

Adesina Bukunmi Sunday

University of Ibadan

Temidayo Akinrinlola

McPherson University, Abeokuta

Discourse strategies of handling denials in police – suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria

Abstract

Studies on police interrogation have examined interrogating police officers' (IPOs') deployment of power abuse in gleaning confessional statements from suspects. However, studies on how IPOs handle denials during interrogation has not been given adequate attention. Therefore, this study investigates discourse strategies of handling denials in police – suspect interaction in Ibadan, Southwest Nigeria. Spencer-Oatey's rapport management theory served as theoretical background. Recorded police interrogation sessions at the State Criminal Investigation and Intelligence Department (SCIID) Iyágankú, Ibadan, constituted the data. Four cases (assault, stealing, Internet fraud and robbery) were sampled, owing to their robust manifestation of facial, sociality, and interactional cues between the IPOs and suspects. While suspects adopt empathic and explanatory forms of denial to threaten IPOs' goals, IPOs make lexical, discursive, and paralinguistic choices to negotiate discursive acts of appealing to suspects' needs, constructing testimonies against suspects, emphasising suspects' rights and engaging detention and investigation to threaten the face, sociality rights, and goals of suspects.

Keywords: police interrogation, criminal cases, rapport management theory, strategies of handling denials, police – suspect interaction, Ibadan

1. Introduction

Police – suspect interaction (PSI) is a platform for negotiating contextual goals between interrogating police officers (IPOs) and suspects. While IPOs are officers charged with the responsibility of arresting and prosecuting offenders within the ambit of the law, suspects are individuals assumed to have committed crimes. IPOs are charged with the task of eliciting confessional statements from suspects during interrogation. To achieve this objective, they deploy series of strategies to elicit confessional statements from suspects (Heydon 2005, Nicola 2012, Akinrinlola 2016, Sunday & Akinrinlola 2017, Udoh 2010). Conversely, suspects adopt denials to escape incrimination in such interactions.

With regard to the Nigerian policing context, suspects engage in denials to manipulate the context of interrogation. Suspects' engagement in denials is not unrelated to the consciousness of their disadvantaged position during crime investigation. Aware of the legal implications of confessional statements made during interrogation, suspects consciously refute every incriminating statement of IPOs. Suspects adopt denial as a tool to beat IPOs' investigative skills. Denial is a discursive strategy adopted by suspects to avoid accusations during PSI (Benneworth 2009). They construct denial by refusing to acknowledge their involvement in crimes (May, Granhag & Tekin 2017). Denial is manipulated by suspects to invalidate IPOs' testimonies, and such construction of denial is geared towards escaping incrimination (Akinrinlola 2016; Sunday & Akinrinlola 2017).

Existing studies from the sociological (Udoh 2010, Nicola 2012), psychological (Soukara, Bull, Vrij, Turner & Charryman 2009; May, Granhag & Tekin 2017) and discourse analytical (Benneworth 2009; Ajayi 2016; Akinrinlola 2016; 2018; 2019) perspectives have investigated how IPOs manipulate discursive devices in enacting control, hegemony and abuse in PSI without attempting to explain how IPOs handle denials in interrogation. Contemporary scholarship argues that PSI transcends the use of threat and abuse to handle suspects' denials; studies are now interested in examining how IPOs discursively handle denials without subjecting suspects to physical abuse. Such studies are devoted to investigating how IPOs defeat suspects' construction of denials. Apart from the fact that studies from the discourse analytical angle are very scanty, existing discourse analytical investigations in PSI have not sufficiently interrogated how denial could be handled through IPOs' display of positive interactional cues during investigation. In other words, research has not considered how IPOs' construction of rapport with suspects could contribute significantly to handling

denials during interrogation. This study argues that denial could be handled in PSI by adopting rapport building as an ethnographic method in policing. Another striking shortcoming in the previous studies lies in their neglect of the role of context in the interpretation of the motivations of participants in PSI. This weakness is handled in this study by rapport management theory (RMT), considering its strength in engaging aspects of politeness in achieving interactional goals.

The thesis of this paper is that rather than deploying physical threat, IPOs devise discursive strategies in handling suspects' denials in PSI. This is so because suspects' denials constrict IPOs' investigative capacity. Since PSI thrives on the strength of interaction, this study maintains that, rather than resorting to force, IPOs utilise the resourcefulness of rapport management in handling cases of denial in PSI. This study addresses the following questions: What are the strategies adopted by IPOs in handling denials in PSI? What implications do such strategies have for the language of crime investigation in Ibadan? To respond to these questions, the study adopts Oateys' RMT as its theoretical framework, in view of its emphasis on the resourcefulness of politeness in achieving intended goals in interaction.

2. Studies on police interrogation

Many studies have investigated PSI from the psychological, sociological and discourse analytical perspectives. While psychology-based studies (Soukara, Bull, Vrij, Turner & Charryman 2009; Fisher, Edwards & Geiselman 2010; May, Granhag & Tekin 2017) examine the manipulative strategies of engaging suspects' psyche in a bid to elicit confessional statements, studies within the sociological field (Udoh 2010; Omoroghomwan 2018) deploy the resourceful of socio-cultural variables in crime investigation. Discourse analytical studies (Benneworth 2009; Akinrinlola 2016; 2019) interrogate the import of discourse devices in projecting the orientations of participants in PSI. On the significance of psychological tactics in police investigation, Soukara et al. (2009) investigate the use of psychological tactics by police in England. Using audio-recorded interviews assessed by forensic psychologists, the study reveals that coercive tactics were infrequently used. Rather than resorting to coercion, IPOs adopted strategies that enabled the elicitation of information from suspects. The study is quite relevant to the present research in terms of scope; the subject examined is crime investigation. However, the point of departure lies in the goals; Soukara et al.'s (2009) study is not located within discourse analysis. Besides, the study does not consider how denial is managed in PSI. Fisher et al. (2010) investigate

the components of police interview that restrict suspects' contributions during crime investigation. The study uses interview with 70 participants. Its findings reveal that IPOs' construction of the structure of the interview militates against suspects' triumph over psychological problems. The study recommends the cognitive interview model which enhances suspects' recollection.

With focus on the nature of evidence in crime investigation, May, Granhag and Tekin (2017) interrogate how evidence disclosure affects the elicitation of information. The researchers interviewed 80 participants. Two modes of evidence disclosure were found: strategic use of evidence and confrontation. The study demonstrates that a significant correlation exists between mode of evidence disclosure and cases examined. This study provides information on how evidence is managed in PSI. On the significance of context in police interview, Kelly, Dawson and Hartwig (2019) describe how IPOs use space to enact and sustain control over suspects during crime investigation. The authors created an experimental room to accommodate more space than the control context. Using 77 copies of an interview questionnaire by detectives, suspects in the experimental room reported that it was more comfortable. On the use of language by Nigerian police officers, Udoh (2010) investigates the language of traffic police officers in Onitsha, southeastern Nigeria. The study reveals that Nigerian police officers' use of the English language reflects their educational background. Omoroghomwan (2018) focuses on four notable police behavioural strategies in crime investigation among police personnel in Nigeria. Using 217 respondents, the study indicates that police officers' use of service and deflection is instrumental to criminal identification.

With respect to how IPOs elicit confession from suspects, Benneworth (2009) notes that IPOs seek constitutionally preferred confessions from suspects. Concentrating on suspects of paedophile cases, the study uses a case of a 54-year-old man sexually assaulting females of 8-12 years. With critical discourse analysis as theoretical framework, the study shows the challenges faced by interviewers. Akinrinlola (2016) examines discursive elicitation and response strategies in PSI in Ibadan. The study uses 200 recorded cases of rape, felony, arson, murder, and defamation of character, among others. The study contends that elicitation strategies of IPOs and suspects' construction of response account for power negotiation in PSI. On the use of deixis in PSI, Akinrinlola (2019) argues that deixis functions as resourceful discourse device used in expressing collectivism, labelling, assertion, and legitimacy during police interrogation.

The aforementioned studies reveal that critical investigations have approached police discourse from the psychological, sociological, and discourse analytical

perspectives. This study agrees with the position of Soukara et al. that psychological tactics are instrumental to eliciting confessional statements from suspects. The submission of Fisher et al. (2010) that the structure of police interview restricts the scope of suspects' responses is in consonance with the view of the present study. However, the studies do not explore suspects' adoption of denial and how IPOs deploy strategies to manage denial in PSI. The emphasis of Kelly et al. (2019) on space as an instrument of control in police interrogation corroborates Akinrinlola's (2016) submission on dynamics of power negotiation in PSI.

Although Udoh's (2010), Omoroghomwan's (2018) and Akinrinlola's (2019) description of the sociolinguistic-cum-discourse-analytical peculiarities in PSI is commendable, the studies' neglect of denial in PSI undermines how discourse devices are deployed to create interpersonal relations in PSI. While the psychology-based studies identified above (Soukara et al. 2009; Fisher et al. 2010; May et al. 2017) provide informative and relevant insights into the workings of police interrogation, the studies' neglect of an interpersonal discourse analytical model limits understanding of how participants in PSI negotiate contextual goals. This study holds that denial by suspects often culminates in forced confession in PSI, hence the need to discursively handle it via discursive devices. It is against this background that this study investigates how denial is handled in PSI.

2.1. Rapport management theory

Rapport management theory (RMT) is a reaction to the weaknesses of the earlier theories of politeness (Brown & Levinson 1987). It relies on the relational strength of social interaction. As a theory of interpersonal communication, RMT investigates how interpersonal communication is managed and sustained within communication ethics (Spencer-Oatey 2000). It holds that face, the social value of interlocutors in communicative interaction, should be protected in order to realise communication goals. Another important aspect of RMT is sociality rights and obligations, which have to do with the rights of the participants and their roles during communicative encounters. The theory also identifies interactional goals as an important aspect of communication. As a theory of interpersonal communication, RMT investigates factors influencing the (mis)management of relations. Spencer-Oatey hinges his theory on face and politeness. He emphasises individuality and harmony of interpersonal communication. Of particular interest to him is how harmonious or disharmonious relationships are created. The essence is to examine how the use of language promotes or maintains or threatens harmonious social relations (Spencer-Oatey 2000; 2008; 2009). The theory looks beyond politeness to investigate the bases of rapport, which include face, sociality

rights and obligation and interactional goals. Face sensitivities concern personal traits, beliefs, physical features, language choice, and affiliation. However, rapport can be threatened through face-threatening, rights-threatening and goal-threatening behaviour.

The RMT strategies cover a number of linguistic choices which can be adopted for the management of face and sociality rights. These include face management and sociality rights management (Spencer-Oatey 2000; 2008; Wu, Huang & Liu 2020). Face management has to do with quality face, which is related to individual and social identification, while sociality rights concern equity face rights in interpersonal communication. Various linguistic choices can be adopted to manage face. Some of these include stylistic choices, speech acts, discourse content, and other paralinguistic cues. A number of factors influence choice of rapport management strategies. These are rapport orientation, contextual variables, and pragmatic conventions. Rapport orientation refers to the desire to improve, maintain or neglect social relations while contextual variables concern participants' relation, the content of the message, rights, and the communicative activity. Pragmatic conventions are pragmatic concepts, like topic choice. Interpersonal rapport is influenced by behavioural expectations and interactional needs. Behavioural expectations are also influenced by the particular speech act, the genre type, and norms (Spencer-Oatey 2000).

The adoption of Spencer-Oatey's RMT in this study is predicated on its strength in handling how face, sociality, and interactional goals of IPOs and suspects are managed in PSI. Since suspects deploy denial in achieving their goals in police interrogation, IPOs equally devise means through which their own goals are achieved within the law, hence the need to examine how IPOs handle denials in PSI. The study interprets the discursive use of face, sociality rights and obligations, and interactional goals of IPOs and suspects during interrogation sessions. This study argues that IPOs handle denials by engaging discursive acts and context.

3. Research method

This qualitative study employed the descriptive research design. After seeking written permission from relevant authorities, police interrogation sessions were tape-recorded at the State Criminal Investigation and Intelligence Department (SCIID) Ìyágankú, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria, from 15th January, 2015 to 21st May, 2016. The SCIID is a unit of the Nigeria Police Force devoted to crime investigation. It is a department to which serious criminal cases are referred. It has IPOs that are versed in the techniques of handling denials in PSI. Permission to

tape-record the sessions was sought from the IPOs and suspects, and such permission was documented. The rationale behind the recording of the sessions was explained to the suspects and IPOs, they were informed that the research was for academic purpose, and that the completed work would be kept in library for further academic use. The researchers' idea was not known to the IPOs and suspects.

The non-participant observation technique was adopted. The recordings were done from a distant place in the interrogation room. The names and location of suspects were coded. Ten cases on felony, fraud, assault and robbery, affray, burglary, arson and malicious damage, and rape were tape-recorded. However, four cases on stealing, fraud, assault and robbery were purposively selected considering their robust engagement of the facial and sociality management strategies.

The recorded conversations were transcribed, and conversations in Yoruba and Pidgin were translated into the English language. While most of the interrogation sessions were conducted in Yoruba, only few were done in Pidgin English. Although Ibadan is the largest Yoruba speaking city in Southwest Nigeria, it is heterogenous, the residents speak diverse languages. So, Pidgin English is the language adopted for communication by residents from different linguistic backgrounds. This language serves incidental communicative purposes in Ibadan. It assists communication between speakers who are in contact. It is associated with the group with less social power in a multilingual setting like Nigeria. It is predominant in the South-South region of Nigeria. There are no specific rules for the usage of Yoruba and Pidgin English during interrogation sessions in Ibadan. The language a suspect understands is always used to conduct interrogation, as many of the police officers could speak English, Yoruba, and Pidgin English.

Structured and unstructured interviews were also deployed. 50 IPOs (30 IPOs from the inspectorate cadre and 20 from the rank and file cadre) were interviewed on how denials are handled in PSI. The purpose of the interview was to confirm if the result of the tape-recorded cases would agree with that of the interview. Spencer-Oatey's RMT was adopted as the theoretical framework. The study investigated how IPOs and suspects explore Oatey's facial, sociality, and interactional goals to handle denials in PSI. The theory was adopted to determine the way contextual variables inform how suspects construct denials to threaten IPOs' goals. The tenets of RMT were utilised to describe how IPOs device a number of discursive strategies to handle denials in PSI. The implications of IPOs' use of such strategies were described. This study maintains that IPOs handle suspects' denials by employing discursive acts of appealing to suspects' needs, con-

structing testimonies against suspects, exercising suspects' sociality rights, and engaging detention and interrogation.

4. Data analysis

4.1. *Kikọbiara sí àwon ohun tí afurasí fẹ́* 'Appealing to suspects' needs'

One of the strategies adopted by IPOs in handling cases of denials is appealing to the emotional and physiological needs of suspects. Kassin (1997: 45) observes that "response to suspects' needs during interrogation enables interviewers to get a better part of suspects". Excerpt 1 below presents a case of IPOs' response to the suspects' needs:

Excerpt 1

1. P: Láti ìgbà wo ni o tí n bá Chief XX ọ́sẹ́ gégé bi aṣìrò owó rẹ?

'How long have you been working with Chief XX as his accountant?'
2. S: Mo ti wà nìbẹ́ fún bíi ọdún méje.

'I have been there for seven years now.'
3. P: Chief gan-an jẹ́rì sí jìjẹ olótító rẹ fún àwon ọdún yìí. Kí wá ló dé tí o fi pàdánù owó bàhà-bantan yìí?

'Chief attested to your honesty for those years. Why did you lose such a huge amount?'
4. S: Mi ò jì lówó. Mo ọ̀làyé fún Chief bí a ọ̀ ná owó nàà.

'I did not steal his money. I explained how we spent the money to Chief.'
5. P: Inú mi kò dùn lórí ọ̀sẹ́sì rẹ lórí ọ̀rọ̀ yìí. Mo lérò wípé Sergeant XX n fún ọ̀ ọ̀unjẹ gidi fún bíi ọ̀jọ̀ mẹ́fà ọ̀yìn. Mo ọ̀ fún-un wípé kí ó máa fi ọ̀ sínú túbù pẹ̀lú àwon ọ̀mọ̀ ọ̀górí ọ̀lọ̀ṣà.

'I am not happy with your attitude towards this case. I hope Sergeant XX has been giving you good food for the past six days. I told him not to put you in the same cell with the hardened criminals.'
6. S: Mo mọ́ rírí ipa yín, Sir. Mo ọ̀ fún Chief gbogbo ohun tí ó ọ̀lẹ̀, ọ̀gbọ̀n kò gbà mí gbọ.

'I appreciate your efforts, sir. I told Chief all that transpired, but he did not believe me.'
7. P: O nílò láti lọ wẹ, kí ó sì sinmi fún ìgbà diẹ. Chief kò fẹ́ kí a fiyà jẹ́ ẹ́ rára. Mo ba sọ̀rọ̀ lánàá.

'You may need to have your bath and rest. Chief does not want us to subject you to any torture. I spoke with him yesterday.'

8. S: Òṣiṣẹ́, mo fẹ́ kí o ràn mí lówó lóri ọ̀rọ̀ yíí. Èmi kọ̀ ló jí owó náà. Mo ní ilé ifowópamọ̀ méjì tí Chief XX gan le jẹ́rì sí.
'Officer, I want you to assist me in this case. I did not steal the money. I have two bank accounts, and Chief XX knows.'
9. P: Njẹ́ o ti lo ògùn ibà rẹ? O nilò láti s'ara gírí nígbà tí wọn bá n fí ọ̀rọ̀ wá ẹ lẹnu wò. Gbogbo ohun tí o ṣàlàyé fún mi lóyè mi yékéyéké. Mo sì tí ṣàlàyé fún Chief nípa gbogbo idákònkò iwádií tí mo tí ẹ. Maa pe nọ́sì láti wá wo ipò ìlera rẹ.
'Have you taken your malaria drug? You need to be emotionally stable in the interrogation room. I understood your side of the story. I also informed Chief of the findings I have made so far. I may need to invite the nurse again to check your malaria status.'
10. S: Òṣiṣẹ́, èmi ni mo maa n pín owó tí a máa n ná nínú ilé-iṣẹ́ yíí jáde, mo sì máa n jáàbò gbogbo ẹ fún Chief. Owó tí à n wá kò sọ̀nù. Oṣù tó kọ́já ni a ra àwọn nṣkan tuntun tí ó wọ̀n sínú ilé-iṣẹ́. Mo mò èmi lówà nípa tètò isúná, sùgbọ̀n...
'Officer, I allocate money for all expenditures in our firm, and I report to Chief. The missing money is not stolen. We bought some expensive items for the factory just last month. I know I am in charge of the treasury, but...'
11. P: Fí ọ̀kàn rẹ balẹ̀. Maa yanjú ọ̀rọ̀ náà. Ìlera rẹ ló ẹ pàtàkì ẹ kókó.
'Calm down. I will deal with the case. Your health is more important now.'

Excerpt 1 is a case of stealing. The suspect was arrested for misappropriating the sum of two million naira (2,000,000) belonging to Chief XX, the proprietor of XX company. The suspect is the one in charge of the company's treasury, and he had played the role for a number of years. The last audit conducted in the company revealed that the said amount was misappropriated. The suspect was subsequently arrested. In the excerpt, the speech act performed by the IPO is that of appealing to the suspect's emotional and psychological needs in a bid to achieve the goal of the interrogation. Such appeal is negotiated through the deployment of interactional cues. His question on the length of service the suspect had invested in the firm is an instance leading question, a stylistic device, aimed at initiating the case-relation phase of the interrogation.

In line 3, the IPO discursively deploys justification of the suspect's credibility, a form of facial management device, according to Spencer-Oatey (2008), to create emotional stability for the suspect. The IPO's justification of the suspect's credibility is a conscious attempt aimed at saving the face of the suspect. His accent on the suspect's honesty over the years contradicts his (IPO's) account in the later clause, in line 3. The IPO's use of *Chief gan-an jẹrì sí jìjẹ olótítọ̀ rẹ fún àwọn ọ̀dún yíí. Kí wá ló dé tí o fí pàdà̀nù owó bàntà-bantan yíí?* 'Chief attested to your honesty for those years. Why did you lose such a huge amount?' reveals contrasting construction of facial attributes of the suspect. While the first clause,

which describes the suspect as being honest, reveals the positive face on the part of the suspect, the second clause deploys a leading question to challenge and allege the suspect for being responsible for the misappropriation of the said amount. In other words, the IPO deploys the leading question negotiating challenge. In constructing positive face of the suspect, he deploys *pàdánù* ('lose') instead of *jí* ('steal') or *sowó básubàsu* ('misappropriate'). The IPO's stylistic choice of *pàdánù* ('lose'), a device aimed at mitigating the suspect's crime, is an instance of face management technique which is targeted at ensuring the stability of the suspect. The stylistic-cum-contextual use of *pàdánù*, which conceals the suspect's offence, is a form of interactional strategy aimed at ensuring elicitation of relevant information from the suspect. In response, the suspect, in line 4, constructs denial by refusing to acknowledge involvement in the crime. The suspect's use of *Mi ò jì lówó. Mo şàlàyé fún Chief bí a şe ná owó náà.* 'I did not steal his money. I explained how we spent the money to Chief.' is an instance of empathic denial. The denial is constructed by using the negative marker *not* to pose dissociation of self.

In line 5, the IPO further dwells on the suspect's needs by posing a positive face. The expression *Inú mi kò dùn lóri işesí re lóri òrò yi. Mo lérò wipé Sergeant XX ñ fún o l'ouñje gidi fún bíi ojò méfà şeyin. Mo şo fún-un wipé kíi ó máa fi ó sínú túbú pèlú àwon omọ ògórí ołóşà.* 'I am not happy with your attitude towards this case. I hope Sergeant XX has been giving you good food for the past six days. I told him not to put you in the same cell with the hardened criminals.' is a discursive act of appealing to the suspect's physiological state. His expression of dissatisfaction with the suspect's attitude is an interactional tool to get access to more confessional statements from the suspect. He builds rapport in line 5 by engaging facial, sociality rights, and obligation and interactional goals as spelled out by Spencer-Oatey (2008). The IPO, who equally exercises power, performs the act of condemning the actions of the suspect. He equally constructs sociality rights and obligation by affirming to the suspect that he had instructed sergeant XX to constantly provide food and better cell for him. His appeal to the suspect's needs is a discursive device aimed at eliciting confessional statements from him (the suspect).

In line 7, the IPO negotiates sociality and obligation by appealing to the suspect's comfort. He informs the suspect of the need to have a bath and take some rest. His emphasis on the needs of the suspect and assurance from the other IPO to exclude the suspect from any physical torture is means of identifying with the suspect's physiological and emotional demands. The suspect's construction of denial in line 8 is greeted with further interactional management skill

from the IPO in line 9. He de-emphasises the suspect's denial and focuses on the well-being of the suspect. His expression *Ŋjẹ o ti lo ògùn ibà rẹ? O nílò láti ẹ̀ara girí nígbà tí wón bá n fi òdò wá ẹ lẹnu wò. Gbogbo ohun tí o ẹ̀làyé fún mí lóyè mí yékéyéké. Mo sì tí ẹ̀làyé fún Chief nípa gbogbo ìdákònkò ìwádíí tí mo tí ẹ. Mháa pẹ nọ̀sì láti wá wo ipò ìlera rẹ.* 'Have you taken your malaria drug? You need to be emotionally stable in the interrogation room. I understood your side of the story. I also informed Chief of the findings I have made so far. I may need to invite the nurse again to check your malaria status.' is a form of discursive appeal to douse the suspect's fears and tension. The IPO responds to the suspect's denial by disregarding the construction of denial, and emphasising the suspect's emotional and physiological needs. This study negates Ajayi's (2016) emphasis on physical torture as a means of eliciting confessional statements from suspects.

4.2. *Jijéritako àwon afurasí* 'Constructing testimonies against suspects'

Bull (2012) writes that police interrogation thrives on information management. He notes that interviewers construct evidence to achieve their desired ends in interrogation. Construction of testimonies against suspects features as a strategy adopted by IPOs to handle cases of denials during the recorded interrogation sessions. An instance is presented in Excerpt 2:

Excerpt 2

1. P: *Ìgbà wo lo bèrè iṣẹ̀ ayélujára?*
'When did you start the internet business?'
2. S: *Mo bèrè ní ọ̀dún 2017, ó kàn jẹ̀ wípé àwon iṣẹ̀ ayélujára tí ó tònà nikan ni mò n ẹ̀.*
'I started in 2017, but I only engage in legitimate businesses online.'
3. P: (*Rẹ̀rín músẹ̀*) *Àwon iṣẹ̀ ayélujára tí ó tònà nikan? O ẹ̀ aláabáapádé Mrs. XB ní ọ̀dún 2015, o sì lúú ní jìbiti l'ọ̀ dún kan náà. Ọ̀tótó àbí irọ̀?*
(*Smiles*) 'You only engage in legitimate business? You came in contact with Mrs. XX in 2015, and defrauded her in the same year. True or false?'
4. S: *Sir, Mi ò bá máa ẹ̀yí. Báwo? Mo ní iṣẹ̀ ayélujára tí ó ní òhntẹ̀ ìjọba. A ẹ̀ n gbọ̀ wípé irú èyàn bí tẹ̀mí ní ó máa lu ẹ̀lòmíràn ní jìbiti? A pádé lórí ẹ̀rọ̀ ayélujára, a sì di aláabááṣiṣẹ̀pò.*
'Sir, I could not have done that. How? I have a registered online business. How can such a person be defrauding people? I met her online and we became business partners.'

5. P: Ñjẹ o rántí ifòròjẹwọ láárin iwọ àti XB, tí ó şèlérí fún-un wípẹ o máa ja àwọn ojà kan fún-un. Ó san miliọnu kan lé oḡórùn igba méjì náírà (1.2 million naira) fún ọ. Ñjẹ o kó àwọn ojà náà fun bí? Àwọn àkálẹ-òrọ àti èdà owó tí ó san niyíí.
'Do you recall that you had a conversation on XB, and you promised to make some deliveries for her. She paid you 1.2 million naira. Did you deliver the items? The print out of your conversation and her teller are here.'
6. S: Òhun ló fàá, sir. Kò mú màjẹmú rẹ şẹ. Ó kàn fi mí şeré lásán ni. A padà yanjú è láárin ara wa.
'She caused it, sir. She did not honour our agreement. She took me for granted. We later resolved our differences.'
7. P: Apart from the first deal you did, was there any other occasion where you defrauded her?
'Yàtò sí ti àkọkọ yẹn, òhẹ ọnà mirán wà tí ó gbà lùú ní jìbìtì?'
8. S: Mí ò lùú ní jìbìtì, sir. Ọlórún gan lè jẹrí sí wípẹ mí ò yánjẹ.
'I did not defraud her sir. God knows I did not cheat her.'
9. P: Ñjẹ o f'ìgbà kán şe ilérí láti ran oṃọ ẹ lówọ lójúpònà láti lọ ilú òyinbó ní ọdún 2015?
'Did you ever promise to assist her son to travel out of Nigeria in 2015?'
10. S: Bẹ̀ẹ̀ni, Mo sapá-sapá, şùgbọ̀n kò bọ̀sí. Ohun gan náà mọ oun tó şẹ̀lẹ̀. Mo şe gbogbo ohun ti agbára mi ká, kò kan bọ̀sí ni.
'Yes, but it did not work. She knows the story. I did all I could, but the plans fell through. I made a lot of efforts.'
11. P: Ñjẹ o gba owó lówọ rẹ?
'Did you collect money from her?'
12. S: Bẹ̀ẹ̀ni, lílọ sí òkè-òkun máa f' gba owó, tí kò síí ẹ̀ni tí ó lè şọ bọ̀yá ó má bọ̀sí tàbí kò ní bọ̀sí.
'Yes. Travelling requires money, and one cannot tell if it will be successful or not.'
13. P: Àwọn àkálẹ-òrọ àti iwádíí ilé-ifowópamọ̀ fihàn wípẹ ó san miliọnu méjì náírà (2million naira) sí àpò àsùwọ̀n rẹ. Mr. XC àti Mrs. XD gan le jẹrí sí ifórówèrọ̀ yín.
'The print out of your bank details has it that she transferred 2 million naira to your account. Mr. XX and Mrs. XX are also witnesses to the discussion you had.'
14. S: Ọ̀şíşẹ̀, báwo lo şe máa ràn mí lówọ̀ lórí ọ̀rọ̀ yíí?
'Officer, how do you want to help me with this case?'

Excerpt 2 is a case of Internet fraud. The suspect was arrested after repeated fraudulent acts perpetrated against one Mrs. XB. The IPO tracked the shady deals of the suspect for six months before he was eventually arrested. The IPO probes the suspect's denial by posing testimonies of the suspect's crime. In line 1, the IPO demands the specific time the suspect started his criminal act. The sus-

pect's response in line 2, *Mo bèrè ní ọdún 2017, ó kàn jẹ wípé àwọn iṣẹ ayélujára tí ó tònà nìkan ní mò ní ẹ*. 'I started in 2017, but I only engage in legitimate businesses online.' includes more extraneous details. His inclusion of the nominal group *legitimate business* is an instance of facial sensitivity created to constrain the creation of negative face by the IPO. Since the interactional goal of the suspect is to escape incrimination, he engages face sensitivity to create a positive self. In line 3, the IPO says: *Àwọn iṣẹ ayélujára tí ó tònà nìkan? O ẹe aláábàpádé Mrs. XB ní ọdún 2015, o sì lùú ní jìbìtì l'ọdún kan nàá. Ótótó àbí irọ?* 'You only engage in legitimate business? You came in contact with Mrs. XX in 2015 and defrauded her in the same year. True or false?'. The IPO responds by using facial sensitivities to achieve his interactional goal. Facial sensitivities, according to Spencer-Oatey (2008) include personal traits, beliefs, physical features, language choice, and affiliation. First, the IPO uses smile, a paralinguistic cue, to challenge the suspect. The IPO's repetition of the suspect's response, *Àwọn iṣẹ ayélujára tí ó tònà nìkan?* 'You only engage in legitimate business?' is contextually constructed to render invalid the narrative of the suspect. To further legitimise his allegation in the same line, the IPO presents some factual testimonies against the suspect by informing him about when he (the suspect) met and defrauded the victim. The IPO deliberately threatens the suspect's face by providing unquestionable testimonies against the suspect.

Having presented testimonies against the suspect, the IPO, through the use of alternative question *Ótótó àbí irọ?* 'True or false?', utilises sociality rights of the suspect by informing him to contest his allegation. This question type is often used by the Yoruba to box the respondent in. It does not give room for explanation. It is deployed to make the suspect commit himself and own up to the crime. In line 4, the suspect further negotiates the discursive act of contesting the IPO's stance by using explanatory form of denial. He provides justification for and explanation on why he could not have done such a shady act. The suspect equally constructs denial by framing rhetorical question *A ẹe ní gbọ wípé irú èyàn bí tẹmi ní ó máa lu èlòmíràn ní jìbìtì?* 'How can such a person be defrauding people?' to perform the act of challenging the IPO's claim. The Yoruba often use this to make the interlocutor confirm the truth of a claim. In this instance, the suspect invites the IPO to attesting to his innocence, making him a witness. In response, the IPO resorts to a paralinguistic act to further provide testimonies against the suspect by playing a recorded voice of the suspect on failed business transactions with Mrs. XB. He (the IPO) asks *Ẹjẹ o rántí ifọdọ jẹwọ láàrin iwọ àti XB, tí ó ṣẹlérí fún-un wípé o máa ja àwọn ojà kan fún-un. Ó san miliọnu kan lé ogórùn igba méjì nàírà (1.2 million naira) fún ọ. Ẹjẹ o kó àwọn ojà nàá fun bí? Àwọn àkálẹ-òrọ àti ẹdà owó tí ó san nìyí.* 'Do you recall that you had a conversation on XX, and you

promised to make some deliveries for her. She paid you 1.2 million naira. Did you deliver the items? The print out of your conversation and her teller are here.' The IPO's presentation of testimonies against the suspect is an interactional strategy targeted at threatening the face and goal of the suspect.

The testimonies of the IPO force the suspect to admit in line 6 by saying *Òhun ló fàá, sir. Kò mú màjè mú rẹ ẹ. Ó kàn fi mí ẹrẹ lásán ni. A padà yanjú ẹ láàrìn ara wa.* 'She caused it, sir. She did not honour our agreement. She took me for granted. We later resolved our differences.' Another instance of presentation of testimonies to threaten the face and goal of the suspect is captured in line 13. The IPO asks the suspect, in line 9, if he had collected money from the victim: *Ẹjẹ o f'ìgbà kán ẹ ilé rí láti ran ọmọ ẹ lówó lójúpọnà láti lọ ilú òyìn bó ní ọdún 2015* 'Did you ever promise to assist her son to travel out of Nigeria in 2015?'. The suspect's affirmative response compels the IPO to present evidence against the suspect, in line 13: *Àwọn àkálẹ-ọrọ àti ìwádíí ilé-ìfowópamó fihàn wípé ó san miliyọnu méjì náirà (2million naira) sí àpò àsùwọ̀n rẹ. Mr. XC àti Mrs. XD gan le jẹrì sí ifọrówérò yín.* 'The print out of your bank details has it that she transferred 2 million naira to your account. Mr. XC and Mrs. XD are also witnesses to the discussion you had.' The suspect eventually admits in line 14 by saying *Òsìşẹ, báwo lo ẹ máa ràn mí lówó lóri ọrọ yí?* 'Officer, how do you want to help me with this case?'. The suspect constructs empathic denial by refuting the IPO's claims so as to escape incrimination while the IPO engages facial sensitivities to achieve confession. This study converges with Akinrinlola (2016) and Sunday and Akinrinlola (2017) on the significance of linguistic cues in negotiating interactional goals in PSI.

4.3. *Piipakuuru mó ẹtọ afurasí* 'Harping on suspects' sociality rights'

The IPOs deploy justification of suspects' rights to pursue interactional goals during interrogation sessions. Kalbfleisch (1994) describes justification of suspects' rights as a form of language of deceit during interrogation. An instance is presented below:

Excerpt 3

1. P: *Şẹ ọkùnrin Fulani yíi daran jẹ nínú oko rẹ?*
'Did the Fulani man graze on your farm?'
2. S: *Bẹ̀ẹ̀ni ọ̀sìşẹ. Ó ti ba gbogbo ohun tó wà lóri oko mi jẹ. Nígbà tí mo débẹ, mo sokún. Ó gbámí ní ọdún mērin lati gbìn àti dá oko náà.*
'Yes officer. He destroyed everything on the farm. When I got there, I cried. It took me four years to cultivate and plant the crops.'

3. P: Şùgbón ọkùnrin Fulani yíí sọ wípé oun kò dé ibi oko rẹ. Kíló dé tí o fí ń halẹ mọ? Mo mọ wípé ọkùnrin Fulani yíí tí tẹ ẹ̀tọ̀ rẹ lójú mólẹ. Ó mọ mọ ba àwọn èrè oko rẹ jẹ ni. 'The Fulani man said he did not destroy your farm. Why did you threaten him? I know the Fulani man has infringed on your rights. He wilfully damaged your crops.'
4. S: (*Ó fi ojú ẹ̀rọ-ibáraenisòrò rẹ han IPO*) Mi ò halẹ mọ, Sir. Ó paró fún ẹ ni. Gbogbo ohun tí ó şeḽẹ l'óko rẹ ni mo yà sínú ẹ̀rọ-ibáraenisòrò mi. Ẹwo bí gbogbo ẹ ẹ paarun. Tani irú ẹ yóò ẹ tí kò ní bínú? Njé ó ọrùn láti fúrúgbin bí? Báwo ni mó ẹ fé rí gbogbo owó tí mo ná lórí oko yíí padà?
(*Displayed his cell phone to the IPO*) 'I did not threaten him, sir. He lied to you. I snapped the farm on my phone. Here is the scene of the destruction. How will I not react to this? Is it easy to plant? How will I recoup the money I spent on the farm?'
5. P: Ọkùnrin Fulani yíí sọ wípé o kojú ìjà sí òun, ó ní ká wo òun nílẹ. Kílódé tí o fi ẹ ìdájọ̀ l'owó ara rẹ? Mo mọ wípé, o tí nàwó-nára lórí oko yíí.
'The Fulani man said you attacked him, and you can see him on the floor. Why did you take laws into your own hands? I know you have invested so much in the farm.'
6. S: Mi ò kojú ìjà sí, sir.
'I did not attack him, Sir.'
7. P: Gbogbo wa la mọ wípé ọkùnrin Fulani yíí kógun ja agbègbè rẹ,tí ó jẹ ẹ̀ṣẹ̀ l'òná kan. Yíya bo agbègbè rẹ yíí léwu fún ọ àti àwọn ìpakúpa àwọn èrè oko rẹ ni ò bójúmu tí ó sí tọ̀ fún ìjyà lábẹ̀ òfin. Şùgbón ètò ààbò tí ẹ nàà ẹ kókó. Kò yẹ kí o kojú ìjà sí rárá.
'The Fulani man invaded your territory, and that is an offence in the first place. His invasion is a threat to your life and his reckless destruction of your farm is also condemnable. But his life is precious, too. You should not have attacked him.'
8. S: Bí ó tilẹ̀ wù kí ó rí, ẹbí mi ni a tí sọ sínú ìpayínkeke àti inira. Kò sówó, kó óúnjẹ. Ẹmá bínú lórí ẹyí, Sir.
'As it is now, my family has been thrown into misery and hardship. No money, no food. I am sorry about that, sir.'
9. P: Ọṣẹ̀ tí wón ẹ lórí oko rẹ kò b'òfin mu, tí ó sí tọ̀ fún ìjyà lábẹ̀ òfin. Ẹyí tún mọ̀ sí wípé a tí tẹ ẹ̀tọ̀ rẹ lójú mólẹ.
'The damage done on your farm is unlawful and punishable. It is an infringement of your rights.'
10. S: Ẹ ẹ gan ni, Sir. Ọlórún a bükún fun yín.
'Thank you, sir. God bless you.'
11. P: Şùgbón iwọ nàà tí ẹ ìdájọ̀ l'owó ara rẹ. Ẹyí nàà tó fún ìjyà lábẹ̀ òfin.
'But you took laws into your own hands. That is punishable, too.'
12. S: Ẹmá bínú, ọ̀ṣiṣẹ̀.
'I am sorry, officer.'

Excerpt 3 is a case of assault. Mr. XE, a Fulani herder, reported that Mr. XF accosted and beat him mercilessly on his (the suspect's) farm. Mr. XF was eventually arrested. In the excerpt, the IPO makes use of sociality rights and obligation, a tenet in Spencer-Oatey's RMT, as a strategy to achieve interactional goal in his interaction with the suspect. Asked if the Fulani man had grazed on his farm, the suspect, in line 2, says: *Bèni òşìşé. Ó ti ba gbogbo ohun tó wà lóri oko mi jé. Nígbà tí mo débè, mo sòkún. Ó gbàmi ní ọdún méréni lati gbin àti dá oko nàà.* 'Yes officer. He destroyed everything on the farm. When I got there, I cried. It took me four years to cultivate and plant the crops.' The suspect resorts to the use of facial cues, in line 2, to construct identities within the context of the case presented. His choice of *ba gbogbo ohun tó wà lóri oko mi jé* 'destroyed everything on the farm' poses a threat on the face of the complainant. In other words, he constructs the complainant as a culprit and destroyer. Besides, the suspect, through the deployment of facial cues, constructs sympathetic mood before the IPO by saying *Nígbà tí mo débè, mo sòkún.* 'When I got there, I cried.' His utterance contextually draws a mental picture of the destruction caused on his farm by Mr. XE. The suspect's construction of a positive face is targeted at threatening the face of Mr. XE and the IPO and escaping incrimination. In line 3, the IPO refutes the suspect's allegation by harping on the rights of the suspect. Through the deployment of sociality rights cues, the IPO admits Mr. XE's excesses and advances the rights of the suspect within the scope of the law. He says: *Mo mò wípé ọkùnrin Fulani yíi tí tẹ ẹtọ rẹ lójú mọlẹ. Ó mò mò ba àwọn èrè oko rẹ jé ni.* 'I know the Fulani man has infringed your rights. He wilfully damaged your crops.' The IPO creates appropriate context for the suspect by engaging facial cues to construct Mr. XE as a wilful destroyer by emphasising his (the suspect's) rights so as to enhance the suspect's interactional goal and threaten Mr. XE's face.

The IPO's emphasis on the suspect's rights is an interactional strategy aimed at eliciting confessional statement from the suspect. The suspect's resort to rhetorical question constitutes an affront to the IPO's face. The suspect's contextual deployment of rhetorical questions negotiates the discursive act of challenge and justification of his actions. He affirms that *Gbogbo ohun tí ó şelẹ l'óko rẹ ni mo yà sínú ẹrọ-ibáraenisòrò mi. Ẹwo bí gbogbo ẹ şe paarun. Tani irú ẹ yóò şe tí kò ní bínú? Ñjé ó rọrun láti fúruşin bí? Báwo ni mó şe fẹ rí gbogbo owó tí mo ná lóri oko yíi padà?* 'I snapped the farm on my phone. Here is the scene of the destruction. How will I not react to this? Is it easy to plant? How will I recoup the money I spent on the farm?'. In line 5, however, the IPO provides a counter narrative by saying *Ọkùnrin Fulani yíi sọ wípé o kojú jà sí òun, ó ní ká wo oún nílẹ. Kílódé tí o fi şe idájọ lówọ ara rẹ? Mo mò wípé, o ti nàwó-nára lóri oko yíi.* 'The Fulani man said you attacked him, and you can see him on the floor. Why did

you take laws into your own hands? I know you have invested so much in the farm.' The IPO's response, in line 7, *Gbogbo wa la mò wípé ọkùnrin Fulani yí kógun ja agbègbè rẹ, tí ó jẹ ẹ̀ṣẹ̀ lónà kan. Yíya bo agbègbè rẹ̀ yíí léwu fún ọ̀ àti àwọn ipakúpa àwọn èrè oko rẹ̀ ní ò bójúmu tí ó sì tọ̀ fún ijìyà lábé òfin. Súgbón ètò ààbò tí ẹ̀ nàá ẹ̀ kókó. Kò yẹ́ kí ọ̀ kọ́jú jìà sí rárá.* 'The Fulani man invaded your territory, and that is an offence in the first place. His invasion is a threat to your life and his reckless destruction of your farm is also condemnable. But his life is precious, too. You should not have attacked him.' thrives on sociality rights of the suspect by creating an identity of innocence for the suspect. He establishes victimhood on the part of the suspect by condemning the actions of Mr. XE.

The IPO's lexical choices, such as *kógun ja* ('invaded'), *agbègbè* ('territory'), *ẹ̀ṣẹ̀* ('offence'), *léwu fún ọ̀* ('threat to your life'), *ipakúpa àwọn èrè oko* ('reckless destruction of farm'), and *ò bójúmu tí ó sì tọ̀ fún ijìyà lábé òfin* ('condemnable') contextually threaten the face and goal of Mr. XE. The construction of such negative face implies or justifies Mr. XF's innocence. As seen in line 9, *Ọ̀ṣẹ́ tí wọn ẹ̀ lórí oko rẹ̀ kò bófin mu, tí ó sì tọ̀ fún ijìyà lábé òfin. Èyí tún mọ̀ sí wípé a tí tẹ̀ ẹ̀tọ̀ rẹ̀ lójú mọ̀ lẹ̀.* 'The damage done on your farm is unlawful and punishable. It is an infringement of your rights.', the IPO further uses interactional cues to affirm the rights of the suspect. He alleges that Mr. XE's actions were unlawful and that the suspect's rights were challenged. He, however, condemns the suspect's act of taking laws into his own hands, in line 11. The suspect eventually apologises, in line 12. In the interaction, the participants negotiate interactional goals by means of face and sociality rights during the interrogation. This finding agrees with Heydon (2005) and Nicola (2012), that IPOs and suspect contextually construct their goals by exploring contextual variables during interaction sessions.

4.4. *Using cell and investigation for suspects 'Engaging detention and thorough investigation'*

Interrogating police officers resort to continued detention of suspects to create a platform for better interaction during interrogation sessions. Griffiths (2008) describes continuous detention as an advanced investigative skill. Excerpt 4 below is an instance of IPOs' use of continued detention:

Excerpt 4

1. P: Corporal XG arrest you sey you follow go do the robbery for XO. Na true or lie?
'Corporal XG arrested you as one of the syndicates of the robbery incident at XO. True or false?'

2. S: I no dey, sir. As dey finish the robbery, na im police dey arrest anybody wey dem see. I was not part of them, sir.
'When the robbery was carried out, IPOs raided our compound and arrested everybody.'
3. P: Na three of you we arrest. The remaining don run. Na today make am second week wey you don dey cell. I go help you if you cooperate. IPO XX wan hang you self, but I no go let am punish if you confess.
'We arrested just three of you. Others are still at large. Today makes it your second week in the cell. I am ready to assist you if you cooperate. IPO XX is ready to hang you, but I will not let him punish you that way provided you confess.'
4. S: I no dey, sir. Nobody wey no know me for our compound. I be Christian, and I never thief before.
'I was not part of them, sir. Everybody knows me in my neighbourhood. I am a Christian, and I do not have any previous crime history.'
5. P: (*Nodes im head*). I don know sey you go fit tell me information about the case. I wan dey talk with you about other suspects wey dey inside cell. You see sey I dey comot you for inside cell to talk with you for day time. Who plan the thing between suspect XF and AA? I sure sey you tell me.
(*Nodes his head*) 'I have discovered that you can give me useful information relating to the case. So, I want to be interacting with you about other suspects in the cell. You can see I bring you out during the day to interact with you. Who planned the thing between suspect XF and AA? I am sure you will tell me.'
6. S: Oga, I no know. But dem dey together before the thing happen.
'Sir, I do not know. But they were usually together before the incident.'
7. P: Wetin dem dey do together any time wey you see dem?
'What were they doing together each time you saw them?'
8. S: Sometime dey talk till 11pm.
'At times they talked till 11 p.m.'
9. P: I go put you here while I go dey do my investigation go. I don reach your community go do some investigation. The two suspects there be correct thieves. I go release you if you don tell me somethings about the suspects.
'I will keep you here while I carry out some investigations. I have been to your community and I made some consultations and interrogation. The two suspects have very good crime history. Your release from custody is consequent upon your provision of useful information on these suspects.'
10. S: Oga, the two guys be correct thieves for our place o. Police don catch dem many times.
'Sir, the two suspects are known criminals in our compound. They have been arrested many times by police.'

11. P: I put some people for cell there to dey monitor their talk. I even tell one of the spies to ask dem why dem go rob. Dem sey dem do am to gather money for business.
'I planted some informants in the cell to help me monitor the conversation of these two suspects. I even told one suspect to ask them (the two suspects) why they carried out the robbery. They confessed to the suspect that they did it to raise some money for a business.'
12. S: Dem won start bunker business, and dey sey dey need that kind 2 million naira. I no know if na that one push dem go rob o.
'They are about starting bunker business, and they said they needed 2 million naira for a start. So, I cannot tell if that was what informed their involvement in the robbery.'

Excerpt 4 is from a case of robbery. The suspect was arrested in connection with a robbery case that was carried out in XO. The IPO employs detention and investigation as a device for handling denials during the interrogation sessions. Although the IPO uses a leading question to establish the suspect's guilt in line 1, such question recognises the sociality right of the suspect. Although the IPO's question is a threat to the suspect's face and goal, his (the IPO's) inclusion of *Na true or lie?* 'True or false?' enables the IPO to contest the IPO's allegation. In line 3, the IPO stresses the act of detention and investigation by the police team in tracking the case. He says: *Na three of you we arrest. The remaining don run. Na today make am second week wey you don dey cell. I go help you if you cooperate. IPO XX wan hang you self, but I no go let am punish if you confess.* 'We arrested just three of you. Others are still at large. Today makes it your second week in the cell. I am ready to assist you if you cooperate. IPO XX is ready to hang you, but I will not let him punish you that way provided you confess.' The IPO's accent on the number of weeks the suspect has been kept in custody does not only pose a threat to the suspect's face, but it also affirms the IPO's emphasis on keeping the suspect in custody so as to have access to confessional statements.

In a bid to further pursue his interactional goal, the suspect, in line 4, poses explanatory denial by giving justification for his innocence: *I no dey, sir. Nobody wey no know me for our compound. I be Christian, and I never thief before.* 'I was not part of them, sir. Everybody knows me in my neighbourhood. I am a Christian, and I do not have any previous crime history.' His justification is aimed at protecting his face from being threatened. In line 5, the IPO resorts to engaging rapport with the suspect by harping on the strength of interaction in eliciting confessional statement from him. He says: *I don know sey you go fit tell me information about the case. I wan dey talk with you about other suspects wey dey inside cell. You see sey I dey comot you for inside cell to talk with you for day time. Who plan the thing between suspect XF and AA? I sure sey you tell me.* 'I have

discovered that you can give me useful information relating to the case. So, I want to be interacting with you about other suspects in the cell. You can see I bring you out during the day to interact with you. Who planned the robbery between suspect XF and AA? I am sure you will tell me.' With detention as a strategy, the IPO deploys sociality by giving preferential treatment to the suspect. While other suspects were kept in cell throughout the day, he allowed the suspect being investigated to stay in the interrogation room. In his interaction in line 5, there is an instance of facial construction of sociality identified by Spencer-Oatey (2008). The IPO's trust in the suspect facially constructs the suspect as an honest person who should not be subjected to physical torture. His emphasis on the strength of interaction in the same line agrees with Oatey's submission that achieving interactional goal is hinged on participants' strength of handling the complexities of interaction.

Having created a sense of mutual interaction and trust in the suspect, the IPO asks who was responsible for the robbery. As seen in line 6, *Oga, I no know. But dem dey together before the thing happen.* 'Sir, I do not know. But they were usually together before the incident.', the suspect admits to seeing the two other suspects together days before the incident. Emphasising detention and investigation, the IPO makes use of social obligation by informing the suspect that he had done spirited investigation about the crime. He also affirms that the two other suspects are liable. He says: *I go put you here while I go dey do my investigation go. I don reach your community go do some investigation. The two suspects there be correct thieves. I go release you if you don tell me some things about the suspects.* 'I will keep you here while I carry out some investigations. I have been to your community and I made some consultations and interrogation. The two suspects have very good crime history. Your release from custody is consequent upon your provision of useful information on these suspects.' The IPO's utterance forces the suspect to reveal the identities of the two other suspects in the cell. The suspect says: *Oga, the two guys be correct thieves for our place o. Police don catch dem many times.* 'Sir, the two suspects are known criminals in our compound. They have been arrested many times by police.'

In line 11, the IPO informs the suspect that he had planted some spies in the cell to monitor the communication of the two other suspects: *I put some people for cell there to dey monitor their talk. I even tell one of the spies to ask dem why dem go rob. Dem sey dem do am to gather money for business.* 'I planted some informants in the cell to help me monitor the conversation of these two suspects. I even told one suspect to ask them (the two suspects) why they carried out the robbery. They confessed to the suspect that they did it to raise some money for

a business.' In line 12, the suspect tells the IPO: *Dem won start bunker business, and dey sey dey need that kind 2 million naira. I no know if na that one push dem go rob o.* 'They are about starting bunker business, and they said they needed two million naira for a start. So, I cannot tell if that was what informed their involvement in the robbery.' In the excerpt above, the IPO uses continued detention of the suspect to initiate and sustain spirited investigation of the crime committed. In a bid to elicit confessional statement from the suspect, the IPO manipulates facial and sociality cues. While May, Granhang and Tekin (2017) identify evidence disclosure as the only viable strategy of ensuring elicitation of confessional statements in PSI, this study contends that detention and spirited investigation also aid elicitation of confession in PSI.

5. Implications of IPOs' handling of denials for crime investigation at SCIID, Ibadan

This paper has explored the deployment of denial in PSI in Ibadan, Nigeria. The study provides a counterdiscourse of police elicitation strategy during interrogation sessions. While some studies (Ajayi 2016, Akinrinlola 2016) confirm the use of physical threats in eliciting confessional statements from suspects, this study argues the contrary. While this study recognises denial as a weapon of defeating IPO's investigative endeavour, it contends that the IPOs elicit confession from suspects by deploying the resourcefulness of face, sociality, obligations, and interactional goals during interrogation sessions.

The study argues that the IPOs' discursive strategies of handling denials have implications for crime investigation in Ibadan, Nigeria. From the interactions considered in this study, it could be deduced that the suspect is an important stakeholder in crime investigation. While most of the earlier studies did not recognise the place of the suspect, this study argues that the suspect's rights should be protected during crime investigation. With reference to police interrogation sessions in SCIID, Ibadan, this study claims that suspects threaten IPOs' interactional goals in a bid to save their (suspects') face during crime investigation. They adopt denial as a tool to justify their actions and beat IPOs' investigation skills. Conversely, IPOs pose threats to suspects by constructing negative identities for suspects.

With reference to the sampled cases, IPOs appeal to suspects' emotional and physiological needs as a strategy of handling denial in cases of stealing while suspects deploy empathic denial to render invalid the allegations of IPOs. In fraud-related cases, IPOs handle denials by constructing testimonies against

suspects. While IPOs harp on suspects' rights in cases of assault, continued detention-cum-spirited-investigation strategy is adopted to handle denial in robbery cases.

From the cases considered in this study, it could be deduced that IPOs use linguistic cues to mitigate denials in PSI. Handling suspects' denials is imperative for IPOs. Since the goal of IPOs is to elicit confessional statements from suspects, they adopt strategies to minimise cases of suspects' denial. The reason is that suspects' denials constrict the elicitation of relevant confession from suspects. Also, IPOs discursively handle denials to avoid forced confession from suspects. It could be inferred that the power of the PSI does not reside in the IPOs alone, as claimed by Ajayi (2016) and Omoroghomwan (2018). Power is initiated, managed, and sustained in the interactions presented above through manipulative engagement of context, participants, and interactional goals. Power is interpreted with respect to how IPOs handle suspects' denials in the interaction.

This study does not only extend the frontiers of scholarship in forensic discourse studies, but it also equips students and teachers of discourse studies with necessary discourse analytical strategies of negotiating civility in communicative encounters. Besides, officers of the Nigeria Police Force, especially personnel attached to the State Criminal and Investigation and Intelligence Department (SCIID), are armed with requisite strategies of coping with denial in PSI through the findings of this study.

References

- Akinrinlola, T. 2019. "Deixis as a discourse strategy in police – suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria". *Journal of English Scholars' Association of Nigeria (JESAN)* 21(2). 49–60.
- Akinrinlola, T. 2018. "Turn management strategies in police – suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria". *The Quint* 10(2). 146-177.
- Akinrinlola, T. 2016. *Discursive elicitation and response strategies in police – suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Department of English, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Benneworth, K. 2009. "Police interview with suspected paedophiles: A discourse analysis". *Discourse and Society* 20(5). 555-569.
- Brown, P. & S. Levinson 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bull, R. 2012. "How do interviewers attempt to overcome denials?" *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law* 19(2). 151-168.

- Fisher, R. & G. Edward. 2010. "The cognitive method of conducting police interview: Eliciting extensive information and promoting therapeutic jurisprudence". *International Journal Law and Psychiatry* 33(1). 5-6.
- Griffiths, A. 2008. "An examination into the efficacy of police advanced investigative interview and training?" Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Portsmouth.
- Heydon, G. 2005. *The language of police interviewing: A critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kalbfleisch, P. 1994. "The language of detecting deceit". *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 13(1). 469-496.
- Kassin, S. 1997. "The psychology of confession evidence." *American Psychologist* 52(1). 221-233.
- Kelly, C., E. Dawson & M. Harwig. 2019. "Context manipulation in police interview: A field experiment". *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 22(2). 12-24.
- May, L., P. Granhag & S. Tekin. 2017. "Interviewing suspects in denial: On how different evidence disclosure affect the elicitation of new critical information". *Frontiers in Psychology* 154(2). 212-224.
- Nicola, S. 2012. *Discourse of rape*. London: Routledge.
- Omoroghomwan, B. 2018. "Police behaviour and identification of criminals in Nigeria: A study of the South-South States". *Sosyal Bilimler Metinleri* 2(1). 1-17.
- Soukara, S., R. Bull, A. Vrij, M. Turner, & S. Charryman. 2009. "What really happens in police interview of suspects? Tactics and confessions" *Psychology, Crime and Law* 6(1). 493-506.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2000. "Rapport management: A framework for analysis." *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures*, ed. by H. Spencer-Oatey. London: Continuum.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2008. "Face (impoliteness) and rapport". *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory*, ed. by H. Spencer-Oatey. London: Continuum. 11-47.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. 2009. *Intercultural interaction: A multidisciplinary approach to intercultural communication*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sunday, A.B. & T. Akinrinlola. 2017. "Negotiation tactics in police – suspect interaction in Ibadan, Nigeria" *Journal of Communication and Language Arts* 8(1). 161-181.
- Udoh, C. 2010. *Linguistic features of the language of the Nigeria Police Force, Onitsha*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Department of English, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Wu, J., Z. Huang & M. Liu. 2020. "Rapport management in intercultural interaction: A case study in e-mails". *Intercultural Journal of Studies in English and Literature* 8(3). 6-16.