the language used" (p. 29). Thus, (Walton, 2003) indicates that a PI is essentially "an asymmetrical type of dialogue, so the goals and methods of argumentation used by the one side are quite different from those on the other side". Therefore, there are different powerful and coercive strategies used by POIs to practice power in PIs. These strategies have been investigated by many scholars like Heydon (2005), Berk-Seligson (2009), Nakane (2014), and others. A brief account of each strategy is plotted below.

Topic Control

Generally speaking, topic control refers to the power to control topics in PIs. Heydon (2005, p. 115) notices that the right to ask questions and control turns is the main powerful instrument available to POIs. They have the opportunity to control responses and limit suspects to merely providing answers. For Berk-Seligson (2009) being an interviewer means that "the police officer… has more power to control topics through turn-taking" owing to the pre-distribution of turns. In other words, POIs hold power in the interaction because "power in legal speech situations often resides in the right to ask questions and the concomitant right to expect answers" (p.38), for instance:

> *(1)* **POI**: *"When they said they (police) were looking for you, what did they say you did?"*
> **Suspect**: *"They said I stole laptop and that I have sold it"*.
> **POI**: *"Eh eh, what happened after that?"* (Farinde et al., 2015, p. 152).

The Struggle for the Floor

The struggle for the floor is clearly evident in the interruption of the speech (Berk-Seligson, 2009). Mentioning this strategy and emphasizing its significance, Berk-Seligson (2009) asserts that "interrupting the examinee in mid-answer" is one sign of coercive and powerful questioning and that it is especially significant when the examinee's answer takes the form of a narrative (p.113). **Nakane (2014)** mentions that this strategy occurs when a speaker initiates a turn and interrupts the current speaker far before s/he has reached the relevant transition of the turn (p. 14), for instance:

> *(2)   **Suspect***: *"On the first time I talk to you, you know, I'm, I don't feel comfortable, I don't know <u>I was scared . . .</u>"*
> **POI***: "What did you tell me tonight about ah Moncho" (Berk-Seligson, 2009)*

Recycling Topics

Recycling topics means the "repetition of the same questions or lines of questioning over and over again". Recycling topics is a tool to practice "pressure and control". It is used when the suspect's responses are inconsistent with the relevant facts or evidence of the case. That is, POIs repeatedly go back to the same topic, suggesting that the answers they have received are not acceptable or satisfactory. They keep on asking the suspect until they are satisfied with the answers (Berk-Seligson, 2009). The following example shows how the POI recycles the same questions after few turns as the suspect refuses to answer:

> *(3)   **POI**: "Okay. Well then, where is she?"*
> **Suspect:** *"I don't know where she is".*
> **POI:** *"where is Savannah?"* (Appendix C. Case 3).

Rephrasing Answers

Rephrasing the suspect's answers means, for Berk-Seligson (2009), 'reformulating' their description of events which may result in "the introduction of lexical items that altered the sense of the suspect's statements". It aims at helping suspects to be more precise in their speech (p.129). In the following example, the POI rephrases the details that the suspect has offered regarding his clothes during the robbery, saying:

> a.   **POI**: *"You're describing like a knit cap of some sort, but the kind, uh, I know this because you told me already what kind it was, but a knit cap like for skiing . . ."* (Berk-Seligson, 2009)

Accusation

Accusation is practiced during police interviewing when the suspect is implicitly assumed to be guilty. Thus, despite being told to provide a free account of events, suspects feel that the POI has already made the decision that they are guilty and will not believe them (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, p. 228). Accusation can be framed in three ways:

(1) Direct accusation where the POI asks suspects directly about their guilt or innocence. It is intended only to provoke a straightforward response, whether admission or denial (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, p. 228), for instance:

> *(4)   **POI**: "<u>Bronwyn did you commit the burglary".</u>*
> **Suspect***: "No comment"* (Heydon, 2005)

(2) Evidence strategy which is an indirect way of seeking an admission wherein the POI lists part or even all of the evidence against the suspects and then asks for an explanation (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, p. 228). In the following example, the POI accuses the suspect by citing the victim's story as evidence.

> *(5)*   **POI**: *"He states that it was a closed fist that you punched him in mouth?"*
> **Suspect***: "Nah"* (Heydon, 2005)

(3) Supported direct accusation, which combines both previous accusatorial methods. The latter is the most powerful as evidence supports accusation (Moston & Engelberg, 1993, pp. 228-9), for example:

> *(6)*   **POI:** *"I put it to you that you actually went into the kitchen and helped drag in Wayne Gibson one of the bouncers".*
> **Suspect:** *"No way".*
> **POI:** *"I'll read a section of the victim's statement"* (Heydon, 2005)

Maximization

Maximization is another strategy used by the POIs to frighten the suspects and oblige them into a confession. It embraces over-exaggerating the strength of the evidence, the amount of the charges, and the probable harmful consequences of the situation **(**Kassin & Mcnall, 1991, as cited in Leahy-Harland & Bull, 2016, p. 139). It also involves using certain techniques such as "intimidation and veiled threats". Moreover, it may include the use of "trickery and deception" to obtain announcements of guilt. Maximization might include telling the suspect, for example, that there is evidence such as an eyewitness or fingerprints in the crime scene where there is none, i.e., presenting false evidence (Redlich, Silverman, Chen, & Steiner, 2004). Maximization also implicates the POI's adoption of "unfriendly demeanor" and "a strong conviction of guilt" towards the suspect (Horgan et al., 2012, p. 68), for instance:

> *(7)*   **POI:** *"You still dey received call (you are still receiving call). See this criminal. You don't know the gravity of the offence you have committed. See how he is looking at me. Bring that handcuff. Give me that pistol. I will condemn your leg".*
> **Suspect:** *"Sorry sir. I am sorry sir. I am sorry sir"* (Farinde et al., 2015, p. 153).

Minimization

Minimization refers to the use of "feigning sympathy, friendship, or understanding, and flattering suspects" with the intention of mitigating offense or lessening the strength of evidence (Redlich et al., 2004). In contrast to maximization, minimization is applied to PIs when the POI lulls, deceives suspects, and leads them into a false sense of security by moderating the crime, making justifications for the suspect, or even blaming the victim **(**Kassin & Mcnall, 1991, as cited in Leahy-Harland & Bull, 2016, p. 139). Put differently, POIs tend to manipulate suspects by minimizing the seriousness of the crime so as to gain their trust and make it easier to elicit a confession (Areh, 2016). (Horgan et al. (2012) summarize minimization techniques as follows:

*   adopting a friendly demeanor,
*   mitigating consequences,
*   emphasize the advantages of collaboration,
*   using face-saving justifications,
*   minimizing the severity of the crime,
*   evoking empathy,
*   boosting ego/flattery, and
*   appealing to the suspect's conscience (p.68).

In the following instance, the POI minimizes the suspect's act by using the expression "passed out of possession" instead of the more straightforward term "stolen":

> *a.* **POI**: *alright, that passed out of the possession of the true owner into someone's hands who let's face it isn't the true owner (Carter, 2013).*

Methodology:

The current research utilizes a mixed-methods approach in a form of a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. This combination causes both methods to complete and strengthen each other, resulting in a "richer and more comprehensive" research (Neuman, 2014; Publishing, 2009). The qualitative part of this research is represented by sociopragmatically examining the concept of power in selected American PIs. Meanwhile, the quantitative part includes using the Statistical Program for Social Sciences (SPSS) as a statistical tool to enrich the findings of the study, support the researcher's interpretation, and avoid bias or subjectivity.

The data collection followed in the current research is internet-based. At first, the researcher searched for data and found about **(94)** scripts of PIs. Later, following specific criteria, she downsized these interviews into three video-recorded PIs. The selected data includes publicly available scripts of three American PIs with murder suspects. The website from which the data are obtained is (https://criminalwords.net/police-interrogation-transcripts/), whereby videos of the PIs along with their scripts are published using three links within this website.

The following criteria are taken into account:

First, the current study focuses exclusively on real video-recorded PIs documented "as part of the standard police procedure" and then published on YouTube (de Pablos-Ortega, 2019).

Second, all the data include male suspects in order to avoid any interference of gender differences in the interpretation of results.

Third, the data include suspects who would later be proved to be guilty. The reason is to assess the truthfulness of a confession and the observance or non-observance of Grice's maxims.

Forth, all texts deal with suspects who are accused of murder rather than other types of crimes such as robbery, sexual assault, or fraud offenses; the aim is to avoid the impact of crime type on the intensity of suspects' resistance. In the present cases, they are all murderers.

Regarding the analysis model, the researcher has developed a suitable model that embraces two layers to cope with the nature of the targeted data and the aims of the study. The first layer is composed of PPS (cf. 2.3.2), while the second layer is composed of devices that assist in the manifestation of these strategies in discourse. Thereby, the study has selected specific devices out of certain models of powerful interaction, namely those of N Fairclough (1992); Norman Fairclough (2015) and Heffer . These models are closely related to the strategies resisting power. The selected devices include *questions, topic management, interruption, formulation, hedges,* and *politeness*.

Data Analysis

Analysis of Case 1

The murder of Yeardley Love, George Huguely's ex-girlfriend, is the focus of the ensuing investigation. Yeardley and George were both University of Virginia students. They were also members of the lacrosse team at college. The couple's relationship was turbulent, with frequent fights, excessive alcohol consumption, and domestic abuse. One week before the assassination, Yeardley supposedly sent George messages, stating that she had sexual relations with another man when she was out of town. After a few days, they found themselves face to face in a bar. Yeardley then aggressively stormed into George's apartment. Because she was violent, one of his roommate's girlfriends had to evict her. After the last fight, Yeardley refused to speak to George. However, he attempted to email her several times to talk about what had happened. On 2 May 2010, after a heavy drinking day, George decided to leave the bar and go to Yeardley's apartment. Shortly after midnight, he entered Yeardley's apartment through the front door. After discovering that Yeardley would not allow him to go to his apartment, he kicked a hole and hit his arm to open the door. He began to argue with Yeardley about the previous events that had irritated him, though she yelled at him to leave and leave her alone. George said he shook her and wrestled with her in an attempt to calm her down. Then he threw her onto the bed and walked away. When Yeardley's roommate returned at 2:15 a.m., she found the body and called the cops. On 30 August 2012, Huguely was officially convicted for the second-degree murder conviction for 23 years. In the following PI, the participants are George Huguely, the suspect, and two police investigators ("Murder of Yeardley Love",2021).

2257

Illustrative Excerpt

▪   *"Investigator 1: Okay<u>. She has a pretty good knot on her head. That's why I'm asking. How</u>*
<u>*you could explain how that would have happened?*</u>
▪   *George Huguely: I mean, I don't even know. A knot?*
▪   *Investigator 1: <u>On the sided of her head, she's been hit pretty good right there. So I'm just</u>*
<u>*trying to figure out did you hit her with something?*</u>
▪   *George Huguely: No. I never. Never touched her or struck her or anything…*
▪   *Investigator 1: <u>Well, you touched her. You had your hands on her</u>.*
▪   *George Huguely: I said I never struck her. Never at all like …*
▪   *Investigator 1: <u>I'm trying to figure out why she has a black eye and why she's got a big</u>*
<u>*lump right there.*</u>
▪   *George Huguely: I mean, we… were… I mean…*
▪   *Investigator 1: <u>So, you don't know how it happened.</u>*
▪   *George Huguely: So, she's got a black…*
▪   *Investigator 1: <u>It's fine It's fine.</u> Um, So you. <u>I'm going through this one more time and make</u>*
<u>*sure we're on the same page. You're pretty pissed at her from a week ago for sending those text*</u>
<u>*messages. Do you have those text messages where she said, as you said, fucked somebody?*</u>
▪   *George Huguely: I actually might have those, yeah".*
(Appendix A. Case 1)
In this excerpt, the investigator proceeds to present evidence and inquire about the chain of events until she reaches the core of the case, accusing George of hitting Yeardley for the first time. To achieve her goals, she employs the following five power strategies:

Topic Control

The investigator utilizes *topic control* strategy in the first line of this excerpt. To manifest her control, she uses three power devices: *topic management, questions,* and *politeness*. At first, she manages the topic via *initiating* a new one; she says that Yeardley's head is injured, **"She has a pretty good knot on her head. That's why I'm asking**". She brings up this topic to pave the way towards the impending accusation as she doubts that George is involved in the murder. After initiating the topic, the investigator uses the second power device to manifest her topic control: the *declarative-free narrative question*, **"How you <u>could</u> explain how that <u>would</u> have happened?",** where she attempts to elicit a lengthy and detailed response from the suspect. Although the investigator has reservations about George being the murderer in the case at hand, she is not forthright in her topic control. Instead, she uses the third power device, *negative politeness,* to embody her indirectness, as shown by the use of the underlined hedges, **"could"** and **"would".**

Accusation

When George persistently denies knowing anything about the victim's head trauma, the investigator resorts to *accusation strategy*, more specifically direct accusation. Her second turn encompasses three power devices to manifested her accusation: *formulation, questions,* and *politeness*. At first, she formulates *what has been said* earlier where she answers George's question, **"A knot?",** saying, "**On the sided of her head, she's been hit pretty good right there".** Afterward, she employs *negative politeness* as a manipulation tool by using the 'minimize imposition' strategy saying, "**I'm just trying to figure out**". In other words, she justifies her questioning and conveys the impression that she takes the suspect's freedom and privacy into consideration. Lastly, the investigator explicitly asks the suspect to tell the truth by employing the *yes-no direct question*, saying, **"did you hit her with something?".** She utilizes this question to elicit as specific, precise, and brief answers as possible.

Struggle for the Floor

The investigator employs *struggle for the floor strategy* four times because the suspect does not respond to the elicitation process. The suspect denies confessing to hitting the victim's head

against the wall and shaking her until she dies from head shock and nose bleeding. Hence, the investigator takes the floor back whenever she is unconvinced of the answers.

The first instance takes place after the suspect's second denial in: **"No. I never. Never touched her or struck her or anything…",** while the second instance occurs after repeating the same denial by the suspect when he answers, **"I said I never struck her. Never never at all like …".** Both occurrences are manifested via *competitive interruption* since the investigator contradicts the suspect and disagrees with him, saying, **"Well you touched her. You had your hands on her".**

The last two occurrences differ from the previous ones in that *cooperative interruption* is used to manifest them instead of the competitive interruption. First, the investigator interrupts the suspect, not to contradict him but to complete his anticipated answer saying, **"So you don't know how it happened".** Next, when George insists on ignoring anything related to the victim's injury, she interrupts him to expresses her agreement saying, **"It's fine It's fine"** because she has given up hope of getting a confession.

Rephrasing Answers

As seen earlier, after the suspect's second denial, **"No. I never. Never touched her or struck her or anything…"**, the investigator interrupts George and employs *rephrasing answers strategy*, saying, **"Well you touched her. You had your hands on her".** Two power devices aid in the manifestation of this strategy: *formulation* and *politeness*. Firstly, the investigator formulates and rephrases the information that George has previously given about what happened on the night of the murder; George has stated that he did touch Yeardley and put his hand on her shoulders. Secondly, the investigator uses *negative politeness* via the hedging expression **"well"** to avert confronting the suspect directly.

Once again, the investigator utilized this strategy in **"So you don't know how it happened"**, whereby she uses the *formulation* device 'so' to summarize *what has been said* by George. She aims at obtaining George's ratification on this version of events since the investigation later shows that the reverse is true.

Recycling Topics

Recycling topics strategy is employed twice in this excerpt. The first instance occurs after interrupting George's repetition of his denial when he says, "**I said I never struck her. Never never at all like…".** The investigator grabs the floor back to recycle the reason behind why Yeardley has a black eyesore and head injury, **"I'm trying to figure out why she has a black eye and why she's got a big lump right there".** She employs *formulation* device by providing a gist of what has happened to the victim. Nevertheless, she aims at referring to *what is implied*; George caused those injuries.

The second instance occurs when the investigator loses hope in George's willingness to confess whether or not he struck the victim in the head. Therefore, she recycles a previously discussed topic and overtly states, **"I'm going through this one more time and make sure we're on the same page".** She exploits two power devices to manifest this strategy: *formulation* and *questions*. Initially, to enforce explicitness, she formulates the suspect's words by presenting a summary of what *has been said* regarding how George was enraged by Yeardley's text messages, **"You're pretty pissed at her from a week ago for sending those text messages".** Thus, *formulation* this time latches on the suspect's description of events. Afterward, she uses the *yes-no cross question*, **"Do you have those text messages where she said, as you said, 'fucked' somebody?"** wherein she roughly quoted the suspect's words to ask about the text messages. However, this time, she wants to see those messages by herself.

Analysis of Case 2

In Louisville's Shelby Park neighborhood, Jodie Cecil and Bryan Greenwell were convicted of murdering a woman and leaving her husband badly wounded. The victims were Derrell Wilson and Jennifer Cain, who were Jodie and Bryan's neighbors. On May 13, 2016, Jennifer Cain had several gunshot wounds and died due to her injuries. Meanwhile, Derrell Wilson was rescued from certain death and played a vital role in the suspects' confession. According to police reports,

Derrell Wilson, who was still hospitalized and in poor health, claimed that Jodie and Bryan were both actively involved in the assault. During the PI, the suspects were shown a recording of Derrell Wilson and a police officer. Once confronted with the victim's audio recording of the allegation, Bryan and Jodie claimed that their neighbors were involved in a domestic violence incident, and they rushed to help. Rather than calming down the situation, as they presumably intended, Derrell and Jennifer ended up being shot by Bryan. Jodie stated that there was a fight over the gun, whereas Bryan said he freaked out and did not realize what had happened. The participants of the following PI are the suspect, Bryan Greenwell, and the investigator. The aim is to identify the guilty person and to obtain a confession from Bryan (Lee, 2019a).

Illustrative Excerpt

▪   *"**Investigator**: I can give you the, **I can give you the details of, I guess the general of what she's said.** Is that, and he goes on to say that, they were involved in a domestic situation. Then apparently, he may have been getting the best of her, and she came over for help. You guys go back to their apartment, it happened inside their apartment, you guys intervened on the good side of this to start with, trying to help her out. And things went bad from there. **Does that sound, is that a fair statement of how things may have occurred?***
▪   ***Bryan Greenwell**: No. I mean**…***
▪   ***Investigator**: **It's not?***
▪   ***Bryan Greenwell**: **No. I had no**. **Yeah, I know these people. I don't know them personally.** You know what I'm saying? **I know them from that apartment. And yes, we did go over there. But, that's it. I mean** hell, if you finger print the place you **can** find my fingerprints on **a couple things** because where I walked in the room. I **kind of picked some stuff up**, you know, because it was laying everywhere so I was like [noises from cuffs on table while he demonstrates moving stuff over] I mean, other than that.*
▪   ***Investigator**: Alright. I know right now you're trying to figure out where to go with this. **Because I don't want you to start digging yourself a hole.***
▪   ***Bryan Greenwell**: I know what you want me to do is to commit, you know, say**…***
▪   ***Investigator**: Oh, I don't need you to, I don't need you to. I got, you know, **I've got Jodie's statement. I have enough to walk out of this room right now.** What I'm trying to do is try to give you an opportunity to do the same thing she just did which is go at it with the angle, we were trying to help and things just went bad. That's a whole lot better than just not making a statement and me just going off him. I mean, **you think I put a guy who's paralyzed from the neck down on a ventilator with an interview like this up to twelve people on a jury that they're not going to sympathize with him instead of you?** I'll take that all day long, twice on Sunday".*
(Appendix B. Case 2)
Before this excerpt, the investigator informs Bryan that he has shown the recording to Jodie, and she has confessed. Bryan insists on understanding what she said. In this excerpt, the investigator explains Jodie's part of the story and advises Bryan to confess.
The investigator practices power through four strategies:

Accusation

In his first turn, the investigator utilizes *accusation* strategy when he confronts Bryan with the second piece of evidence; Jodie's confession. Accusation strategy, more precisely, supported direct accusation, is manifested by three power devices: *formulation*, *questions,* and *politeness*.
Formulation occurs in **"I can give you the details of, I guess the general of what she's said"**, whereby the investigator uses the reported speech as a formulation device to summarize *what she has said*. He reports that there was a domestic situation in which she sought assistance, but things went disastrously wrong. *Questions* are represented by using the *yes-no-leading* question in **"Does that sound, is that a fair statement of how things may have occurred?"** wherein the investigator attempts to put words into Bryan's mouth and leads him to agree with the proposed story. *Politeness* occurs when the investigator uses *negative politeness* to manipulate the suspect and makes him feels a false sense of freedom. He does so by the use of three hedging expressions within the same utterances above: "**I guess**", "**sound",** and "**may have occurred**".

Struggle for the Floor

The *struggle for the floor* strategy is utilized twice in this excerpt. Both are manifested by *competitive interruption*. The first time takes place when Bryan denies the accusation mentioned above in **"No. I mean⸲⸲⸲"**, while the second time occurs when Bryan refuses to cooperate and tries to defend himself in **"I know what you want me to do is to commit, you know, say⸲⸲⸲"**. These interruptions reflect the disagreement of the investigator and his demand for more clarification.

Topic Control

Topic control strategy appears in the investigator's second turn, "**It's not?**". It is manifested by two power devices: *topic management and questions*. After interrupting the suspect, the investigator returns to the same topic to develop it and to obtain more information. Thus, *topic management*, particularly *topic development*, is employed. The same turn, "**It's not?**", is also categorized as a *declarative-direct question* because it is a brief question used to check the suspect's consistency. Besides, this question reveals that the investigator does not believe Bryan's denial.

Maximization

When the suspect resists confessing the crime, the investigator utilizes *maximization* strategy two times. The first time is in the third turn, where the investigator frightens the suspect by exaggerating the consequences and comparing the situation to digging a hole, saying, **"Because I don't want you to start digging yourself a hole."** This strategy is manifested by *politeness*, specifically *positive politeness*. That is, the investigator adheres to *positive politeness* because he expresses his interest and concern in Bryan's difficult situation using 'exaggerate interest with H' strategy.
The second instance of *maximization* occurs in the fourth turn, where the investigator exaggerates Derrell and Jodie's evidence, claiming that it is so powerful that he can arrest Bryan without a confession. As a consequence, *maximization* implies implicit intimidation. This maximization is manifested by *politeness*. That is, the investigator intensifies and exaggerates facts via *positive politeness strategy 'intensify interest to H by exaggerating facts'*, saying, "**I've got Jodie's statement. I have enough to walk out of this room right now**". Besides, he is pessimistic towards Bryan's dilemma by using *negative politeness strategy 'be pessimistic' in,* "**you think I put a guy who's paralyzed from the neck down on a ventilator with an interview like this up to twelve people on a jury that they're not going to sympathize with him instead of you?**".

Analysis of Case 3

The murder of Savannah Gold on August 2, 2017 is the focus of the subsequent investigation. Rodarte worked as a chef and manager at the Bone Fish restaurant when he slew 21-year-old Savannah, a waitress there, in his car in the parking lot. Though he dated other women, Rodarte was known to have an off-and-and-on relationship with Savannah. Immediately after the murder, he sent the victim's brother and mother misspelled text messages saying she was traveling with a boyfriend. Security cameras captured the incident, but investigators were unable to see what happened inside the car. When questioned by police, Lee initially denied any information, but three days later, he confessed that he cut off her tire and killed her. Then he directed the police to her corpse in a Westside Pond. The medical examiner could not determine the exact cause of Savannah's assassination, but he labeled it as violent murder. Later, Lee was captured and charged with assassination. He was sentenced to 24 years in prison for second-degree murder in February of 2021. In the following PI, the participants are Lee Rodarte, the suspect, and two police detectives, Reeves and Sally. The detectives' speeches are perceived as referring to one participant in the analysis because both deal with police power (Lee, 2019b).

Illustrative Excerpt

- ▪ **"Detective 2:** *Okay, well* **so tell us when you left with her in the car, that is what is shown, we can't make up that. We can't falsify video camera, Lee.** *I'm not lying to you. Because*

*you know I'm telling the truth because you know what's on the video. How else would I know that? I don't unless I have the video. **Where did you go with her?***
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: I didn't go anywhere with her**.*
▪   ***Detective 2: You did.***
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: No.***
▪   ***Detective 2: You did. So, the video cameras lie?***
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: I don't know this, I mean…***
▪   ***Detective 2:*** *Well, I'm telling you, …. **A 28-year-old man, that first says you haven't seen her, you didn't see her that day, to now the roles have reversed a little bit, because we have been doing our background okay? And now you're saying that she was sitting in your car,** which all lines up with the video, actually, I'm glad you said you got in the back seat with her, all that lines up. **You know what doesn't line up? That passenger door comes open, and shuts, opens and shuts. She never gets out of that car.** And you drive off. She never gets out of that car. **There is no green truck.** And that's not right to her. We are fact finders, Lee. We don't have anything personal against you.*
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: [Silence]***
▪   ***Detective 1***: *No, no. Not at all. **It's over. Just tell us what happened. Where is she?***
▪   ***Detective 2:*** *We're fact finders, just doing our job.*
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: [Silence]***
[Rodarte shakes head, no]
▪   ***Detective 2:*** *No, no, no. **Where did you go with her?** Where did you go with her, Lee. **You're human, you're human, you're a man.** Where did you go with her? **I know you're not that cruel inside.** Seriously, where did you go with her?*
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: [Silence]***
▪   ***Detective 1:*** *Maybe, **maybe you don't know where she is now**. **Where did go with her?***
▪   ***Lee Rodarte: [Silence]"***
(Appendix C. Case 3)
The following excerpt represents the center of the 'account stage' whereby the conflict of versions becomes apparent between Lee's story and the detectives' account of events; therefore, they challenge him straightforwardly with proofs. To practice power over the suspect, the detectives employ five strategies:

Accusation

Detective Sally employs accusation strategy thrice. First, she directly accuses Lee of lying: he lies despite the fact that the police have a surveillance camera that demonstrates his role in the crime. Her accusation is a potent 'supported direct accusation' because she openly accuses him using camera evidence as support. To manifest her accusation, she employs two power devices: *politeness* and *questions*. To start, she clearly and concisely makes the allegation that Lee was the last who left with Savannah, saying, "**so tell us when you left with her in the car, that is what is shown, we can't make up that. We can't falsify video camera, Lee**". Accordingly, she performs a FTA without redress, i.e., *bald on record politeness*. She then uses the *Wh-direct question*, "**Where did you go with her?",** to demand more clarity of where they (Savannah and Lee) went. Since her accusation is evidence-based, she is pretty sure that they were together. Therefore, her question is direct and requires a specific answer.
When detective Sally gets an unresponsive answer from Lee as represented by his stubborn denial, "***I didn't go anywhere with her",*** she reuses accusations strategy again in ***"You did",*** in which she employs *formulation* by making hints at *what is implied*: his inevitable involvement in the assaults.
 Additionally, she utilizes accusation strategy for the third time after Lee's denial, ***"No"***. She restates the accusation without change to the basics of the contents. Here, she employs *formulation* by repeating what *she has said* earlier, ***"You did"***. Besides, she uses the *declarative-cross question*, ***"So, the video cameras lie?",*** highlighting the perceived deficiency in the suspect's version of events as it is the reverse of the evidence.

Struggle for the Floor

Detective Sally utilizes *struggle for the floor* strategy once in this excerpt, which she manifests by *competitive interruption*. She interrupts Lee when he denies taking Savannah anywhere and refuses to admit his guilt in, "***I don't know this, I mean…".***

Maximization

To magnify the strength of evidence and inconsistencies between Lee's and the detective's versions of events., detective Sally exploits *maximization* strategy. She uses *politeness, formulation, and questions* in the manifestation of the strategy. When she refers to Lee as **"A 28-year-old man"**, she employs the *negative politeness* strategy 'impersonalize H'. Then, she uses *formulation* to summarize *what has already been said*, stating, "**that first says you haven't seen her… now you're saying that she was sitting in your car"**. She draws attention to the discrepancies in the suspect's present narrative and the one he told before this excerpt; he says he has not seen Savannah but now admits to sitting in his car with her. Since the second portion of the tale coincides with the video camera, *formulation* aids in exaggerating the intensity of the proof. The detective then switches to the *declarative-leading question*, **"You know what doesn't line up?"**. To emphasize the evidence's intensity even more, she uses *bald on record politeness* by directly threatening him with the contents of the video to show that he is lying: **"That passenger door comes open, and shuts, opens and shuts. She never gets out of that car…There is no green truck".**

Recycling Topics

Because of Lee's use of no comment strategy, the detective's resort to *recycling topics* strategy thrice in an attempt to extract a confession. *Politeness* and *questions* assist in the manifestation of the first occurrence of this strategy. Detective Reeves uses *bald on record politeness* to order Lee to tell the truth, **"It's over. Just tell us what happened".** Then he utilizes the *Wh-cross question* **"Where is she?"** to recycle the same topic.
Recycling topics strategy is utilized again yet by Detective Sally, this time as she uses the *Wh-cross question*, **"Where did you go with her?"** to manifest her strategy. The third time is employed by Detective Reeves where he uses the same *Wh-cross question*, **"Where did go with her?".**

Minimization

Minimization appears twice in this excerpt. Firstly, Detective Sally resorts to *minimization* strategy to decrease the suspect's resistance to confession by flattering the suspect and emotionally appealing to his consciences. To manifest her *minimization*, she uses the *positive politeness* strategy, 'exaggerate approval with H', by describing the suspect as **"You're human, you're human, you're a man… I know you're not that cruel inside".**
Secondly, Detective Reeves utilizes *minimization* strategy again to reduce the suspect's hand in the crime and download the offense's seriousness so as to elicit a voluntary confession. To manifest the strategy, the detective uses the *hedging expression* **"maybe"** in, **"maybe you don't know where she is now"**; he offers possible justifications for Lee.

Results And Discussion

Power Strategies

The frequency and percentage of occurrence of PPS in all cases are displayed in Table (1). the overall results exhibit an obvious preponderance of *topic control* over other strategies. *Topic control* is the most dominant strategy in the data since it amounts to 217 times (31.73%). *Maximization*, in contrast, is the least frequent strategy as it records only 38 times (5.56%). One possible explanation is that the POIs' powerful position has helped them to dominate and control topics. They obviously have the ability to start any topic that serves their legal aims, continue the topic at hand, resist any topic change or terminate and end the topic at any point they want. As such, they can forbid suspects' elaboration of any topic if it does not serve their purposes. Alternatively, they lessen the use of *maximization* due to their ethics, lack of proof, or to appear friendly and empathetic. Other strategies are arranged by percentage from the highest to lowest depending on the POIs' goals as follows: *recycling topics* (126 times, 18.42%), *struggle for the floor* (122 times, 17.84%), *rephrasing answers* (74 times, 10.82%), *minimization* (59 times, 8.63%), and *accusation* (48 times, 7.02%).

Table 1
The Frequency and Percentage of PPS in All PIs

No.	Strategy	Fr.	Pr.
1.	Topic Control	217	31.73%
2.	Recycling Topics	126	18.42%
3.	Struggle for the Floor	122	17.84%
4.	Rephrasing Answers	74	10.82%
5.	Minimization	59	8.63%
6.	Accusation	48	7.02%
7.	Maximization	38	5.56%
Total		684	100%

The statistical tool of One-Way ANOVA is employed to examine PPS. Table (2) below displays the mean of the overall analysis of these strategies and their minimum and maximum occurrences. It reveals that *topic control* records the highest mean of occurrences (72.33) while *maximization* achieves the lowest mean (12.67). The means of other strategies vary between (42–16); as such, the results are consistent with and support the prior analysis. This table is used to calculate One-Way ANOVA statistics.

Table 2
Descriptive Analysis of PPS

Descriptive Strategy	Sample	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Topic Control	3	72.33	28	107
Recycling Topics	3	42.00	14	68
Struggle for the Floor	3	40.67	18	61
Rephrasing Answers	3	24.67	8	33
Minimization	3	19.67	13	29
Accusation	3	16.00	4	24
Maximization	3	12.67	7	19
Total	21	32.57	4	107

Table 3
Difference Analysis of PPS

	One Way ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Calculated	Tabulated	P. value
Between Groups	3785.143	6	630.857			
Within Groups	5216.667	14	372.619	1.69	2.51	0.195
Total	9001.810	20				

The findings, shown in Table (3), indicate that the calculated value of (F) for the strategies is (1.69), which is smaller than the tabulated value of (2.51) at two degrees of freedom (20,7). Meanwhile, the P. value amounts to (0.195), which is greater than the significance level of (0.05), indicating that there are no statistically significant differences between PPS in impact. The results reveal that all PPS can be effectively exploited by POIs to practice power. This finding conforms to the quantitative analysis since POIs use various strategies and switch from one to the next in their consistent attempts to exert power over suspects and extract a confession. Consequently, the analysis shows the vast variance of using different strategies rather than relying on one strategy.

The Devices of Power Strategies
The following section presents the analysis of the devices that are used to manifest PPS.

Topic Control

Topic control is manifested via three devices, namely *questions*, which have the highest frequency (230 times, 43.65%), *topic management*, and *politeness,* which record 206 times (39.08%) and 91

times (17.27%) respectively. These devices are to be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs.

Questions (henceforth Q.) are analyzed according to their form and function. By form, *Wh-Q.* register the highest rate (102 times, 44.43%). Other types can be sorted by their use ratio from top to bottom as follows: *Yes-no Q.* (63 times, 27.40%), *declarative Q.* (49 times, 21.30%), *alternative Q.* (15 times, 6.53%), and finally *tag Q.* achieves the lowest rate (1 time, 0.34%). By function, *direct Q.* register the highest rate (72 times, 31.30%). Other types can be arranged from top to bottom by their use ratio: *free narrative Q.* (69 times, 30%), *leading Q.* (33 times, 14.35%), *closed Q.* (28 times, 12.18%), *loaded Q.* (15 times, 6.53%), *review Q.* (7 times, 3.04%), and finally *cross Q.* record the lowest rate (6 times, 2.60%).

As for *topic management*, it includes using *initiation* (29 times, 14.08%), *development* (114 times, 55.34%), *change* (49 times, 23.79%), and *end* (15 times, 6.79%). It is observed that *development* records the highest rate whereas *end* registers the lowest. Regarding *politeness*, it comprises *bald on record*, which has the highest frequency of 46 times (50.54%), *negative*, and *positive* which come next and record 25 times (27.48%) and 20 times (21.98%) respectively.

Recycling Topics

Recycling topics is manifested through three devices, namely *questions*, *formulation*, and *politeness*. *Questions* are the most prevalent recording 115 times (43.23%). They are examined according to their form and function. In terms of form, *declarative Q.* record the highest rate (55times, 47.83%). Other types can be sorted by their use ratio from top to bottom as follows: *Wh-Q.* (38 times, 33.04%), *Yes-no Q.* (16 times, 13.92%), and lastly, *alternative Q.* (6 times, 5.21%). It is noted that *tag Q.* are not used and thus achieve zero presence. In terms of function, *cross Q.* register the highest rate (60 times, 52.18%). Other types can be ranked by their use ratio from top to bottom: *leading Q.* (18 times, 15.66%), *free narrative Q.* (12 times, 10.44%), *review Q.* (8 times, 6.95%), *direct Q.* (6 times, 5.21%), *loaded Q.* (6 times, 5.21%), and finally *closed Q.* record the lowest rate (5 times, 4.35%). Regarding *formulation*, it comes next and records 94 times (35.34%). It involves two types: *what has been said* and *what is implied*. The former has the highest rate (61 times, 64.89%), while the latter has the lowest (33 times, 35.11%). As for *politeness*, it comes last and records 57times (21.43%). It embraces three strategies: *negative politeness* is the most prevalent (24 times, 42.11%), followed by *bald on record politeness* (18 times, 31.57%), and *positive politeness* (15 times, 26.32%).

Struggle for the Floor

Struggle for the floor is manifested by *interruption,* which falls into two types: *competitive interruption* and *cooperative interruption*. The former achieves the highest rate as it records 81 times (66.4%), whereas the latter comes next and registers 41 times (33.6%).

Rephrasing Answers

Three devices manifest *rephrasing answers* in discourse: *questions*, *formulation*, and *politeness*. Notably, *formulation* is the most dominant recording 56 times (46.66%). it involves two types: *what has been said* and *what is implied*. The analysis exhibits that only the former is used as it records 56 times (100%), while the latter records zero presence. *Questions* record 34 times (28.34%) are investigated in terms of form and function. By form, *declarative Q.* have the highest rate (18 times, 52.94%). Other types can be arranged by their percentage from top to bottom: *alternative Q.* (6 times, 17.65%), *Yes-no Q.* (5 times, 14.70%), *Wh-Q.* (4 times, 11.77%), and *tag Q.*, which are used only once making (2.94%). By function, *review Q.* register the highest rate (23 times, 67.65%). Other types can be listed from top to bottom based on their percentages as follows: *loaded Q.* (5 times, 14.71%), *leading Q.* (3 times, 8.82%), *cross,* (2 times, 5.88%), *free narrative Q.* (1 time, 2.94%), and finally, *closed* and *direct Q.* are not used at all. As for *politeness*, it comes last and records 34 times (28.34%). It involves three strategies: *bald on record politeness* is the most dominant (24 times, 46.67%), followed by *negative politeness* (10 times, 33.33%), and *positive politeness* (6 times, 20%).

Minimization

The analysis shows that minimization is manifested in discourse via four devices, including *hedges, politeness, formulation*, and *questions. Hedges* represent the most dominant device recording 78 times (42.39%). As for *politeness*, it records the second rate (60 times, 32.61%). It involves three strategies: *positive politeness* as the most dominant (48 times, 80%), followed by *negative politeness* (11 times, 18.33%), and *bald on record politeness* (1 time, 1.67%). *Formulation* records the third rate (34 times, 18.47%). It involves two types: *what has been said* and *what is implied*. The highest rate goes to the former, which records 22 times (64.70%), whereas the lowest rate goes to the latter (12 times, 35.30%). *Questions* achieve the last rate (12 times, 6.53%). They are investigated in terms of form and function. By form, *Yes-no Q.* have the maximum rate (7 times, 58.33%) followed by *Wh-Q.* (4 times, 33.34%) and *declarative Q.* (1 time, 8.33%). Both *alternative* and *tag Q.* are not used. By function, *leading Q.* register the highest rate (6 times, 50%) followed by *cross, Q.* (4 times, 33.34%) while *closed, review,* and *free narrative Q.* are not used at all.

Accusation

Three devices manifest *accusation strategy* in discourse: *questions, formulation*, and *politeness*. Interestingly, the rates illustrate that *politeness* is the most dominant recording 52 times (42.62%). *Politeness* includes three strategies: *bald on record politeness* which is the most frequent (29 times, 55.77%), followed by *negative politeness* (22 times, 42.30%), and *positive politeness* (1 time, 1.93%). *Questions* and *formulation* are equally used recording 35times (28.69%) for each. *Questions,* on the one hand, are examined according to form and function. Regarding form, *Yes-no Q.* has the maximum rate (16 times, 45.72%). Other types can be ranked from the highest to lowest by their percentage: *declarative Q* (9 times, 25.37%), *Wh-Q.* (8 times, 22.85%). It is noticed that *alternative Q.* and *tag Q.* are equally used recording (1 time, 2.85%). When it comes to function, *leading Q.* achieve the highest rate (19 times, 54.29%) followed by *direct Q.* (8 times, 22.85%) and *free narrative Q.* (4 times, 11.43%). *Cross* and *loaded Q.* record equal rates (2 times, 5.71%) while *review* and *closed Q.* and are not used at all. *Formulation*, on the other hand, includes two types: *what has been said* and *what is implied*. The first has the highest rate (20 times, 57.15%), while the second has the lowest rate (15 times, 42.85%).

Maximization

The analysis demonstrates that *maximization* is manifested in discourse through four devices, including *politeness, formulation, hedges,* and *questions. Politeness* represents the most dominant device recording 49 times (49%). It involves three strategies: *bald on record politeness* as the most dominant (26 times, 53.07%), followed by *negative politeness* (13 times, 26.53%), and *positive politeness* (10 times, 20.40%). *Formulation* achieves the second rate (27 times, 27%). It involves two types: *what has been said* and *what is implied*. The use of the two types is almost identical; the former records 14 times (51.86%) whereas the latter registers 13 times (48.14%). *Hedges* record the third rate with 14 times (14%). Finally, *questions* achieve the last rate (10 times,10%). They are investigated in terms of form and function. By form, *declarative Q* have the maximum rate (4 times, 40%) followed by *Wh-Q.* and *Yes-no Q.* at the same rate (3 times, 30%). Both *alternative* and *tag Q.* are not used. By function, *leading Q.* register the highest rate (8 times, 80%) followed by *cross, Q.* (2 times, 20%). Other types are not used.

The analyses of the seven strategies exhibit the prominent devices of each strategy. Tables (4 and 5) draw a comparison between these analyses.

Table 4
The Overall Analysis of Devices in PPS

Power Device												
Power Strategy	**Questions**		**Topic Management**		**Interruption**		**Formulation**		**Hedges**		**Politeness**	
	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.
Police Topic Control	230	52.76%	206	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	91	26.85%

	Questions		Topic Management		Interruption		Formulation		Hedges		Politeness	
	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.	Fr.	Pr.
Struggle for the Floor	0	0%	0	0%	122	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Recycling Topics	115	26.37%	0	0%	0	0%	94	38.21%	0	0%	57	16.81%
Rephrasing Answers	34	7.79%	0	0%	0	0%	56	22.77%	0	0%	30	8.85%
Accusation	35	8.03%	0	0%	0	0%	35	14.22%	0	0%	52	15.34%
Minimization	12	2.75%	0	0%	0	0%	34	13.83%	78	84.79%	60	17.69%
Maximization	10	2.30%	0	0%	0	0%	27	10.97%	14	15.21%	49	14.46%
Total		100.00%	206	100.00%	122	100.00%	246	100.00%	92	100.00%	339	100.00%

Table 5
The Devices of PPS

No.	Power Devices	Fr.	Pr.
1	Questions	436	30.25%
2	Politeness	339	23.52%
3	Formulation	246	17.09%
4	Topic Management	206	14.30%
5	Interruption	122	8.46%
6	Hedges	92	6.38%
Total		1441	100.00%

The analysis reveals the following results:

1. **Questions** occupy the first rank on the scale; they represent the most frequently utilized device to manifest PPS as they amount to 436 times (30.25%). *Questions* are used to manifest all PPS except for *struggle for the floor*. This outcome could be attributed to the fact that the source of power in PIs stems from POIs' pre-allocated right to ask questions and to assess whether an answer is satisfactory or not.
Table (4) demonstrates that the highest rate of using *questions* goes to *topic control* since questions are employed for (230) times making (52.76%). In contrast, the least rate goes to *maximization* as *questions* are exploited for (10) times, making (2.30%). Other strategies vary in using *questions* from 12 times (2.75%) up to 115 times (26.37%) depending on the multiple goals of POIs. Additionally, it is remarkably noticed that the same form can be used to fulfill different functions according to the requirement of the situation. Generally speaking, *free narrative Q.* provide the POIs with the power to elicit long answers from the suspects. *Closed Q.* help POIs in exercising their power over the suspects by limiting suspects' opportunity to expand or elaborate their answers. *Cross Q.* are used to verify any (in)consistency of the suspects' previous answers, check the degree of the accuracy and clarification of the long-detailed information they have provided, and to get any more information that might not be mentioned or elaborated before. *Direct Q.* are deployed to get precise and specific answers but usually simply worded and brief. *Review Q.* are used to summarize any previously mentioned information, to get more information, or to obtain the suspects' confirmation. POIs use such questions to end or terminate the current topic before moving to another one. *Leading Q.* grant POIs maximum control over the suspects' answers; the POIs use these questions to lead and force the suspects to think in a certain way and pushing them to agree and confirm whatever propositions. Finally, *loaded Q.* are very powerful and coercive weapons that POIs to control the suspects and their minds. The nature of the complexity of such questions makes them reasonable and full with propositions that help POIs assign accusations that direct misleading conclusions.
2. **Politeness** occupies the second-highest rank on the scale in manifesting PPS as it amounts to 339 times (23.52%). Similar to *questions*, it is employed to manifest all PPS except for *struggle for*

the floor. Table (4) demonstrates that the highest rate of using *politeness* goes to *topic control* since it is used for (91) times making (26.85%%). Conversely, the least rate goes to *rephrasing answers* as *politeness* is exploited for (30) times, making (8.85%). Other strategies differ in the use of *politeness* from 49 times (14.46%) up to 60 times (17.69%) depending on the POIs' various goals. The results indicate that POIs employ the three politeness strategies to manifest their strategies. First, *bald on record* politeness is employed for intimidation and coercion. As a result, it embodies the most explicit and threatening strategy where the POI is straight to the point. Second, *positive politeness* is used to establish common ground with suspects and show sympathy towards them, for instance, when the POIs explicitly express their approval of the suspects' behavior. Lastly, *negative politeness* is utilized to avoid restricting suspects' freedom and to minimize imposition.

3.   Formulation is ranked third on the scale in terms of manifesting PPS, with 246 times (17.09 %) as indicated in Table (5). It is utilized to manifest five strategies, beginning with *topic control* (91 times, 26.85%) and ending with *rephrasing answers* (30 times, 8.85%) in accordance with the POIs' aims. The results suggest that POIs generally use *formulation* to construct their preferred version of events and lead suspects to accept it, thereby limiting suspects' contributions. Furthermore, POIs utilize it to prove that suspects' versions of events are inadequate and portray suspects as unreliable criminals. The findings also suggest that both types of *formulations*, *what has been said* and *what is implied*, are used, but the former is used more frequently than the latter. One possible explanation is that the POIs primarily rely on the suspect's earlier statements when accusing them rather than proposing new explanations about what happened.

4.   Topic management is rated fourth on the scale with206 times, (14.30 %). It manifests one strategy: *topic control*. This result may be explained by the fact that a prominent feature of *topic control* is the POIs' right to initiate, develop, change, and end the topic discussed during the investigation. Consequently, topic *initiation, development, change,* and *end* are deployed. It is noticed that *development* has the highest rate, while *end* has the lowest. This result could be because most topics are left open since the suspects refuse to answer the questions, causing the POIs to develop or shift to another topic.

5.   Interruption is rated fifth on the scale and records 122 times (8.46%). %). It is used to manifest one strategy: *struggle for the floor*. According to the findings, *interruption* is exclusively exploited by POIs which could be explained by the fact that POIs have the authority and are in a more powerful legal position to interrupt suspects; hence *interruption* substantially correlates with POIs' efforts to stay in control and seize the floor.

Interruption involves two types: *competitive* and *cooperative*. The analysis shows that the former is more frequently used than the latter relying POIs' purposes after using interruption. On the one hand, they may use *competitive interruption* for different reasons, such as resisting any change of the topic during the interaction, returning to a previous topic, and preventing suspects from providing irrelevant information. Additionally, they employ it to resume their role back, expose their disagreement and dissatisfaction with the provided answers, and bring the suspects' words to an end. On the other hand, they sometimes deploy *cooperative interruption* not to contradict suspects but to complete suspects' anticipated answers, encourage them to continue, or show agreement and satisfaction. It can be noticed that the nature of PIs dictates the utilization of the former more frequently than the latter.

6.   Hedges embody that least utilized device to manifest PPS and occupy the lowest rank. They amount to 92 times (6.38%) and are used to manifested two strategies: *minimization* (78 times, 84.79%) and *maximization* (14 times, 15.21%). A possible reason for this outcome is that the use of hedges generally correlates with less powerful participants, i.e., suspects. That is, POIs are in a powerful position that does not necessitate extensive usage of hedges. Moreover, POIs usually use hedges to manipulate suspects to obtain a voluntary confession and mitigate the direct threat as much as possible.

Conclusions

In the light of the qualitative and quantitative analyses of the selected data, the study has arrived at the following conclusions:

1-   Depending the findings of the analysis, it has been deduced that power plays a significant role in the selection of these strategies and the degree of focus on one strategy more than others. POIs' legal and institutional rights have given them a great advantage of accessing the different power strategies with specific emphasis on using *topic control* strategy. In other words, the

inherently authoritative position of the POIs provides them with institutionally guaranteed right of choosing, changing, ending in addition to controlling and dominating any topic. This grants them control over the suspect and consequently over the whole process of interaction. Accordingly, the analysis reveals that hypothesis **No.1** is partially invalid because *topic control*, rather than *recycling topics*, is the most dominant strategy used by suspects, whereas *maximization* rather than *minimization* is the least frequent strategy.

2-		Contrary to expectations, the findings have shown that there are no statistically significant differences between police power strategies in impact. This suggests that all power strategies are employed interchangeably, and they complete each other. POIs resort to using a new strategy whenever the current one is useless and futile in extracting a confession. As such, all the strategies are of equal importance, and the difference in frequencies and percentages is a matter of focus. Hence, hypothesis **No.2** is refuted.

3-		The analysis indicates that PPS are manifested in discourse through certain devices, including *questions, politeness, formulation, topic management*, *interruption*, and *hedges*. Thereupon, the findings obviously verify hypothesis **No.3**.

References

Angermuller, J., Maingueneau, D., & Wodak, R. (2014). *The discourse studies reader: Main currents in theory and analysis*: John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/z.184

Areh, I. (2016). Police interrogations through the prism of science. *Psihološka obzorja, 25*, 18-28. Retrieved from http://psiholoska-obzorja.si/arhiv_clanki/2016/areh.pdf

Berk-Seligson, S. (2009). *Coerced confessions*: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110213492

Brown, K., & Mey, J. L. (2009). *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*: Elsevier Science. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=GcmXgeBE7k0C.

Bruijnes, M., Linssen, J., op den Akker, R., Theune, M., Wapperom, S., Broekema, C., & Heylen, D. (2015). Social behaviour in police interviews: relating data to theories *Conflict and Multimodal Communication* (pp. 317-347): Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14081-0_16

Carter, E. (2013). Analysing Police Interviews. Retrieved from https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/analysing-police-interviews-9780567129093

Dahl, R. A. (1957). The concept of power. *Behavioral science, 2*(3), 201-215. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830020303 de Pablos-Ortega, C. (2019). "Would it be fair to say that you actively sought out material?": Mitigation and aggravation in police investigative interviews. *Pragmatics and Society, 10*(1), 49-71. doi:https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.00015.pab

GenericDrew, P. heritage, J.(eds)(1992) Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). (1992b) Discourse and Social Change. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Farinde, R. O., Olajuyigbe, O. A., & Matthew, A. (2015). Discourse control strategies in police-suspect interrogation in Nigeria. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *5*(1), 146. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v5n1p146

GenericFairclough, N. (2015). Language and power. 3.[updated] ed: London: Routledge.

Haworth, K. (2006). The dynamics of power and resistance in police interview discourse. *Discourse & Society, 17*(6), 739–759. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0957926506068430

Heffer, C. The Language of Jury Trial A Corpus-Aided Analysis of Legal-Lay Discourse. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9780230502888

Heydon, G. (2005). The language of police interviewing. *Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan*. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057%2F9780230502932

Horgan, A. J., Russano, M. B., Meissner, C. A., & Evans, J. R. (2012). Minimization and maximization techniques: Assessing the perceived consequences of confessing and confession diagnosticity. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *18*(1), 65-78. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2011.561801

Johnson, A., & Coulthard, M. (2010). Introduction Current debates in forensic linguistics *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics* (pp. 29-44): Routledge. Retrieved from

https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203855607-9/introduction-current-debates-forensic-linguistics-alison-johnson-malcolm-coulthard

Leahy-Harland, S., & Bull, R. (2016). Police strategies and suspect responses in real-life serious crime interviews. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, *32*(2), 138-151. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-016-9207-8 .

Leech, G. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*: Routledge. doi:https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835976

Lee, L. (2019a, September 10). *Bryan Greenwell and Jodie Cecil case summary*. Criminal Words. https://criminalwords.net/2019/09/10/bryan-greenwell-and-jodie-cecil-case-summary/

Lee, L. (2019b, September 15). *Lee Rodarte case summary*. Criminal Words. https://criminalwords.net/2019/09/15/lee-rodarte-case-summary/

MacKay, I. R. A. (2016). David Crystal. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 2nd ed. London: Blackwell. 1985. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique, 32*(2), 220-223. doi:10.1017/S0008413100012202 Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/article/david-crystal-a-dictionary-of-linguistics-and-phonetics-2nd-ed-london-blackwell-1985/0F71C7B4F38C31E098D1C2A5DA4018F1

Moston, S. & Engelberg, T. (1993): Police questioning techniques in tape recorded interviews with criminal suspects. Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy, (3)3, 223-237. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10439463.1993.9964670

Mulayim, S., Lai, M., & Norma, C. (2014). *Police Investigative Interviews and Interpreting: Context, Challenges, and Strategies*: Taylor & Francis. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=YI1qBAAAQBAJ.

Murder of Yeardley Love. (2021, February 22). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Murder_of_Yeardley_Love&oldid=1008193609

Negura, L., Plante, N., & Lévesque, M. (2019). The role of social representations in the construction of power relations. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *50*(1), 25-41. https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12213

Nakane, I. (2014). *Interpreter-mediated police interviews: A discourse-pragmatic approach*: Springer.

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches: Pearson new international edition*: Pearson Education Limited.

Police Interrogation Transcripts. (n.d.). https://criminalwords.net/police-interrogation-transcripts/

Publishing, S. (2009). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Retrieved from https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675

Redlich, A. D., Silverman, M., Chen, J., & Steiner, H. (2004). The police interrogation of children and adolescents *Interrogations, confessions, and entrapment* (pp. 107-125): Springer. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-38598-3_5

Richards, J. C. (2002). *Longman Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*: Pearson Education.

Shuy, R. W., & Shuy, E. P. L. R. W. (1998). *The Language of Confession, Interrogation, and Deception*: SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.pk/books?id=blxuzGLFpRYC.

Swann, S. J. (2019). *Dictionary of Sociolinguistics*: Edinburgh University Press.

Tiersma, P., & Solan, L. M. (2005). Speaking of crime: The language of criminal justice. doi:https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=721625

Victoria, M. (2009). Power and politeness: a study of social interaction in business meetings with multicultural participation. *ESP across Cultures*, *40*, 129-40. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280723065

Walton, D. (2003). The interrogation as a type of dialogue. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*(12), 1771-1802. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00201-1

Appendices:

- **Appendix A: George Huguely Police Interview**
https://criminalwords.net/2019/09/09/george-huguely-police-interrogation/
- **Appendix B: Bryan Greenwell Police Interview**
https://criminalwords.net/2019/09/11/bryan-greenwell-interrogation-transcript/
- **Appendix C: Lee Rodarte Police Interview**
https://criminalwords.net/2019/09/15/lee-rodarte-interrogation-transcript