

POLICE PROFESSIONALISM IN INTERVIEWS WITH HIGH VALUE DETAINEES: CROSS-CULTURAL ENDORSEMENT OF PROCEDURAL JUSTICE

**Jane Goodman-Delahunty,* Kate O'Brien & Thea Gumbert-Jourjon
Charles Sturt University**

Procedural fairness has received widespread attention in policing but is under-researched in investigative interviews. In simulated interviews in the laboratory, authorities were more focussed on just outcomes than fair processes, but little research has been conducted in the field to examine practices regarding procedural fairness and variations in different cultures and jurisdictions. This study examined these issues in a sample of experienced police and military practitioners in Australia, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, and Sri Lanka. In semi-structured interviews probing effective practices, 123 practitioners with expertise in criminal investigative and HUMINT interviews described the strategies they used to (a) build rapport; (b) elicit reliable information; and (c) achieve interview goals. Responses to these questions were coded by trained raters for the importance of four procedural justice components: respectful treatment, trust, neutrality and voice. Consensus emerged on the importance of procedural fairness to establish rapport, secure reliable information and achieve interview objectives. The majority of practitioners endorsed strategies respectful of suspect rights and police trustworthiness; less priority was accorded to interviewee voice and police neutrality. Differences in emphasis on voice and neutrality emerged between jurisdictions in relation to cultures High versus Low in Context and cultural variations in individualism, power-distance and uncertainty avoidance. Examples are cited reflecting police professionalism that employs procedural justice to enhance interviewing expertise and police legitimacy.

Reports of abusive interrogation methods such as those at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay have damaged police reputations in many jurisdictions. In part, this public controversy has been fuelled by the lack of transparency about police procedures (Bradford, Jackson & Hough, 2014; Schafer, 2013) and interview methods (Dixon, 2010). In some jurisdictions, in cases that have proceeded to court, evidence gathered using coercive methods has been excluded, diminishing public trust and confidence in law enforcement officers (e.g., Nolan, 2009). Although most police and military interviewers receive training in rapport-building, harsh treatment of suspected violent extremists and other high value detainees may be exacerbated by cultural

* © 2014 by authors, reprinted here by permission. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to jdelahunty@csu.edu.au, Charles Sturt University Manly Campus, Sydney, Australia. This research was funded by a grant from the US Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Investigation High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group through the Centre for Law and Human Behavior at the University of Texas at El Paso (Grant Number: J-FBI-10-009). Statements of fact, opinion and analysis are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the FBI or the US Government. We are grateful to Samara Barchet, Loene Howes, Melissa Martin, Ida Nguyen and Jessica Kingsford for assistance in coding interview transcripts.

differences and retributive motives (Carlsmith & Sood, 2009), leading to use of interrogation strategies that are counterproductive and culturally ineffective. Research has repeatedly shown that suspects who have experienced physical abuse during interrogations are more likely to make false confessions (Leo, Constanzo, & Shaked-Shroer, 2009), which reduced public confidence in the criminal justice system. Mistreatment of suspects during interviews results in loss of perceived legitimacy of police, and diminishes community cooperation and support (Roberts, 2011). Accordingly, law enforcement agencies and police practitioners are motivated to identify interview techniques that are effective, but do not involve torture or lead to inadmissible evidence and public controversy (Borum, Gelles & Kleinman, 2009). Yet little is known about practitioner views on effective interview methods and strategies and the extent of consensus between jurisdictions. Whether less controversial methods are in fact more widely used and perceived as effective is a topic that has remained unaddressed, as has the extent to which cultural differences may influence the use and perception of different methods. The current study sought information from seasoned interviewers from a variety of cultural backgrounds about strategies and methods of interrogation that they regarded as effective.

In a systematic review of research on police interviewing, Meissner, Redlich, Bhatt, and Brandon (2012) examined studies that compared the efficacy of accusatorial (guilt-presumptive) vs. information-gathering interview methods in eliciting confessions. Information-gathering methods emphasise rapport-building and use of open-ended, non-confrontational questioning (Walsh & Bull, 2012). Results of laboratory-based interview simulations revealed that while both accusatorial and information-gathering interview methods yielded confessions, information-gathering strategies had greater diagnostic value, *i.e.*, increased the number of true confessions, while reducing the number of false confessions. Whether practitioners in the field endorse the use of less coercive practices to enhance the reliability of the information secured in interviews is unknown.

Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy

Insights from social psychological theory and research are helpful in addressing some gaps between police and public perceptions of police performance. Research has revealed that negative personal encounters with police have between four and fourteen times more impact upon citizen ratings of confidence in police than do positive encounters (Skogan, 2006). Moreover, effect sizes were larger for citizen-initiated encounters than for police-initiated encounters, suggesting the importance of “customer service” during interactions with citizens, as well as fair treatment of suspects, in promoting police legitimacy (Skogan, 2006). In the wake of negative publicity about police practices, interest has increased in factors that influence perceptions of police legitimacy (Brown, 2014). Police legitimacy refers to public acceptance of, and respect for police authority, as well as the level of citizen obedience (Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, & Manning, 2013; Tyler, 1997, 2001, 2006).

A primary influence on public perception of police legitimacy is the extent to which police are perceived as trustworthy, enabling “policing by consent” (Her Majesty’s Inspector of Constabulary, 2011; Goldsmith, 2005) rather than coercion. Citizens who view the police as legitimate are intrinsically motivated to self-regulate their behaviour to cooperate and comply with police (Tyler & Fagan, 2008). A substantial body of research has demonstrated that the primary means for promoting perceptions of fairness and police legitimacy is adherence to components of procedural justice (PJ) (Murphy, Hinds & Fleming, 2008; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1989). A recent meta-analysis confirmed

that police-led interventions promoting PJ dialogue significantly improved public perceptions of police legitimacy (Mazerolle et al., 2013).

PJ theory is founded on the idea that building trust, treating people with fairness and neutrality, and allowing them the opportunity to express their viewpoint results in greater satisfaction, cooperation and compliance with authority (Tyler, 1989). The primary model of PJ theory, the Group Value Model (GVM; Lind & Tyler, 1988) posits that perceptions of PJ are directly influenced by an individual's sense of belonging to a group or community. The GVM is comprised of four key elements or components: respectful treatment, trustworthiness, neutrality and voice (Goodman-Delahunty, 2010; Mazerolle et al., 2013) and has received extensive empirical support (Hinds and Murphy, 2007; Naumann & Bennett, 2000; Tyler, 1989, 1990, 2001, 2006). Respectful treatment is demonstrated by the extent to which authority figures afford citizens dignity and fairness. Trustworthiness reflects the extent to which individuals perceive that authority figures are acting in their best interests. Neutrality refers to transparency, and a lack of bias by authorities (Tyler, 2008). Voice refers to an individual's ability to be heard and to express their opinion and viewpoint in legal proceedings (Goodman-Delahunty, 2010).

Limited research has addressed the application of the GVM and PJ theory to police interviewing. Previous studies demonstrated that individuals who perceived authority figures as trustworthy showed compliance with and commitment to that authority (Tyler, 1989), while those who mistrusted interviewers were less likely to cooperate and comply with the authority's requests and procedures (Gudjonsson, 2003). A psychologist has speculated that investigative interviews will be more successful when authority figures demonstrate interest in their subjects, and avoid aggressive challenges (Roberts, 2011). By acknowledging suspects as valued members of society through a display of respectful treatment, individuals' acceptance of authoritative decision making should increase (Henderson, Wells, Maguire & Gray, 2010). Behaviours by authority figures such as police interrogators demonstrating respectful treatment may include attention to the individual interviewee's cultural and religious needs, such as prayer times and dietary restrictions (Roberts, 2011). Voice is particularly important to procedural fairness as acknowledgement of individual viewpoints suggests that authority figures value those individuals as members of the community (Tyler & Lind, 1988). Police interviewers can promote voice by allowing suspects to give complete accounts of their experiences, and by avoiding interruptions, which may increase interviewee anxiety and impact the accuracy of accounts (Gudjonsson, 2003).

Prior social justice research demonstrated that fairness of police and court procedures was more important than performance outcomes (such as crime reduction) in promoting perceptions of police trustworthiness and legitimacy (Canada & Watson, 2013; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003a; Tyler, 1989, 1990, 2001, 2006). Some recent experimental studies revealed what the researchers referred to as an "authority-subordinate disparity" between values espoused by authority figures, such as judges, law enforcement officers and military personnel, and the recipients of their decisions, such as members of the public, or detainees, regarding procedural fairness. While the police emphasised the importance of fair outcomes, such as solving crimes, the citizens and suspects (decision recipients) gave more emphasis to respectful treatment (Heuer, Penrod, & Kattan, 2007). In the context of police interrogations, this disparity would lead police interrogators who value outcome-based concerns more highly than process-related concerns, to endorse coercive interrogation procedures as an acceptable means to achieve a fair investigative outcome (Sivasubramaniam & Heuer, 2011). To date, most procedural justice research has examined the views of community members rather than authorities, and this issue has not been examined outside of the laboratory. The current study is one of the first to test

this theory in the field from the perspective of a group of law enforcement authorities, i.e., police and military interviewing practitioners.

The Influence of Cultural Values on Interview Methods and Procedures

The issue of cultural differences in interview practice and procedures remains under-researched. A series of laboratory studies revealed that the use and effectiveness of different police interview techniques was influenced by the culture of both the interviewer and interviewee (Beune, Giebels, Adair, Fennis & Van Der Zee, 2011; Beune, Giebels & Sanders, 2009; Beune, Giebels & Taylor, 2010; Giebels & Taylor, 2009). Whether the same issues are important to police and military interviewers working in different jurisdictions and cultures remains largely unexplored. To date, few empirical studies have examined police interviewing practices in the Asia Pacific jurisdictions. The current study examined whether (1) police endorsements of procedural fairness varied among interviewers from different cultures in the Asia Pacific, and (2) police showed greater concern with interview outcomes than interview procedures. Based on the findings of Sivasubramanian and Heuer (2011) we hypothesized that interviewers would emphasise outcome-related over process-related concerns, i.e., they would be willing to sacrifice procedural justice in order to achieve desired outcomes, such as securing a confession from a suspect to solve a crime.

A useful paradigm for analysing cultural differences developed in the 1970s by organisational psychologist, Geert Hofstede, has been widely adopted in cross-cultural research (Minkov & Hofstede, 2011). The model proposes that cultures vary on five key dimensions, three of which are particularly salient to cross-cultural investigative interviews, namely individualism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance. These three cultural dimensions were investigated in the current study as they pertained to interviewing practices in Asian Pacific cultures and jurisdictions.

The level of individualism or collectivism in a society determines the degree to which its members act independently or are integrated within groups (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). For instance, Australia is a highly individualistic culture. Authorities in individualistic cultures expect people to act for themselves, their immediate family, and to show initiative. On the other hand, many other countries in the Asia-Pacific, including Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea and Sri Lanka are collectivist societies (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). People in these societies form strong relationships, where everyone takes responsibility for members of their group, and there is a greater focus on maintaining harmonious relationships between group members.

The dimension of power distance refers to the degree to which individuals within a culture accept and expect that power is distributed unequally among its members (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). Countries with high power-distance scores reflect a high level of acceptance that power is distributed unequally, whereas low scores indicate lower levels of acceptance of inequality. Australia scores low on power-distance, since within Australian organizations, hierarchy is established for convenience, information is shared frequently, and communication tends to be informal, direct and participative. In contrast, power-distance scores are high in Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, and Sri Lanka (Hofstede, 2011). In these cultures, hierarchy within organisations reflects inherent inequalities; leaders are more inaccessible and authoritative, while subordinates expect to be told what to do (Hofstede, 2011, p. 107). Although there are some exceptions to the general finding that high power distance orientations are correlated with collectivist

cultures, these were not applicable to the current study (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).

Uncertainty avoidance refers to the extent to which members of a social group feel comfortable or uncomfortable in ambiguous and uncertain circumstances (Hofstede, 1980, 2001), and is observed in the degree to which a society endeavours to control the uncontrollable. Australia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and the Philippines have mid- to low scores on this cultural dimension, indicating a more relaxed attitude, in which deviance from the norm is more readily accepted (Hofstede, 1980, 2001). In contrast, South Korea has one of the highest uncertainty avoidance scores in the world. In South Korea, people observe strict moral codes and social norms, and security is an important element of individual motivation.

Culture also influences communication styles, and is therefore an important consideration in selecting investigative interviewing methods. Anthropological research on cultural differences in communication styles distinguished communications as either low or high in context, based on the extent to which the communication was self-explanatory or highly embedded and contextually dependent (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2009; Hall, 1976). In Western, individualistic cultures, such as Australia, communication is generally more direct and content-oriented, whereas in non-Western, collectivist cultures such as Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea and Sri Lanka, communication is more indirect and context-oriented, emphasizing relational harmony (Beune et al., 2011; Copeland & Griggs, 1986; Kim, Pan & Park, 1997).

Consistent with theory that interpersonal relationships influence satisfaction with outcomes for participants from collectivist cultures (Hall, 1976), a study of simulated interviewer-suspect communication strategies (Beune et al., 2009) revealed that the use of rational persuasion yielded more admissions by suspects from low context (LC) than high context (HC) cultures. Conversely, treating suspects with kindness enhanced the quality of interviewer-suspect relationships in HC cultures more than it did in LC cultures. Analyses of videotaped police interviews (Beune et al., 2010) revealed that kindness to suspects from HC cultures elicited more suspicion and negative responses, while the use of rational arguments was most effective with suspects from LC cultures.

Other research demonstrated that voice was more central to PJ reasoning in cultures lower on the Hofstede variable of power distance (Van den Bos, Brockner, Van den Oudenalder, Kamble, & Nasabi, 2013). Conversely, police interviewers who employed active listening techniques (to operationalize voice) elicited more information from suspects in collectivist than individualistic cultures, which tend to be lower in power distance (Beune et al., 2011).

Together, the foregoing studies revealed cross-cultural differences in communication and interview strategies, and that the success of strategies varied depending on the cultural affiliation or membership of the interviewee or suspect. However, aside from Beune et al. (2010), most studies have addressed cross-cultural differences in police interviewing practices in role-playing simulations by university students in the laboratory (e.g., Beune et al., 2009; Rotman, 2011) and there is a paucity of research from the perspective of practitioners in the field. In the present study, we hypothesised that cultural differences would manifest as differences in the extent to which investigative interviewers endorsed procedural justice strategies in conducting interviews. Since voice is generally more central to PJ reasoning in low than high power-distance cultures, rapport-building techniques may be viewed as differentially effective when employed in interviews in high versus low power-distance cultures (Van den Bos et al., 2013). Furthermore, interviewers from cultures higher in uncertainty avoidance may be more willing to approve coercive interview techniques and compromise PJ in order to

achieve certainty of outcome. Accordingly, we hypothesised that interviewers from HC, high uncertainty avoidance, high power distance cultures would be more likely than those from LC, low uncertainty avoidance and low power distance cultures to value outcome concerns over process-based concerns, approve coercive interview techniques and place less emphasis on rapport-building and PJ. In particular, it was hypothesised that cultural differences would impact attitudes towards the importance of interviewee voice.

Method

Participants

Participants were 123 experienced interviewing practitioners working in one of five Asian Pacific countries: Australia, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Korea, and Sri Lanka. The majority of the participants were men (92%); ten were women (8%). Participants had experience conducting counter-terrorism interviews and investigative interviews with high value detainees in their capacity as a police or military officer (28%), as a criminal investigator or special agent (32%), during intelligence operations (20%) or across a range of capacities (20%).

This purposive convenience sample was recruited via their employers, including the Australian Defense Forces, Australian Federal Police Force, Australian Security and Intelligence Organization, Indonesia Republic National Police, Korean National Police Agency, Korean National Intelligence Service, New South Wales Police Force, Philippine National Police, Sri Lanka Police Service and State Intelligence Service, and the Victorian Police Force. One half of the sample was Australian (counter-terrorism police 28.5%; military officers 15.4%). One third of the sample was comprised of police officers from the Philippines (12.2%), Indonesia (8.1%), South Korea (8.1%), and Sri Lanka (8.1%). One fifth of the sample (19.5%) consisted of international agents from Australia, India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and the United Kingdom.

Most participants reported that interviewing was one of multiple primary duties (73%), or their primary duty (12%). On average, they had been conducting interviews for more than ten years (71%). Two-thirds of the sample was very experienced, having conducted in excess of 100 investigative interviews; one third were either moderately experienced (20-100 interviews), or were comparative novices (7% had conducted fewer than 20 investigative interviews).

Materials

A set of semi-structured, open-ended questions addressed rapport-building; interview techniques that produced reliable information; and definitions of successful interviews.⁴⁴ Notably, none of the questions directly probed uses of PJ components.

⁴⁴ Data reported in this study were drawn from responses to 56 questions developed by Russano, Narchet, Meissner, & Kleinman (2013) to address interviewer training, experience, and practices in an interrogation with a high value target. Interview questions that yielded data reported in this study were:

- a. Take a moment to think about the role that developing rapport plays in an interview.
 - How would you describe rapport within the context of an interview?
 - Do you believe that developing rapport is important during an interview? If yes, why, and to what extent? If no, why not?
 - How do you develop rapport with an interviewee?

Procedures

Interviews were conducted in person by one of seven trained interviewers, based on the location of and language spoken by the participants; 2% were conducted by telephone. The full interviews lasted over one hour ($M = 68$ mins; range = 27-131 mins), in the course of which the foregoing questions were included. Interviews were audio-recorded and professionally transcribed.

Data Coding and Analysis

In responding to the target questions, many participants spontaneously mentioned the importance of one or more of the four procedural justice components (Respectful treatment, Trustworthiness, Voice and Neutrality) as key considerations in rapport building, eliciting reliable information and achieving the interview objectives. Interview transcripts were coded by trained researchers for any mention of the four PJ components regarding (a) rapport-building; (b) procedures for eliciting reliable information; and (c) interview outcomes (whether an interview was successful or unsuccessful). Where participants mentioned the PJ components, the content was scrutinized to determine (i) whether that component was (i) important to apply and observe in the interview, or conversely, (ii) whether the participant affirmatively avoided its implementation. A third code was used when the component was not mentioned. Across the 12 categories of responses, only 3% of the 123 interviewees (range 0% - 6.5%, $n = 0-8$) reported that purposive avoidance of the PJ component. This category of responses was too small to analyse separately, thus for this study, those responses were combined with the “absent” category. The four components (Respect, Trust, Voice, and Neutrality) were analysed as important and present (score = 1) or absent/purposively avoided (score = 0). A randomly selected sample of 20% of participant responses was dual coded by a second rater, blind to the classifications of the first coder. Comparisons yielded a high degree of consistency in classifications (Krippendorff’s $\alpha = 0.96$; Cohen’s $\kappa = 0.96$).

Analyses allowed a comparison of the extent to which participants from different cultures and jurisdictions emphasized PJ component in describing their interview procedures and outcomes. Mean scores for the importance of each PJ component within each interview stage were compared by summing the scores for each component. Dimensions of individualism-collectivism, power-distance and uncertainty avoidance were coded as suggested by Hofstede (1980, 2001). For cross-cultural analyses of cultural communication style, individualism-collectivism, power distance and uncertainty avoidance (UA), participants were grouped as: (1) High Context (non-Western, high

-
- Are there facets of your personality or physical presence that you use and consider useful when establishing rapport? If yes, please explain.
 - Are there facets of your personality or physical presence that you feel you have to overcome in order to establish rapport? If yes, please explain.
 - How do you know when rapport has been achieved (or not) with a detainee/suspect/source (i.e., what evidence or indicators do you look for)?
 - What strategies for developing rapport do you find to be most effective?
 - What strategies for developing rapport have you found to be least effective?
 - b. In your experience, what interview techniques or approaches do you believe are most effective in eliciting reliable information from an interviewee? In your experience, what interview techniques or approaches do you believe are least effective in eliciting reliable information from an interviewee?
 - c. Let’s talk for a moment about effective practices in interview. How would you define a successful interview? How would you define an unsuccessful interview?

power-distance, collectivist countries, $n = 51$) vs. Low Context (Western, low power-distance, individualistic countries, $n = 72$); and (2) Low UA ($n = 16$, scores 64-93) vs. Moderate UA ($n = 81$, scores 51-53) vs. High UA ($n = 26$, scores 8-48). International agents were allocated to one of the cultural groups based on their self-reported nationality/country of origin.

Results

The Importance of Procedural Justice in Investigative Interviews

Regarding the first hypothesis, that interviewers would tend to value outcomes over processes and place little emphasis on PJ, a comparison of mean PJ scores revealed that PJ was most likely to be mentioned as an important feature in the rapport-building stage of an interview ($M = 2.4$, $SD = 1.0$, $n = 121$), in comparison with techniques used in the course of an interview to elicit reliable information ($M = 1.6$, $SD = 1.1$, $n = 116$), or with regard to interview outcomes ($M = 1.9$, $SD = 1.3$, $n = 122$). In the overall study sample, across all jurisdictions, the PJ component mentioned most frequently as an important consideration at all stages of the interview was Respectful Treatment, followed by Trust, Voice and Neutrality (Table 1).

Table 1. The Importance of Procedural Justice Components in Investigative Interview Procedures and Outcomes (percent)

Interview Stage	Procedural Justice Component			
	Respect	Trust	Voice	Neutrality
Rapport-building	85.1	80.3	45.1	31.1
Eliciting reliable information	56.9	44.8	31.0	26.7
Interview objectives	68.9	53.3	39.3	36.9

Examples of the interview responses reflecting the consideration by practitioners of procedural justice components from which these quantitative outcomes were derived are provided below, respectively regarding rapport-building, information reliability, and interview outcomes.

The Importance of Procedural Justice in Establishing Rapport

The strong support shown by participants for Respectful Treatment of interviewees as an aspect of rapport-building was apparent in practitioner comments on this topic, as shown in the following excerpts:

My approach is very much ‘I *respect* you being here. This is not about personal likes and dislikes. This is my job. My job is to talk to you about what you have done. I am hoping that, you know, we can have a conversation about this.’ (International Agent 72)

Several practitioners reported the need to adapt interview procedures to demonstrate Respect for cultural and religious practices of detainees in order to establish a more comfortable and cooperative setting for an interview:

You have to respect some customs that they practice, otherwise they will become antagonistic to you, and they will not cooperate with you after all. For the Muslims, we have to respect prayer time, the right food that you should offer them while in custody. (Filipino Practitioner 15)

We have to make sure that they've prayed, that they're fed, that they've eaten the right food, and if they have a prayer time coming up. We've got to deal with all those issues. (Australian Practitioner 70)

Practitioners suggested that the perception of an open and Trusting relationship with an interviewee was important, especially during the rapport-building stage of the interview. Some practitioners held the view that concern about the interviewee had to be sincere, while others did not, as demonstrated in the following interview excerpts:

If you are genuinely interested in what they want to say, which you should be if you're there in the first place, well then you should show that rapport-building and that respect to them. Everyone wants to feel wanted. (Australian Practitioner 3)

If I'm treating them openly, and just pretending I'm caring, at that point hopefully I'll get that reflected in their attitude, and they might feel safe enough to open up a little bit more. (International Practitioner 29)

Although participants were less likely to spontaneously endorse the importance of Voice and Neutrality than Respectful Treatment and Trustworthiness, many interviewers offered interviewees the opportunity for Voice. For example, practitioners recommended active listening techniques, and allowed interviewees sufficient time to provide their version of events uninterrupted and unchallenged.

One of my big ones is appearing friendly and trying to smile, and I guess maintaining eye contact, and showing an interest in what the other person says, and actively listening and then questioning the individual on things that they've said, just to continue that flow of conversation, and to get the other individual talking and feeling comfortable. Me doing less talking, and them doing more talking. (Australian Practitioner 2)

To establish rapport, a Neutral stance implied that "You have to be willing to pursue an avenue that someone's interested in talking about" and the importance of avoiding a biased, judgmental attitude: "I'm never going to get anywhere if I'm going to call him a criminal" (Australian Practitioner 1).

The Importance of Procedural Justice in Eliciting Reliable Information

The majority of practitioners endorsed noncoercive methods to elicit more reliable information in interviews. "Torture's not one of them" (International Practitioner

73). Observations that there was a relationship between procedurally fair methods and more reliable information included the following:

If we can elicit information from the suspect without force, then the information given was based on facts, based on the truth. (Indonesian Practitioner 7)

To secure reliable information, some practitioners aligned the absence of coercion and fair procedures, with Respectful Treatment. For example, an Australian Practitioner recommended no use of force or aggression, treatment with Respect, no “good cop bad cop” techniques, and no direct contradictions of statement by the detainee. Another practitioner defined Respectful Treatment more simply: “Make it so they understand what you are talking about.” (Australian Practitioner 15)

The establishment of a relationship of Trust was cited as an important component to obtain reliable information from an interviewee: “A certain amount of trust has to be built up between you and the interviewee” (International Practitioner 13). Trustworthiness was conveyed in multiple ways, for example:

You’ve got to obviously make yourself be open to the information, not only through the questioning techniques but the way that you may sit, or the way that you may interact with them. (International Agent 47)

The significance of interviewer Neutrality in securing reliable information was expressed as keeping in mind the detainee’s right to “presumption of innocence” (Indonesian Practitioner 8), which might require the practitioner “to be willing to pursue an avenue that someone’s interested in talking about” (Australian Practitioner 1).

Denial of the detainee’s Voice was identified as one of the least effective methods to elicit reliable information, as was noted by one participant:

Probably not letting them talk about a certain topic....let them fill in rather than you think you know everything and just get them to confirm what you think you already know. (Australian Practitioner 65)

Some practitioners advised that the interviewer should not cross-examine detainees or challenge their recollection of facts (Australian Practitioner 14).

The Importance of Procedural Justice in Achieving Interview Goals

In responding the questions about properties of a successful interview, practitioners kept broad goals and the wider context in mind, e.g., “A successful interview would mean that lives are saved and the government did not lose its credibility” (Filipino Practitioner 1). Many practitioners reflected on the procedural strategies employed in the interview. Across all jurisdictions, the use of force was generally opposed. For example, one practitioner defined a successful interview as one in which “you are able to extract information without force or intimidation” (Filipino Practitioner 4); another said “Violence is counterproductive” (Indonesian Practitioner 7). In line with this, tactics that confronted the detainee were associated with unsuccessful outcomes: “‘In your face’ interviews don’t work” (Australian Practitioner 38), and;

It's always good where the interviewee is a participant, rather than forced to provide information, or believing they are being forced to provide information. Waterboarding is inappropriate. (Australian Practitioner 37)

The absence of a show of force was also associated with Respectful Treatment in securing a successful interview outcome, as shown in these comments: "Respect, no pressure, force, or coercion," (Indonesian Practitioner 3) and "Provide food, no violence, heart-to-heart, look for truth" (Indonesian Practitioners 9).

In defining a successful interview, some practitioners emphasised both Respectful and Trustworthy procedures as the keys to success: "Explain interview procedure, focus on achieving aims, and listen with genuine interest" (Australian Practitioner 3); and

Firstly the setting must be very comfortable. You must always treat the detainee with utmost friendship and respect, with food, with tea, coffee, juice -- whatever he needs to make him feel comfortable. I feel that if you don't do that, then you don't build a good connection with the detainee. That relationship is at the heart of a good interview. (Sri Lankan Practitioner 10)

The integrity of police methods and approaches was a critical feature of Trustworthiness, which some practitioners cited as a pre-requisite of interview success that the interviewer should not step outside legal and moral boundaries as the objective was to find information, not to secure confessions (Australian Practitioner 12). In other cultures, honesty to the interviewee was paramount:

You don't lie, can never lie. (Sri Lankan Practitioner 9)

Several practitioners highlighted the importance of Neutrality in their approach as well as fair and even-handed treatment of the interviewee to achieve a successful outcome. For example, practitioners advised against investigative bias:

The worst thing you can do is go in wanting to believe something. (International Agent 29)

If you prejudge a situation it increases the chance of getting error in the information you gather, so it must be done naturally ...When a trust relationship called rapport in psychology, is formed, as naturally as possible, lightly inquire, trying to make them talk about the information you are looking for. (S. Korean Practitioner 2)

Conversely, an unsuccessful interview was defined as unfair or biased interview:

An unsuccessful interview is one where through your manner or your processes you've put someone off-sides (Australian Practitioner 57)

Where my emotions have run away with me and I haven't been *fair* (Australian Practitioner 72).

Neutrality was also prominent in the following definitions of successful interviews. One agent described a successful interview outcome as "establishing the truth without a

particular hypothesis” (Australian Practitioner 1). Australian Military Practitioners emphasised the importance of the treatment of the detainee in an unbiased manner, by preventing other agency staff from looking in on the interview, being culturally sensitive, and using neutral methods such as presenting facts and asking for an explanation or seeking additional information without an authoritarian manner, without any accusations of lying, threats or use of harsh techniques.

The emphasis on Voice in achieving interview goals was evident in the following responses:

You listen, so you know that there’s a relationship built, and it’s a human bond. So, even with the terrorists, or whoever, it’s that human bond (Sri Lankan Practitioner 7).

But I would feel that an interview is successful if the interviewee will express his, whatever views, or what he is thinking, spontaneously, without any duress. So, talking freely. (Filipino Practitioner 5)

Cultural Variation in the Importance of Procedural Justice by Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance

To test the hypotheses that cultural differences would impact upon use and endorsement of PJ and rapport-building, correlational analyses were carried out using Hofstede’s scores for individualism, Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance for each of the five countries included in the study. Overall, consistent with hypotheses, the results revealed that power distance scores were significantly negatively correlated with ratings of PJ importance in relation to rapport-building ($\rho = -.28, p = .002$), interview techniques for eliciting reliable information ($\rho = -.23, p = .014$), and interview outcomes ($\rho = -.36, p < .000$). A similar pattern emerged for uncertainty avoidance scores on rapport-building ($\rho = -.20, p = .030$), interview techniques for eliciting reliable information ($\rho = -.24, p = .010$), and interview outcomes ($\rho = -.32, p < .000$). In contrast, Hofstede individualism scores showed a significant positive relationship with the importance of PJ in rapport-building ($\rho = .25, p = .024$), eliciting reliable information ($\rho = .21, p = .010$), and interview outcomes ($\rho = .40, p < .000$). Interviewers from highly individualistic countries were more likely to mention PJ when discussing interview procedures and outcomes. Conversely, participants from countries with high power-distance (indicating a high level of acceptance that power is distributed unequally) and participants from countries with greater uncertainty avoidance were less likely to discuss PJ in regard to interview procedures and outcomes.

Variation in the Importance of Procedural Justice in High vs. Low Context and Uncertainty Avoidant Cultures

To further explore how cultural dimensions impacted approaches to investigative interviews, a series of chi-square analyses were conducted to investigate whether participants classified as working in High versus Low Context countries, or countries with Low, Moderate or High Uncertainty Avoidance held different perspectives regarding the importance of PJ components in investigative interviews. Table 2 presents the results of these analyses.

Table 2. The Importance of Procedural Justice Components in Investigative Interview Procedures and Outcomes, by Cultural Dimensions (percent)

Interview Stage	Cultural Context		Uncertainty Avoidance		
	Low Context	High Context	Low	Moderate	High
Rapport-building					
Respect	85.9	84.0	87.5	85.0	84.0
Trust	84.5	74.5	75.0	86.2	65.4
Voice	54.9	31.4 *	25.0	51.2	38.5
Neutrality	43.7	13.7 ***	43.8	37.5	3.8 **
Eliciting reliable information					
Respect	61.4	50.0	62.5	61.0	39.1
Trust	45.7	43.5	43.8	45.5	43.5
Voice	41.4	15.2 **	25.0	39.0	8.7 *
Neutrality	32.9	17.4	37.5	31.2	4.3 *
Achieving interview objectives					
Respect	77.8	56.0 *	68.8	76.2	46.2 *
Trust	59.7	44.0	62.5	57.5	34.6
Voice	54.2	18.0 ***	25.0	52.5	7.7 ***
Neutrality	52.8	14.0 ***	25.0	50.0	3.8 ***

Note: Significance of chi-square test: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Overall, there were very few differences between groups regarding the importance of Trust and Respect in investigative interviews. That is, contrary to our hypothesis, participants from both High and Low Context countries rated Trust and Respect as very important to build rapport with suspects, and moderately important in eliciting reliable information from interviewees. Perspectives in the two groups were similar regarding the importance of Trust for interview outcomes, however, in partial support of our hypotheses, some differences emerged regarding Respect in that more participants working in Low Context countries (78%) rated Respect as an important consideration in achieving their interview objectives, compared to participants from High Context countries (56%, $\chi^2=6.53$, $df=1$, $p = .011$, $\Phi = -.23$). Additionally, more participants from countries with Low (69%) and Moderate (76%) Uncertainty Avoidance

rated Respect as important in achieving interview outcomes, compared to participants from countries High in Uncertainty Avoidance (46%, $\chi^2=8.29$, $df=2$, $p = .016$, $\Phi = .26$).

As hypothesised, a number of differences between groups emerged in the ratings of the importance of Voice in investigative interview procedures and outcomes. Participants from Low versus High Context countries were more likely to specify that Voice was important in building rapport (55% vs. 31%, $\chi^2=6.65$, $df=1$, $p = .010$, $\Phi = -.23$), in eliciting reliable information (41% vs. 15%, $\chi^2=8.9$, $df=1$, $p = .003$, $\Phi = -.28$), and in achieving interview objectives (54% vs. 18%, $\chi^2=16.17$, $df=1$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = -.36$). Cultural differences also emerged regarding the importance of Neutrality. Participants from Low versus High Context countries were more likely to regard Neutrality as important for building rapport (44% vs. 14%, $\chi^2=12.40$, $df=1$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = -.32$) and achieving their interview outcomes (53% vs. 14%, $\chi^2=19.06$, $df=1$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = -.40$).

Similarly, a number of differences emerged for Voice and Neutrality, based on the Hofstede uncertainty avoidance (UA) groups. Participants from countries with Low (44%) or Moderate (38%) UA were more likely to rate Neutrality as important for rapport-building, compared to participants from High UA countries (4%, $\chi^2=11.73$, $df=2$, $p = .003$, $\Phi = .31$). A similar pattern of results emerged for interview techniques and interview outcomes. That is, participants from countries with Low or Moderate UA were more likely to discuss Voice and Neutrality as important for interview techniques (voice: $\chi^2=7.90$, $df=2$, $p = .019$, $\Phi = .26$; neutrality: $\chi^2=7.61$, $df=2$, $p = .022$, $\Phi = .26$) and for interview outcomes (voice: $\chi^2=18.10$, $df=2$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .39$, neutrality: $\chi^2=19.07$, $df=2$, $p < .001$, $\Phi = .40$), compared to countries with High UA.

Discussion

Overall, the foregoing findings demonstrated that practitioners valued PJ in investigative interviews processes and outcomes. Rather than coercive or accusatorial approaches, participants reported use and reliance upon respect and politeness to secure the cooperation of interviewees and to develop rapport to achieve their interview objectives. Contrary to our hypothesis that these law enforcement officers would replicate the authority-subordinate disparity by placing greater emphasis upon interview outcomes than interview procedures, most practitioners from all jurisdictions and cultures expressed opposition to using coercive, accusatorial interview techniques. Procedural justice techniques were seen to foster the goal of eliciting reliable information and achieving interview goals.

As hypothesised, some cross-cultural differences emerged in the emphasis accorded by interviewers in different jurisdictions to certain PJ components. Overall, all Asian Pacific participants acknowledged the importance of PJ in both the interview process and the interview outcomes. Trust and Respectful Treatment were rated as particularly important aspects of interview procedures and outcomes, and varied the least by culture. Differences between cultures emerged more prominently in relation to the importance accorded to interviewee Voice and interviewer Neutrality. As hypothesised, participants from Low Context cultures, and countries with Low/Moderate uncertainty avoidance were more likely to rate PJ principles, particularly Voice and Neutrality, as important in interview procedures and interview outcomes, compared to their counterparts in High Context cultures and high uncertainty avoidant countries. Although correlational analyses showed greater endorsement of PJ principles by practitioners in low- than high power-distance cultures, contrary to our hypothesis, no significant differences in use and endorsement of PJ components emerged as a function of differences in power distance orientation.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the study was potential sample bias, as a result of purposive and convenience sampling. While these sampling methods were necessary in order to access interviewees in different jurisdictions, they did not generate a representative sample of practitioners in the field. Further research is needed to examine the generalizability of these findings. Results of a subsequent online survey of a larger sample of 324 interviewing practitioners in the same Asian Pacific jurisdictions confirmed that these practitioners favoured less coercive approaches and implemented procedural justice components in their interviews (Goodman-Delahunty, Sivasubramaniam, & Gumbert-Jourjon, 2014). A second limitation of both interviews and online surveys is reliance on self-reports, which may be susceptible to social demand characteristics and not accurately reflect the participants' actual practices. The fact that in these interviews, participants were not questioned directly about the use of procedural justice components may have minimized the socially desirable demand characteristics of those methods, but may also have led to under-reporting because the questions on that topic were not direct. Controlled experimental field investigations with practitioners are needed to ensure that findings derived from self-report measures are not susceptible to under or over-reporting. A follow-up controlled experimental study of Asian-Pacific investigative interviewing practitioners that addressed this concern yielded parallel outcomes, confirming that results reported in this study were robust (Goodman-Delahunty & Sivasubramaniam, 2013; Sivasubramaniam & Goodman-Delahunty, 2014).

A noted limitation of the cross-cultural comparisons is their reliance on correlational evidence which limits the empirical strength of the findings (Van Den Bos et al., 2013). Future research should be informed by analyses of behavioural evidence of interview approaches gathered from observations or recorded interviews, although research access is difficult. Cross-national comparisons supplemented by individual measures of cultural values may yield more nuanced assessments of the influence of cultural variables in multicultural communities and settings. The manipulation of independent or intervening variables and the addition of control conditions is recommended.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The foregoing findings indicated practitioner consensus that implementing components of procedural fairness was integral to secure cooperation from interviewees, to elicit reliable information in the course of an interview, and to achievement of interview goals. Across all Asian-Pacific jurisdictions, rapport-based interpersonal relationships between interviewer and interviewee were perceived to facilitate suspect cooperation and enhance the accuracy of information obtained. Future research should examine the extent to which this emphasis may differ between practitioners who conduct suspect interviews for criminal investigations and practitioners who interview sources for intelligence purposes.

While interviewees frequently endorsed the PJ values of trustworthiness and respectful treatment in interviews, they were less likely to refer to the values of neutrality and voice. It will be beneficial for interviewer training programs to place greater emphasis on these values, particularly in high context cultures, high uncertainty avoidance and high power-distance cultures where they were less frequently endorsed. Interviewer training in neutrality should emphasise that interviewees respect and act in

accordance with legal components, ensuring that rules are enforced fairly and consistently, and that interviewees are not singled out, targeted, or treated differently on the basis of race, religion, gender, or other personal background factors. To promote voice, interviewers should be trained to refrain from interrupting, talking over or ignoring interviewees, and to avoid unjustified accusations of deceit. Rather, interviewers should be trained to ask interviewees to explain their version of events in their own time and their own words, promoting PJ and enhanced perceptions of police legitimacy.

Conclusion

Adherence to the four elements of PJ was rated as important by experienced police and military interviewers across five discrete Asia Pacific jurisdictions. Consensus emerged on the importance of noncoercive strategies and tenets of procedural fairness to establish rapport, secure reliable information and achieve interview objectives. The majority of practitioners endorsed strategies respectful of suspect rights and police trustworthiness; less priority was accorded to the voice of the suspect and police neutrality. Differences in emphasis between jurisdictions emerged in relation to cultural variations in individualism, power-distance and uncertainty avoidance. The study findings reflected positive trends in police professionalism, and emphasis on use of noncoercive, procedurally-just interview procedures that have been shown to increase public perceptions of police legitimacy by promoting confidence in interrogation and interview procedures (Mazerolle et al., 2013).

References

- Beune, K., Giebels, E., Adair, W. L., Fennis, B. M., & Van Der Zee, K. I. (2011). Strategic sequences in police interviews and the importance of order and cultural fit. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38, 934-954. doi: 10.1177/0093854811412170
- Beune, K., Giebels, E., & Sanders, K. (2009). Are you talking to me? Influencing behavior and culture in police interviews. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15, 597-617. doi: 10.1080/10683160802442835
- Beune, K., Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2010). Patterns of interaction in police interviews. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37, 904-925. doi: 10.1177/0093854810369623
- Borum, R., Gelles, M. G., & Kleinman, S. M. (2009). Interview and interrogation: A perspective and update from the USA. In R. Milne, S. Savage, & T. Williamson (Eds.), *International developments in investigative interviewing* (pp. 111-125). Cullompton, UK: Willan.
- Bradford, B., Jackson, J., & Hough, M. (2014). Police futures and legitimacy: Redefining 'good policing'. In J.M. Brown (Ed.). *The future of policing* (pp.79-101). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Brown, J.M. (2014). *The future of policing*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Canada, K.E., & Watson, A.C. (2013). "Cause everybody likes to be treated good": Perceptions of procedural justice among mental health court participants. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(2), 209-230.
- Carlsmith, K.M., & Sood, A, M, (2009). The fine line between interrogation and retribution. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 191-196.

- Copeland, L., & Griggs L. (1986). Getting the best from foreign employees. *Management Review*, 75(6), 19–26.
- Dixon, D. (2010). Questioning suspects: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26, 426-440.
- Giebels, E., & Taylor, P. J. (2009). Interaction patterns in crisis negotiations: Persuasive arguments and cultural differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 5-19.
- Goldsmith, A.J. (2005). Police reform and the problem of trust. *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(4), 443-470.
- Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2010). Four ingredients: New recipes for procedural justice in Australian policing. *Policing: A Journal of Policing and Practice*, 4, 403-410.
- Goodman-Delahunty, J., & Sivasubramaniam, D. (2013). *Investigative and intelligence interview practices: an Australasian experimental study*. Report to US Federal Bureau of Investigation High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group. School of Psychology and Australian Graduate School of Policing and Security, Charles Sturt University, Manly, Australia.
- Goodman-Delahunty, J., Sivasubramaniam, D., & Gumbert-Jourjon, T. (2014). *Information gathering in law-enforcement: Interview practice by HUMINT and criminal investigators*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City: Anchor Press.
- Henderson, H., Wells, W., Maguire, E. R., & Gray, J. (2010). Evaluating the measurement of procedural justice in a correctional setting. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 37(4), 384-399. doi: 10.1177/0093854809360193
- Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary of England, Wales and Northern Ireland (HMIC; 2011), *Without fear or favour: A review of police relationships*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Heuer, L., Penrod, S., & Kattan, A. (2007). The role of societal benefits and fairness concerns among decision makers and decision recipients. *Law and Human Behavior*, 31, 573-610. doi: 10.1007/s10979-006-9084-2.
- Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 27-42.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organisations across nations*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M. (2010), *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions and organisations across nations* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Kim, D., Pan, Y., & Park, H. S. (1998). High- versus low-context culture: A comparison of Chinese, Korean and American cultures. *Psychology and Marketing*, 15, 507–521.
- Leo, R. A., Costanzo, M., & Shaked-Schroer, N. (2009). Psychological and cultural aspects of interrogations and false confessions: using research to inform legal decision-making. In D. A. Krauss & J. D. Lieberman (Eds.), *Psychological expertise in court: Psychology in the courtroom* (pp. 25-55). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E. & Manning, M. (2013). Procedural justice and police legitimacy: a systematic review of the research evidence. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 9, 245-274.
- Meissner, C.A., Redlich, A.D., Bhatt, S., & Brandon, S. (2012). Interview and interrogation methods and their effects on true and false confessions. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 13, 4-52, doi: 10.4073/csr.2012.13
- Minkov, M., & Hofstede, G. (2011). The evolution of Hofstede's doctrine. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 18(1), 10-20, doi: 10.1108/13527601111104269
- Murphy, K., Hinds, L. & Fleming, K. (2008). Encouraging public cooperation and support for police. *Policing and Society*, 18(2), 136-155.

- Naumann, S.E., & Bennett, N. (2000). A case for procedural justice climate: Development and test of a multilevel model. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 881-889.
- Nolan, M. (2009). Counter-terrorism interviewing and investigative interoperability: *R v ul-Haque* [2007] NSWSC 1251. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 16(2), 175-190.
- Roberts, K. A. (2011). Police interviews with terrorist suspects: Risks, ethical interviewing and procedural justice. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, 13, 124-134. doi: 10.1108/14636641111134369.
- Rotman, L. H. (2012). *How culture influences the telling and detection of lies: Differences between low- and high-context individuals*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands.
- Russano, M. B., Narchet, F. M., Meissner, C. M., & Kleinman, S. (2013). *Structured interviews of experienced intelligence and military interrogators*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., & McDaniel, E.R. (2009). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Sivasubramaniam, D., & Heuer, L. (2011). Procedural fairness evaluations in interrogations. In B. Cutler (Ed.), *Conviction of the innocent: Lessons from psychological research* (pp. 79-102). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.
- Sivasubramaniam, D., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2014, March). *An experimental survey of investigative and intelligence interview practices in Australasia*. Presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Psychology-Law Society, New Orleans.
- Schafer, J.A., (2013). The role of trust and transparency in the pursuit of procedural and organisational justice. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism*, 8(2), 131-143.
- Skogan, W.G. (2006). Asymmetry in the impact of encounters with police. *Policing & Society*, 16(2), 99-126.
- Snook, B., Luther, K., Quinlan, H., & (Milne, R. (2012). Let 'em talk! : A field study of police questioning practices of suspects and accused persons. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39, 1328-1339.
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T.R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy on shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513-548. Doi: 10.1111/1540-5893.3703002
- Snyder, S. (1999). Patterns of negotiation in a South Korean cultural context. *Asian Survey*, 39, 394-417.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 830-838. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.830.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T. R. (1997). The psychology of legitimacy: A relational perspective on voluntary deference to authorities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 1, 323-345.
- Tyler, T.R. (2001). Public trust and confidence in legal authorities: What do majority and minority group members want from the law and legal authorities? *Behavioural Science and Law*, 19, 215-235.
- Tyler, T.R. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375-400.
- Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6, 231-275.
- Van den Bos, K., Brockner, J., Van den Oudenalder, M., Kamble, S. V., & Nasabi, A. (2013). Delineating a method to study cross-cultural differences with experimental control: The voice effect and countercultural contexts regarding power distance. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 624-634.
- 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.