Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT) *Vol. 7 No.4* 2024

CONFESSIONS IN THE INVESTIGATIVE INTERVIEWS: A FORENSIC LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF ROBERT BRYNDZA'S *THE GIRL IN THE ICE*

Mahnoor Sher,
MPhil Scholar
Mahnoorsher@uop.edu.pk
Department of English and Applied Linguistics
University of Peshawar
Dr. Amjad Saleem,
Assistant Professor
Amjad.saleem@uop.edu.pk
Department of English and Applied Linguistics
University of Peshawar

Abstract

This study analyses the selected chapters of Robert Bryndza's crime thriller The Girl in the Ice (2016) in the forensic context of Andrea Douglass Brown's murder from the perspective of Aubry and Caputo's (1965; 1980) investigation strategies. Frequently used by police officers in the investigative interviews, these strategies include the sympathetic approach, leading questions, rapport building, and constant repetition of one theme. This critique highlights the cordial yet goal-oriented way of carrying out the investigative interviews that achieve their aim of finding out the truth; the interviewee is either innocent, or the actual culprit, or just a partner in the crime. Through qualitative content analysis, the study focuses on the case where Linda, during the investigative interview, conceals the information regarding the murder of her sister, Andrea, and thus, becomes partner in the crime. It is pertinent to underline the significance of suspects' emotional state during the police investigations even if the suspects are the real culprits in the crime being investigated. Highlighting the manipulative linguistic practices of the police detective characters, previously limited to active violence, but now exercised in more indirect ways and with seemingly positive undertones, is the central concern of the study. We conclude that language as a tool of communication is exploited to feed the vested interests of the detective characters in the novel.

Keywords: Investigation, Interview, Confession, Interrogation, Detective, Forensic linguistics

1. Introduction

Police interrogations are known to be either implicitly or explicitly manipulative or coercive in nature when it comes to getting the suspect or the accused to make a confession. The mainstream attitude of the police officers towards interrogation from the suspects, witnesses or the victims is just to get a confession. This confession culture had given rise to many wrongful convictions on part of the courts and judiciary in the 1980s and 1990s in United Kingdom. Courts had given unfair verdicts due to the coerced and forced confessions from people who were otherwise innocent (Gudjonsson, 2006). This practice was soon discerned as invalid and improper since it caused the public to doubt the fairness and justness of the judicial system. Contrary to this interrogation system that contains the confession culture with intimidating and bullying connotations, a new approach was introduced which advocated for a more open and welcoming attitude of the police officers and detectives while dealing with the suspects, witnesses, or victims. This new approach was known as investigative interviewing which favoured creating a friendly and cooperative environment for the suspects, witnesses, or victims where they feel at ease to exchange information about the case under investigation. Investigative interviews paved way for novel methods of conducting an investigation which included officers building rapport with the interviewee (suspect), seeming to be sympathetic and sensitive to their feelings, asking leading

questions to substantiate their answers, and to questioning them by recycling the same subject in different ways in order to discover the truth.

The police detective characters, in the work under study, leave no stone unturned in ambushing and tricking the suspect to get the truth out of her, not through physical violence or verbal abuse, but with the help of investigative techniques that apparently seem cooperative and supportive in nature; however, in reality, they push the suspect to the verge of an emotional breakdown with little to no effect on the detective characters. The purpose is to bring forward the issue of flooding the suspects with questions in an overwhelming manner by the detective characters in investigative interviews in order to acquire a confession in Bryndza's *The Girl in the Ice* (2016)

2. Literature Review

The existing literature in forensic linguistics focuses primarily on the real-life conversations between police investigators and the suspects. The scholars in the field, therefore, have worked to a great extent to establish the importance of linguistic and discursive techniques found effective by the detectives to extract confessions. Speaking of which, Thomas (1979) claims that in the interrogation manuals penned down by Aubry and Caputo (1980), the sole aim of police interrogation had been stated as to uncover the guilt and acquire a confession from the accused by any means necessary (p. 1189). He asserts that Aubry and Caputo's investigative techniques include tactics such as making wild fabricated guesses about the crime to the accused in order to gain a confession. Nonetheless, they also suggest to remain highly vigilant of not letting the accused suspect about the bluffing which would ultimately halt the process of investigation. An interrogation technique proposed by Aubry and Caputo (1980) is to show the suspects that strong physical evidence against them has been found by the police which probably will lead the actual guilty person to confess their crime. It has been considered as an ubiquitous practice during police interrogations. However, Aubry and Caputo (1980) also suggest that this interrogation technique might also fail since the innocent suspect would know that the police is only fabricating things. Whereas, the actual suspect can assume that since such fake evidence does not exist in the first place, the police do not have enough evidence against him (Thomas, 1979, pp. 1195–1196).

Another technique the police might use to gain a confession is to incriminate the suspect, guilty or innocent, by creating a hypothetical situation including the presence of eyewitnesses. Again, this technique can result as an unsuccessful one since the suspects can be sure of the fact that no such thing has happened, that no one has seen them committing the crime. Aubry and Caputo (as cited in Thomas, 1979, p. 1196) consider this technique to be a weak one. They argue that faking the presence of eyewitnesses and the like does not guarantee an honest confession. Apart from orchestrating the eyewitnesses, what can be viewed as a potential source to judge the authenticity of the suspects' response is, according to Hromadka (1993), facial expressions. He believes, however, that facial expressions do not serve as a reliable source for the investigators to identify whether the accused is being deceptive or honest. Face, including all its features, can easily be controlled by the suspects (pp. 15–16) (as cited in Aubry & Caputo, 1980). In a similar vein, Kassin and Kiechel (1996) argue that acquiring confessions from suspects using tools such as fingerprints, fake polygraph, prison informants and feigned friendships is also possible (p. 125).

In addition to the paralinguistic features, Wang, Chen and Atabakhsh (2004) acknowledge the fact that the main objective of the police is to detect deception in the suspects' statements which can be successfully done by noticing the signs that can be mental, emotional, and physical in nature (p. 120). Slobogin (2020) quotes that police bluffing about the actual or false incriminating evidence to extract

the confession from the suspect has been considered a gold standard in the pre-trial investigation process. The fact that in the case of actual evidence, the stratagem of the police will definitely prove effective since the pressure on the suspect to talk will be more whereas, in case of false evidence, the police might not pressurize the suspect as much as required and will lead to the suspect doubt and eventually catch the bluff (p. 13) (as cited in Aubry & Caputo, 1965, pp. 85–86). Thus, not only can the suspect deceive the interviewer, the interviewer can equally deceive the suspect into confessing. Hence, deception works both ways and has an equal chance of being caught by either of the parties during the investigative interview. The existing literature in the field of forensic linguistics provides ways to identify the techniques used by both the suspects and the interviewers to achieve their objectives–of denial and confession respectively.

Moreover, the difference between interrogation and investigation is defined by several researchers as the boundary between collecting information and securing a confession is fuzzy. The former can be defined under the category of investigative interviews; the latter is considered as part of the interrogation process. They believe that interrogations imply that the guilt has already been proven, yet the interviews suggest that the guilt is yet to be decided (Aubry & Caputo, 1980; O'Hara & O'Hara, 1988; Royal & Schutt, 1976; Yeschke, 1987) (as cited in Wilhelmsen, 2009, p. 104). As far as the investigation is concerned, Christianson (2007) discusses the techniques proposed by Inbau, Reid, Buckley and Jayne (2001). These researchers have put forward a number of effective methods to acquire confessions from the offenders. These methods include making the suspect believe that the investigator has reliable evidence against him, showing an understanding behaviour, distracting the suspects from denying their involvement in the crime, using wordplay to make the suspect give up and be willing to confess, maintaining eye contact, showing sympathy, building rapport, getting the suspects to self-incriminate by choosing a seemingly lesser evil alternative, engaging them in conversation and last but not least, getting a written confession to avoid any retraction by the suspect in future (pp. 238–240).

Kassin and McNall (1991), very much like Inbau et al. (2001), also introduce the minimization and maximization as investigative techniques in which the former includes tactics such as mitigating the threatening effect of the crime of the suspect, making them believe that they will be treated leniently in the court if they confess, whereas the latter includes threatening the suspects with severe penalty. Kassin and McNall's (1991) work is an experiment on how these techniques can prove effective for investigators in eliciting either a true or a false confession (p. 248). Another significant work that indicates interviewers' deceptive tendencies in acquiring confessions is by Adams-Quackenbush (2019) who claims that, at times, the investigators show confirmation bias in the interviews with the suspects. This means that their language already possesses implications of the suspects' guilt and instead of gathering information about the offence, the investigators' goal becomes more focused on finding evidentiary elements that can support their claim of the suspects' guilt. The study argues that close observation of such confirmation bias is required in order to prevent, discourage, and minimize this practice in the investigative interviews (p. 318).

Based on the reviewed literature, it has been observed that several methods and techniques to elicit confessions under duress have been proposed, experimented with, and also rejected by the scholars and theorists for various reasons in the field of forensic linguistics. While each method has its strengths and weaknesses based on the context in which it is used by the police investigators, they all work towards a mutual goal i.e. to acquire a confession. All these studies have been conducted in

relation to real life cases where the suspects, through different manipulative linguistic and non-linguistic tools were deceived into making a confession. Such deception often leads to the miscarriage of justice, and at the same time, it might also turn out to be an effective method. Having said this, the genre of crime fiction needs to be explored from the forensic perspective for highlighting the nuances of linguistic manipulation involved in reinforcing the deceptive approach of the investigators in acquiring confessions. It is significant to bring to light how psychologically vulnerable suspects are taken advantage of by the investigators in getting them to confess with the help of different interviewing technique. This study walks us through the interview process and offers us the true yet negative picture of the police interviews: how the methods used in investigative interviews are exploited for the mere purpose of gaining confessions even if that is being achieved at the cost of the suspects' mental health being compromised.

3. Theoretical Framework

Aubry and Caputo's (1965; 1980) work on sympathetic approach to interrogation, leading questions, constant repetition of one theme, and rapport building is employed to analyse Robert Bryndza's *The Girl in the Ice* (2016). The selected chapters have been chosen as they possess the traces of these investigative techniques which give a rich insight into the investigation methods employed by the detective characters to discover the accurate and reliable information and get the confession. These investigation methods primarily govern Linda's investigative interview while she is in police detention. Sympathetic approach works well in cases especially where the innocent suspects are in a vulnerable emotional state and are eager to have someone believe their non-involvement in the crime. Verbal, physical, vocal, and spatial elements along with choosing triggering themes for conversation are a few techniques detectives use to extract a confession. Aubry and Caputo (1980) suggest a sympathetic approach to interrogations and interviews and claim that by showing sympathy, compassion, and understanding with the emotionally and psychologically vulnerable suspect, both verbally and physically, suspects can be made to confess to their crimes. Aubry and Caputo (1980) call this an "all-around approach". They believe that the police officers, during the investigative interviews, may bring up the subjects for discussion which can potentially stir up an emotional response from the suspects. The subjects can range from their employment, veracity, and even family (as cited in Janniro, 1991, p. 38).

Leading questions is a significant component in leading the suspects to the confessions. It includes questions that already contain in most cases the assumptions of the suspects' guilt. Such questions are asked to bring the suspects to confess and thus, incriminate themselves. This interviewing technique has been claimed as a tried and tested one to wittily force a confession. It has been observed that leading questions prove undoubtedly successful at the point when the suspects are on the verge of giving up, tired, and frustrated during the investigative interview, and are willing to confess just to rid of the situation. However, in case of children suspects, it is commonly advised not to ask leading questions since children suspects, innocent or otherwise, are more vulnerable than adult suspects to fall prey to the investigation techniques and can also result in false confessions. Therefore, asking leading questions is encouraged in cases where the suspects are adults. In their notable work, Aubry and Caputo (1980), in a detailed manner, argue about the leading questions by claiming that such questions have a predetermined motive i.e., to have the suspects answer in a way that is desired by the police officers. The answer already lies in the leading questions and the questions merely act as a nudge to get the suspects to elicit the interviewers' desired response. Framing your questions as leading question,

therefore, is a shrewd way of assuaging the resistance of the suspects and 'leading' them to confess. Aubry and Caputo (1980) believe that this approach is mostly used and tested as a rewarding one in the final stages of the investigative interview; this is the time when the suspect is already emotionally and psychologically drained and is susceptible to fall for the trap set by the interviewers in the form of leading questions (as cited in Janniro, 1991, p. 24).

Another component of the investigative interview is constant repetition of one theme to not let the suspects deviate from the interviewers' questions. The interviewers keep questioning the suspects on one subject by rephrasing the questions in several ways. The trick is to not let the suspects distract from the original argument by recycling the same questions over and over again. It is believed to be a useful interrogation technique by leading contributors of the field who perceive it as the ability of the interviewer to keep the conversation with the suspects going without losing the control over the subject matter being discussed. This technique is widely practiced and is known to work if the interviewer is persistent enough not to drop the subject and even if they do, they come back to it after a brief while without being upfront about it. The scholars of the field call for a subtle switching to the topic of interrogation to eventually make the suspect confess the truth i.e. either his own guilt or the knowledge of the crime to which they have become a witness (Aubry and Caputo, 1980, p. 210 as cited in Cotterill, 2002, p. 140).

Aubry and Caputo (1965) proposed different concepts of rapport building practices during the police interviews of which only the relevant ones will be used. Rapport between the interviewer and the suspect is an essential factor for the smooth extraction of a confession. It is perceived that rapport can be built through several techniques including offering realistic incentives and quick comforts such as a cup of coffee, a cigarette, showing concern, understanding, and sympathy, asking background questions, or faking to have experienced a same situation in life, etc., all of which to a great extent assist the interviewer in making the suspects speak and keeping the conversation flowing. No rapport ultimately means no progress and the interviewer fails at the very initial stage. Therefore, to avoid such a hazard, it is recommended in manuals for criminal interrogation including Aubry and Caputo's (1980) work that, while building rapport, it is key to ensure a safe environment with an air of confidence for the suspects. They assert that some of the major rapport building techniques that will serve the interviewers well include addressing the suspects by their first or surname, analysing their personality, and deciding the questioning approach based on their analysis of the suspects' personality (as cited in Swenson, Destro, & Fein, 2006, pp. 181–182).

The present research employs Leedy and Ormrod's (2016) content analysis method. They argue that in order to use qualitative methodology, one of the five commonly utilised methods is content analysis which suggests breaking down lengthy texts and analyse them to find out patterns, themes, and biases. It also allows us to thoroughly read the text and study the characters' attitude, dialogues, and conversations during the interrogation and helps unveil the traces of the aforementioned investigative methods found in the text. The analysis will be focused on exploring the police interview approaches by carefully and separately examining each dialogue of the characters in the selected text.

4. The Novel at a Glance

The Girl in the Ice (2016), a British crime thriller by Robert Bryndza, tells the story of the murder of a young English socialite, Andrea Douglass Brown, and the investigation of this case that follows. This British detective fiction interlinks two plots; Andrea's life and her murder investigation, and DCI Erika Foster's life as a police officer. This literary piece is an engaging read which, apart from providing to

the readers an entertaining plot with many twists, also draws the reader's attention to important social issues such as biases against immigrants, the implications of power and control addiction on human behavior, corruption of high-ranked officers, prostitution, and women trafficking; besides, it also opens a window onto the world of police investigation procedure in British police department. The book has double narratives; the crime and the investigation, which is usual for any crime mystery fiction. This novel also highlights matters of siblings' jealousy, parental negligence towards children and its repercussions seen in their behaviour, empowered and strong-headed woman lead character (in form of DCI Foster's character) unwilling to give up her job as a police officer even after encountering a traumatic experience of a police raid in which she loses her husband.

5. Analysis

In order to conform to the statement made above about Linda being a naïve and easy target because of her emotionality, first, we will establish her emotional persona with the help of the evidence from the text itself. In chapter 42, when DCI Foster and her team find Linda's criminal record, they visit her floristry and ask her about it, particularly the *eight thousand pounds' worth of damage to Giles Osborne's offices…* (p. 238) *and killing his cat* (p. 239). Although Linda reacted normally to the former accusation, however, she could not control her sentiments about the latter and reacted,

> I DID NOT KILL HIS CAT!' cried Linda. I would never do something like that. Cats are the most beautiful, intelligent creatures…You can stare into their eyes, and I think they know all the answers…If only they could talk.…I didn't do it. I am not a liar! (p. 239).

These statements, on one hand, prove Linda's sentimentality towards the subject of cats in particular, on the other hand, it confirms her as a person who acts on impulses probably because she has always been the neglected one among her siblings, one who has lived her entire life under the shadow of a prettier and a more appreciated younger sister. Foster dictates the list of her crimes which further verify Linda's rash and irresponsible actions such as *assault, shoplifting, credit card fraud, vandalism,* (p. 238). Later, in the same chapter, after she retrieves the photos from Andrea's previously hidden cellphone, DCI Foster assumes that Igor, Andrea, and Linda attended a party together since there were photos of Igor, Andrea and Linda with the same setting and people in the background. In an attempt to find a connection between the three of them, detective Moss questions Linda about the party and repeats the question about Giles's cat knowing that the topic has an emotional basis for Linda,

> Where was Giles?
>
> I would have thought that he'd left by then so he could avoid having to see me.
>
> Because you harassed him, vandalised his offices, and killed his …' finished Moss.
>
> *How many more times, I did not kill Clara!' cried Linda.* Tears welled up in her eyes...Clara was…she was a lovely animal. She would let me hold her. She wouldn't let many other people, not even Giles. [Emphasis added] (p. 239).

This interaction, therefore, depicts Linda's great affection for cats and demonstrates her as a person who can be easily-triggered and taken advantage of if the right strings are pulled. Coming towards Linda's investigative interview in chapter 67, DCI Erika Foster tells Linda about the sexual relation between Igor and Barbora, Igor's unlawful activities, and Barbora's suicide, all of which leaves Linda in utter shock. As usual, she *was shaking, her eyes filling with tears which spilled down her cheeks* (p. 353). She asks about Barbora's suicide to which DCI Foster responds that,

> She hung herself. She was terrified. So now do you see how important it is that we find out the truth about Igor Kucerov? He is linked directly to Andrea (p. 353).

In these lines, we see that DCI Foster is playing on Linda's feelings knowing that the latter is already saddened by the news and is extremely affected by it. During this conversation, Foster notices Linda's disturbed state because of the news of Barbora's death and not only does she simply assert that *she hung herself*, but also adds another sentence to intensify Linda's emotions i.e., *she was terrified*, and hence, get her talking about Igor, which, of course, works and Linda cooperates. The plot progresses and in chapter 73, detective Peterson is put in charge to interview Linda. He starts the interview by building rapport with her which is the common technique used by the detectives or police officers. He attempts to build a friendly environment, offers Linda coffee, and states,

> Look, they never get it right; I said my name was Peterson. They've written "Peter Son". Linda stared at him for a moment, and then reached out for her cup and checked the side. They got my name right, she said. She turned the cup and her face broke into a smile. Oh, and they drew a little cat! Look! She twisted the cup round so Peterson could see. I thought you'd like that. Peterson grinned.

Here we can see detective Peterson's interrogation method of rapport building and gaining Linda's trust in order for the interview to be productive and to get Linda to open up about what she knows about Andrea's murder. This technique works and Linda becomes quite comfortable *sipping at her coffee* (p. 369, chapter 73). Detective Peterson cuts to the chase and directly talks about her favourite subject–cats. He inquires,

> Linda, you said yesterday you didn't have a cat.' 'No. I don't,' she said ...'Did you?' 'Yes, I did,' she said softly. 'His name was Boots.' 'Boots?' 'Yes, he was black, but he had four white paws, like he was wearing boots …' The minutes ticked by, and Linda became quite animated, talking about Boots. She was just telling Peterson about how Boots used to sleep under the covers with her, with his head on her pillow… (p. 369, chapter 73).

In this interaction, Linda's lively and energetic conduct proves detective Peterson to be a good investigator since he managed to raise her interest in the ongoing conversation and thus, gained her cooperation. The detective already knows her weak spot and continues to build the dialogue around that point so as to keep the suspect talking. This interrogation approach is known as 'constant repetition of one theme' discussed by Aubry and Caputo (1980) and cited by Cotterill (2002, p. 149). This approach, according to Aubry and Caputo (1980), means recycling the topic of interest and "repeating the same questions or line of questioning over and over again" (as cited in Cotterill, 2002, p. 149) which in police discourse has another label i.e., "keep the talk going" worked upon by Van Meter and Bopp (1973) and cited in in Cotterill's (2002) *Language in the Legal Process*. The same strategy is adopted in chapter 73 when detective Moss asks detective Peterson to "Keep her talking about Boots," (p. 369). Peterson keeps the discussion going and appears to be intrigued by the conversation about Boots and asks if he had a middle name to which Linda replies,

> No. He was Boots Douglas-Brown; that was quite enough. I wish I had a middle name, or even a nicer name than just boring old Linda.' 'I dunno; I like the name Linda,' said Peterson (p. 369).

Detective Peterson's role as an investigator, here, can be seen as an empath who compliments Linda's name and continuously shows an attentiveness towards her favourite topic. This friendly attitude on part of the detective is a positive emblem that contributes to Linda not being hesitant or resistant to the questions asked in the investigative interview. The conversation proceeds with detective Peterson asks,

> And, what happened to Boots? I take it she's not still with us?' asked Peterson. 'He, Boots was a HE… And no. He's not with us,' said Linda. She gripped the edge of the desk. 'Are you okay? Is this upsetting to talk about how Boots died?' pressed Peterson (p. 370, chapter 73).

Noticing that Linda is under emotional stress while talking about Boots, her pet cat, detective Peterson's tone suddenly becomes empathetic and concerned. He addresses and validates her emotional experience and feelings of being upset. Another important thing to be observed here is that the detective directly asks about Boots's death; he does not inquire whether he got missing or did they give him away to someone else since Linda never mentions Boots's death earlier; she just tells about he not being present in their lives which could equally mean that he might have got lost or that they intentionally gave him away. However, the detective's direct inquiry about Boots's death may mean that he wants to provoke Linda to react and come clean about her sister's murder. His strategy is successful and Linda responds,

> Of course it was upsetting. He DIED!' shouted Linda. There was a silence. 'Okay, this is good, Peterson, keep on at her. We're breaking her down,' said Moss, in his ear (p. 370, chapter 73).

It is clear that the detectives have an obvious agenda to go to the extremes to achieve their goal by being insistent with their questioning about a topic that Linda (one of the suspects) has an emotional attachment with. They appear to be understanding and sympathetic towards her emotional condition but in reality, they are just pursuing their own ends. In chapter 75, detective Moss gets a document from Linda's physician stating her to be mentally unfit for police interrogation but detective Moss takes it for granted and lets Peterson continue the interview. She urges detective Peterson to *push her harder* (p. 374). He complies and the interview proceeds with the same line of questioning. He recycles the same topic and asks Linda,

> "How did he die, Linda?'... 'How did Boots die?' Linda's bottom lip was now trembling and she gripped the coffee cup, running her finger over the tiny cartoon cat. 'None of your business.' 'Were your family upset when Boots passed?' 'Yes.' 'Andrea and David, they must have been younger, too?' 'Of course they were younger! Andrea was upset, But David …' Linda's face clouded over; she bit down hard on her lip. 'What about David?' asked Peterson. 'Nothing. He was upset too,' said Linda, flatly (p. 374, chapter 75).

Linda clearly gives cues through her body language that she feels uncomfortable answering these questions and it becomes difficult for her to retain the same enthusiasm as before. Her unhappiness is evident in her tone and manner of answering the questions which does not stop the detective and he carries on the inquiry. The investigation continues with, *You don't look too convinced. Was David upset, or wasn't he, Linda?* (p. 374, chapter 75). Here, detective Peterson makes use of a leading question by suggesting the answer himself in order to get his desired response. Linda,

> …started to breathe fast, sucking in air and blowing it out, almost hyperventilating. 'He … was … up … set … too,' said Linda, her eyes wide, looking at the floor. 'David was upset?' *pushed Peterson.* 'I JUST SAID HE WAS! HE WAS FUCKING UPSET!' shouted Linda. 'I think this is getting—' started the solicitor, *but Peterson went on* (my emphasis) (p. 374, chapter 75).

An obvious instance of intimidating and tricking the suspect into making a confession is how the detective, regardless of Linda's emotional collapse, keeps on recycling the same question until she fails to hold the truth inside. It is also notable that seeing Linda's vulnerable condition, her advocate attempts to stop the interview but the detective deliberately and knowingly keeps the interview going. The interrogation continues with, *David's away at a stag party, isn't he, Linda? He's only gone for a*

few days, hasn't he? asked Peterson. Linda was now crying, tears pouring down her cheeks (p. 374, chapter 75).

Another example of the detective using the interrogation strategy of leading questions is noticeable when he tries to lead Linda to the answer he is looking for. He phrases, in form of a question, the information about stag party that she already knows in order to confirm and get additional knowledge about David's whereabouts and how she feels about it since the detective has seen Linda's changed behaviour when David's name is brought up. Therefore, he intentionally asks her about David and she replies, *Yes. I was surprised at how hard it was to let him go,' she said. She froze, and frowned* (p. 374, chapter 75). Hence, Linda, in this answer, inadvertently, gives an indirect cue about David being the actual killer when she hints that letting him go to the party was hard and it surprised her. Of course, it should not have been hard because Simon Douglass Brown (her father), is aware of David's crimes and knowing that the police is investigating the case, he should have easily sent David somewhere far to save him from getting caught or detained. It should not have been 'hard' and that surprised Linda. The detective again wears the mask of sympathy and understanding and tries to calm her by saying,

> *It's okay* … He's coming back, Linda … David is coming back, said Peterson. Linda was now gripping the desk and her face was red, her mouth curled up. 'My client is …' started the solicitor. 'I don't want him back,' Linda hissed. 'Linda, why don't you want David back? *It's okay, it's me; you can tell me,*' said Peterson... [Emphasis added] (p. 375, chapter 75).

The repeated claims of detective Peterson's apparently kind and supportive attitude indicates his use of Aubry and Caputo's (1980) sympathetic approach to investigative interviews. He motivates Linda to open up to him about her aversive feelings for David and her disapproval of him being back by phrasing his questions in the veil of sympathy and considerateness. Also, he again ignores the solicitor's attempt to stop the interview and remains persistent in his inquiry. As a result, Linda maintains,

> …'Far away,' said Linda darkly. 'I want him gone far away … Gone … GONE!' 'Why, Linda? Tell me why; why do you want David gone far away?' 'BECAUSE HE KILLED MY CAT!' she suddenly cried. 'HE KILLED BOOTS! Killed Boots! No one believed me! They all thought I was making it up, but he killed my baby cat. He killed Giles's cat too, and made it look like it was me! …' (p. 375, chapter 75)

Now, even though Linda finally and quite emphatically discloses the reason for her hostility towards David, detective Peterson asks her again, *David? David killed your cat?' said Peterson. Yes! Like who, Linda? Like those girls, she finished, in a tortured whisper* (p. 375, chapter 75). He reiterates David's name to further verify her answer and then keep the conversation flowing by asking,

> How did he kill him? asked Peterson. Linda was now turning purple, gripping the desk, trying to rock it, but it was bolted to the floor. The words were pouring out of her now. 'He strangled him … He strangled him … Like, like …' Linda bit down on her lip so hard that a spot of blood oozed out (p. 375, chapter 75).

Another significant point here is detective's constant use of Linda's first name that might have enhanced and increased the effect of compassion and thoughtfulness in his voice while interviewing her. Addressing the suspect with first or last name is also recommended by Aubry and Caputo (1965) in order to build rapport with them. Moreover, Aubry and Caputo (1965) argue that the interviewer should "size-up" the suspect and decide which investigation approach to use according to that judgment. This

method is also evidently practiced when the detectives come to realise Linda's weak point i.e. her fondness for cats and emotional nature, they adopt the sympathetic tone and provide her a positive ambiance where she can least resist answering the questions. At the end, he manages to get the real offender's name with the help of all these investigative techniques of sympathetic approach, leading questions, recycling the same topic, and rapport building.

6. Conclusion

Taking into account the above discussion, it can be concluded that although the police characters in this novel are involved in solving a murder case and thereby enforcing the law by endeavouring to catch the criminal and bringing justice to the victim, however, their law enforcement practices have some gray connotations. On one hand, they follow the investigative approaches encouraged by the courts which require them not to question the interviewees in a threatening environment; however, on the other hand, while conducting interview of the suspect, they conform to the obsolete and traditional techniques of emotionally pushing the suspect either to the brink of an honest confession or their desired answer. This outdated way is mere interrogation for the sake of confessions, be it a true or a false one, and adheres to the techniques that fall under the discouraged and non-recommended practices by the courts.

The analysis also showed that police detectives exercise the detested and unpopular interrogation methods, that too, under the label of investigative interviewing. They ignore the suspect's solicitor when he tries to stop the interview, become ignorant to Linda's emotional breakdown until they get their desired response, and remain determined in their questioning despite receiving her medical report from her doctor saying that she is mentally unstable to be questioned by the police. All this shows that this novel accurately depicts the characters of the detectives to be downplaying the suspect's right to stop talking in the interview and mitigating the adverse and unhelpful impact of their iterative inquiry methods on Linda. The analysis recounts the textual evidence from the novel that is supported by Aubry and Caputo's (1965; 1980) investigative techniques of rapport building, showing sympathy, asking leading questions, and recycling the topic to discover the truth. All these techniques are practiced in good faith apparently, however, the ulterior motive behind utilizing these methods is to make Linda confess or to reveal any important information about the actual murderers. The analysis of the text thus indicates the hidden agenda of the detectives under the cover of investigative interviewing (that is otherwise a positive method), hence highlighting the negative undertones in their attitude.

The study also highlights Linda as an emotionally weak character who can be easily manipulated which then makes her vulnerable to the detectives' implicit attempts at controlling or influencing her answers in the interview. The study thus offer new insights into how the novel highlights the twisting of the real purpose of investigative interview and covers it up in sham sympathy and pretentious camaraderie towards the suspects

References

Aubry, A. S., & Caputo, R. R. (1980). *Criminal Interrogation* (3rd Ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Aubry, A. S., & Caputo, R. R. (1965). *Criminal Interrogation*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Adams-Quackenbush, N. M. (2019). The influence of guilt presumptive language on investigative interview outcomes. Doctoral Thesis, Maastricht University. Maastricht University. https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20190618naq

Bryndza, R. (2016). *The Girl in the Ice*. Bookouture. Retrieved from

https://todaynovels.com/the-girl-in-the-ice-by-robert-bryndza-pdf-download/

Cotterill, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Language in the Legal Process*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK: Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from https://vdoc.pub/download/language-in-the-legal-process-4do5v1hbjeu0

Christianson, S. A. Offenders' Memories of Violent Crimes. Wiley Series in The Psychology of Crime, Policing and Law. *John Wiley & Sons Ltd*.

Gudjonsson, G. (2006). Disputed Confessions and Miscarriages of Justice in Britain: Expert Psychological and Psychiatric Evidence in the Court of Appeal. *Manitoba Law Journal*. 31(*3*), 489–522. Retrieved from https://themanitobalawjournal.com/?s=Gudjonsson

Janniro, M. (1991). *Interview and Interrogation* (4th Ed.). Antipolygraph.org. Retrieved from https://duckduckgo.com/?sites=antipolygraph.org&k8=%23444444&k9=%23D51920&kh=1&kg=p&kt=n&q=interview+and+interrogation

Kassin, S.M., Kiechel, K. L. (1996). The Social Psychology of False Confessions: Compliance, Internalization, Confabulation. *American Psychological Society*. 7(*3*). 125–128

Kassin, S.M., McNall, K. L. (1991). Police Interrogations and Confessions. *Law and Human Behavior*. 15(*3*), 233–251 (1991). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01061711

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. P. (2016). *Practical Research Planning and Design* (11th Ed.). Pearson Education, Inc. Retrieved from https://pce-fet.com/common/library/books/51/2590_%5BPaul_D._Leedy,_Jeanne_Ellis_Ormrod%5D_Practical_Res(b-ok.org).pdf

Slobogin, C. (2020). The Legality of Trickery During Interrogation. *Vanderbilt Law Research* Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=3522510 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3522510

Swenson, R.G., Destro, R. A., & Fein, R. A. (2006). *Educing Information: Interrogation: Science and Art, Foundations for the Future, Intelligence Science Board. Phase 1 Report*. Semantic Scholar. Retrieved from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Educing-Information%3AInterrogation%3AScienceandforSwensonDestro/a0770a70ccd74cef6d342402f86ac2d7788143aa

Thomas, J. G. (1979). Police Use of Trickery as an Interrogation Technique. *Vanderbilt Law Review*. 32(*5*), 1167–1213 https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3034&context=vlr

Wang, G. A., Chen, H., & Atabakhsh, H. (2004). Criminal Identity Deception and Deception Detection in Law Enforcement. *Group Decision and Negotiation 13*: 111 file:///C:/Users/scs/Downloads/Criminal_Identity_Deception_and_Deception_Detectio.pdf

Wilhelmsen, S. (2009). Maximising Organisational Information Sharing and Effective Intelligence Analysis in Critical Data Sets. A case study on the information science needs of the Norwegian criminal intelligence and law enforcement community. Dissertation. University of Bergen, Norway. https://bora.uib.no/bora-xmlui/handle/1956/3657