

The Role of Rapport in Investigative Interviewing: A Review

ALLISON ABBE* and SUSAN E. BRANDON

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, DC, USA

Abstract

Rapport often appears in training and discussions regarding investigative interviewing, yet very little empirical research has examined rapport systematically in law enforcement or intelligence settings. Using a model of rapport developed from therapeutic settings, we address in this paper the components of rapport and their relevance to investigative interviewing. Rapport can play a facilitating role in supporting the goals of an investigative interview, to include developing a working alliance between interviewer and source, exercising social influence, and eliciting information from a source. A better understanding of how rapport develops in these contexts and its impact on interview outcomes would enhance the effectiveness of investigative interviewing. Research on rapport in the investigative interview would enhance our understanding of the interpersonal dynamics in these situations. We identify several gaps that such research should address, including the relationship between rapport and social influence and the development of rapport in multiparty interactions. Copyright © 2012 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Key words: rapport; social influence; interrogation; investigative interview; mimicry

In many professions, rapport is considered the foundation for effective interaction. In sales, medicine, counselling, social science research, and law enforcement, rapport is often discussed as a critical step in gaining trust and building a relationship in professional interactions. Investigative and intelligence interviewing also reference and emphasise building rapport. Investigative interviewing may include a range of different sources and situations: interviews with witnesses, custodial interrogations of suspects or intelligence targets, crisis negotiation, and operations with informants or human intelligence sources, all of which may benefit from the development of rapport.

Described as the ‘heart of the interview’ (St. Yves, 2009, p. 104), rapport is considered a prerequisite for the use of interrogation techniques and, as such, forms a stage of the interrogation in many guidance documents. For example, in the U.S. Army Human Intelligence Field Manual (Department of the Army, 2006), rapport is used during the approach phase to try to gain cooperation from a source (p. 8-1). Rapport is step 2 of

*Correspondence to: Allison Abbe, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 935 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, SACV-SV200, Washington, DC 20535, USA.
E-mail: aabbe@mac.com

Scotland's PRICE model and is included in the 'Engage and Explain' phase of the PEACE investigative interview model used in England and Wales.¹ Rapport is considered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the USA as the basis for interrogation (Caproni, 2008) and a core interviewer skill by the UK's National Policing Improvement Agency (Shawyer, Milne, & Bull, 2009).

Rapport is not only central to formal interrogation policy and doctrine but also important to practitioners. One study showed rapport to be the fourth highest rated practice of 16 interrogation practices used by police (Kassin *et al.*, 2007), preceded only by controlling the physical environment (isolating the suspect and conducting the interrogation in private) and identifying contradictions in a suspect's account. Anecdotal reports also suggest that the use of rapport is common, although researchers note that what is meant by 'rapport' may vary considerably (Borum, Gelles, & Kleinman, 2009).

Although much of the research on rapport has been conducted in settings other than law enforcement or intelligence interviewing, empirical findings suggest several ways that rapport may be beneficial to such interviewing. Rapport building is the first stage of the cognitive interview technique, preceding the information gathering stages of the interview (Fisher, Geiselman, & Amador, 1989). Rapport has further been shown to help witnesses recall more information (Collins, Lincoln, & Frank, 2002), increase trust (Macintosh, 2009), and lead to more cooperation and faster agreement in bargaining and negotiation (Drolet & Morris, 2000; Valley, Thompson, Gibbons, & Bazerman, 2002). In police interviews, interviewers' attempts to build rapport were associated with higher suspect responsiveness and cooperation (Bull & Soukara, 2010).

Given the widespread recognition of its importance, it is perhaps surprising that so little research has examined the nature and contributions of rapport in investigative interviewing. The potential value of rapport warrants a closer look at the components, benefits, and means of achieving rapport in the context of the investigative interview.

COMPONENTS OF RAPPORT

Rapport may be considered a 'state of communicative alliance'—that is, rapport has meaning only as a description of a dyad or group. Although individuals may differ in the ease with which they develop rapport with different interaction partners, rapport does not characterise the individual but rather the smoothness of the interaction. In addition, because rapport is a dynamic state, it should be considered as distinct from the overall relationship that two parties have with one another. That is, one may have good rapport with another individual in a particular interaction, even if the relationship is not generally close or positive. Alternatively, one may experience days of being 'out of sync' with loved ones, where rapport is low but the overall relationship is valued and positive.

Rapport has been defined as consisting of *mutual attention*, *positivity*, and *coordination* (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1990). The Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal model is one of the only theoretical models of rapport in the literature. The three components of rapport identified in this model appear to have differential effects on the interaction, may be differentially under the control of an interviewer, and may require different levels of emphasis over the course of an interview or series of interviews.

¹'Engage and Explain' is the second phase of the interview. The five phases are 'Preparation and Planning', 'Engage and Explain', 'Account', 'Closure', and 'Evaluation', referred to by the acronym PEACE.

The Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1990) model focuses primarily on the behavioural aspects of rapport (see Table 1), although affective aspects also are addressed (pp. 285–286). Although mutual *attention* is certainly cognitive in nature, this conceptualisation omits an explicit cognitive component, which may be a useful addition to the model. *Coordination* can take the form of shared understanding, which allows interactants to feel as though they are ‘on the same page’. In some interactions, one can anticipate what the other party is going to say before they say it, because of the interactants sharing a mental model of the topic of discussion.

Mutual attention is the degree of involvement or engagement that interactants experience. Attention is often signalled by a forward lean and direct body orientation (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1990), by nodding, or with back channel responses at appropriate points in the dialogue (‘uh huh’, ‘okay’, ‘yes). Of the three aspects of rapport, mutual attention should be the easiest to establish but is not a given, and its neglect can pose an obstacle to developing the other aspects of rapport. A source may attempt to shut out or ignore the interviewer to avoid the interaction. An interviewer and a source must first demonstrate some mutual attentiveness before they can establish positivity or coordination, or proceed to more substantive issues.

Positivity in social interactions has typically been described in research as friendliness or caring (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1990). However, positivity is not limited to mutual liking or caring. Researchers have identified two fundamental dimensions of social judgment: warmth (liking) and competence (respect) (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008; Fiske, Cuddy, & Glick, 2007), also termed *communion* and *agency* (Wojciszke, Abele, & Baryla, 2009). Warmth represents someone’s perceived intentions toward you, for example, perceived helpful versus harmful intentions, whereas competence represents the ability to act on those intentions. These dimensions have emerged as the central concepts in judgments across cultures (Abele, Uchrowski, Suitner, & Wojciszke, 2008), about both groups and individuals (Fiske *et al.*, 2007). Warmth and competence perceptions of individuals are only minimally linked to each other.

Because much of the literature on rapport has focused on interactions between clinicians and patients or clients, there has been an understandable focus on warmth and liking in building rapport. The concept of ‘unconditional positive regard’ has been widely adopted in therapeutic contexts (Rogers, 1957). However, there are dissenting views, and some have proposed alternative orientations that allow a clinician to build rapport and trust without depending heavily on positivity (Wilkins, 2000). Aiming for ‘unconditional neutral regard’ may be more realistic in certain contexts (Willshire & Brodsky, 2001).

Mutual respect as a foundation of rapport has appeared less often in literature on clinical settings (Fischer, 1969), but respect may be equally useful and has been somewhat neglected in previous research. Although research has shown that warmth/communion (liking) is often more salient than competence/agency (respect) in interpersonal relations, in some contexts agency may be primary (Wojciszke & Abele, 2008). Investigative

Table 1. An exploration of Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal’s components of rapport

	Affect	Behaviour	Cognition
Mutual attention		X	X
Mutual positivity	X	X	
Coordination		X	X

interviewing may be one of those contexts. The interrogation situation in particular is usually characterised by a strong power differential, and differences in perceived status have been linked more directly with perceived competence than with warmth (Brambilla, Sacchi, Castellini, & Riva, 2010; Wojciszke *et al.*, 2009). Thus, establishing positivity in the interrogation may be best initially accomplished through mutual respect, as indicated in the Army Field Manual (Department of the Army, 2006, p. 8-5).

The *coordination* aspect of rapport is the degree to which interactants' behaviour is synchronised (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1990). Whether interactants are behaving in a way that is similar or complementary, coordination implies that they are responsive to each other and patterned in their responses. The perception that an interaction has gone smoothly is driven by the coordination between partners. They have developed a pattern of interaction that allows some predictability. Coordination may manifest as *synchrony*, *complementarity*, *mimicry*, *accommodation*, or *convergence* between partners, taking one of several different forms of reciprocity. Crisis negotiation demonstrates the coordination aspect of rapport, with behaviour sequences between interacting parties becoming more mutually constraining over the course of the interaction (Taylor & Donald, 2003).

Although not included in Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal's model, coordination not only can emerge in behaviour but also may emerge in cognition, in the form of *shared understanding*. Shared understanding is a common mental model of the situation, the parties' respective roles, and/or the goals for the interaction. Shared understanding may be pre-existing, if the parties come into the interaction with similar expectations and framing of the situation, or a shared history of interaction. Or it may be established through the interaction itself, through the mutual exchange of information, expectations, and preferences (Valley *et al.*, 2002). Although not investigated in the context of interviewing or interrogation, shared understanding has been demonstrated to enhance team performance (Stout, Cannon-Bowers, Salas, & Milanovich, 1999) and negotiation outcomes (Swaab, Postmes, van Beest, & Spears, 2007; Van Boven & Thompson, 2003).

The three components of rapport are interrelated but also somewhat distinct and can develop at different rates. For example, coordination without positivity can occur, as it often does among drivers who coordinate turn taking at a busy intersection. A state of high coordination and attention but low positivity can emerge. This state can sometimes be observed in romantic couples repeating a familiar argument, who are quick to descend into conflict spirals in which a negative act by one partner is quickly reciprocated by the other. Although there is presumably positivity in the relationship overall, interactions between the partners can show coordination without reflecting any positivity.

Attention is the component most readily established, but an interviewer could select any component as the starting point. If mutual attention cannot be readily established, the interviewer can attempt to coordinate his behaviour with the sources or express positivity unilaterally in an attempt to establish mutuality in one of the dimensions of rapport. Coordination can be both a cause (Chartrand & Bargh, 1999; Stel & Vonk, 2010) and a consequence (Gueguen & Martin, 2009) of positivity between partners. However, positivity and attention can be faked, leading to a state of *pseudorapport* (DePaulo & Bell, 1990). One or both parties may convey positivity that they do not genuinely feel, or an interactant may give back channel responses (nodding, saying 'uh huh') at appropriate times without listening to the verbal content, leading to an overestimate of rapport by one of them. Pseudorapport carries the risk that once detected, the relationship will be damaged and the interviewer will have to spend time trying to repair rapport and trust. Some relationships do not cover from such a break.

Coordination is by definition a group or dyadic concept, but the attention, positivity, and understanding components must also be mutual. The interviewer has to elicit liking or respect from the source but also has to convey liking or respect for the source that is perceived as genuine. Similarly, attention and understanding cannot be one sided. The interviewer has to capture the source's attention but also must communicate attention. It is important for the interviewer/interrogator to recognise that note taking and any other distractions can detract from establishing mutual attention. Establishing the mutuality of these components means that interviewers must potentially allow the source to influence the interviewer's own behaviour, within the confines of the interview session. The interviewer should also recognise that the source may be building rapport for his or her own purposes.

In general, rapport should be a consideration throughout the interview. Rapport is likely more critical in the earlier stages of the interview and often appears explicitly as an early stage of interview techniques, such as in the 'Engage and Explain' phase of the PEACE model. But treating rapport as a stage can be misleading because, although important to develop early on, rapport can fluctuate over the course of an interview. One should not assume that once established, rapport can be assumed without further effort and therefore ignored. A recent study of police interviewing showed that rapport *maintenance* was more relevant to interview outcomes than was initial rapport building (Walsh & Bull, 2012). In this study, investigators who demonstrated rapport building in the Account phase of the interview (the 'A' in PEACE) were more likely to achieve successful interview outcomes (a full account or confession), regardless of whether they had previously built rapport in the Engage and Explain phase of the interview.

Because rapport is a dynamic state, it can increase, decrease, or otherwise change over the course of an interaction. Monitoring the levels of attention, positivity, and coordination throughout the interaction can help alert an interviewer to signals that the source is becoming more or less receptive (and vice versa). In addition, it may be necessary to re-establish rapport in subsequent interactions with the same source, although this presumably happens more readily where there is an existing relationship.

Rapport is a necessary but insufficient condition for a successful interview. Rapport serves an instrumental function in achieving the goals of interrogation and intelligence interviewing—ultimately, gathering or educing information from a human source. The succeeding sections explore the utility of rapport in achieving the goals of an investigative interview: a working alliance between interviewer and source, social influence on a source, and educing information from a source.

RAPPORT IN WORKING ALLIANCE

Kleinman has proposed the concept of *operational accord* to describe a productive relationship between interviewer and source, which includes but goes beyond rapport (Kleinman, 2006, p. 103). In operational accord, the interviewer and target have a shared view of at least some of the goals of the interview and are both willing to contribute to achieving these goals. An analogous concept in research is the *working alliance* between a therapist and client (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989).

The therapeutic working alliance is predictive of client improvement (Horvath & Symonds, 1991), and research suggests that agreement on task and goals may be particularly important (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). Although the literature includes various definitions, one

concept of working alliance includes task, goal, and bond components (Bordin, 1976). Task refers to the therapeutic process, goal refers to the attempted outcomes of therapy, and bond refers to the relationship between therapist and client. In a strong working alliance, therapist and client would show agreement on all three of these components. The bond aspect of working alliance is strongly correlated with overall rapport in an interaction (Sharpley, Guidara, & Rowley, 1994; Sharpley, Halat, Rabinowicz, Weiland, & Stafford, 2001).

Operational accord could be similarly defined. Interviewer and source may experience an operational bond of mutual affinity or respect (Kleinman, 2010). This bond would include agreement about the roles, expectations, and desired outcomes of both the interviewer and the source, as this relationship is not always obvious to both parties. In law enforcement interviews, researchers have found that suspects are occasionally unaware that the police interviewer views them as suspects (Vanderhallen, Vervaeke, & Holmberg, 2011), suggesting that mismatches in understanding may be relatively common.

As mentioned previously, interviewer and source would also benefit from a shared understanding of the task and goals of the interview or interrogation. This shared understanding does not necessarily mean that a source has no resistance but instead that the interviewer and source have a shared view of the desired end state and of the process by which the interview will be conducted. For example, the rules guiding the interview process have been discussed and acknowledged (part of the 'E' of the PEACE approach), and both the interviewer and source have some shared expectations about how to proceed. In law enforcement interviews, the working alliance is related to interviewer empathy, respect, interview clarity, and lower source anxiety (Vanderhallen *et al.*, 2011).

It is important to consider operational accord or a working alliance as part of the interview process, encompassing but not limited to rapport. Rapport can be established in an interaction where no specific goal or task is present for either party—one may simply experience rapport in a positive interaction, such as when chatting with strangers at a cocktail party. Because an interview is a task-oriented interaction, rapport should be viewed as supporting the task of obtaining information.

RAPPORT IN SOCIAL INFLUENCE

Investigative interviewing is fundamentally an attempt at social influence, with an interviewer attempting to gain the participation of, disclosure from, or admission from a source. It is thus worthwhile to consider the role of rapport in achieving that influence. Kelman identified three motivational bases for social influence (1958, 2006): interest based (compliance), relationship based (affiliation and identification), and identity based (consistency, internalisation). A similar framework has been proposed to characterise motivations underlying negotiation (Taylor, 2002), suggesting that bargaining behaviours reflect instrumental, relational, and identity concerns. These forms of influence are not exclusive of each other; that is, a particular person may have more than one motivation operating simultaneously.

Rapport generally facilitates social influence, but the different components may need different emphasis for different influence approaches. In other words, how one goes about establishing rapport may depend on the type of influence being attempted (including any influence the interviewee is seeking to have on the interviewer). Although attention is a constant requirement regardless of the influence approach, the other components may take a somewhat different form. Coordination and positivity may need to be established

differently depending on the form of influence used (see Table 2). Each of the three forms of influence is described succeeding paragraphs with suggested considerations for the components of rapport.

Interest-based social influence occurs when the target perceives that there is something to be gained by compliance or something to be lost by non-compliance. Responding to an influence attempt is therefore based on instrumental concerns about potential reward or punishment for an action. The ability to influence a target using interests usually depends on one’s capability and authority to control the situation. Clearly, the interrogation context can afford an interrogator an uncommon degree of control and therefore the ability to systematically leverage this type of influence.

In *interest-based compliance*, the interviewer must establish his or her own authority and credibility to establish means control, demonstrating competence to fulfil a source’s instrumental concerns. Although this respect must be elicited from the source, interest-based influence can occur without the interviewer reciprocating and showing respect in kind. Thus, as long as the interviewer and source have a shared understanding of the situation and the rules guiding it, then mutual positivity may be less important. However, coordination is still critical to the interaction. The coordination might take the form of complementarity, with the interviewer showing dominant non-verbal behaviour and the source responding with submissive behaviour (cf. Tiedens & Fragale, 2003). But caution is warranted when attempting to establish this power dynamic, as non-verbal dominance behaviour (higher muscle tension, glaring or angry facial expression, a raised voice) can sometimes undermine perceptions of competence (Driskell & Salas, 2005) or may create reactance.

Relationship-based influence occurs when the source is invested in building or maintaining a relationship with the interviewer—that is, when he or she feels some affiliation or identification with the interviewer. Influence depends on the degree to which a target wants to fulfil a particular role with or obligation toward the influencer or seeks that person’s approval or acceptance. The ability to influence someone using relational means depends on the target’s identification with the influencer—often as a result of the influencer’s attractiveness, role, or similarity with the target.

Rapport forms the foundation of relationship-based social influence. More specifically, mutual positivity is important; establishing a relationship of warmth and liking would be critical, although mutual respect would certainly also be beneficial. Coordination would likely take the form of mimicry and congruence (Chartrand & Dalton, 2009). A shared understanding of the relationship would also emerge, such that both parties would be aware of each other’s goals and roles within the interaction. Finding commonalities facilitates this

Table 2. Conceptualising rapport for different forms of social influence

	Interest based	Relationship based	Identity based
	Compliance	Affiliation and identification	Internalisation
Attention		Constant	
Coordination	Complementarity	Convergence	Convergence
Type of positivity required	High competence (Respect for interviewer)	High warmth (Liking)	High competence (Mutual respect)
Shared understanding	Rules	Roles	Values and worldview

form of influence and helps the source to identify with the interviewer (Kelman, 1961). An extreme example of this phenomenon is the hostage identification syndrome (Turner, 1985), more popularly known as ‘Stockholm syndrome’, in which an emotional bond forms between captor and captive. Hostage identification syndrome tends to occur when the relational influence is one sided by the captor but can be mutual.

Identity-based influence typically occurs when someone appeals to the self-concept, values, or beliefs of a target. Change is motivated by the desire to maintain a subjective sense consistency and accuracy among one’s internalised values, beliefs, and/or behaviour. The result of identity-based influence is internalisation.

The ability to exercise this form of influence often depends on the influencer’s credibility (Kelman, 1961). Influencers who are perceived by the target as an expert or as high-status members of a social group in which the target is invested can better exercise this form of influence (Haslam, McGarty, & Turner, 1996). An interviewer may be unlikely to have this level of status with a target initially, but he or she can seek to use personal credibility and context to facilitate this form of influence (see Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994 for discussion of the context dependence of identity).

In the investigative interviewing context, an understanding of the source’s self-concept, values, and worldview is potentially critical to achieving identity-based influence, as the source himself (or herself) understands them. In this way, interviewers can attempt to convey expertise and to tailor their messaging to fit within the source’s cognitive frames. This form of influence is likely the most difficult of the three, requiring more time, contact, and background knowledge. Good preparation, supported when possible by indirect personality assessment (see, e.g. Meloy, 2004), will enhance the use of identity-based influence, beyond the traditional theme development often used in US interrogations of criminal suspects (Blair, 2005; Boetig, 2005).

Of course, interviewers often employ multiple forms of influence over the course of a single interview. Whichever type of influence is attempted, the interviewer can look for emerging signs of influence in the coordination of the interaction. A receptive source may begin to show subtle signs of non-verbal convergence before any explicit cooperation occurs regarding the subject matter of the interview. For example, a source may begin orienting his posture and gestures to match those of the interviewer, or match his vocal volume and pace to that of the interviewer, while verbally expressing the intent not to cooperate. Interviewers should attend to and interpret such behaviour with caution, as it may represent some desire to affiliate with the interviewer (cf. Lakin & Chartrand, 2003; Stel *et al.*, 2010) or could be a signal of influence *by the source* on the interviewer (cf. Swaab, Maddux, & Sinaceur, 2011). Research should examine the relationship between rapport and social influence and determine whether rapport should be developed differently to support different forms of influence.

RAPPORT IN EDUCING INFORMATION

Rapport has benefits for educing interviewees’ memories, but there has been little research to examine exactly how the rapport advantage occurs. Collins *et al.* (2002) showed that an encouraging and positive interviewer was able to elicit more detail from a witness without increasing the number of errors, relative to a neutral or abrupt interviewer. Research with child witnesses has found similar results (Roberts, Lamb, & Sternberg, 2004). Some research even suggests that the benefits of the cognitive interview technique are largely

due to rapport, rather than due to cognitive retrieval mnemonics (Memon, Wark, Holley, Bull, & Koehnken, 1997), although a meta-analysis has confirmed the added benefit of specific mnemonics (Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, 2010).

The benefit of rapport for memory may be motivational—respondents may simply try harder in a more positive interaction, at least when predisposed to cooperate (Collins *et al.*, 2002). The National Institutes of Justice guide on eyewitness interviewing argues for this explanation (see National Institutes of Justice, 2003, pp. 10 and 14). In addition, some researchers have suggested that rapport is important because it transfers control over the recall process to the interviewee (Memon *et al.*, 1997).

There has been no research to date examining the various components of rapport in educating information from human sources. Presumably, positivity would affect someone's *motivation* to engage in memory retrieval, as in the study of Collins *et al.* (2002), and coordination would benefit memory retrieval more directly. Coordination may help by minimising interviewer disruptions to the retrieval process. In addition, an interviewer who adapts his or her behaviour to converge with that of the interviewee may be better able to cue memory retrieval, although research on collaborative memory² suggests that this possibility is unlikely (cf. Basden, Basden, Bryner, & Thomas, 1997). Research is needed to test whether rapport plays a role in eliciting memories, beyond that of simply motivating a source to remember. Certainly, it would be difficult to imagine a scenario in which building rapport with a source might be counterproductive in terms of its effect on recall (unless it were the source who was building rapport but avoiding recall of what the interviewer was seeking).

RESEARCH GAPS

Despite the emphasis on rapport in interviewing and interrogation across agencies and countries, very little empirical research is available to determine how rapport contributes to interview outcomes. We know from other fields that rapport facilitates interaction in different settings and for different goals, but how best to establish rapport and how to use it for instrumental purposes in an investigative interview are relatively unexplored. This paper has presented some tentative ideas about rapport based on behavioural science findings and theories, many of which need to be tested in an interview context. For example, research should examine the extent to which positivity is a central component of rapport in intelligence or law enforcement interviewing. Some practitioners and instructors discuss the concept of 'negative rapport', which suggests that perhaps positivity is not always critical to establishing rapport, but this notion could be tested empirically. The active role of the interviewee in building and/or destroying rapport is similarly important and should be addressed in future research.

Also untested is the notion explored here that different social influence tactics may benefit from different routes of rapport building. That influencers can be persuasive because of either liking (warmth) or credibility and authority (competence) is well established in the social influence literature (cf. Cialdini, 2001). It is plausible that these dimensions are also two different aspects of positivity in rapport and might support different forms of social influence. Coordination may also develop through different paths. Convergence and

²Collaborative memory refers to the process of remembering information with a partner or in a group.

complementarity have emerged as two forms of coordination; whether they lead to similar or different outcomes for an instrumental interaction (e.g. negotiation or intelligence interview outcomes) has not yet been addressed.

Extending Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal's (1990) model of rapport beyond affect and behaviour to include cognition may also be beneficial. Research examining how rapport includes or contributes to the development of shared mental models may reveal an important link between processes of rapport and social influence.

One limitation of research on rapport is that it has focused primarily on dyadic interactions. As a result, multiparty interactions have been relatively unexplored. Law enforcement or intelligence sources may interact with multiple interviewers or handlers, including interpreters and interviewers potentially representing multiple agencies. Very little research has been conducted on rapport beyond the dyad (although some has examined teacher–student rapport in the classroom setting).

When multiple interviewers interact with the same source, some aspects of rapport may transfer whereas others do not. For example, if a source has a productive relationship with one interviewer, a subsequent interviewer may benefit from the transfer of positivity but will likely have to establish attention and coordination himself or herself. One effort to examine the impact of interpreters on rapport found no differences between criminal investigative interviews with and interviews without an interpreter, in terms of linguistic use of immediacy and positivity (Driskell & Driskell, 2011). This result suggests that using an interpreter has neither a negative nor positive effect on the interview. However, this research looked only at the interviewee's language, not in relation to the interviewer's language. In addition, linguistic evidence of rapport was very low in these interviews overall, particularly on the positivity dimension, making it more difficult to detect any potential impact of an interpreter.

Although not tested in intelligence interviewing, research in other contexts has shown mixed results for the effects of interpreters on rapport. In one study, physicians reported that interacting with patients through an interpreter did not disrupt trust or rapport but did report having difficulty eliciting symptoms and exploring treatment plans (Karliner, Pérez-Stable, & Gildengorin, 2004). Another study found that physicians speaking through an interpreter were less likely to engage in small talk with their patients and asked them fewer questions, resulting in conversations dominated by the physician (Aranguri, Davidson, & Ramirez, 2006). These findings suggest that doctor–patient interactions are often missing opportunities to use interpreters to enhance rapport. Research on the interpreter role is needed to determine whether investigative interviewing may include similar challenges, which could likely be addressed through training and practice.

To address any of these research gaps, methods for assessing rapport in an investigative interview are necessary. Previous research has examined both observer judgments of rapport and interactants' own perceptions of rapport (Bernieri & Gillis, 1995). In peer-to-peer interactions, observers often rely on invalid cues when judging rapport (Bernieri and Gillis), using the behaviours of smiling and expressivity to the exclusion of more valid cues. In addition, adversarial interactions lead to less accurate judgments of rapport than do more cooperative interactions (Bernieri, Gillis, Davis, & Grahe, 1996). These findings suggest that development of a observational measure of rapport would be beneficial for studying rapport in investigative interviewing (see Walsh & Bull, 2012).

Existing theories in the behavioural science literature provide a basis for forming testable hypotheses, but research on the social and interpersonal dynamics of law enforcement and intelligence interviewing has proceeded in a largely atheoretical fashion. The limited

body of research on investigative interviewing tends to be descriptive in nature (Milne & Bull, 1999). Drawing from the extensive empirical and theoretical literature on topics such as rapport, social influence, and negotiation would help move interviewing research forward into more explanatory hypotheses that can be tested with a combination of laboratory and field research. Such research would provide direct benefits for the training and operations of practitioners who already recognise the importance of rapport in their professional interactions.

REFERENCES

- Abele, A. E., Uchronski, M., Suitner, C., & Wojciszke, B. (2008). Towards an operationalization of the fundamental dimensions of agency and communion: Trait content ratings in five countries considering valence and frequency of word occurrence. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 1202–1217.
- Aranguri, C., Davidson, B., & Ramirez, R. (2006). Patterns of communication through interpreters: A detailed sociolinguistic analysis. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 21, 623–629.
- Basden, B. H., Basden, D. R., Bryner, S., & Thomas, R. L. (1997). A comparison of group and individual remembering: Does collaboration disrupt retrieval strategies? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23, 1176–1189.
- Bernieri, F., & Gillis, J. S. (1995). The judgment of rapport: A cross-cultural comparison between Americans and Greeks. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 19, 115–130.
- Bernieri, F. J., Gillis, J. S., Davis, J. M., & Grahe, J. E. (1996). Dyad rapport and the accuracy of its judgment across situations: A lens model analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 110–129.
- Blair, J. P. (2005). What do we know about interrogation in the United States? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 20, 44–57.
- Boetig, B. P. (2005). Reducing a guilty suspect's resistance to confessing: Applying criminological theory to interrogation theme development. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 74, 13–20.
- Bordin, E. S. (1976). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16, 252–260.
- Borum, R., Gelles, M. G., & Kleinman, S. M. (2009). Interview and interrogation: A perspective and update from the United States. In T. Williamson, B. Milne, & S. P. Savage (Eds.), *International developments in investigative interviewing* (pp. 111–128). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Brambilla, M., Sacchi, S., Castellini, R., & Riva, P. (2010). The effects of status on perceived warmth and competence: Malleability of the relationship between status and stereotype content. *Social Psychology*, 41, 82–87.
- Bull, R., & Soukara, S. (2010). Four studies of what really happens in police interviews. In G. D. Lassiter, & C. A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations* (pp. 81–95). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Caproni, V. E. (2008, June 10). Federal Bureau of Investigation statement before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Washington, DC.
- Chartrand, T. L., & Bargh, J. A. (1999). The chameleon effect: The perception–behavior link and social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 893–910.
- Chartrand, T. L., & Dalton, A. N. (2009). Mimicry: Its ubiquity, importance, and functionality. In E. Morsella, J. A. Bargh, & P. M. Gollwitzer (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of human action* (pp. 458–483). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Collins, R., Lincoln, R., & Frank, M. G. (2002). The effect of rapport in forensic interviewing. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 9, 69–78.
- Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 61–149.

- Department of the Army. (2006). *Human intelligence collector operations* (Field Manual 2-22.3). Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Bell, K. L. (1990). Rapport is not so soft anymore. *Psychological Inquiry, 1*, 305–308.
- Driskell, T., & Driskell, J. E. (2011). Effects of an interpreter on rapport. Final Report under Defense Intelligence Agency Contract HHM402-10-C-0091.
- Driskell, J. E., & Salas, E. (2005). The effect of content and demeanor on reactions to dominance behavior. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 9*, 3–14.
- Drolet, A. L., & Morris, M. W. (2000). Rapport in conflict resolution: Accounting for how face-to-face contact fosters mutual cooperation in mixed-motive conflicts. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 36*, 26–50.
- Fischer, C. (1969). Rapport as mutual respect. *Personnel Guidance Journal, 48*, 201–204.
- Fisher, R. P., Geiselman, R. E., & Amador, M. (1989). Field test of the cognitive interview: Enhancing the recollection of actual victims and witnesses of crime. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 722–727.
- Fiske, S., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal dimensions of social cognition: Warmth and competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 11*, 77–83.
- Gueguen, N., & Martin, A. (2009). Incidental similarity facilitates behavioral mimicry. *Social Psychology, 40*, 88–92.
- Haslam, S. A., McGarty, C., & Turner, J. C. (1996). Salient group memberships and persuasion: The role of social identity in the validation of beliefs. In J. L. Nye, & A. M. Brower (Eds.), *What's social about social cognition?* (pp. 29–56). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1989). Development and validation of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 223–233.
- Horvath, A. O., & Symonds, B. D. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 139–149.
- Karliner, L. S., Pérez-Stable, E. J., & Gildengorin, G. (2004). The language divide: The importance of training in the use of interpreters for outpatient practice. *Journal of General Internal Medicine, 19*, 175–183.
- Kassin, S. M., et al. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: A self-report survey of police practices and beliefs. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*, 381–400.
- Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Conflict Resolution, 2*, 51–60.
- Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 25*, 57–78.
- Kelman, H. C. (2006). Interests, relationships, identities: Three central issues for individuals and groups in negotiating their social environment. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 1–26.
- Kleinman, S. M. (2006). KUBARK counterintelligence interrogation review: Observations of an interrogator—lessons learned and avenues for further research. In *Intelligence science board, educating information: Interrogation science and art* (pp. 95–140). Washington, DC: National Defense Intelligence College.
- Kleinman, S. M. (2010). Approaching the interrogation challenge: Systematic planning and preparation. Unpublished manuscript.
- Lakin, J. L., & Chartrand, T. L. (2003). Using nonconscious behavioral mimicry to create affiliation and rapport. *Psychological Science, 14*, 334–339.
- Macintosh, G. (2009). The role of rapport in professional services: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Services Marketing, 23*, 70–78.
- Meloy, J. R. (2004). Indirect personality assessment of the violent true believer. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 82*, 138–146.
- Memon, A., Meissner, C. A., & Fraser, J. (2010). The cognitive interview: A meta-analytic review and study space analysis of the past 25 years. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 16*, 340–372.
- Memon, A., Wark, L., Holley, A., Bull, R., & Koehnken, G. (1997). Isolating the effects of the cognitive interview techniques. *British Journal of Psychology, 88* (2), 179–198.
- Milne, R., & Bull, R. (1999). *Investigative interviewing: Psychology and practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- National Institutes of Justice. (2003). *Eyewitness evidence: A trainer's manual for law enforcement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Roberts, K. P., Lamb, M. E., & Sternberg, K. J. (2004). The effects of rapport-building style on children's reports of a staged event. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18*, 189–202.

- Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions for therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95–103.
- Sharpley, C. F., Guidara, D. A., & Rowley, M. A. (1994). Psychometric evaluations of a 'standardized client' procedure with trainee counselors. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 7, 69–82.
- Sharpley, C. F., Halat, J., Rabinowicz, T., Weiland, B., & Stafford, J. (2001). Standard posture, postural mirroring, and client-perceived rapport. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 14, 267–280.
- Shawyer, A., Milne, B., & Bull, R. (2009). Investigative interviewing in the United Kingdom. In T. Williamson, B. Milne, & S. P. Savage (Eds.), *International developments in investigative interviewing* (pp.24–38). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- St. Yves, M. (2009). Police interrogation in Canada: From the quest for confession to the search for the truth. In T. Williamson, B. Milne, & S. P. Savage (Eds.), *International developments in investigative interviewing* (pp.92–110). Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.
- Stel, M., & Vonk, R. (2010). Mimicry in social interaction: Benefits for mimickers, mimickees, and their interaction. *British Journal of Psychology*, 101, 311–323.
- Stel, M., et al. (2010). Effects of a priori liking on the elicitation of mimicry. *Experimental Psychology*, 57, 412–418.
- Stout, R. J., Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Salas, E., & Milanovich, D. M. (1999). Planning, shared mental models, and coordinated performance: An empirical link is established. *Human Factors*, 41, 61–71.
- Swaab, R. I., Maddux, W. W., & Sinaceur, M. (2011). Early words that work: When and how virtual linguistic mimicry facilitates negotiation outcomes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 616–621.
- Swaab, R., Postmes, T., van Beest, I., & Spears, R. (2007). Shared cognition as a product of, and precursor to, shared identity in negotiations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33, 187–199.
- Taylor, P. J. (2002). A cylindrical model of communication behavior in crisis negotiations. *Human Communication Research*, 28, 7–48.
- Taylor, P. J., & Donald, I. (2003). Foundations and evidence for an interaction-based approach to conflict negotiation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 14, 213–232.
- Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The nature of rapport and its nonverbal correlates. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1, 285–293.
- Tiedens, L. Z., & Fragale, A. R. (2003). Power moves: Complementarity in dominant and submissive nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 558–568.
- Turner, J. T. (1985). Factors influencing the development of the hostage identification syndrome. *Political Psychology*, 6, 705–711.
- Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 454–463.
- Valley, K., Thompson, L., Gibbons, R., & Bazerman, M. H. (2002). How communication improves efficiency in bargaining games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 38, 127–155.
- Van Boven, L., & Thompson, L. (2003). A look into the mind of the negotiator: Mental models in negotiation. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 387–404.
- Vanderhallen, M., Vervaeke, G., & Holmberg, U. (2011). Witness and suspect perceptions of working alliance and interviewing style. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 8, 110–130.
- Walsh, D., & Bull, R. (2012). Examining rapport in investigative interviews with suspects: Does its building and maintenance work? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 27, 73–84.
- Wilkins, P. (2000). Unconditional positive regard reconsidered. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 28, 23–36.
- Willshire, D., & Brodsky, S. L. (2001). Toward a taxonomy of unwillingness: Initial steps in engaging the unwilling client. *Psychiatry, Psychology, and Law*, 8, 154–160.
- Wojciszke, B., & Abele, A. E. (2008). The primacy of communion over agency and its reversals in evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 1139–1147.
- Wojciszke, B., Abele, A. E., & Barylka, W. (2009). Two dimensions of interpersonal attitudes: Liking depends on communion, respect depends on agency. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 973–990.

Copyright of Journal of Investigative Psychology & Offender Profiling is the property of John Wiley & Sons, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.