UNIVERSIDAD DE CHILE

FACULTAD DE FILOSOFÍA Y HUMANIDADES

DEPARTAMENTO DE LINGÜÍSTICA

"I only want the truth from you": A pragmatic discourse analysis of Jeffrey Dahmer's honest confession to the FBI

Proyecto de Seminario de Grado para optar al grado de Licenciado/a en Lingüística y Literatura Inglesas

Profesor Guía: Pascuala Infante Arriagada

Daniela Bravo Flores

Camila Flores González

Dominique Galaz Fernández

Anttonia Monsalve Martínez

Constanza Saavedra Díaz

Josefa Téllez Feliú

Nicolás Zúñiga Zurita

DICIEMBRE, 2023

SANTIAGO, CHILE

Acknowledgements

Muchas gracias a todas las personas que me motivaron a seguir, sobre todo en los momentos en los que no me sentía capaz de hacerlo. A mi familia -a mi mamá, papá, abuelxs, y a mis tías- quienes mostraron interés en mis estudios y en este proyecto final, y por quienes, al final del día, decidí terminar este proceso para que estén orgullosos de mí, y hacerme sentir orgullosa también de mí misma por haber terminado.

A mis amigues, con quienes más de una vez nos acompañamos en llamada hasta quedarnos dormidxs, en nuestros más estresantes momentos. A mis compañerxs peludxs -Miyuki, Flan, y Mochi-, que con sus ojitos brillosos y cariño incondicional lograron despejar mi mente, devolviéndome a la realidad. A mi Rayito, por todas esas noches en las que estuve -y estuvimos- escribiendo sin parar o en reunión, en uno de los semestres más extraños y estresantes que hemos tenido. Muchas gracias por siempre recordarme que creías en mí. También, por supuesto, a la profesora Pascuala por su guía y paciencia, muchas muchas gracias jeje. Y a mis queridxs compañerxs en este proyecto sin los cuales nada habría sido posible. Nadie lo entendería mejor que ustedes. Lo logramos, yeii. Muchas gracias por ser lxs mejores compañerxs de tesis.

Camila Flores González

En primer lugar, quiero agradecerle a mi abuelo, que me dio todo el cariño y apoyo que necesité durante 21 años de mi vida. Lo extraño cada día, y no hay momento en el que no piense en usted, y en hacerlo sentir orgulloso. A mi mamá, que solo con una sonrisa y un beso me devuelve las ganas de vivir. Le agradezco por nunca dejar que me rinda, por siempre tener la palabra correcta, por reírse y apoyar todas las locuras que se me ocurren, sin juzgarme jamás, y apoyarme en este arduo camino universitario. Por ser mi lugar seguro, mi persona favorita, mi mayor apoyo. No sé qué sería de mi vida sin ti en ella. A mi papá, que ha apoyado cada decisión que he tomado, por su amor genuino, por su esfuerzo y constancia en darnos lo que necesitamos. Por cada mensaje de apoyo y felicitaciones, y por siempre mostrarse completamente orgulloso de cada logro de sus hijxs. A mis hermanxs, por la paciencia y comprensión que han tenido conmigo. Por soportar mis constantes cambios de humor, por cuidarme, por entregarme una felicidad enorme, y sobre todo, por amarme tan fuerte como solo ustedes saben hacerlo, y por dejarme amarlos a mi manera.

A mis amigas –las que han llegado, las que se han ido, y las que siguen–, por ser una curita para el corazón, por sus consejos y sus bromas, por prestarme su hombro cada vez que necesitaba llorar, por hacerme olvidar todo lo malo, por hacer que el tiempo que estamos juntas se sientan como 5 minutos, y por seguir a mi lado. A mis michis, que me enseñaron a amar sin esperar nada a cambio, por alegrar mis días con solo verlxs, y por entregarme calma cuando sentía que todo el mundo se venía en mi contra. La vida no sería la misma sin sus maullidos, sus pelos y sus caritas preciosas que me hacen ser completamente feliz. A mis compañerxs de tesis, por el sudor y las lágrimas puesto en esto. Cuando creíamos que no se podía, se pudo. Sin ustedes esto hubiera sido mucho más difícil. Gracias por hacer las sesiones más llevaderas con sus estupideces y risas. Me llevo los mejores recuerdos, y siempre tendrán un pedazo de mi corazón.

Finalmente, a esa Domi de 15 años que no se rindió, que se permitió soñar, y creer en ella misma. Te abrazo con mucha fuerza, y te aseguro que todo mejorará. Lograrás cumplir cada meta que te propongas –por muy locas que parezcan–. Lo estás haciendo muy bien, no te rindas nunca. Te guardo siempre en mi corazón, y prometo hacerte sentir orgullosa siempre.

Dominique Galaz Fernández

Quiero comenzar agradeciendo a mi familia, a mi mamá, papá y hermana menor que siempre han sido las personas que me han apoyado en mis mejores y peores momentos. Yopipa, Zorro y Cotorro, nada de esto hubiera sido posible sin ustedes. También agradezco al resto de mi familia tanto en Osorno como en Santiago, quienes ya sea prendiendo una vela o tan solo teniéndome en sus pensamientos me hacen sentir el apoyo necesario para vivir en una ciudad tan penca como Santiago.

A mis compañeros del Seminario, sin ustedes *obviamente* esta tesis monstruosa nunca hubiera visto la luz. Gracias por cada momento compartido entre risas y tallas a las 8.30 de la mañana por casi 9 meses, aun cuando todos somos tan diferentes es agradable poder ver como nos volvimos un grupo más unido que cualquier otro seminario previo.

A la profe Pascuala, por ser la mejor profe guía que nos pudiera haber tocado. por la paciencia infinita y los retos en los momentos en los que más necesitábamos ese empujón para dar lo mejor de nosotros.

A mis amigos más cercanos y queridos, Antar, Domi y Kathy, mi vida sería mucho más monótona y gris sin ustedes en ella. Antar, aun cuando la distancia entre nosotros es inmensa en estos momentos de nuestras vidas, no se puede negar que nuestra amistad sigue intacta. Domi y Kathy, aun cuando entraron en mi vida hace poco más de dos años, nunca había tenido el placer de tener el tipo de amistad que ustedes me han brindado. A ustedes tres, realmente espero tener el privilegio de llamarme su amiga por muchos años más.

A todo artista que me hace la persona que soy hoy en día. A BTS, quienes aparecieron de imprevisto en mi vida, aun cuando yo me resistí a dejarlos entrar. A Taylor Swift, a quien después de 7 años al fin pude ver en concierto, que me ha acompañado desde mi adolescencia y ha marcado el soundtrack de mi vida. A Ismael Serrano, quien posee la voz más triste que he escuchado, pero que ha marcado mis momentos más felices con mi mamá. A Vincent Van Gogh, quien aun teniendo siglos de distancia entre nosotros, a través de sus obras me ha motivado para seguir adelante y cobijado para no rendirme.

A todos ellos y los que vendrán, gracias totales.

Anttonia Monsalve Martínez

No se cómo partir esto pero creo que lo más apropiado es agradecer a la persona más importante de mi vida. Gracias, gracias, gracias, Mamá. Gracias por estar siempre ahí. Gracias por siempre creer en mí, aún cuando yo no lo hiciera. Gracias a mi Papá por el amor incondicional. A mis hermanos, Nicolás, Vicente, Mariano y Celeste, los amo con toda el alma. Gracias a mi Lala, por los abrazos y la cómida rica que solo tú sabes hacer.

A la Jesús, Josefita, Dani y Fefy, gracias por enseñarme que el amor entre mujeres en los más lindo que puede haber y por quererme de la forma más comprensiva y empática. Espero poder reciprocar al menos un pedacito del cariño que me dan. Mi vida es más linda, y entretenida, porque ustedes están en ella.

Gracias a la Dani, mi compañera más fiel en esta dificil tarea. Y a mis compañeres de Seminario, gracias por las risas y el apañe infinito.

A la Profe Pascuala, gracias por ser las más seca. Sin su sabiduría y su paciencia nada de esto habría sido posible.

Mención honrosa a la saga de Crepusculo, al albúm 'Electra Heart' de Marina y al segundo EP de New Jeans por acompañarme cada mañana, tarde, y noche que me senté a escribir la tesis.

<div align="right">

Constanza Saavedra Díaz

</div>

Mis agradecimientos van hacia todas las personas sin las cuales no podría haber llegado a este punto. Principalmente, a mis compañeras Dani, Domi, Antto, Jo, Coni y Cami, con quienes tuve la fortuna de embarcarme en este largo, largo, largo proyecto. Muchas gracias por las risas, las preocupaciones, las horas que le dedicamos a esta tesis y todo lo que este proceso conllevo desde marzo hasta ahora. Con lo bueno, lo no tan bueno y lo malo (aunque fue poco de todas formas), sin lugar a duda me llevo una experiencia que voy a recordar por siempre. Gracias, también, a nuestra profesora guía, Pascuala Infante, principalmente por la paciencia de tener que aguantar a tan particular (y porfiado, a veces) grupo de tesistas, y por todo lo que las conversaciones que hemos tenido tanto dentro como fuera de la sala han significado para mi no solo durante este año.

Agradezco también a mi familia, a mi mamá María Soledad y a mi padre Andrés por todo lo que su apoyo constante y comprensión en los momentos difíciles ha significado para mí a lo largo de mi vida. Costó, pero aquí estamos finalmente. A mis primas Valentina, Mónica y su esposo Javier y mi primillo chico Emil, que, a punta de comida, buenos consejos y conversaciones me han mantenido cuerdo durante este proceso. También agradecer a mis amigos que ya pareciera que nos conocemos de toda la vida, José, Gabriel, Álvaro, Diego, Cristián, Francisca y Benjamín. Gracias por estar ahí cuando los necesitaba. También a toda la ganga de la universidad, sin los cuales todo este viaje no hubiera sido lo mismo: Esteban, Trinidad, los Diegos, Valeria, Dharma, Vicente, Agustín, Tomás, Anaís, Leia, Alexander, Antonia y Denisse. Gracias por hacer de cada ventana un momento no tan indeseable.

Por último, mis agradecimientos a la gente con la cual probablemente pasé más tiempo del que me gustaría este año (es broma, les quiero mucho): Juglares, mi guild de World of Warcraft. A Nico, Fizzura, Lucas, Vaine, Ruwen, Chvmy, Basti, Wayla, Kujen, Kuru y quizás cuantos más que se me van quedando en el tintero… gracias por volverse mi lugar predilecto para pasar mis ratos libres (y no tan libres), por el cariño y la compañía que han sido durante todo este proceso.

Nicolás Zúñiga Zurita

Abstract

Police interrogations constitute a significant and extensively explored domain within forensic linguistics, with a focal point being the examination of coerced and false confessions (Leo & Ofshe, 1998, Shuy, 1998, Coulthard et al., 2017). This study, in contrast, centres on a contrary form of confession—the honest confession. Specifically, it conducts an in-depth analysis of various characteristics intrinsic to confessions, using the case of the cannibal serial killer, Jeffrey Dahmer, as a primary subject.

The analysis of Jeffrey Dahmer's honest confession is grounded in the taxonomy for questions and responses introduced by Chandia et al. (2020), which originated from the examination of two coerced confessions. Our study employs an analysis based on discussion topics from the confession, motivating our first objective of identifying differences and similarities between the established question and response types in both coerced and non-coerced interrogations through a contrast between the two. Aiming to illustrate the distinctive features arising from the power dynamics in the honest confession setting, as well as to characterise and compare the established question and response types proposed for both coerced and non-coerced confessions. Likewise, in the scenario of an honest confession, another research question of ours aims to characterise the power dynamics with a focus on the topic management and turn-taking in the confessional process. Thus, resistance and cooperation will be taking paramount importance in the analysis of the different phenomena happening in the confession.

For the analysis it was taken into account the cooperative principle (Grice, 1975), resistance (Butler, 1991, as cited in Raby, 2005), and power dynamics (Haworth, 2006; Rock, 2015), which are fundamental aspects of comparison between the different types of confessions, and therefore analysed along the study. Notably, power asymmetry becomes a key element when considering the way it manifests in a conventional communication setting as opposed to the one present in an institutionalised context. During interrogations, this inherent power asymmetry typically anticipates or commonly results in the accused displaying resistance and providing direct answers to establish their innocence (Shuy, 1998; Taranilla, 2011; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017; Mason & Rock, 2020).

This dynamic often emphasises an opposition between the roles of the interrogator and the accused, a phenomenon extensively explored in the context of coerced confessions.

The characterization of an honest confession was based on an examination of one of Jeffrey Dahmer's initial interrogations conducted by the FBI. The main results found when applying Chandia's taxonomy for coerced confessions in Jeffrey Dahmer's honest confession were mainly the different use of grammatical questions formulated by the interrogator. At the same time, some of the types of questions and responses proposed in Chandía's taxonomy were not found in an honest confession. The dynamics of questions and responses, as well as the nature of the cooperative interaction, deviated from those observed in coerced confessions. In this instance, the subject exhibited a cooperative demeanour, providing an elaborate and detailed account of their past crimes. Importantly, the interrogator(s) actively encouraged the individual to continue their narrative without introducing potentially incriminating information—a departure from the conventional dynamics typically encountered in this type of interaction and in coerced confessions.

Key words: forensic linguistics, police interrogation, honest confession, power dynamics, cooperativity principle, resistance, type of questions, type of responses.

Context Index

Table Index

1. Introduction

Our investigation is focused on questions and responses, along with topics and turns management in a police interrogation setting resulting in an honest confession. To contextualise our study, a general introduction to forensic linguistics will be given. Additionally, the aforementioned concepts of police interrogation, confessions, questions, responses, topics, and turns will be contextualised and described.

1.1. Forensic Linguistics

Forensic linguistics, at the intersection of linguistics and legal studies, is a specialised field that applies linguistic principles to the analysis of language in legal contexts (Gibbons, 1994). This multidisciplinary field is essential to the study, interpretation, and analysis of language in a range of legal contexts (Oyanedel & Samaniego, 2001). As such, it encompasses a diverse range of applications, including the examination of written and spoken language in legal documents, courtroom proceedings, police investigations, and other forensic contexts (Gibbons, 1994; Gibbons & Turell 2008; Coulthard et al., 2017). Forensic linguistics, essentially, investigates the complex interaction between language and the law. Experts in this discipline of linguistics use their knowledge to solve a wide range of problems, including authorship identification, legal discourse analysis, and the evaluation of linguistic evidence in criminal investigations. (Gibbons, 1994; Oyanedel & Samaniego, 2001; Gibbons & Turell 2008; Coulthard et al., 2017).

1.2. Police Interrogation

Police interrogation is an institutionalised procedure that has the purpose of obtaining relevant information for a specific case from the individual who is being questioned (Shuy, 1998; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017; Mason & Rock, 2020). The information acquired during an interrogation can be used to decide whether a suspect is charged or not (Hartwig et al., 2005; Godsey, 2008). The dynamics of a police interrogation tend to be rigid and must follow a formal regulation. This implies the presence of a power asymmetrical relationship between the interrogator and the interrogated subject (Shuy, 1998; Taranilla, 2011; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017; Mason & Rock, 2020). The inherent rigidness of an interrogation suggests that it is only the interrogator who asks the questions and it is only the interrogated subject who answers them, with no space to

question this exchange nor to change the roles of this interaction; however, in practice, this does not tend to be as fixed (Taranilla, 2011).

In police interrogations, despite the clear asymmetry between speakers, the interrogated must know their rights and it is a requisite for the interrogator to make them known, which in the United States are formally identified as "Miranda Rights". They serve as a way to grant suspects rights during an arrest and remind them what they can or can not do, including the search for legal counsel (David et al., 2018; Janzen, 2019). This works as a way of giving the suspect a form of resistance to the asymmetrical nature of police interrogations by allowing them to not answer the questions asked by the police interrogator (David et al., 2018).

A key concept in police interrogations is Investigation Relevant Information (IRI). It refers to the important information given in the suspect's answers or provided in the questions asked by the interrogator. It is important to remark that questions should not contain IRI, as it can negatively affect the integrity of the investigative process (Farrugia & Gabbert, 2019). In order to obtain said crucial information, a series of interrogation methods have been developed and applied, such as the Reid technique in the United States and the PEACE method in the UK.

1.3. Confessions

Confessions are primarily given in the presence of another person who has the authority to demand it (Foucault, 1981, as cited in Fairclough, 1992). This assertion highlights the asymmetry of power involved in a communication situation that requires eliciting a confession, such as a police interrogation. Since our investigation is based on a police interrogation that took place in the United States, it is important to note the coercive nature of the Reid technique and its likelihood of producing false confessions (Godsey, 2008; Skerker, 2010, as cited in Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; Janzen, 2019; Slobogin, 2017). This is a relevant issue, in view of the fact that confessions are considered the most powerful piece of evidence by juries (Wigmore, 1972 as cited in Shuy, 1998; Kassin, 2005; Wallace & Kassin, 2012; Coulthard et al., 2017; David & Trainum, 2020).

False confessions are defined as the admission of guilt and the subsequent detailed description of a criminal act that the confessor did not commit (Kassin et al., 2010; Janzen,

2019). Even though they can be hard to keep track of and identify, factors such as the apprehension of the real perpetrator or the appearance of new evidence can deem a confession as false (Kassin et al., 2010). On the other hand, honest confessions are the optimal outcome of an interrogational process and are characterised by their reliable and voluntary nature (Leo & Ofshe, 1997). They can be provided if a suspect considers that the evidence gathered by the police is enough to incriminate them (Leo & Ofshe, 1997; Houston et al., 2014) or by young criminals who are not able to deal with the guilt of their actions (Malloy et al., 2014). Additionally, if a suspect believes that they are already considered guilty by the police, this could prompt them to give an honest confession. (Gudjonsson & Petursson, 1991; Gudjonsson & Bownes, 1992; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1994 as cited in Gudjonsson, 2003).

1.4. Questions, Responses, Topics, and Turns

For our analysis, it is important to consider some fundamental concepts: questions and responses, which are the two main elements used in Chandía et al.'s taxonomy (2020). This investigation identified and described different types of questions and responses found in two false confessions. The taxonomy will be used to compare and apply these types of questions and responses in an honest confession and identify possible similarities or discrepancies in terms of function that may arise.

Topic management is the act of engaging in a conversation to accomplish communication dynamics (Angus & Wiles, 2018). In a conversation, the speakers have equal rights to take control of the conversation through the option of proposing and changing the topic when they deem it appropriate (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011).

Finally, turns play a fundamental role in police interrogations, as it establishes the general idea that both parties engaging in a conversation must respect each other's turns, without interrupting one another (Waara and Shaw, 2006). The notion of turns emphasises the importance of each party taking their time to express thoughts and respond, creating a structured and organised dialogue in the form of an interrogation. This principle ensures that the interrogation unfolds in a manner where both the interrogator and the suspect make use of the role attributed to each one by the interrogation. But even when the turns are

predetermined by the interrogation, following a question-response structure, the suspect has the right to refuse to speak (Taranilla, 2011), thus skipping a turn.

These four concepts –questions, responses, turn, and topic– can be closely analysed using ideas such as resistance or the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975). In order to have an appropriate communicative exchange, both sides must be willing to share the necessary information required, putting aside any resistance that must present at any moment in a conversation (Grice, 1975). By using the different categories of the CP, as proposed by Grice, a better understanding of how linguistics works within the context of an interrogation can be achieved. Elements as important as the truth, or how willing the suspect is to collaborate with the interrogation, are vital to obtain the pertinent analysis.

1.5. Presentation of the study

In forensic linguistics, the examination of false confessions has been a prevalent focus, driven by their common occurrence during police interrogations (Janzen, 2019). This emphasis on false confessions has overshadowed the study and analysis of honest ones. Having recognized police interrogations as institutionalised settings with distinct conversational rules, this study aims to shed light on the less-explored territory of honest confessions within the forensic linguistics landscape.

Despite the research in forensic linguistics concerning confessions, a significant gap exists in the examination of honest ones. This study contemplates addressing this void by delving into the analysis of an honest confession made by the notorious serial killer Jeffrey Dahmer. This investigation serves the purpose of scrutinising a specific honest confession using a taxonomy developed based on two distinct coerced false confessions. The analysis aims to elucidate if different types of questions and responses are unique to honest confessions, highlighting the crucial concepts of cooperation and resistance along the analysis.

Our main findings show that certain question-response dynamics prevalent in false confessions are not fully present in honest ones. Cooperation and resistance are elements that are not exclusive to the questions and responses dynamic as they can happen in any conversational situation, however, they are key concepts in the comprehension of these

findings, emphasising that honest confessions largely hinge on the willingness of the confessant, as exemplified by Dahmer.

By evaluating the results, our analysis seeks to provide a deeper understanding of linguistic strategies within an honest confession, one of the least explored phenomena in the field of forensic linguistics. The uniqueness of Jeffrey Dahmer's confession resides in the truthfulness of his claims that can be proved with the real events, which offers a new perspective when analysing the different particular characteristics of the confession.

1.6. *Research questions and/or objectives of the study*

As aforementioned, this study explores and analyses the use of linguistics in an honest confession in police interrogations, focusing on a specific case of a first-degree murder trial in Wisconsin in 1992. The research questions aim to provide answers about the distinctions between question and response dynamics in coerced versus non-coerced confessions, specifically on the power dynamics inherent in non-coerced interactions. The objectives encompass identifying similarities and differences in question and response types, characterising power asymmetry, and delving into the grammatical and pragmatic aspects of non-coerced confessions. The study's final purpose is to propose explanations for the differences in the application of Chandía et al's taxonomy and of the analysis in terms of topic and turn management in relation to power-asymmetrical dynamics to gain a better understanding of how linguistics works in an honest confession.

1.7. *Structure of the investigation*

The structure of the investigation is organised to present firstly a theoretical framework contextualising concepts and previous studies on police interrogation and confessions. Then, explain the methodology used for acquiring and analysing the corpus and the study's objectives and research questions. Subsequently, results and discussions will be presented, explaining the analysis of questions, responses, topics, and turns in that order. In this part, we will compare Chandía et al's taxonomy with our corpus, present the types –and subtypes– under which we placed each phenomenon we encountered, analyse the presence of resistance and cooperation, and the number of words executed by each person who took part in this interrogation.

The analysis of questions is categorised between those present in both honest and coerced confessions, those that do not work well in honest confessions, and the ones that are not present in our corpus. Responses follow a similar pattern to Questions. For topics and turns, different types of topics identified within the confession are presented first in an overview and then, each one individually with the corresponding subtopics. Finally, the conclusions will be drawn based on the insights derived from the study.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Police Interrogation

Police interrogations constitute a structured and regulated institutionalised procedure, aiming to systematically elicit pertinent information during interactions between police officers and individuals who may be suspected of a crime, victims, or witnesses to such crimes (Memon et al., 2003; Taranilla, 2011; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017; Thomas, 2017). This process involves the systematic questioning of an accused or suspect, with the goal of obtaining a truthful statement, and has been eloquently described by British criminologists as the art or science of compelling suspects to divulge the truth (Thomas, 2017). The ultimate objective is to gather evidence that will later be transcribed into a written statement that will be subsequently used in court (Coulthard et al., 2017).

Within this structured environment, the conduct of the interrogating officer is rigorously guided by established guidelines and legal statutes, encompassing distinct opening and closing phases characterised by specific procedural requirements (Taranilla, 2011; Haworth, 2013). These may include the collection and validation of case details and the explanation of the Miranda rights of the individual being interrogated. Notably, the primary focus of a police interrogation, established as the most important stage in a criminal investigation (Baldwin, 1993; Holmberg & Christianson, 2002), may vary on the role of the individual under interrogation, whether they are a suspect, victim, or witness (Rock, 2015).

A differentiation between "police interview" and "police interrogation" needs to be established in order to comprehend why the present analysis prefers the latter. The term "police interview" delineates a dynamic interpersonal exchange, undertaken with the aim of gathering veracious information conducive to judicious decision-making and equitable course of action (Yeschke, 1987, as cited in Shuy, 1998). Such interviews are typically

conducted with individuals believed to possess knowledge pertinent to an official investigation (O'Hara and O'Hara, 1988, as cited in Shuy, 1998). In contrast, "police interrogation" signifies a structured face-to-face encounter explicitly geared towards eliciting an admission or confession regarding an actual or perceived transgression of the law, policy, regulation, or other legal constraint (Yeschke, 1987, as cited in Shuy, 1998). Interrogations are predominantly directed at individuals suspected of having committed an offence (O'Hara and O'Hara, 1988, as cited in Shuy, 1998), with the primary objective being the procurement of an admission of guilt concerning a criminal act (Aubry and Caputo, 1980, as cited in Shuy, 1998). Authorities differentiate between interviews and interrogations, reserving the latter for situations in which there is reasonable certainty of the individual's guilt (Shuy, 1998), just as in the case that we revised as our corpus.

Since interrogations are considered a vital stage of a criminal investigation, it is essential that they are conducted effectively, efficiently, and ethically. The information gathered by the police must be as complete and objective as possible because prosecutors must use this information in the first place to decide whether to charge a suspect and, therefore, arrest and initiate formal proceedings against them. (Hartwig et al., 2005; Godsey, 2008).

Police interrogations are discursively constructed and institutionally used (Shuy, 1998; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017; Mason & Rock, 2020), for which their setting and general dynamics must observe formal regulations, including the operation of different interrogation methods. The rigid interrogation structure usually leads to a power and dominance asymmetry between the interrogators and the interrogated (Shuy, 1998; Taranilla, 2011; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017; Mason & Rock, 2020). Even though the power asymmetry favours the individual conducting the interrogation, the interrogator also needs to develop a collaborative relationship with the interrogated subject. The concept of power asymmetry will be more extensively reviewed below.

The examination of police discourse constitutes a focused area of study for various theoretical frameworks, including Critical Discourse Analysis, Interactional Sociology, Conversation Analysis, and Forensic Linguistics, among others (Taranilla, 2011). Forensic linguists primarily concentrate on two significant aspects of police interrogations: the

formulation of questions by the interrogator and the nature of responses to these questions (Shuy, 1998; Haworth, 2013; Rock, 2015). However, it is noteworthy that these aspects have not received the level of attention they should.

In the analysis of responses, a critical concept known as Investigation Relevant Information (IRI) plays a pivotal role. IRI encompasses the valuable information extracted from the suspect's reactions to the questions posed or the interrogation techniques employed. IRI serves as the information that holds significant value, often containing details that may not have been previously known to the interrogators. It acts as a unique lens through which investigators can gain deeper insights into the suspect's knowledge, involvement, or potential connection to the subject under investigation (Farrugia & Gabbert, 2019).

Another facet worthy of examination in the context of police interrogations is the challenge associated with analysing written records of interrogations when original oral records are inaccessible. This can potentially lead to misinterpretations of the implied meanings of words when they are spoken (Shuy, 1998; Gibbons, 2003; Haworth, 2006, 2013; Coulthard et al., 2017). It is important to consider this limitation in linguistic analysis when dealing with a police interrogation.

2.1.1. Power Asymmetry

As previously mentioned, police interrogations are institutionalised procedures that, given their nature, represent an unequal situation directly related to the inherent power and social prestige held by the institution. Interrogators, then, will always have the interactive upper hand over common, lay citizens, especially if the person being interrogated is a suspect, as ultimately their freedom is at risk depending on the answers provided during the police interrogation (Gudjonsson, 2003; Leo, 2008; Taranilla, 2011; van Dijk, 2015).

Another aspect of a police interrogation that explains its intrinsic power asymmetry is the management of the topic agenda; in a police interrogation, only one of the parties involved will always take the lead in the topics discussed and the rhythm of the conversation. (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011). In fact, questions are used as a means of control by institutional representatives, making it difficult for non-organisational participants to establish their own proposals (Adelsward et al., 1987, as cited in Harris, 1995). This means

that the person in charge of asking questions has control of the interrogation through topic management, by proposing and changing the topics to adjust to the specific necessities of the interrogation being carried out (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011). Meanwhile, the person being questioned is limited to answering without questioning the interrogator, or the relevance of the questions asked.

This power asymmetry is intrinsically linked to the physical authority wielded by the police over individuals in custody. Consequently, suspects often experience a heightened sense of powerlessness compared to their normal daily lives when they are put into the interrogation setting (Ainsworth, 1993). It is worth mentioning that the ultimate outcome of the interrogation relies on the information provided by the interrogated subject, which would later be used as evidence during future legal proceedings. As a consequence, the main purpose of the interrogated may be to protect themselves and to avoid self-incrimination. Along the same line, it has been suggested that interactive power is a dynamic and constructed entity, rather than a static one, and thus can evolve throughout the interrogation. This can be attributed to the interrogated's use of resistance strategies.

Discussions on power dynamics often conceptualise resistance within a binary framework, characterised by the interplay between dominance and submission. In this paradigm, power is seen as a possession wielded by the dominant group against the subordinate, who may, in turn, engage in resistance, striving to reclaim agency and challenge the status quo (Raby, 2005). Resistance, as a concept, is frequently linked to an intrinsic aspect of humanity—such as an inherent aversion to subjugation—or as a reaction to lived experiences. Despite its conceptualization as a conscious, political, and directed response, the term is predominantly utilised within disciplines like sociology, cultural studies, activism, and psychoanalysis to describe intentional acts of opposition (Raby, 2005).

Drawing on J.L. Austin's theory of speech acts, Butler (1991, as cited in Raby, 2005) further refines the understanding of resistance by emphasising the pivotal role of the gap between speech acts and their reception. This gap introduces uncertainty, as there is no guarantee that speech acts will be interpreted as intended, thereby creating a space for resistance to emerge (Butler, 1991, as cited in Raby, 2005). This perspective highlights the

complex nature of resistance, positioning it not only as a deliberate and conscious act, but one that evolves within the dynamics of communication and interpretation.

Moreover, the complexity of resistance is underscored by the idea that resistance to a discourse within a specific domain often remains entangled with that very discourse. Kingfisher's (1996, as cited in Simpson & Mayr, 2010) assertion that resistance may adopt the language and structures of the dominant discourse challenges conventional notions. It suggests that overt resistance may not be the sole manifestation of opposition, as apparent accommodation can, at times, serve as a covert tool of subversion. This understanding expands the scope of resistance, acknowledging its multifaceted nature and highlighting its potential to operate within the subtleties of discourse and interaction.

The resistance strategies are intricate and complex discursive mechanisms available to the interrogated subject that serve as a way for them to preserve a degree of agency and influence within the conversation or to redirect the course of the interrogation process and, consequently, challenge the interrogator's dominance, especially in a police interrogation setting, where the interrogated subject is in a vulnerable position (Haworth, 2006). There are different ways strategies of resistance can be deliberately used throughout an interrogation. First, the interrogated may employ evasive tactics such as the provision of responses that, at first glance, may seem cooperative but are rather vague and inherently evade the initial question. Secondly, interrogated subjects may attempt to steer the conversation from its initial topic by changing the subject or by responding with a 'counter-question' reformulating the interrogator's question, thereby challenging the asymmetrical power structure of the conversation. Lastly, the subject may resort to other techniques such as silence, avoidance, denial of allegations, or the provision of minimal information, all with the intent to combat the power imbalance and assert their agency in the conversational process (Haworth, 2006, Taranilla, 2011; Nakane, 2020).

Individuals have the right to own and regulate specific aspects of their lives, maintaining certain reservations, in particular, a collection of personal data that individuals aim to control access to (Goffman, 1979, as cited in Taranilla, 2011). These reservations extend to refusing the disclosure of personal information, and individuals have the autonomy to determine the boundaries of what they are willing to share with others. However, this

autonomy encounters a significant challenge when individuals find themselves in a police interrogation setting. In this context, the traditional reservations individuals hold about personal data become null and void, as there is a legal and social expectation for cooperation with law enforcement (Taranilla, 2011). The dynamics of a police interrogation create an environment where individuals may find it challenging, if not impossible, to completely refuse to answer personal questions. The inherent tension between the right to privacy and the institutional demand for cooperation adds complexity to the interactions within the interrogation room, raising important questions about the balance between individual rights and collective security interests.

During police interrogation, interrogators employ a variety of strategies to foster a sense of proximity or connection with the subjects they are questioning. This involves skillfully navigating the inherent power asymmetry, which can stem from both physical authority and the positional power held as an interrogating officer. One of the goals of the interrogator in facing this power asymmetry is to establish *rapport*, build trust, and encourage cooperation. It is necessary to not forget that although some of the methods used, such as the PEACE model that will be explored below, are legal and moral, others, such as the Reid method, can be deemed forceful or manipulative and may breach ethical lines. Some of the most commonly used techniques are building rapport, active listening, the use of appropriate non-verbal cues, offering sympathy or understanding to the interrogated, the use of the good cop/bad cop approach, providing incentives in exchange for a confession, and appealing to shared interests (College of Policing, 2022).

Rapport is produced when the interrogator tries to create a connection with the interrogated subject, aside from the established relationship of the interrogation (Coulthard et al., 2017, Mason & Rock, 2020). At times, when rapport is established, the power asymmetry is somehow lessened. When questioning a suspect, interrogators frequently need to listen attentively to what they are saying and express their sentiments and concerns. This shows that the interrogator is interested in and paying attention to what the suspect has to say. In the same way, interrogators have to show empathy and understanding by keeping eye contact, nodding, and copying the suspect's body language. In order to develop rapport and

foster a sense of connection, interrogators may look for areas of overlap or shared interests with the subject (Mason & Rock, 2020; College of Policing, 2022).

Another crucial aspect of rapport building is the effective communication of empathy. In this context, the interrogator must convey a genuine willingness to understand the situation from the perspective of the individual being interrogated. This may involve displaying sympathy or empathy for the suspect's predicament while emphasising their commitment to assisting in finding a resolution (Mason & Rock, 2020). Interrogators may go a step further by offering incentives, such as the possibility of leniency or assistance, in exchange for the suspect's cooperation or information (Mason & Rock, 2020; College of Policing, 2022). Such gestures can often encourage the suspect to become more forthcoming in their responses.

Interrogators have at their disposal a method to further assert their authority over the interrogated: the act of interruption during the interrogation. This interruption serves a variety of purposes, categorised by Momeni (2011) into nine distinct types, each associated with a specific intention. The nine categories of interruption are as follows: (1) Interrogative Interruption: This type involves using a question to gather information from the suspect. (2) Confirmative Interruption: It is employed when the interrogator poses a question to seek confirmation from the suspect. (3) Non-confirmative/Informative Interruption: This form of interruption is used solely to insult or threaten the suspect. (4) Information-Objection Interruption: It aims to gather information but is framed as an objection rather than a question. (5) Declarative-Informative Interruption: In this category, some information is provided to elicit information from the suspect. It resembles the first and fourth types but distinguishes itself by its declarative approach. (6) Non-Information Objection Interruption: This form of interruption constitutes an objection but does not seek to obtain information. (7) Confession Interruption: It occurs when the interrogator introduces information from their own presumptions or from the confession of the individual being interrogated. (8) Cooperative Interruption: In these instances, the interrogator collaborates with the suspect. The primary objective is not to extract information, although it may yield some in return. (9) Correction Interruption: This type of interruption is used when the interrogator wishes to rectify or amend their own statements. These distinct interruption categories serve as tools for interrogators to navigate the interaction and elicit specific responses from the interrogated.

As seen before, power asymmetry is inherent to police interrogation because of the institutionalised nature of the procedure, where the interrogator obtains the greater source of the domain. The physical authority wielded by the police further reinforces the power imbalance, leading to a heightened sense of powerlessness for suspects. But even when it is the interrogator who possesses more power than the suspect, the latter can resist and fight said asymmetry. Such resistance strategies used by the suspect can be seen through evasive tactics like changing topics or remaining silent. Consequently, the interrogator must not blindly trust their power, understanding the importance of tactics such as rapport and active listening in order to keep the suspects cooperative in the interrogation.

2.1.2. Turn-Taking

Turn-taking, defined as the ways people organise their discourse under the basic assumption that one party talks at a time (Schegloff, 2000), plays an essential part in a fluent and smooth casual conversation or, as is the main object of this investigation, in an institutionalised setting such as a police interrogation. However, even if the essential dynamic of question-response is comparable in both conversations and interrogations, the institutional context of the latter has an impact on how turn-taking develops.

Three rules have been formalised by Duncan (1972) to explain the constitution of an appropriate exchange of speaking turns: (1) turn-yielding signals, which indicate that speakers may take their turn after a signal is presented; (2) attempt-suppressing signals, which display that the speaker may maintain their turn, regardless of the cues shown to stop them; and (3) back-channel communication signal, in which although the speaker is displaying signals, the listener does not want to take their turn. In addition to this set of rules, Sacks et al. in 1974 provide a clear organisation of the conversation structure: (1) the current speaker selects the next turn; (2) another participant can self-select to take the following turn; and (3) the current speaker may continue with their same turn. Such rules have continued to be referenced in further turn-taking-related work, such as Goodwin (1981), where Sacks et al.'s system is referenced and compared to others in order to understand the fundamentals of turn-taking, as well as by Heritage (2017) and ten Have (2007), who elaborated on the previously mentioned rules in their discussions on conversation analysis.

Within the police interrogation field, turn-taking has been widely debated as being of paramount importance to get a confession. In police interrogation, protocols and methods are set to measure the topics spoken and the time at which they are brought up, that seek to obtain a suspect's confession (Mason, 2016), thus impacting the turn-taking rigid structure of the genre. In the legal field, turn-taking rules are severe as it is expected that every speaker must wait for their turn to speak, without appropriating the turn of others (Waara and Shaw, 2006). When these turns are respected, both statements begin to form a narrative that complements each other (Taranilla, 2011; Haworth, 2006, 2013; Coulthard et al., 2017). However, it has been argued by Nakane (2020), that in monolingual interrogation, these rules can be broken by the interrogated or the interrogator by overlapping each other, influencing the narrative development process, as opposed to multilingual interrogation, where this interaction has a third participant, which is an interpreter, making the turns more prominent since the interrogator and interrogator cannot interact due to the language barrier.

As mentioned, topic management is a key concept when talking about police interrogations, due to the structured dynamics the topics are typically given in this context. Subsection 1.1.3 develops how the interrogator can manage the topics and what strategies can be implemented in order to control the flow and pace of the interrogation.

2.1.3. Topic Management

Widely discussed in conversation analysis, topic management refers to how people engage in communication, negotiate, and use concepts to achieve different communicative goals (Angus & Wiles, 2018). Topic analysis has been approached from two main perspectives: a) one in which the topic is seen as a discrete element or unit, and b) another where the topic is viewed as an organising frame, without the two perspectives being mutually exclusive (Goutsos, 1997). For our analysis, both approaches will be used, examining the movement of topics in such a way that they are understood as a) elements different from each other, as in one adjacent pair more than one topic could be touched upon at the same time, without affecting the flow or understanding of the topics in the institutional context, and b) an organisational frame proposed by the interrogator to follow a course during the interrogation.

In a conversation, the dynamics of topic control involve a continuous negotiation between the participants, characterised by various distinguishing moves. Among these,

Opening and Closing Moves hold particular significance. The former pertains to the initiation of a topic by one participant, while the latter involves providing a concluding remark about the current topic or preparing to transition to a new one (Downing, et al., 1998).

As previously mentioned, in a police interrogation, the management of the topic agenda reflects the intrinsic power asymmetry; when only one of the parties involved will always take the lead in the topics discussed and the rhythm of the conversation. This face-to-face inequality (Fairclough, 1989) is another essential feature of police interrogations, where the one in command is always the interrogator and never the interrogated. The interrogated may refuse to pursue a topic, propose a new one, or show insecurity about their own knowledge of the topic through hedges (like 'I don't know', 'I think', 'maybe', 'I guess/suppose', etc.) (Lindroth, 1996, as cited in Waara & Shaw, 2006).

Topic shifts do not occur randomly in an interrogation; they take place in distinct settings and in distinct ways (Maynard, 1980), but whether or not changes in dialogue are explicitly stated, participants nonetheless contribute to them (Howe, 1991). In the process of closing a topic, it is imperative for all participants, regardless of the level of resistance exhibited by the individual being interrogated, to collaborate and coordinate their efforts. Different strategies are used to achieve the closing in both cases and said strategies include the use of acknowledgement tokens, the repetition or summary of an utterance, a pause or laughter, at the end of a story or when one of the speakers refocuses the conversation (Maynard, 1980; Howe, 1991).

In the process of transitioning between topics in a conversation, acknowledgement tokens play a vital role by briefly reiterating the preceding speaker's words without elaboration, encompassing words and phrases like 'yes,' 'yeah,' 'no,' 'oh,' 'mm,' 'okay,' and 'right' (Maynard, 1980; Howe, 1991). Furthermore, to indicate their comprehension of the prior speaker's statement, a participant may repeat part or all of the previous statement just before a topic shift, usually with some modifications (Howe, 1991). In instances where a participant believes that a phrase in the utterance is incorrect, insulting, or misinterpreted, they might wait to see if the speaker will provide further clarification. If the speaker does not, this often results in a pause (Maynard, 1980; Howe, 1991).

A similar phenomenon occurs when concluding a story or narrative. Stories and narrative exit devices may not necessarily prompt the listener to introduce more related information. In such cases, topic shifts are introduced to reinstate the traditional turn-by-turn conversation (Maynard, 1980). At times, one of the speakers may request a refocus on the conversation, asking to return to a previously discussed subject. This approach can lead to non-continuous topical dialogue, thus becoming a pivotal moment in topic negotiation (Maynard, 1980).

All of these methods play a crucial role in the negotiation of topics during a conversation, as the appearance of any of the elements mentioned can signal the interrogated individual's inclination to change the topic. The decision to accept this change or persist with the current topic rests with the interrogator.

In the police interrogation genre, markedly stable yet somehow still negotiable power dynamics underlie the distribution and handling of a topic within this institutional context (Haworth, 2006). The power to bring, maintain, and change topics translates into the interrogator having far more influence over what is said than the interrogated. Interrogated subjects may be at a major discursive disadvantage when the very uneven power dynamics between the participants in a police interrogation are taken into consideration (Haworth, 2013). In theory, then, management of the topical arrangement is given solely to the institutional interrogators, and the individuals being interrogated are thus only able to engage with the topics established by the interrogators' question turns since they are only allowed to respond (Greatbach, 1986). In practice, however, even when topics are mostly proposed by the interrogators, the topic is in constant movement in the unavoidably dynamic communicational situation, which gives the interrogated the option to negotiate the topic to be discussed (Haworth, 2006; Rock, 2015). It must be said, however, that when the interrogated gets to manage the topic being discussed, this does not necessarily mean that they are controlling the topic agenda, as often interrogators seem to yield their discursive power to promote the disclosure of information, this to the service of the ultimate institutional goal: getting the interrogated to speak (Haworth, 2006; Rock, 2015; Coulthard et al., 2017).

2.1.4. *Grice's categories and the concept of Cooperation*

To understand how cooperation works within an asymmetrical communicative context as is a police interrogation, considering Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) is valuable for the present work. As this study contemplates a contrast between findings on false confessions (Chandía et al., 2020) and the current analysis of an honest confession, and expecting to find more Gricean cooperation in the latter, it seems only pertinent to explore the cooperative dynamics manifested between interrogator and interrogated in the question-and-response sequences, as well as in the management of turns and topics.

In Grice's view of conversational communication, conversations are collaborative and cooperative exchanges of information in which the participants share, to some extent, a common communicative goal, which means they assume a mutual commitment to cooperation in order to achieve an effective conversation (Grice, 1975). This implies that the participants adhere to the four conversational categories: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner so as to establish that the information being exchanged is informative, true, relevant and clear. The first category is that of Quantity, with the maxims (1) Make your contribution as informative as is required and (2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required. This category suggests that the information provided by a speaker should be neither too much nor too little, in order to inform yet not overwhelm the listener with unnecessary information. The second category of Quality covers the maxims (1) Do not say what you believe to be false and (2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. This category emphasises the importance of veracity in trustful and credible conversations. In this sense, speakers should limit their contribution only to truthful information and avoid providing unsupported facts or opinions. Grice's third category of Relation, more commonly known as Relevance, has only one maxim: 'Be relevant'. This category stresses the appropriateness of the information offered in relation to the context of the conversation. On this basis, the speaker should avoid making contributions that are irrelevant in the specific. The fourth and last category of Manner has four maxims: (1) Avoid obscurity of expression, (2) Avoid ambiguity, (3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and (4) Be orderly. This category highlights the need for an organised, clear conversation. The information then should be conferred in a way that is comprehensible, unambiguous, and well-organised so as to ensure an effective communicative process (Grice, 1975).

However, it is important to note that the communicative setting of the corpus analysed diverges from a typical conversational scenario. Police interrogations should aim at eliciting a non-coerced and truthful confession, but they are often challenged by an inherent asymmetrical dynamic and participants' cooperativity. As such, it is essential to examine how Grice's Cooperative Principle operates in this context.

A basic concept associated with the Gricean CP is Conversational Implicature (CI). CIs are parts of a sentence which are left unsaid and used to communicate something more than the meaning of the words. To express it differently, they are the additional meaning of what is being conveyed, hence, implicatures require the active involvement of the receiver to infer said additional meaning (Siregar & Murni, 2021). Implicatures, in the context of the CP, arise when speakers choose to depart from the principle of providing only the necessary information to convey their message. Instead, they strategically omit details, relying on the listener's cooperative engagement and interpretive skills to fill in the gaps. This intentional withholding of information, while expecting the listener to deduce the implicit meaning, is known as '*flouting*' the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975).

Flouting occurs when the speaker intentionally violates the expectations of the CP, aiming to evoke a specific implicature. It involves a deviation from the conventional norms of communication, prompting the listener to actively engage in the conversational process by making inferences based on the speaker's deliberate omissions. Through flouting, speakers leverage implicatures to convey the layered meanings that enrich the communicative exchange, requiring the listener's collaboration in constructing the complete message (Grice, 1975).

In the police interrogation context, CIs are an appropriate method to avoid the use of violence and prevent violations of the law while performing police duties during interrogation (Apriyanto & Santoso, 2020), as they are often used by interrogators to express their integrity, a positive side, or build a friendly image with the suspect (Apriyanto, 2020). Although CIs can help to obtain a confession by being subtle about the interrogators' intentions, and thus create a more comfortable environment to achieve the task (Apriyanto & Santoso, 2020), the police may be influenced by previous conceptions and ideas about the interrogated person. As previously seen, in some cases the police are conditioned to see the

suspect only as guilty, or as it happens on many occasions, the police's main interest is to gather the substance of the statements made by the individual being interrogated, focusing on getting a confession, not information (Taranilla, 2011; Apriyanto & Santoso, 2020).

While CIs are often manifested through non-verbal cues or implicit communication, the analysis of their interactions can extend to examining both questions posed by law enforcement and the responses given. This broader analysis aims to discern not only what is explicitly communicated verbally, but also to identify potential coercion or manipulations that may be present in the unspoken aspects of the conversation. By delving into the unspoken dynamics, the analysis seeks to uncover any underlying misunderstandings or influences that might not be overtly expressed but could significantly impact the overall communication and dynamics of the interrogation process.

With the conclusion of the category of 'police interrogations', the focus shifts to the comprehensive exploration of the product of an interrogation that is a confession. Subsection 1.2 encompasses an exploration of what constitutes a confession, methods employed to obtain a confession, and the various types it can manifest—ranging from coerced and false confessions to honest ones.

2.2. Confessions

A confession is considered to be a powerful and unique piece of evidence (Schatz, 2018) that is defined as the admission of guilt in regard to committing an act and the description of this act. A confession, however, does not equal guilt, and the lack of one does not equal innocence (David & Trainum, 2020). An important aspect of a confession is the power relationship between the people involved, considering that a person does not confess without the presence of another person who is an authority and requires the confession (Foucault, 1981, as cited in Fairclough, 1992). These authorities do not only work for an admission, an 'I did it', but instead, they try to obtain a full confession with a logical narrative and details that are relevant and unknown for the people who are not involved in the crime (Schatz, 2018; Manson & Rock 2020).

A confession holds significant implications for an individual's life, as it triggers a cascade of negative consequences following its disclosure. The extent of these repercussions is

inherently tied to the nature of the committed crime, ranging from damage to one's reputation and integrity to the severe consequence of imprisonment. Consequently, many people question what leads a person to confess during a police interrogation after discovering the possible consequences (Gudjonsson, 2003), the answer being either the feeling of guilt or an irrational act, as we will see below.

It is important to consider that there are different degrees of admission when it comes to confessing: if the suspect admits to all the crimes that are being charged against them, that would be considered a full confession; on the other hand, if they only admit to part of them, it would be considered just a partial admission (Schatz, 2018). Considering the nature of our corpus, which consists of an honest confession, the available literature for both honest and false confessions, and in order to create a contrast between both, the next sections will address methods of interrogation, coerced and false confessions, and honest confessions.

2.2.1. Methods of interrogation

Confessions in police interrogations can be secured through techniques devised to elicit an honest confession from a guilty suspect. However, these same techniques may, in some cases, result in a coerced confession from an innocent suspect. In this context, if a confession emerges from the suspect's volition rather than being coerced by the various interrogation methods, it can be deemed an irrational act, as the suspect, whether guilty or innocent, might succumb to the pressure or manipulation applied during the questioning process (Leo & Ofshe, 1997). The irrationality lies in the psychological and emotional impact of the interrogation environment, where individuals may feel compelled to confess to alleviate the stress, anxiety, or discomfort associated with the intense questioning. Even in cases where the suspect is innocent, the coercive nature of certain interrogation techniques can create a situation where the individual perceives confessing as the quickest route to end psychological distress (Leo & Ofshe, 1997). Moreover, the desire to please the interrogator or gain a perceived benefit, such as a promise of leniency or a quicker resolution to the interrogation, can cloud rational decision-making. In the heat of the moment, individuals may not fully consider the long-term consequences of a false confession. The psychological strain imposed during an interrogation, coupled with the inherent power imbalance between the suspect and the interrogator, can lead to impulsive and irrational decisions (Leo & Ofshe, 1997).

In England and Wales, a plain room with just four seated participants and audio recording equipment is required for a police interrogation to be conducted. In most cases, there will be two police officers—one conducting the interrogation and the other taking notes—as well as a witness or suspect who may be accompanied by a lawyer, a parent, or a social worker (Haworth, 2013; Coulthard et al., 2017). This type of procedure, inserted in what is now known as the PEACE model (an acronym for Preparation and Planning, Engage and Explain, Account and Clarification, Closure, and Evaluation), has been the appointed model for police officers in the UK, and other countries of the region as well, to approach police interrogation (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011).

The model describes a five-stage process that takes into consideration the psychological and emotional vulnerabilities of the individual being interrogated in order to avoid unnecessary inaccuracies from the interrogator that could jeopardise the procedure and, eventually, lead to a false confession. Thus, police officers are trained to encourage the individual being interrogated to provide factual and truthful information rather than to pressure and coerce a confession from the interrogated (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011).

In the United States, in contrast, the approach to police interrogation is rooted in a presumption that individuals subject to questioning are inherently guilty and likely to provide false information to their interrogators (Godsey, 2008). This stance is notably distinct from the protocols described in the United Kingdom. In the US, police are allowed to employ tactics that involve misleading suspects regarding the evidence in their possession while attempting to give the impression that they have a shared goal with the suspect and that the only way for him to avoid or lessen punishment is by cooperating with them and making a complete confession (Godsey, 2008, Slobogin, 2017). A notable contrast between the two systems lies in the reluctance of American police departments to videotape interrogations, which would provide comprehensive records for future scrutiny and investigation (Godsey, 2008, Slobogin, 2017). This stance is influenced by the distinct approach of the American justice system to the interrogation process.

When it came to questioning tactics, American and Canadian interrogators were comparable to one another and adopted an accusatorial style, while interrogators from Europe, Australia, and New Zealand, on the other hand, tended to use a more information-

gathering technique. (Miller et al., 2018). The previously mentioned accusatorial style method is similar to the Reid technique.

The Reid technique is a three-stage process that encourages police officers, as we have previously commented, to focus on eliciting a confession from the individual being interrogated through the use of a highly confrontational method that aims to weaken the subject in order to obtain the admission of a crime. As such, this method, as opposed to the PEACE model, determines that the aim of police interrogation is acquiring a confession rather than establishing the factuality of a crime (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011, Slobogin, 2017). Although some may argue about its effectiveness, others question whether this technique increases the chances of police officers coercing false confessions (Skerker, 2010, as cited in Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011). Slobogin (2017) addresses this issue by mentioning that even though PEACE produces more information than Reid and it is less prone to cause false confessions, it also produces fewer true confessions, which means that if the false confessions generated by Reid can be exposed before their use in adjudication, it clearly could be a more effective interrogation technique than PEACE. However, the moral and ethical basis of PEACE is gradually being recognised worldwide.

2.2.2. Coerced and false confessions

False confessions can be defined as the admission of a criminal act that the confessor did not commit, which contains specific details about how and why the crime took place (Kassin et al., 2010; Janzen, 2019). They are hard to keep track of, due to their lack of record and publication, but still, they can be deemed false by the following factors: (1) subsequent evidence proves the admission was false, (2) evidence shows that it was physically impossible for the accused to commit the crime (they were proven to be on another place at the moment the crime was committed), (3) the real perpetrator is apprehended an linked to the crime, or (4) scientific evidence affirmatively establishes the confessor as innocent (Kassin et al., 2010).

There are three different types of false confessions: voluntary false confession, compliant false confession, and persuaded false confession. A voluntary false confession, also defined as the admission of guilt by an innocent suspect without the police external pressure (Kassin & Wrightsman, 1985, as cited in Leo, 2008; Rogal, 2017), is related to the

psychological state of the confessor, whether it is a psychological disturbance or psychiatric condition. They are given to expiate the guilt of an imagined or committed act, to pursue fame, for vindictive purposes, or to protect the real perpetrator of a crime (Leo, 2009). On the other hand, compliant false confessions, also known as coerced compliance (Kassin & Wrightsman, 1985, as cited in Leo, 2008), are given in response to police coercion. Here, the suspect admits to committing the crime knowing that they are innocent (Leo, 2009; Rogal, 2017). Lastly, persuaded false confessions are the result of police interrogation where officers use coercive techniques to make the suspects temporarily question their innocence and memories of what happened, making them believe that they are guilty (Leo, 2009). This type of confession is also known as coerced internalised (Kassin & Wrightsman, 1985, as cited in Leo, 2008) and internalised false confessions (Rogal, 2017).

The primary objective of a police interrogation is to ascertain the truth (Haworth, 2013). However, when faced with a reluctant suspect, the interrogator needs to employ a series of institutionally structured techniques, often including aspects of the well-known Reid technique, to elicit a confession. These methods involve the utilisation of legally allowed (or, at the very least, not explicitly prohibited) psychological coercive techniques (Kassin et al., 2010; Janzen, 2019). These elements lead police interrogations to be inherently stressful and coercive. Even though police interrogations can lead to truthful confessions, they frequently lead to false confessions, which highly impacts the criminal justice system's search for truth and justice (Janzen, 2019). However, a distinction must be made between false and coerced confessions, since all interrogations have coercive aspects in them, including those which are PEACE oriented, as police officers are part of a law enforcement system whose ultimate goal is to charge a suspect with a crime (The Supreme Court of the United States, as cited in David et al., 2018).

Three main factors have been identified that lead to obtaining coerced false confessions: (1) misclassification error. Here, police officers misclassify the suspect as guilty, and they are overconfident in their first theory of guilt, which makes them ignore later key case evidence; (2) coercion error, occurring in an accusatory interrogation where the police confront the suspect using different manipulative techniques in order to obtain admissions of guilt. Presenting the suspect with fabricated evidence, lengthy interrogations,

and sleep deprivation are all legal (yet questionable) examples of this error, oriented at suspects questioning their own innocence. Finally, (3) the contamination error results from a long interrogation, where police officers introduce new information to the suspect to be used against them (Leo, 2009).

In the United States, Miranda Rights grant suspects the right to not incriminate themselves through their testimony (Fifth Amendment), and their right to legal counsel (Sixth Amendment) (David et al., 2018; Janzen, 2019). This awareness of the suspect's rights permits them to partially shift, or at least balance, the intrinsically asymmetric power dynamics of police interrogations, thus allowing the interrogated to not answer the interrogator's questions (David et al., 2018). However, it has been demonstrated that Miranda Rights are often not adequately read to suspects by police officers, since they are generally trivialised, read quickly, or treated just as a simple bureaucratic requirement, and not as a right to grant. This improper management, the willingness of innocent suspects to cooperate with the investigation, their nervousness, and the concern of talking to members of the police institution, in most cases, often lead suspects to waive their rights (Kassin et al., 2010; David et al., 2018; Janzen, 2019; Farrugia & Gabbert, 2019). Additionally, the lack of full comprehension of Miranda Rights is an important factor for a suspect to wave them, with adults with mental disabilities and children under the age of sixteen being the most vulnerable groups (Kassin et al., 2010; Coulthard et al., 2017; David et al., 2018; Janzen, 2019). As already pointed out, this lack of comprehension of suspects' rights during police interrogations lies at the core of the cases discussed in Chandía et al. (2020).

2.2.3. Honest confession

Contrary to the extensive research on false confessions, the investigation into honest confessions remains limited. An honest confession, characterised by its voluntary and reliable nature, is considered an ideal scenario that should occur spontaneously during police interrogations (Leo & Ofshe, 1997). Typically stemming from feelings of guilt related to the committed crime, such confessions may also arise when suspects realise the substantial evidence gathered against them by the police (Leo & Ofshe, 1997; Houston et al., 2014). Young criminals, especially, may find it challenging to cope with the overwhelming sense of guilt (Malloy et al., 2014).

Moreover, a common reason among a large number of suspects who confess is the belief that the police already consider them guilty of the crimes, suggesting that under different circumstances, such as the less confrontational PEACE paradigm, these confessions might not have occurred (Gudjonsson & Petursson, 1991; Gudjonsson & Bownes, 1992; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1994 as cited in Gudjonsson, 2003).

Following a confession, a significant challenge emerges in determining its veracity, specifically discerning between honest and false confessions. A confession is considered by the juries the most powerful evidence of what truly happened (Wigmore, 1972 as cited in Shuy, 1998; Kassin, 2005; Wallace & Kassin, 2012; Coulthard et al., 2017; David & Trainum, 2020). The difficulty of this task is compounded by the prevailing belief that innocent individuals do not confess to crimes (Kassin, 2005; Schatz, 2018).

For a confession to be considered honest and admissible in court, the information provided by the suspect must align with previously gathered evidence. Corroboration is crucial in this step and has different characteristics: (1) the confession includes information that cannot be known by anyone else but the person who committed the crime and other people involved, since it is not public information; (2) the confession includes information that leads to new discoveries of key evidence of the crime, such as the weapon used or a crucial location, and (3) the confession includes information about specific details of the crime scene that can only be known by the perpetrator or an accomplice (Leo & Ofshe, 1998; David & Trainum, 2020).

Honest confessions can be divided into three main different types: (1) voluntary, which derive from a non-accusatory interrogation or from police strategies that fit within the legal protocol; (2) stress-compliant, usually obtained because of the interpersonal pressure that the suspect feels that becomes intolerant and they admit what they did to make it end, and (3) coerced compliant, obtained as a result of the use of interrogation techniques and given to avoid worse consequences (Leo & Ofshe, 1997).

Distinguishing between an honest and coerced confession hinges on understanding the underlying motivations. Internal motivations, rooted in feelings of remorse and internal conflicts, contrast with external motivations driven by social pressures (Houston et al., 2014). Honest confessions typically arise from the suspect's internal emotions (Goodman-Delahunty

& Martschuk, 2020). Gudjonsson (2003) identifies three primary reasons for honest confessions: (1) External Pressure, where suspects confess due to techniques employed during police interrogations and the behaviour of involved officers; (2) Internal Pressure, linked to guilt after committing the crime, compelling them to confess to alleviate emotional burden; and (3) Perception of Proof, where suspects believe the police possess sufficient evidence of their culpability, rendering denial futile.

2.3. Questions and responses in a false confession

Chandía et al. (2020) will be consulted in order to compare the corpus of non-coercive interrogation presently under examination with their types of questions and responses in two coercive interrogations leading to coerced confessions. This prior investigation focused on the classification of questions and responses in coerced confessions with vulnerable subjects in the situation of a police interrogation, with the main objective of identifying the manipulation orientation of interrogators' questions and the way in which it affects the responses of the suspects, classifying their grammatical characteristics and relevant pragmatic functions, and describing relevant contrastive observations as to the amount of discourse produced by suspects and by interrogators in their interventions. An original taxonomy of types and subtypes of questions and responses was proposed, as this type of classification had been made and studied by other disciplines, such as law and psychology, but not by language studies.

The different types and subtypes of questions and responses that were proposed in Chandía et al. (2020) will be explained in the following subsections. Along with this, the main findings in regard to the application of this taxonomy to their corpus will be described.

2.3.1. Types of Questions

This taxonomy identified nine types of questions, with a total of thirteen subtypes. They were categorised as *wh-questions*, *polar questions*, *forced choice questions*, *modal questions*, *declarative statements*, *imperative statements*, *echo questions*, *"do you understand/know" questions*, and *complete-in-context statements*. Most of these types are divided regarding the presence of Investigation Relevant Information, or IRI (Farrugia & Gabbert, 2019) in the subtypes 'guiding' and 'non-guiding'. In a police interrogation oriented to the disclosure of

information and not to the imposition of the police narrative (Taranilla, 2011), IRI is not expected to occur in the interrogators' questions, as it is the suspects' answers that should provide the details of the case, and when it does occur in the question turns, this can be considered to be guiding the type of information that the answer will include. The guiding nature of interrogators' questions relates to two main factors: (1) whether or not the interrogator introduces IRI, which is the use of information that has not been presented by the suspect yet, or (2) whether the interrogator uses any type of discourse strategy that could influence the direction of the suspect's response. The types and subtypes are the following:

'Wh-questions' represent a distinct grammatical interrogative structure, featuring Wh-elements such as 'what,' 'where,' 'when,' 'which,' 'who,' and 'how.' The responses generated by these questions can significantly vary based on their nature, which encompasses freedom and guidance. 'Wh-questions' are categorised into three subtypes: *Wh-open questions*: These questions are designed to encourage the speaker to express themselves freely without seeking specific information. An instance of this is: "Where would you like to go for your vacation?". *Wh-specific non-guiding questions*: This subtype presents a pre-defined piece of information, often found in the response, serving to confirm or reiterate it. However, it does not inherently include guiding information. To illustrate this category, we can use the sentence: "Who was present at the party last night?". *Wh-specific guiding questions*: In this category, the questions contain guiding information, which may take the form of suggestions or assumptions related to the information still needed by the interrogators. These questions offer more specific directions in the response. A good example of this is: "What about seeing Pascuala with Jeffrey made you angry?".

'Polar questions' are designed to elicit a 'yes' or 'no' response from the interrogated. This type of question is divided into two subtypes: *polar question non-guiding*, where the question does not contain IRI and does not include information that can be used by the suspect to give a response. Consider, for instance: "Do you know this song?". *Polar question guiding*, in turn, does contain IRI or suggests a response. A good example is "Did you see Pascuala yesterday?".

Forced choice questions are intentionally structured to provide the interrogated individuals with limited response options, necessitating them to choose from a predefined set

of alternatives. An instance of this is: "Do you prefer green or blue?" It is worth noting that forced choice questions are inherently guiding in nature, and as such, they do not exhibit any subtypes due to their distinct characteristics.

'Modal questions' are constructed with the use of modal verbs and serve the purpose of eliciting a response, either in the form of a request or a command. Within this category, there are two distinct subtypes: *modal question non-guiding*: These questions do not provide any information that implies a specific response, nor do they incorporate IRI, as in "Could you lend me a hand with this?". *Modal question guiding*: In contrast, modal questions of this type imply or suggest particular information and anticipate a certain response. They may also contain IRI. An example of this category is: "Shouldn't you be at the meeting by now?"

'Declarative statements' are interventions that are made by the interrogator; they are either opinions or statements, and regardless of the fact that this category does not have the grammatical structure of a question, it encourages a response from the suspect. These are divided into: *declarative statement non-guiding*, which does not have either IRI nor suggestive information. A good example is: "The weather is quite pleasant today"; and *declarative statement guiding*, which suggests information to guide the response, also containing IRI. An instance of this is: "I heard you're interested in cooking, is that correct?".

'Imperative statements' are instructions or commands made by the interrogator, and in this category, a grammatical question is not formulated. These are divided into: *imperative statements non-guiding*, which do not suggest a response, nor do they include IRI. A good example of this is: "Please be quiet". *Imperative statements guiding*, on the other hand, contain IRI and can also suggest or present new information. Consider, for instance: "Describe your experience with the project.".

Do you understand/know questions encompass grammatical interrogative structures intentionally formulated to assess the suspect's comprehension and knowledge throughout the interrogation process. This particular category was introduced by Chandia et al. (2020) and stands as a singular category, with no subtypes due to its relatively straightforward use. To illustrate this category, we can use the sentence: "Do you understand the consequences of your actions?".

Echo questions involve the reiteration of the suspect's prior response, presented in interrogative form. Typically, this repetition serves the dual purpose of seeking confirmation and motivating the suspect to provide further information. In this category, no subtypes have been identified, as echo questions maintain a consistent approach without significant variation in their use. To illustrate this category, we can use the sentence:

- Suspect: "I was at home all night."
- Interrogator (echo question): "You were at home all night?"

The final category pertains to 'complete-in-context statements', which are essentially grammatically incomplete questions that only acquire full meaning and relevance within the context of the conversation. This category was identified and established to better align with the specific characteristics of the corpus under consideration. It is further divided into two distinct subtypes: *Complete-in-context statement non-guiding*: In this subtype, the question lacks IRI and does not introduce or suggest new information to elicit a specific type of response. An instance of this is: "It happened". *Complete-in-context statement guiding*: Conversely, in this subtype, the interrogator introduces or implies new information, and it contains IRI, influencing the type of response expected from the interrogated individual. A good example of this is: "It happened because of the argument". These subtypes provide a clearer distinction within the complete-in-context statement category, considering the presence or absence of IRI and the guidance provided to the interrogated individuals.

2.3.2. Types of Responses

Chandía et al. (2020)'s taxonomy of responses distinguished eight types of responses with eighteen subtypes. The types identified were *short positive responses*, *extended positive responses*, *short negative responses*, *extended negative responses*, *repetition/clarification requests*, *rationalising involvement*, *non-relevant responses*, and *aborted responses*. These types were established based on four primary criteria: (1) Mitigation: This criterion considers whether the response contains mitigation elements, such as hedges, pauses, fillers, or modal verbs. These mitigators are used to express uncertainty. The absence of such elements is also a factor. (2) Interjection: This criterion determines whether the response is characterised by the inclusion of interjections or exclamations, distinguishing it from responses that lack this feature. (3) Verbal vs. Non-verbal: Responses are categorised based on whether they are

44

expressed verbally through spoken language or non-verbally, which may involve gestures, expressions, or other means of paralinguistic communication. (4) Cause of Interruption: Lastly, the criterion of who instigates the interruption of the response is considered, classifying responses into those that are interrupted by others, typically the questioner, or self-interrupted by the responding individual. These four criteria serve to systematically categorise responses within the established response types, offering a comprehensive framework for analysing and understanding the diverse communication behaviours in an interrogation context.

The first type is 'Short positive responses'. These types of responses serve the purpose of agreeing shortly with a question made by the interrogator or briefly stating a fact. This can be divided into five distinct subtypes: *Short Positive Non-Mitigated*; *Short Positive Mitigated Certainty; Short Positive Interjection; Short Positive Non-Verbal,* and *Short Positive Echo.*

Short Positive Non-Mitigated Certainty: In this subtype, the answer is a short agreement, with no hesitation to admit with the question being asked. An example of this is:

- Interrogator: "Were you at the crime scene?"
- Suspect: "Yes, I was."

Short Positive Mitigated Certainty: Here, mitigation is depicted through the use of grammatical elements that diminishes and indicate uncertainty such as hedges, modal verbs, fillers in between words, or silent gaps. To illustrate this, we can say:

- Interrogator: "So you were in the other room when he was killed?"
- Suspect: "I think I was outside the house, but I don't remember"

Short Positive Interjection: In this subtype, to answer in agreement an exclamation or an interjection is made. In this situation, an expression like "uh-huh" can work to agree with the question being asked.

- Interrogator: "Were you at the park at that time?"
- Suspect: "Uh-huh, yes I was."

Short Positive Non-Verbal: This subtype of questions correspond to those positive answers that are not verbalised, but where the suspect gives an answer through, for example, a physical gesture such as a nod.

- Interrogator: "So you're saying you got in the car, right?"
- Suspect: (nods their head)

Short Positive Echo: In this subtype, the response can be conveyed by repeating with the information being given.

- Interrogator: "You took the car that night?"
- Suspect: "I took the car that night?"

'Extended positive responses', unlike the short positive questions, this type of responses are characterised by narrating the events to agree with the question. This type can be divided into two subtypes: *Extended Positive Non-Mitigated Certainty* and *Extended Positive Mitigated Certainty.*

Extended Positive Non-Mitigated Certainty: This subtype is characterised by a non-doubtful and certain agreement without the use of hedges, modal verbs, fillers, or silent gaps. An instance of this is:

- Interrogator: "What do you recall of that event?"
- Suspect: "I remember arriving at her house, then I greeted everyone present. The party ended shortly after I got there, so I left. Then I received a call that something had happened at her house."

Extended Positive Mitigated Certainty: In this subtype, the mitigation here is depicted through the use of grammatical elements that indicate hesitation in the narration of the events, such as hedges, modal verbs, fillers in between words, or silent gaps. To exemplify this, we can say:

Interrogator: "What did you do that day?"

Suspect: "I woke up and went to my morning run. After that, at uhh.. 12 o'clock or so, because I needed to go to the store to buy some things I needed for lunch."

'Short negative responses', which serve the function of challenging assertions, as well as rejecting or denying involvement. They encompass a range of actions, such as denying knowledge, expressing an inability to remember, or outright refusing to provide an answer. We can subcategorise the "Short negative responses" into five distinct subtypes: *Short Negative Non-Mitigated; Short Negative Mitigated Certainty; Short Negative Interjection; Short Negative Non-Verbal*, and *Short Negative Echo*.

Short Negative Non-Mitigated: In this subtype, the response is characterised by a clear and confident denial without expressions of insecurity. An instance of this is:

- Interrogator: "Did you steal the money?"
- Suspect: "No, I didn't."

Short Negative Mitigated Certainty: Here, the response incorporates elements of uncertainty, often expressed through the use of hedges, modal verbs, fillers, or silent gaps. To illustrate this category, we can use the sentence:

- Interrogator: "Were you at the scene of the crime?"
- Suspect: "I'm not really sure, I guess not."

Short Negative Interjection: This subtype involves the use of interjections or exclamations to convey disagreement, deny involvement, or express a lack of knowledge. For instance, the use of phrases like 'uh huh' falls into this category. A good example of this is:

- Interrogator: "Did you see the stolen goods?"
- Suspect: "Nope, uh-uh, I didn't."

Short Negative Non-Verbal: Non-verbal gestures are employed by the interrogated individual to communicate their negative response. This can include actions like shaking one's head. Consider, for instance:

- Interrogator: "Did you witness the accident?"
- (Suspect shakes their head).

Short Negative Echo: In this subtype, the interrogated individual repeats information that was previously mentioned by the interrogator. A good example is:

- Interrogator: "You were at the crime scene last night, weren't you?"
- Suspect: "At the crime scene? No, I wasn't."

These types provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the various forms and expressions of short negative responses in communication.

The category of 'Extended negative responses' serves the same function of denial as their shorter counterparts, but they do so in a narrative form, typically spanning three or more sentences. Within this category, two subtypes distinguish the nature of these responses: *Extended Negative Non-Mitigated* and *Extended Negative Mitigated Certainty*.

Extended Negative Non-Mitigated: In this subtype, the response is characterised by a confident and direct denial without the inclusion of hedges, modal verbs, fillers, or silent gaps. An instance of this is:

- Interrogator: "Tell me about your whereabouts last night.".
- Suspect: "I was at home all night. I didn't leave the house, and I can prove it. There's no way I could have been involved in any crime."

Extended Negative Mitigated Certainty: Conversely, the response in this subtype includes the elements found in the previous subcategory. The presence of hedges, modal verbs, fillers, or silent gaps contributes to the mitigation of certainty in the response. To illustrate this category, we can use the sentence:

- Interrogator: "Can you recall if you were at the park during the incident?"
- Suspect: "Well, I'm not entirely sure, but I think I was at home watching TV. I mean, I don't remember going to the park, uh, and it's unlikely I was there. Uh-uh, I usually stay home in the evenings"

These subtypes help to differentiate and categorise extended negative responses based on the presence or absence of linguistic features that express certainty or mitigation.

In the category of 'Repetition/clarification request,' the interrogated individual seeks further understanding of the question presented by the interrogator. This category can be divided into two distinct subtypes: *Question Repetition Verbal Request*: In this subtype, the request for repetition or clarification is made verbally, often indicated by phrases like "What?". An example is:

- Interrogator: "Did you witness the incident?"
- Suspect: "What? Can you please repeat the question?"

Question Repetition Interjection: Conversely, the request for clarification or repetition takes the form of an interjection, typically accompanied by a rising tone. A good example of this is:

- Interrogator: "Were you at the scene of the crime?"
- Suspect: "Huh? At the scene of the crime?

These subtypes provide a comprehensive classification for how individuals in an interrogation setting request repetition or clarification, highlighting the distinct manners in which this communication occurs.

Within the category of 'Rationalising involvement,' the suspect aims to provide justifications or explanations related to the crime. This is done with the intent of reducing their own level of participation or minimising the seriousness of the offence. Notably, this category does not feature any identified subtypes. Consider, for instance:

- Interrogator: "Why were your fingerprints found at the crime scene?"
- Suspect: "I had been to that place a few days before the incident. I touched a few things out of curiosity, but I had nothing to do with the actual crime."

This category encapsulates instances in which individuals in an interrogation setting attempt to rationalise their actions or involvement in the crime, without further differentiation into subtypes.

The category of 'Non-relevant responses' encompasses situations in which the interrogated individual fails to directly address the question posed to them. Instead, they provide information that is unrelated to the query. Notably, within this category, no subtypes have been identified. An instance of this is:

- Interrogator: "Can you tell me your whereabouts on the night of the incident?"
- Suspect: "Well, I was born and raised in this town, and I have a dog named Max. My favourite colour is blue, and I work at a local store."

This category serves to classify instances where the response provided by individuals in an interrogation setting deviates from the relevant topic, without any further subdivision into distinct subtypes.

The category of 'Aborted responses' involves situations in which the interrogated individuals initiate their response but do not complete it, either due to self-interruption or external interruption. This category is further subdivided into two subtypes: *Aborted by Others*, where the interrogated individual is interrupted by the questioner or another party during their response. To illustrate this category we can use the sentence:

- Interrogator: "Tell me, were you at the scene of the incident?"
- Suspect: "Well, I was walking down the street, and then I saw...[interrupted by the Interrogator]"

Aborted by Self: In contrast, in this subtype, the interrogated individual themselves decides to cease speaking and abruptly abort their response, typically resulting in sudden silence. A good example of this is:

- Interrogator: "Can you explain your actions on the night of the crime?"
- Suspect: "I didn't do anything w...[self-interruption and abrupt silence]"

These subtypes clarify the circumstances in which responses are halted, providing insight into the factors that contribute to the interruption of responses during interrogations.

The analysis of two coerced confessions revealed distinct patterns in the types of questions employed and the corresponding responses generated. The predominant types for questions included wh-questions, polar questions, and declarative statements, while the most frequent response types comprised short positive responses, short negative responses, and extended positive responses (Chandia et al., 2020).

Firstly, a noteworthy observation was that short positive responses were prevalent among both suspects no suspects have been mentioned. This trend was attributed to the inherent power and control imbalance within the interrogation, coupled with the suspects' mental vulnerabilities. The asymmetry in dynamics seemed to influence the suspects to provide brief affirmations, potentially indicating compliance with the interrogators' assertions (Chandia et al., 2020).

Secondly, a significant pattern emerged where declarative guiding questions and polar questions elicited specific types of responses. Declarative guiding questions often led to short positive responses, reinforcing the suspects' tendency to affirm incriminating information. On the other hand, polar questions resulted in extended positive responses, suggesting a higher likelihood of the suspects confirming the details presented by the interrogators. Furthermore, the interrogation process displayed a coercive nature as interrogators frequently reformulated questions from non-guiding to guiding after denials, thereby reinforcing pressure on the suspects (Chandia et al., 2020).

Lastly, the analysis indicated a connection between rationalising involvement and aborted responses with the use of guiding questions. In these instances, interrogators sought to complete the suspects' responses with information that aligned with the IRI. This strategic approach limited the suspects' ability to deny their involvement and pushed them towards minimising their culpability. Consequently, these identified patterns underscored the intricate interplay between the vulnerabilities of the suspects, the power dynamics inherent in police interrogations, and the specific types of questions utilised, all contributing to the elicitation of false confessions (Chandia et al., 2020).

A pivotal distinction arises in the examination of questions and answers. When analysing questions, the primary emphasis lies in dissecting the grammar employed in their formulation. The goal is to understand the structure, syntax, and linguistic features that compose a question, providing insights into the interrogator's intent, tone, and potential influences on the respondent. Conversely, the analysis of answers diverges by centering on two key dimensions: extension and content. The extension of an answer refers to its length or level of detail. This dimension helps discern patterns in how respondents choose to convey information, whether through concise responses or more extensive elaborations. Understanding the extension of answers aids in identifying any tendencies or preferences in the communicative style of the respondent.

Simultaneously, the content of answers is a focal point, delving into the substance and information provided by the respondent. This involves evaluating the accuracy, coherence, and relevance of the information disclosed. Analysing the content of answers is crucial for comprehending and uncovering potential inconsistencies, and gauging the influence of external factors such as coercion or manipulation on the information provided.

In essence, the analytical approach shifts from the structural aspects of questions to the broader dimensions of extension and content when examining answers. This exploration enhances the understanding of the dynamics within interrogative exchanges and contributes to a comprehensive assessment of the communicative interactions between interrogators and respondents.

3. Methodology

3.1. Description of corpus

This investigation analyses one of the first interrogations of the accused conducted by an FBI special agent and a member of the Florida Police Department on August 13, 1992. The interrogation took place at the Columbia Correctional Facility, starting at 13:30 hours

and ending approximately at 14:45 hours of the same day, having a total duration of 75 minutes. The interrogation was transcribed on September 11, 1993, and the copy was sent to the FBI Laboratory Division for behavioural analysis. The corpus consists of an approximately[1] 12,176-word transcription of the interrogation available online. It is constituted by approximately 368 question turns corresponding to the interrogating force (as explained, one member of the FBI and one member of the Florida Police Department), and 365 response turns of the accused. The reported purpose of the interrogation was for the accused to provide information relevant to the investigation that followed his arrest, for the initial investigation focused on the kidnapping and murder of four men, although the accused would later admit to the murder of 13 more men. During the interrogation, he provides details about his personal and professional life: he refers to his years in the military and his subsequent discharge, describes his way of choosing and killing his victims, explains his long-term interest in post-mortem body preservation and how this led him to cannibalism, and gives a brief insight into his mind and his lack of understanding of the reasons for his actions.

During the initial stages of the investigation, a transcription was made based on the excerpts of Dahmer's police interrogation that appear in the novel "Grilling Dahmer" by Patrick Kennedy and Robyn Maharaj. Nonetheless, because the information provided in the book was not a literal transcription but rather a narrative construction of the interrogation made by the authors, it could not be used as a valuable resource for comparative analysis alongside the FBI police interrogation transcript. The intention of working with two comparable corpora was to provide more instances available for analysis that could enhance the study and understanding of honest confessions. However, as mentioned, a notable challenge emerged due to the unreliability of the narration within the book, as the inclusion of the author's narrative voice could have potentially compromised the fidelity of the transcription. The reliability of the information gleaned from the novel became a concern, particularly when seeking to draw direct comparisons with the FBI's official transcript.

1. In this particular interrogation (our corpus) there is more than one interrogator present in the room. However, they are not explicitly differentiated from each other in the transcript; the only possible cue to it being two different people, is the use of parentheses. Therefore, both of their questions have been counted together as one turn. The only separation between them being when there is an explicit topic change, which in that case, both topics are still considered inside the same turn

Narration, tone, and potential embellishments could inadvertently alter the context and substance of the interrogated's statements. As a result, it was decided not to use said book as an object of study.

3.1.1.   *Corpus limitations*

The absence of access to the video recording and audio of the interrogation poses inherent limitations on our analysis. The transcription-based nature of our corpus restricts our ability to consider essential extralinguistic elements such as gestures, intonation, and interruptions between the interrogator and the interrogated subject. Consequently, during the analysis of questions, responses, turn-taking, and topic management, this absence problematized the process of classification and examination of phenomena that rely on these extralinguistic cues.

Because the interrogation was tape-recorded and then transcribed there is the possibility of missing information due to absence of certain parts of the content. When transitioning to 'side B' of the tape, there seems to be missing information. This is evident because the transcription denotes an interruption in the flow of the conversation. While the conclusion of 'side A' is marked by the interrogated's response, the commencement of 'side B' features a response that appears to reference something not present in the transcript.

In instances where the transcript includes portions marked as '[UNINTELLIGIBLE]' or '[REDACTED],' further limitations appear when classifying certain segments. These markers may interfere with the analysis of the interrogation, considering that extralinguistic cues may provide content useful during the analytical process.

3.1.2.   *The case of Jeffrey Dahmer*

Jeffrey Lionel Dahmer was born on May 21, 1960, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and died on November 28, 1994, at age 34. He was the eldest son of Joyce and Lionel Dahmer, and along with his younger brother, they constituted an overall traditional family. In his childhood and adolescence, however, it has been documented that he experienced severe emotional neglect and plain abandonment by his parents (Tithecott, 1997). After he graduated from high school, his mother left the family home along with her youngest son, leaving an 18-year-old Dahmer

alone in Bath, Ohio after his father's departure months earlier. Here Dahmer would commit his first murder. In August of that same year, he enrolled at Ohio State University (OSU), hoping to major in business, only to drop out three months later due to poor performance (L. Dahmer, 1995).

In January 1979, the 19-year-old college dropout enlisted in the U.S. Army, and after completing basic and medical specialist training, he was deployed to Baumholder, West Germany. Due to his alcohol abuse, in March 1981, Dahmer was deemed unfit for military service and was subsequently discharged from the Army, receiving an honourable discharge (L. Dahmer, 1995). He returned to the United States that same year, deciding to live in Miami Beach, Florida until December, before moving to live with his grandmother in West Allis, Wisconsin. It was here that he began his career as a serial killer, murdering three people in his grandmother's home, unbeknownst to her. In September 1988, Dahmer's grandmother asked him to move out. He would live in his new flat in Milwaukee, Wisconsin until May 1989 when he was sentenced to one year in a correctional facility for disorderly conduct (L. Dahmer, 1995). Upon his release, he would again live with his grandmother for a time until May 1990, when he moved into the Oxford Apartments on North 25th Street in Milwaukee. It is here that he would commit most of his crimes and where he would later be arrested for them (Masters, 1993).

Dahmer had already been arrested three times prior to the final detention that would lead to his final prison sentence. He was first arrested in September 1981, under the charges of drunk and disorderly conduct, and almost a year after, he was again arrested, now for exposing himself to a crowd that included families and their children at a fair. In 1986, he was apprehended for masturbating in front of two twelve-year-old boys (Masters, 1993; Kennedy and Maharaj, 2021). In September 1988, the accused was detained a fourth time and charged with second-degree sex assault, after he molested 13-year-old Keison Sinthasomphone. Three years later, in a strange coincidence, Keison's younger brother Konerak would become one of the youngest victims of the accused when he was killed at age 14 (Masters, 1993).

On July 22, 1991, Jeffrey Dahmer was captured by the Milwaukee Police Department after having attempted to murder 32-year-old Tracy Edwards. After being handcuffed by the

accused in the latter's small flat, Edwards managed to escape and alert two police officers about his kidnapper (Masters, 1993). Upon arrival, the police officers conducted a search of Dahmer's flat, where photographs of dismembered human bodies were found along with other body parts in his fridge (Schwartz, 2021). Dahmer attempted to flee the scene but police officers captured and arrested him. He was transferred to the Columbia Correctional Facility, where he was placed under formal investigation for the attempted kidnapping and murder of Edwards and the murder of four men whose dismembered bodies were found inside the accused's flat (Schwartz, 2021).

Dahmer was arrested for the kidnapping and homicide of four men, three white men and one black man but, during his interrogation, he claimed responsibility for a total of 17 murders (Kennedy and Maharaj, 2021). All of the victims were male, between the ages of 14 to 33 years old and from different ethnicities –White, Hispanic, Latino, Asian, and Black–. He did not seem to follow a specific pattern, although most of his victims were Black men. The majority of them came from low-income communities in Milwaukee and could be said to have fit and well-proportioned bodies, which was admittedly important to the accused, who claimed to have chosen his victims following that criterion (Schwartz, 2021).

Finally, on February 17, 1992, Jeffrey Dahmer was sentenced to life imprisonment after being convicted of fifteen of the sixteen homicides he committed in the city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Kennedy and Maharaj, 2021). After spending two years in prison, in 1994, he was murdered by an inmate of the Columbia Correctional Institution in Wisconsin.

3.2. Research questions

On the basis of the corpus under analysis, our study answers the following questions:

1. How can the question and response types proposed for coerced confessions in police interrogations be compared/contrasted with the questions and responses of a non-coerced interrogation resulting in an honest confession?

2. How can the power-asymmetrical interactional nature of a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession be characterised and interpreted?

3.3. Objectives

Following our research questions, our study will undertake the following general and specific objectives:

General Objectives

1. Identify significant similarities and differences between a) the question and response types already described for coerced confessions in police interrogations and b) the questions and responses of a non-coerced interrogation resulting in an honest confession.

2. Characterise the power-asymmetrical interactional nature of a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession.

Specific Objectives

1. Identify significant grammatical and pragmatic similarities and differences between a) the question and response types proposed by Chandía et al. (2020) for coerced confessions in police interrogations and b) the questions and responses of a non-coerced interrogation resulting in an honest confession in a first-degree murder case tried in 1992 in Wisconsin, US.

2. Propose informed explanations for the significant differences identified between a) the question and response types proposed by Chandía et al. (2020) for coerced confessions in police interrogations and b) the questions and responses of a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession in a first-degree murder case tried in 1992 in Wisconsin, US.

3. Characterise relevant aspects of topic management in a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession in a first-degree murder case tried in 1992 in Wisconsin, US.

4. Characterise relevant aspects of turn management in a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession in a first-degree murder case tried in 1992 in Wisconsin, US.

4. Results and Discussion

We will now present and discuss the findings of our investigation. The results will be presented through a series of tables, and each will be explained in detail with a discussion of its principal findings, illustrated with examples of the identified phenomena. First, we will present the contrastive examination of questions and responses, to then move on to the discussion of the interactive nature of the interrogation under analysis in terms of topic and turns, this following our specific objectives. In what follows, the interrogator will be identified as PI (Police Investigator) and the interrogated subject, Jeffrey Dahmer, will be referred to as ACC (Accused). It should be noted that, although two FBI agents conducted the interrogation, the transcription does not clarify which turn belongs to each, thereby all questions formulated by the interrogators will be identified as coming from one entity, the PI.

4.1. Categories for questions in interrogations leading to false confessions: application to an honest confession

This subsection will focus on presenting the results and discussion of the categorisation and comparison of question types present in a coerced confession analysis proposed by Chandía et al. (2020) and a non-coerced confession resulting in an honest one. We based our categorisation on the taxonomy proposed by Chandía et al., now focusing on the grammatical and pragmatic similarities and differences between both corpora. Not all suggested types and subtypes were present in both corpora, and our findings are organised into specific tables highlighting similar identified occurrences and differences.

Given the nature of both corpora as police interrogations, all turns initiated by the interrogator will henceforth be considered as questions formulated by the PI (Haworth, 2006). Conversely, those initiated by the interrogated suspect will be regarded as responses provided by the ACC.

4.1.1. Question types found in interrogations leading to false and honest confessions

Table 1 presents five shared types of questions and their respective subtypes found across both corpora, namely: Chandía et al.'s (2020) investigation of Korey Wise and Jessie

Misskelley's coerced confessions, and the present study of a non-coerced and honest confession by Jeffrey Dahmer. The data presented in the table does not represent all types and subtypes derived from Chandía et al.'s proposed taxonomy. Instead, as denoted by its nomenclature, Table 1 displays all types and their corresponding subtypes found only in both corpora.

Table 1

Type of Questions present in Chandía et al. (2020) and Dahmer's Confession.

Type of questions	Type realisation			Question Subtypes	Subtype realisation		
	Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al. (2023)		Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al. (2023)
	K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer		K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer
Wh-questions	265/817 32%	98/423 23%	63/375 16.8	Wh-open	42/265 16%	5/98 5%	21/65 32.3%
				Wh- specific non-guiding	211/265 80%	42/98 43%	42/65 64.4%
Polar questions	275/817 34%	94/423 22%	147/375 39.2%	Non-guiding	169/275 61%	14/94 15%	132/147 89.8%
Declarative statements	163/817 20%	125/423 30%	125/375 33.3%	Non-guiding	107/163 66%	13/125 10%	105/125 84%
Complete-in-context statements	18/817 2%	4/423 1%	13/375 3.5%	Non-guiding	14/19 74%	1/4 25%	11/13 84.6%
Echo questions	26/817 1%	9/423 2%	10/375 2.7%				

The predominant type of questions in the confessions of Dahmer and Wise are Polar questions. In the former case, this type accounts for nearly 40% of the overall count of turns that belong to the interrogator, while in the latter, it constitutes 35%. Subsequently, the most frequent type of questions in Misskelley's confession are Declarative statements, comprising 30% of the total number of turns attributed to the interrogator. On the contrary, the least frequent type in Dahmer's confession is Echo questions, which account for nearly 3% of all

turns. Contrastingly, in Wise and Misskelley's confessions, the rarest type is complete-in-context statements, comprising 2% and 1% of the total of turns, respectively.

The presence of these question types and subtypes in both studies indicates that they maintain their pragmatic function across both corpora, regardless of variations in their frequency. This might suggest a pattern in how these questions prompt responses from the ACC, emphasising their reliability and adaptability in eliciting honest and relevant information. To illustrate this, examples of both studies will be presented and discussed.

4.1.1.1. Wh-open questions

In essence, Wh-questions are interrogative grammatical structures that are always initiated by a Wh-element —'what', 'where', 'when', 'which', 'who', and 'how'—. These types of questions vary in the information they give and in whether they expect a specific type of answer (Chandía et al., 2020). In our analysis, only the subtypes wh-open and wh-specific non-guiding are present in both corpora.

(1)   Bravo et al.
Q.   As I told you earlier Jeffrey my main purposes of coming up here was to speak to you about your activities after you were discharged from the service and upon your arrival into South Florida. Basically what I would like to cover, **when did you first arrive in South Florida and how did you get there?**
A.   Ok, I was discharged six months early from the.. the service for uh, drinking too much.. Uh, I didn't want to be discharged early but they, they did. So when I arrived in I think it was South from Germany they.. they processed me out and told me that they'd give me a plane ticket to anywhere in the United States that I wanted to go. And I didn't want to.. I didn't want to go home right away because I didn't feel comfortable explaining to my folks why I was out six months early. So I decided that Miami, Florida would be a nice warm place to go. They flew me down there. I stayed, I arrived I think at the end of... The very end of March I think.

(2)   Chandía et al.
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: Well, you said a minute ago that you ran into Eddie.
KW: Yes.
EL: **Okay, what happened after that?**
KW: Umm, he was talking to me about what I was doing, I said "nothing." […]

As seen in examples (1) and (2), Wh-open questions allow the interrogated subject the opportunity and space to freely construct a narrative. Marked by their inherent openness, these questions are devoid of any guiding information. This absence of contextual cues in

formulated questions prompts the ACC to generate comprehensive and expansive answers (Chandía et al., 2020).

4.1.1.2. Wh-specific Non-guiding Questions

This subtype distinguishes itself from the above-mentioned because it is formulated in a way that it provides information in a precise manner. Consequently, it compels the ACC to generate a response in which the provided information is either reiterated or confirmed. Nonetheless, this subtype of Wh-question is precisely formulated yet non-guiding, as it elicits a clear response from the interrogated subject without providing guidance (Chandía et al., 2020).

> **(3)**   **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   **March of what year?**
> A.   Of uh, eighty... eighty one I think, I'm not real sure.
>
> **(4)**   **Chandía et al.**
> Korey Wise's statement #1
> EL: OK. Did you recognize any people of that group?
> KW: Yes.
> EL: **Who did you recognize?**
> KW: I recognized Steve…

Examples (3) and (4) illustrate the claims made in the previous paragraph. In instances where the PI asks specific questions, the response given by the ACC shows that he is allowed to generate answers that are devoid of guidance.

4.1.1.3. Polar Non-guiding Questions

Polar questions are formulated in such a way that the accused is prompted to generate binary responses, either 'yes' or 'no'. This subtype of Polar question refrains from providing the accused with any type of information that may serve as guidance, nor does it contain IRI (Investigation Relevant Information) thereby avoiding the imposition of a specific response type (Chandía et al., 2020).

> **(5) Bravo et al.**
> Q.   I'd like to get into some of you, you know, personal background and so forth you know, and.. (**Do you want another muffin?**)
> A.   No.

(6)   Chandía et al.
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: What's Lisa's last name?
KW: I don't know.
EL: **Do you know where she lives?**
KW: Yes.

As is illustrated in examples (5) and (6), Polar Non-guiding Questions are more likely to lead to a yes or no answer without guidance by the PI. Nonetheless, in the context of our corpus, a distinction can be made when compared with Chandía et al. (2020) as it will be discussed below.

While coerced confessions may suggest expected responses such as 'yes' or 'no', in our honest non-coerced confession corpus, findings suggest that the ACC might produce a broader, more extensive spectrum of responses than the common binary structure. These responses may include details, explanations, or qualifications that go beyond a simple affirmation or denial. We can see this in the following example:

(7)   Bravo et al.
Q.   **Did you report it to the police?**
A.   No. Another time I remember going back to the beach and there was.. Going back to the palace where I had you know my sleeping area set up and there were some other guys there and they, I almost got knifed cause they didn't know who I was. They thought I was trying to rob them or something.. Another time I tripped over an opossum in the middle of the night. Scared the hell out of me.

In example (7), the variability might suggest that the nature of responses may extend beyond the conventional yes/no dichotomy. In sum, this illustrates how versatile polar non-guiding questions are as they adapt to different response styles while maintaining their core function.

4.1.1.4. Declarative Non-guiding Statements

They are statements or opinions given by the PI who expects to receive a response of agreement or disagreement from the accused. It is important to bear in mind that although these are not grammatical questions, they require a response by the ACC and, as such, are categorised as questions (Chandía et al., 2020). This subtype shares the same non-guiding nature as the previous question types.

(8)   Bravo et al.
Q.   You're only means of transportation at the time was just.. Public?
A.   Bus, that's it.
Q.   **Public transportation.**

(9)   Chandía et al.
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: Did you see who did chase after him?
KW: Uh-uh, see I did see who chased him but I don't know I don't know who the people are.
EL: **You don't know their names.**
KW: No.

Examples (8) and (9) demonstrate how non-guiding declarations are valuable sources of acquiring information. In this sense, this subtype of questions, although they may not be grammatically formulated according to conventional question structure where the query is explicitly stated, the interrogated subject is able to understand that he is being prompted to give a response that is adequate to the context.

4.1.1.5. Complete-in-context Non-guiding Statements

Complete-in-context non-guiding statements are structurally incomplete questions that only within an ongoing conversation can gain full meaning and relevance. At the same time, this subtype of questions exhibits a non-guiding nature akin to the preceding question subtypes.

(10)   Bravo et al.
A.   Uhh.. sometimes just masturbating over them.. sometimes uh.. penis to the mouth…other times I'd make a slit right here in the front, a small slit, I know it sounds horrible and it was uh.. do it that way.
Q.   **(Did you find that..)**
A.   Then I did.. yeah.
Q.   (Arousing)

(11)   Chandía et al.

Korey Wise's statement #1
KW: So (pause) there was a car coming and Alfred he's saying "don't throw a rock at the car."
EL: **He said…**
KW: "Don't throw a rock at the car."

As seen in example (11), in Chandía et al.'s corpus, non-guiding questions exhibit a distinctive feature of lacking IRI. This characteristic grants the accused the opportunity to respond with the truth to posed inquiries, which can also be applied to example (10) due to the similarity of how these questions can be used. In consistency with this definition, the five subtypes of non-guiding questions identified in Chandía et al., have the same function in our corpus.

4.1.1.6. Echo Questions

These types of questions are grammatical interrogative structures where the PI repeats the previous response given by the suspect (Chandía et al., 2020). Similarly to Chandía et al.'s observations, Echo questions in our corpus are used as a strategy by the PI and they might serve a dual purpose.

Firstly, the PI asks Echo questions to seek confirmation from the ACC. This intentional repetition of information aims to motivate the ACC to delve deeper into details, encouraging a more elaborate response. By echoing the ACC's statements, the PI signals a desire for affirmation and prompts him to contribute with additional information, as can be seen in the following examples (12) and (13):

> **(12) Bravo et al.**
> Q. You speak very well, you articulate very well, What is your IQ if you know it?
> A. Average.
> Q. **Average IQ**.
> A. Average range from what I've heard anyway from testing.
>
>
> **(13) Chandía et al.**
> Korey Wise's statement #1
> EL: When you saw him hit him, can you tell us, would, did he hit him from the front or the back?
> KW: He jumped on him.
> EL: **He jumped on him**? From the front or the back? [Both at the same time]
> KW: [Both at the same time] He did over…
> EL: He jumped on him from the front or the back?

Secondly, Echo questions also function for closing of a particular line of inquiry. In this context, as demonstrated in example (14), the PI uses repetition as a method to summarise and reinforce the information given by the ACC. By echoing the ACC's statements, the PI effectively brings closure to the topic under discussion, allowing for a smooth transition to the next line of questioning:

> **(14) Bravo et al.**
> A. Not having to pretend that I was something that I wasn't. You know.. and watching the strip tease acts, there's some pretty good ones.
> Q. These were male strippers.
> A. Right.
> Q. **Right**…

This dual functionality evidences the versatility of Echo questions in managing the flow of the interrogation and, more importantly, eliciting the desired information from the ACC. In our corpus, the reason behind the presence of the types and subtypes of questions proposed by Chandía et al. (2020), as shown in Table 1, might be due to the contextual setting corresponding to a police interrogation, as the main objective of these instances is acquiring information that can later on be used as evidence (Coulthard et al., 2017).

In the following section, we will discuss the type of questions that are either not typically found or that are completely absent in our corpus, making the connection between these types of questions and honest confessions. All of this will be accompanied with illustrative examples that support our findings.

4.1.2. Question types not typically found or absent in an interrogation leading to an honest confession

Table 2 presents the type of questions identified in Dahmer's confession, aiming to facilitate a comparison with the findings of Chandía et al (2020). Four types were identified, wherein some are present but infrequently used, or entirely absent. Notably, the two types that are absent in our corpus are questions involving comprehension or knowledge ('Do you understand/ know' questions) and imperative statements.

In our corpus, only two out of the four types proposed by Chandía et al. (2020), which are present in Table 2, are observable, namely: Modal non-guiding questions and Forced choice questions. However, it is important to highlight that these question types are less frequent in this investigation compared to Chandía et al.'s corpus, where they exhibit a higher presence. The disparities in frequency might be attributed to variations in interrogation styles or the nature of the case investigated in our corpus as opposed to Chandía et al.'s. The acknowledgement of these variations might emphasise the diversity in questioning strategies employed by investigators in different settings. This is relevant as Chandía et al., focuses on false confessions, while our corpus involves an honest one.

Table 2

Type of Questions not Typically Found or Absent in Dahmer's Confession.

Type of questions	Type realisation			Question Subtypes	Subtype realisation		
	Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al., (2023)		Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al., (2023)
	K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer		K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer
Modal questions	21/817 3%	3/423 1%	2/375 0.5%	Guiding	1/21 5%	2/3 67%	0/2 0%
				Non-guiding	20/21 95%	1/3 33%	2/2 100%
Imperative Statements	4/817 0.4%	13/423 3%	0/375 0%	Guiding	1/4 25%	6/13 46%	0/0 0%
				Non-guiding	3/4 75%	7/13 54%	0/0 0%
"Do you understand / know" questions	8/817 1%	9/423 2%	0/375 0%				
Forced choice questions	36/817 4%	27/423 6%	5/375 1.3%				

4.1.2.1. Modal Non-guiding Questions

Modal non-guiding questions are interrogative interventions formulated by the PI that are introduced by a modal verb with the intention of commanding or requesting a response by the ACC. This subtype shares the non-guiding nature that was formerly explained in the other types.

(15)   Bravo et al.
Q.   **Would that work?**
A.   Yeah.

(16)   Chandía et al.
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: Do you know where you went when you went in the park?
KW: Yes.
EL: **Would you tell us where you went?**
KW: Went to a field.

The reason this type of question is less frequent than others might reside in the fact that the ACC, as will be discussed in upcoming sections, shows less resistance and is more cooperative when giving information. Therefore the PI, when dealing with this type of subject, might avoid formulating questions that may seem commanding and, instead, might decide to pose questions that are less forceful, as seen in examples (15) and (16).

4.1.2.2. Forced Choice Questions

In terms of frequency, even though Forced choice questions are the most commonly identifiable type among those listed in Table 2, their occurrence in our corpus is still minimal. This type of question is formulated with the intention of limiting the response options available for the ACC.

(17) **Bravo et al.**
Q.   **And you flew into where, Miami or FT. Lauderdale?**
A.   Miami. Got a hotel for a week right on the coast, right in view of the ocean.

(18) **Chandía et al.**
 Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: Did you see how she got to be there?
KW: I know she was forced to go down the hill, but…
EL: When you say she was forced to go down the hill, do you know… **she walked down the hill, or she was dragged down the hill?**
KW: She was dragged.

The low frequency of this type of question can be attributed to, as seen in modal non-guiding questions, the cooperative and less resistant nature of the ACC. Having in mind that the ACC is more open to giving information, limiting his responses by using forced choice questions might not be the best way to approach the interrogation as seen in example (17) where the ACC limits himself to answer shortly just what is being asked, on the contrary to what is commonly observed with other question types where he gives more information than what is being required. In example (18), however, forced choice questions are made so the interrogated subject answers in a certain way that might end up incriminating them due to the details given, which are the PI's intentions from the beginning.

There are two types and a subtype that were not identified in our corpus, Imperative Statements, 'Do you understand/know' questions, and the sub-type Modal-guiding. Their absence or infrequent occurrence in our corpus might be associated with either the

cooperative nature of this confession or matters regarding the ACC's non-vulnerable status. All of which will be further discussed in the upcoming paragraphs.

4.1.2.3. Imperative Statements

Imperative Statements, which are designed to command the ACC to provide information, may be deemed unnecessary by the interrogator in our corpus. The cooperative nature of the ACC implies a willingness to share information voluntarily, eliminating the need for more forceful directives. As will be discussed in later sections, the ACC shows a tendency to present less resistance and more cooperation in comparison to individuals in a coerced interrogation.

> **(19)   Chandía et al.**
> Korey Wise's statement #1
> KW: They probably picked her. They probably picked her up. Picked her up.
> EL: **I'm asking you to try to think as best as you can**. Don't tell me what you think they probably did.
> KW: Okay.
> EL: **Try to tell me exactly what you saw or heard**.

> **(20)   Chandía et al.**
> Korey Wise's statement #1
> EL: **I'm asking you to try to think as best as you can. Don't tell me what you think they probably did**.
> KW: Okay.

Examples (19) and (20), as extracted from Chandía et al. (2020), illustrate the nature of a coerced false confession, where imperative statements are used as a means to give instructions to the interrogated suspect. Meanwhile, in a non-coerced honest confession, as is the case of our corpus, these statements do not appear and therefore cannot be exemplified.

4.1.2.4. 'Do you understand/know' and Modal-guiding

Similarly, 'Do you understand/know' questions and the subtype Modal-guiding, which involve a certain level of suggestion or coercion within the question itself, found limited manifestation in our corpus. The cooperative stance of the ACC minimises the necessity for such explicit prompting, as he is already open to supplying information without the need for coercion or explicit suggestions embedded within the questions. This highlights the importance of considering the specific context and characteristics of a corpus when interpreting the presence or absence of particular question types.

4.1.2.5. 'Do you understand/ know' Questions

The limited presence of 'Do you understand/know' questions in our corpus, as opposed to their higher frequency in Chandía et al., can be attributed to the distinct vulnerability profiles of the accused in the respective investigations. In Chandía et al., both interrogated suspects were recognized as vulnerable individuals due to their age and some form of physical or intellectual disability (2020). Given these vulnerabilities, the interrogators likely employed 'Do you understand/know' questions as a means to ascertain the comprehension and understanding of the interrogative process. The vulnerability of the subjects necessitated a more careful and explicit approach to ensure that they were fully grasping the proceedings and could participate effectively in the conversation, as the following example (21) illustrates:

> **(21)   Chandía et al.**
> Jessie Misskelley's statement #1
> GG: In his groin area?
> JM: Uh-huh.
> GG: Okay.
> BR: **Do you know what his penis is?**
> JM: Yeah, that's where he was cut at.

On the contrary, in our investigation, the ACC, a homosexual man undergoing a police interrogation, can be deemed socially vulnerable due to his sexuality, especially considering that the interrogation took place in 1992, a period in which homophobia was still a prominent issue in American society. Simultaneously, his status as an interrogated subject further places him in an evident vulnerable position. However, he cannot be valued as equally vulnerable as the subjects in Chandía et al., because he lacks any physical intellectual disability, which eliminates the imperative need for explicit confirmation questions about understanding. The ACC's seeming non-vulnerable status implies a higher level of cognitive ability and comprehension, obviating the need for frequent checks. This emphasises the connection between the characteristics of the subjects, the interrogation context, and the formulation of specific question types.

In reaction to our findings regarding the previously mentioned type, we propose a new one labelled 'Do you remember/know' questions. This newly proposed type of question indicates an inquiry aimed at prompting the ACC to retrieve and articulate specific details

from their memory. Unlike Chandía et al.'s type, this new classification aligns more closely with the cooperative and open nature of our corpus, where the ACC willingly provides information without requiring explicit confirmation about comprehension or knowledge.

4.1.2.6. 'Do you remember/recall' Questions

The emergence of the 'Do you remember/recall' question type in our corpus is noteworthy given its limited occurrence, totalling seven instances. They are concentrated within a specific topic, namely 'Personal Life,' indicating a thematic focus for the use of this question type, as illustrated next in example (22):

(22)   Bravo et al.
Q.   **Do you remember her name?**
A.   Her name I don't remember no.
Q.   **Do you remember the name of it?**
A.   Along Collins Avenue. No I don't remember the name of that hotel.

In each instance, 'Do you remember/recall' questions share a common objective—eliciting IRI about the names of individuals or places. This targeted use suggests a specific intention behind employing this question type within the broader context of the interrogation. The concentration of these questions within the topic 'Personal life' emphasises a deliberate choice in probing the ACC's memory regarding specific personal details.

4.1.2.7. Modal Guiding Questions

Modal Verb guiding questions are grammatically interrogative structures that initiate with a modal verb. Its guiding nature depends on two criteria, which is the presence of IRI or of information that might influence the ACC's response in accordance with the interrogator's intentions (Chandía et al., 2020).

(23)   Chandía et al.
Jessie Misskelley's statement #2
GG: Had him in a headlock? Did he, did he have him any other way?
JM: He was holding him like this by his head like this and stuff. (Indicating the victims being held by their ears)
GG: **Could he have been holding him up here like that**? (Indicating another way)
JM: He was, I was too far away he was holding him right there by his head like this (Showed the same as GG).

In example (23), the Modal verb 'could' is used by the interrogator to influence the interrogated subject's response by prompting him to corroborate the claims made in the question (Chandía et al., 2020). As this subtype of question is designed to direct the response provided by the interrogated subject, and since our corpus lacks the presence of such questions, this subtype was not identifiable in any instance.

Due to the different nature of Chandía et al.'s and our study, the types of questions that were discussed in this section were difficult or impossible to find since the ACC is a non-vulnerable subject who seems to be more cooperative compared to the interrogated subjects in Chandía et al. Because of this, new types, that are more in accordance with our corpus, were proposed as a way to elaborate on the differences in question formulation of honest and false confessions.

The next subsection will include the question types found in both false and honest confessions that function in a different way in an honest one. These instances will be supported by examples that demonstrate our findings.

4.1.3 Question types found in interrogations leading to both false and honest confessions with varying functions in the latter

This subsection will address the question types that can be found across the present corpus and in the corpora analysed in Chandía et al (2020), however, focusing on aspects of these types and subtypes that function differently in both investigations. The question types discussed below are all related to the remaining guiding subtypes.

Table 3 shows the questions corresponding to types which appear across both corpora, but do not have the same function in the corpus used for this analysis. The presence of guiding questions in the analysed corpus, despite their occurrence, does not align with the same function observed in Chandía et al. In our corpus, in which the ACC is providing an honest confession and, therefore, is willing to discuss his crimes, the dynamics differ significantly from Chandía et al.'s scenario.

Table 3

Question types identified in both corpora with varying functions in Dahmer's confession.

Type of questions	Type realisation			Question Subtypes	Subtype realisation		
	Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al. (2023)		Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al, (2023)
	K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer		K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer
Wh-questions	265/817 32%	98/423 23%	63/375 16.8%	Wh-guiding	12/265 5%	51/98 52%	2/63 3.2%
Polar questions	275/817 34%	94/423 22%	132/375 35.2%	Guiding	106/275 39%	80/94 85%	15/147 10.2%
Declarative statements	163/817 20%	125/423 30%	105/375 28%	Guiding	56/163 34%	112/125 90%	20/105 19%
Complete-in-context statements	18/817 2%	4/423 1%	13/375 3.5%	Guiding	5/19 26%	3/4 75%	2/13 15.4%

In Chandía et al., formulated guiding questions that contain IRI are strategically employed to coerce the responses given by the ACC. This manipulative use of guiding questions aims to steer the narrative in a particular direction and elicit specific details from the ACC that may not be accurate. The interrogators in Chandía et al., have the intention of shaping the information given by the interrogated subjects.

In contrast, in our corpus, the ACC exhibits a clear willingness to share details about his crimes voluntarily. The ACC's cooperative nature eliminates the need for the PI to force information into the statement, as seen in the comparative lower percentages displayed in Table 3 for all four question subtypes present in our corpus. Guiding questions, while present, may not serve the same manipulative purpose as observed in Chandía et al. Instead, they may function more as clarifying or probing strategies rather than as a means to introduce information. The nature of the ACC's willingness to truthfully confess shapes the dynamics of the interrogation and influences the role and impact of guiding questions in this investigation.

4.1.3.1. Wh-guiding Questions

The distinction in the pragmatic function of Wh-guiding questions between our corpus and Chandía et al. is significant. In the analysed corpus, the guiding information within Wh-guiding questions is not intended to introduce new information or IRI, as observed in Chandía et al. Instead, the guiding function serves to obtain further details about a topic that has not been previously brought up.

The use of Wh-guiding questions in this investigation's context aligns with the concept of leading questions, as proposed by Farrugia & Gabbert (2019), which have the purpose of obtaining relevant information for the interrogation. Therefore, the intention is not to coerce the ACC, as seen in Chandía et al.'s case, but rather to guide the discussion towards unexplored aspects, or gather additional information on a specific topic.

The fundamental goal of obtaining a confession differs in our corpus, where the ACC is willingly giving an honest confession compared to Chandía et al.'s case, where the interrogator's aim is to elicit a confession through strategic questioning, including the use of guiding questions. Understanding these differences in the intentions and outcomes of Wh-guiding questions highlights the adaptability of questioning techniques based on the context and goals of the interrogation process.

> **(24)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   (You hide the smoke while these guards come by) You had an alter set up in your bedroom?
> A.   Right. With the painted skulls.
> Q.   **How would the ritual go?**
> A.   I didn't really have any set..
>
> **(25) Chandía et al.**
> Jessie Misskelley's statement #1
> GG: **Have you ever seen them with a briefcase before?**
> JM: I've seen them once that one night, I seen them with it that night.
> GG: Okay, what is kept inside of that briefcase?
> JM: They had some cocaine, and a little gun.

In example (24), although the ACC mentions experimenting with rituals, he does not openly talk about it, and only briefly explains having an altar with skulls, among other elements. However, it is the PI who leads the conversation into the actual purpose of this altar. On the other hand, in example (25), the guiding information is directly involved with the

adjudication of fundamental elements of the case, in this example, this element being the briefcase, which was not mentioned before by the ACC.

4.1.3.2. Polar Guiding Questions

The way in which polar-guiding questions function in our corpus diverges from their role in Chandía et al. In our case, these questions primarily aim at seeking confirmation rather than introducing specific details that might interfere with the ACC's responses. The polar-guiding questions used by the PI serve to confirm or clarify certain details, as opposed to presenting IRI that could potentially coerce the ACC's responses.

As illustrated in example (26), IRI in a polar-guiding question revolves around a detail related to a place, emphasising its potential importance in associating the ACC with a crime. This aligns with the investigative nature of the questioning, seeking confirmation or elaboration on specific details without directly introducing incriminating information. In contrast, in Chandía et al.'s example (27), polar-guiding questions involve IRI that is more direct and potentially incriminating, such as a name that could directly implicate someone in a crime.

> **(26)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   Did there ever come a time that you moved from the Bimini room, the Bimini apartment? **to someplace further north**?
> A.   Uh huh, to Ohio. That was in September.
> [...]
> Q.   Oh ok, Let's back up then. While you're still in Florida. Did you ever move into **the north Miami beach area**?
> A.   The only place I ever had any residence was Bimini bay. That was the only place where I was at.
>
> **(27)** **Chandia et al.**
> Korey Wise's statement #1
> EL: Who else did you recognize?
> KW: Hmm... Kevin.
> EL: **Is that Kevin Richardson?**
> KW: Yes. I don't know where he live at.

In example (26), the conversation is being led by the PI in order to get to other questions containing IRI. However, at the time, these questions about places were mostly asked to contextualise the situation. In contrast, in example (27) the question contains IRI, and directly works as the identification of another suspect.

This distinction emphasises the importance of considering the specific objectives of interrogations when analysing the impact of question types. The varied use of polar-guiding questions in different contexts highlights the adaptability of questioning techniques to achieve different goals within the interrogation process.

4.1.3.3. Declarative Guiding

The role and function of declarative guiding statements in Dahmer's interrogatory differs from Chandía et al.'s study. As seen in example (29), these statements are used to suggest that the information given by the suspect is incorrect and should be modified, or to directly introduce IRI that has not been disclosed by the suspect. In response, the interrogated is more likely to agree with the statement rather than to offer an independent reply as the PI will have an already made version of events, and rather than seeking a true response, this type of questions allow the PI to request confirmation of their own narrative (Taranilla, 2011).

However, as seen in example (28), declarative guiding statements in our corpus serve a slightly different purpose. While they still aim to guide the narrative, they afford the ACC with the possibility of denying or challenging the information presented. Unlike example (29), which shows how these statements may be more assertive, example (28) illustrates that they are not imposed, and that the ACC has the agency to contest or refute the content of the declarative guiding statement.

(28)   Bravo et al.
Q.   And like I said that's why we're up here and you know **I had to ask you right out if you had anything to do with the kidnapping and the murder of Adam Walsh.**
A.   Nothing.. Nothing.

(29)   Chandía et al's
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: How did she get the injuries that she had when you finally saw her? I mean, **you get you get a punch, you see a fight, you get a punch you get a bruise.**
KW: I know.
EL: **You don't get, you don't get bleeding, you don't get these lines, you don't get a fractured skull from it.**
KW: That more, that more it looked, that more it looked like it's, it's, it's from like, it's like a rock. A rock…

This distinction shows how segments of this particular interrogation can be more symmetrical and participatory, where the ACC retains a degree of control over the narrative.

The flexibility for the ACC to deny or counter the information presented in declarative guiding statements contributes to a more collaborative and open exchange of information, aligning with the overall cooperative nature of the interrogation in our context.

4.1.3.4. Complete-in-context Statements Guiding

In Chandía et al., guiding complete-in-context statements are grammatically incomplete statements that suggest a response which contains IRI. In the corpus analysed for this study, even though this question type aims for the same goal, there are some slight differences regarding pragmatic functions. As mentioned above, the coercive nature of guiding questions is mitigated due to the willingness of the ACC to plainly give information.

> **(30)** **Bravo et al.**
> A.   Never went after children my interest was in older adults of bar age and all of them that I met I thought were bar age.. uh.. the uh..
> Q.   **(Conrad?)**
> A.   Conrad I thought he was of age, so did the police. That's why they let him back out.

Example (30) evidences the elicitation of a response containing IRI. However, it also works as an active listening setting. Active listening is understood as the act of hearing and reacting to someone else which improves understanding between the individuals involved. When individuals communicate with one another, they frequently fail to pay attention attentively (Active Listening: International Online Training Program on Intractable Conflict, 1998, as cited in Royce, 2005). This setting allows the turn to work as an instance in which the question is asked to make the exchange fluent while opening a possibility for the ACC to offer information about a specific situation —one that was not previously touched upon in this specific interrogation but was known by both parts—, regarding the current topic, without the intention of it being incriminatory.

The analysis of the different question types in the corpora of both studies, resulted in the observation that the guiding nature of questions works differently in our corpus. While guiding questions are of great importance in Chandía et al.'s study, as they were analysed as a coercion strategy used by the police to get the confession out of two different vulnerable suspects, in Dahmer's interrogation the role of guiding questions, alongside of not being used as a means of interfering with the narrated events, is limited only to one section of the

interrogatory, as seen in example (28) where the ACC is asked about his implication in the kidnapping and murder of Adam Walsh.

After interrogating the ACC about these events, questions formulated by the PI are about offences that are no longer being investigated. It should be noted that, by the time mentioned, the ACC has already explicitly stated that he has no intention of negating the committed crimes and, in fact, is willing to give information.

In the corpus analysed in this investigation, the guiding subtype serves the role of gathering additional information about a topic instead of prompting the ACC to incriminate himself by giving new information that was implicit in the question, as it might be the case with coerced confessions. In this sense, the lower frequency of the guiding subtype in our investigation might be attributed to the fact that, as has been previously stated, the ACC voluntarily admits his crimes and is open to provide detailed descriptions. Consequently, the PI, a majority of the time, does not have the necessity to formulate questions that command, influence or instruct the responses given by the ACC because he has already shown to be cooperative and descriptive with the information provided.

Plenty of observations were made through the analysis of the questions formulated during the interrogation. One of the most important is that the type of questions present in an interrogation will depend on the nature of it as this might determine if a question is effective or not, thus the reason why some question types and subtypes appear completely, some partially and some are completely absent. Overall, our findings suggest that, when dealing with a subject who voluntarily and openly provides information, it may not be effective to formulate questions that may be deemed as commanding or that might influence the responses given by the ACC as he is already willing to respond. Concerning the question types and subtypes that are entirely absent in our corpus, we proposed a new type of question labelled as 'Do you remember/recall', to include into further taxonomies questions that appeal directly to the interrogated subject's memory of the events in order to evaluate if continuing to mention a particular topic is beneficial or not for the investigation.

The following subsection will display a breakdown of the type and subtypes of the ACC's responses, based on the taxonomy proposed by Chandía et al (2020). Demonstrating

the most remarkable aspects of each type –and subtype– of response, and analysing their function in both corpora, showing that different phenomena occur: some are present in Dahmer's confession, others function in a completely different way, while others could not be found in our corpus. All this will be supported with its corresponding examples and explanation.

4.2. Categories for responses in interrogations leading to false confessions: application to an honest confession

Having already discussed how the difference in nature of both corpora affects the interrogators' use of question strategies, the same approach will be applied to the analysis of response types and subtypes. Said types of responses, will be categorised in three main types: (1) types of responses that are found in false confessions but not in a honest one, (2) types of responses that can be found in both false and a honest confession, (3) types of responses that can be found in both types of confession but with different applications in an honest confession, and (4) types of responses that were not categorised because they did not meet the criteria to be in a category.

4.2.1. Response types in false confessions that are not typically found in honest confessions

Table 4 presents four types of responses: 'Repetition/clarification request', 'Aborted response', 'Rationalising involvement', and 'Non-relevant response'. Two of these types also contain the respectives subtypes 'Verbal request', 'Interjection', 'By other', and 'By self'. All four main types are found in Chandia et al. corpus, but present a reduced appearance or are entirely absent in our corpus.

As shown in Table 4, there are three types of responses that have a limited presence in our corpus but are found in Chandia et al. These types are 'Repetition/Clarification verbal request', 'Rationalising involvement', and 'Non-relevant response'. Their presence is extremely limited and, overall, accounts for less than 4% of the total number of turns that are categorised as responses. One type, 'Aborted response' is completely absent from our corpus, and this might be due to, as discussed in section 3.1.1, our corpus limitations. Since neither audio nor video versions of the interrogation were available, we can not be certain of the

interruptions occurring throughout the confession. All different aspects of the types of responses with limited or absent presence will be now analysed.

Table 4

Response types identified in Chandía et al.: limited or absent in Dahmer's confession

Type of responses	Type realisation			Responses Subtypes	Subtype realisation		
	Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al., (2023)		Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al., (2023)
	K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer		K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer
Repetition/clarification request	71/826 9%	1/344 0.3%	3/366 0.8%	Verbal request	11/53 21%	1/1 100%	3/3 100%
				Interjection	42/53 79%	0/1 0%	0/3 0%
Aborted response	20/826 2%	7/344 2%	0/366 0%	By other	20/20 100%	6/7 85.7%	0/0 0%
				By self	0/20 0%	1/7 14.3/	0/0 0%
Rationalising involvement	29/826 4%	14/344 4%	4/366 1.1%				
Non-relevant response	5/826 1%	11/344 3.2%	5/366 1.4%				

4.2.1.1. Repetition/Clarification Verbal Request Response

This type of response has the pragmatic function of indicating to the PI that the ACC needs, as the name itself states, the repetition or clarification of a previously formulated question. As described before, the vulnerable status of the interrogated subjects in Chandía et al. is related to the presence of this subtype of response, as seen in example (32).

(31)   **Bravo et al.**
Q.   What caught your interest towards the pornographic materials?
A.   **What?**
Q.   What caught your interest specifically?

(32)   **Chandía et al.,**
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: Okay. Did you see anybody masturbate on top of her?
KW: **What you mean masturbate?**
EL: Play with themselves, jerk off?
KW: Yeah, yes.

Expectedly, in our corpus, the low frequency of the same subtype of responses might be attributed to the ACC's non-vulnerable status. This distinction is highlighted by the inference

that, in the corpus analysed in this study, the repetition of a question might stem from potential issues with clarity in formulation or audibility, as illustrated in example (31). In contrast, in Chandía et al., example (32), the interrogator might repeat or clarify a question with the awareness that the interrogated subject may require further explanation to fully understand a claim, considering their diminished capacities.

4.2.1.2. Rationalising Involvement

As previously outlined, the pragmatic function of this type of response is to provide justifications or explanations to diminish the level of participation or downplay the gravity of the offence (Chandía et al., 2020). In our corpus, it is noteworthy that every instance of this response type occurs under the same topic and subtopic, namely 'Sex' and 'Attacks on minors', respectively. Both will be discussed in subsequent sections, nonetheless, for the final analysis, this information is important.

The limited occurrence of this type of response, specifically in the subtopic 'Attacks on minors', might suggest the ACC's hesitation in addressing this particular subject, which may be attributed to the ACC's resistance and discomfort to mentioning this subtopic –and all that these offences entail–. This can be seen in example (33), where the ACC seems to comprehend that a sexual crime towards a child can be perceived as a worse type of crime, that could potentially ruin the perception that the PI could have of him.

> **(33)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   You had no desires towards children at that time either?
> A.   No…. In west Dallas there was some lewd and lascivious behavior in a park that I was involved in for about a year.
> Q.   You were arrested then?
> A.   Right. But uh, there was, **there was no assault on any children or anything it was just masturbation.**

Consequently, the ACC may be inclined to be less cooperative and be more resistant, thus providing less information so as to avoid engaging in further discussions related to this subject. In this case, example (33) shows how the ACC tries to downplay his actions with children not as an assault, but as an action that did not affect them.

(34)   Chandía et al.
Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: How did they dragged her?
KW: They grabbed her from her feet and dragged her from the grass. Her back was on the uh (pause) her back was on the grass. They just dragged her down the grass. They dragged her down. That's when… that's when Steve stripped her clothes with a knife and everything. Slapped her twice in her face, that what he did. When he did all that, **I didn't want to sit right there and look at what's going on**. I didn't wanna look like no... when you… If you were with them, you ask yourself [unintelligible] effort too. So, I had to get it to her too. I wasn't doing what they was doing, they was on top of raping her completely, I was playing with her.

Contrarily, in Chandía et al., the interrogated uses this type of statement to differentiate his actions from those of other parties (2020). The interrogated subject utilises this to reason with the interrogator, trying to make clear his participation in the crime for which he is being accused. One main difference with example (33) is that in example (34) the interrogated refuses the participation in the crime portraying him as an observer, when in example (33) the ACC admits to take part in one of the offences that the PI is interrogating him about.

4.2.1.3. Non-relevant Response

In this type of response, the ACC avoids directly addressing the previously formulated question, instead providing unrelated information. Although scarce in frequency, this response type appears at a similar rate across both corpora. This response type alludes directly to Grice's category of Relation, connecting directly the relevancy and the appropriateness of the answers given by the ACC. Since the frequency across all corpora of this type of response is low, the category of relation is generally fulfilled by the ACC.

(35)   Bravo et al.
Q.   The freedom to..
A.   Not having to pretend that I was something that I wasn't. You know.. and watching the strip tease acts, there's some pretty good ones.
Q.   These were male strippers.
A.   Right.
Q.   Right…
A.   **I used to go to Bistro 2, that's a good one in Chicago.. Carol's, The vortex, these huge multi floor night clubs, stay open till about 4 in the morning. Then they'd have the bath clubs, spend the rest of the night in those.**

(36)   Chandía et al.

Jessie Misskelley's statement #1
GG: Now, did you say that the boys skipped school that day, these little boys did?
JM: **Uh-huh, they was going to catch… going somewhere and like I said, Dav-Damien and 'em left before I did, I told them that I'd meet them there and stuff, I had to get ready I'd meet them there and it was early in the morning so, they went ahead and met me, they went on up there and then I come up later on behind them.**

In example (35) the question asked was related to the sexual freedom that the ACC had according to his sexuality, but the response alludes to places he used to frequent which have nothing to do with the crimes that he is being interrogated for. Similarly, in example (36), the interrogated subject also evades answering the question asked, in this case about a particular activity the boys did –skipping school–, responding with information related directly to him and not providing an answer to the questions posed.

4.2.1.4. Aborted Response

Aborted Response was the only type completely absent in our corpus. This is mainly due to our corpus' limitations. As formerly described, this response type deals with situations in which the interrogated subject is unable to formally complete his turn because of self- or external interruption, as can be seen in examples (37) and (38).

 (37) Chandia et al.
 Korey Wise's statement #1
EL: Raymond, do you know Raymond's last name?
KW: **No. I don't kno…**
EL: **Is that Raymond Santana?**
KW: Yeah, I just knew him from that first day.

(38) Chandía et al.
Jessie Misskelley's statement #2
GG: OK, did, did they pinch their penis in anyway? Or were rough with it or anything like that?
JM: I didn't see nothing like that, not rough with them, **I just seen um…**
GG: But you, you didn't see anyone go down on the boys?
JM: Uh-uh.

Chandía et al. had access to both videotape and a voice recording of the interrogations, which were then transcribed. This allowed them to visually and/or audibly identify instances of this response type. Contrarily, in the case of our corpus, we only had access to the already transcribed document, limiting the examination process only to the available transcription. Due to the lack of audio tape, it is difficult to fully interpret the interrogation when it is unclear whether an incomplete response was caused by an intentional interruption by the PI,

82

an unintentional problem like unclear audio, or whether the ACC stopped himself from providing further information. Having access to audio recordings would have given access to important details such as the pacing, tone, and interruptions made during the interrogation, and it would have provided a better context to notice if this type of response is found or not in this specific interrogation.

The limited frequency or absent presence of some response types and subtypes proposed by Chandía et al. (2020) might be attributed to specific elements. 'Repetition/clarification verbal request' had a low frequency of appearance due to the ACC's non-vulnerable status. Similarly, 'Rationalising involvement', was mainly identified within the subtopic 'Attacks on minors' since he resists discussing the contents relating to this subtopic because they disturb him. Lastly, the 'Aborted response' type was not identified during the interrogation due to our corpus's limitations, as previously mentioned.

Below, the following subsection will present a display of the different question types and subtypes that appear in both types of confessions, but that vary in their function in an honest confession. These findings will be accompanied by their respective analysis and examples.

4.2.2. Response types found in interrogations leading to both false and an honest confession with varied functions in the latter

Table 5 presents the four types of responses identified in both corpora: 'Short positive responses', 'Short negative responses', 'Extended positive responses', and 'Extended negative responses', with their respective subtypes. The four types are found in both corpora, however, these types of responses operate differently in our corpus when comparing their function in Chandía et al.

Table 5

Response types identified in both corpora with varied functions in an honest confession

Type of responses	Type realisation			Responses Subtypes	Subtype realisation		
	Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al., (2023)		Chandía et al. (2020)		Bravo et al., (2023)
	K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer		K. Wise	J. Misskelley	J. Dahmer
Short positive responses	488/826 59%	237/344 69%	211/366 57.7%	Non-mitigated	406/488 83%	131/237 55.3%	180/211 85.3%
				Mitigated	59/488 7%	33/237 14%	11/211 5.2%
				Interjection	11/488 2%	42/237 17.7%	19/211 9%
				Non-Verbal	9/488 2%	0/237 0%	0/211 0%
				Echo	3/488 0.6%	31/237 13%	1/211 0.5%
Short negative responses	117/826 14%	50/344 14.5%	76/366 20.7%	Non-mitigated	77/117 66%	35/50 70%	70/76 92.1%
				Mitigated	20/117 17%	5/50 10%	6/76 13%
				Interjection	12/117 17%	9/50 18%	0/76 0%
				Non-Verbal	8/117 7%	0/50 0%	0/76 0%
				Echo	0/117 0%	1/50 2%	0/76 0%
Extended positive responses	86/826 10%	21/344 6.1%	50/366 13.6%	Non-mitigated	38/86 44%	15/21 71.4%	48/50 96%
				Mitigated	48/86 56%	6/21 28.6/	2/50 4%
Extended negative responses	11/826 1%	3/344 0.9%	11/366 3%	Non-mitigated	5/11 45%	0/3 0%	11/11 100%
				Mitigated	6/11 55%	3/3 100%	0/11 0%

This variation is not because the types imply that their pragmatic function is entirely different. Instead, specific instances are identified in which the ACC offers a response that still aligns with their definition, but not strictly, especially in terms of subtypes. This change in the different responses can be attributed to the degree of mitigation of certainty or the lack of it, and it can also be affected by the extension of the responses, and how effective it is to classify them by length. Notably, the criterion for the length of extended responses needs to be re-evaluated to be effectively applied in the context of an honest confession. This will be further discussed in upcoming paragraphs.

4.2.2.1. Short Positive Response

This type of response can be used by the interrogated suspect with the pragmatic function of expressing agreement on a formulated question or claim proposed by the interrogator, as well as providing concise and factual statements (Chandía et al., 2020). This is the most prevalent response type in our corpus, accounting for more than 55% of the total number of the ACC's turns. Simultaneously, among the five subtypes outlined in Chandía et al., only three are found in our corpus, with 'Non-mitigated certainty' being the most frequent one and 'Mitigated certainty', being the least. The prevalence of this type of response, mirroring Chandía et al.'s findings, emphasises their significance in the interrogation process. Nonetheless, as we conducted our analysis, it was recognized that even when a large number of responses may be classified as short-positive, this did not always indicate that hey fit their description; rather, it simply meant that the ACC might have used this type to agree or disagree with a statement or assertion made by the PI.

> **(39)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   **When** would it have been that you ended up picking up your **first victim**?
> A.   That was **Steven hicks**.

In example (39), the ACC uses a positive short response not to agree with the PI, but to assert positivity about the question posed, in this case, the name of his first victim. Even when the ACC does not answer 'yes' or 'no', he is responding positively to the question. Consequently, we suggest a re-evaluation that broadens the criteria responses must meet to be identified as short-positive. This re-consideration could conserve the length proposed by Chandía et al., and, as seen in example (39), add the occurrence of responses that do not explicitly agree or

disagree through the use of a binary response –yes or no–. This could enable the identification of statements that agree or deny the formulated question in fewer words.

4.2.2.2. Short Negative Response

This response type functions in a manner akin to short-positive responses, but with an opposite objective, as they aim to challenge claims or deny involvement. Despite its frequency of use, this type accounts for only 21% of the total turns of the ACC. Similar to short-positive responses, the most frequent subtype is 'Non-mitigated certainty'. In line with the previous type discussed, following our analysis, we suggest a re-evaluation of this type as well.

> **(40) Bravo et al.**
> Q.   The alcohol?
> A.   It´s still a mystery to me, you know, lots of people are big drinkers and they don´t go out and do this no. **I don't know**.
> Q.   To this day you can´t figure out why?
> A.   **I have no idea. I have no idea** why I started getting the fantasies and thoughts when I was about 16 that´s when it started kicking in. I went over that with you last time.

> **(41) Chandía et al.**
> Jessie Misskelley's statement #1
> BR: Okay, uh does Damien have a knife?
> JM: **No.**
> BR: He doesn't have one, he didn't have one that night?
> JM: **He didn't have one that night.**
> BR: Did he borrow yours?
> JM: **No, he didn't borrow mine.**

As can be noticed in example (40), short-negative statements do function in an honest confession but, as we have analysed, the mitigation of certainty, in this case, lies in the ACC's inability or difficulty to recall information, rather than a way to challenge or deny claims made by the PI. While in a coerced confession, as seen in example (41), it is used to rectify and deny the questions the interrogator is formulating.

4.2.2.3. Extended Positive and Extended Negative Responses

These types of responses operate in a similar way as short positive and negative responses do, allowing for the agreement or denial of claims made by the interrogator. The distinction lies in their length, since extended responses were described as spanning over three or more sentences (Chandía et al., 2020).

In the case of our corpus, the ACC's extended responses are lengthier, and there is a noticeable contrast between the most extended response formulated by the ACC and the proposed length criterion in Chandía et al. Due to the differences in the nature of the two corpora and, specifically because in our corpus, the ACC frequently formulates longer narrative responses in instances of agreement and denial of statements made by the PI, we decided to merge the analysis of both subtypes into a single discussion. In the following examples, (42) and (43), it can be seen the difference between two extended responses.

(42)   Bravo et al.
Q.   Sure. Before killing a human, did you experiment ever killing animals?
A.   **No I never killed animals. Never did that. I always used dead ones just for experimentation.**

(43)   Bravo et al.
Q.   Yeah, it's like I say, it's for behavioral science for teaching.. (I would be willing, to take notes if you want to turn the tape off.)
A.   I'll just give you a general description.
Q.   Sure.
A.   **Just slit from the sternum to the you know, pubic area, removed the internal organs and then cut the flesh starting from the calves, legs, and then up, removed the head and put that in the freezer, and uh.. the bone, the skeleton that was defleshed I would put in that large 80 gallon cooking pot that I had pour in the box of that wall cleaning solution, I'd strip the remaining flesh off, turn up to a boil.. and did the same with the heads so I had a clean skeleton, a big clean skeleton and uh.. sometimes I would saved portions of the flesh with consumption, most of it went out in the garbage or in the acid bath and a lot of the unused skeletons went into the acid bath too. Or were flushed down the toilet.. so that's how it was done**.

Both examples could be considered extended responses under the criteria that their length should be more than three sentences. However, in our corpus, the number of words differs significantly and, as discussed in the introductory paragraph of Table 5, we recommend a reassessment of the criteria, as relying on the three-sentence rule described in Chandia et al., might be restrictive when analysing an honest confession and might not accurately represent the overall length of statements made by an interrogated suspect who is more willing to provide information and be cooperative during the interrogation process.

This is evident in the way the ACC formulates long and intricately detailed responses, as seen in example (43), which might suggest a preference in terms of the communicative style that an interrogated subject might choose while giving an honest confession. In this sense, the formulation of extended responses seems appropriate in a context where the ACC

is more cooperative and less resistant, thereby more open to providing relevant information. On this basis, what should be more relevant is the number of words in order to categorise extended answers, as can be seen in examples (42) and (43) where three or more sentences can have more or fewer words and still be considered three sentences.

4.2.2.4. Mitigation of Certainty

On all four types displayed in Table 5, mitigated and non-mitigated statements are conceptualised as subtypes. For analytical purposes, the analysis of both subtypes –'Non-mitigated certainty' and 'Mitigated certainty'– have been grouped due to their distinct functionality in our corpus compared to Chandía et al. Mitigation then, and as formerly mentioned, refers to expressions used by the interrogated subject to denote uncertainty.

(44)   **Bravo et al.**
Q.   What kind of car did he operate?
A.   I **don't know** some old four door like a dodge, some old underscript, **I wouldn't even remember I'm just guessing.**

(45)   **Chandía et al.**
 Jessie Misskelley's statement #1
BR: Was Damien and Jason having sex?
JM: They, they took turns going up under the water.
BR: Going under the water, what were they doing under the water?
JM: **I don't know.** They, they sit so far away, they were in the water about, **I would say** about five, ten seconds, then come up and then the other one would go down.

In examples (44) and (45), uncertainty can be seen when discussing the events he is being asked about. In our corpus, the ACC gives mitigated responses when confronted with information he might not be able to remember. Contrastingly, in Chandía et al., the interrogated subjects give similar responses when referring to events or actions about which they have little or no knowledge. We propose to include a new function into the 'mitigation' categorisation, where mitigation also indicates a reluctance about a specific claim because of memory loss. Additionally, to indicate ambiguity about the information that is held.

The responses provided by the ACC in our corpus could be categorised under Chandia et al.'s taxonomy because they fit the criteria provided, however, they present minimal differences, such as the ACC giving details when he was not asked to, making the extension of the response longer than intended. On that same line, some extended responses, which may look short in comparison with other responses, in our corpus may fit within the extended

type. The mitigation of certainty may also differ due to the fact that the only instances where the ACC mitigated the certainty of his statements seem to be where he genuinely does not remember the information he was being asked about.

The following subsection presents the types of questions and responses not categorised in our corpus. Along with this, an explanation as to why these types were not categorised will be provided. Subsequently, new categories will be proposed for those types that do not fit.

4.3. Non-categorised questions and responses in our corpus

Table 6 shows the number of realisations of questions and responses that could not be categorised. The inability to classify certain turns in specific types or subtypes lies in the limitations in Chandía et al.'s taxonomy and the absence of audio or videotape in the case of the available corpus.

Table 6
Non-categorised questions and responses in Dahmer's confession

Turn	Realisation
Question	11/375 (2.9%)
Response	6/366 (1.6%)

This observation emphasises the need for flexibility and adaptability when applying taxonomies developed for one context onto a different type of interrogation, namely one resulting in an honest confession. It also highlights the importance of acknowledging and addressing limitations in data access, particularly when audio or video recordings are unavailable, as these elements can significantly impact the depth and accuracy of the analysis.

4.3.1. Non-categorised Questions

The questions which could not be categorised during the analysis of our corpus consist of short statements. In this sense, PI's turns that take the form of interjections such as "Uh huh" or that contain only one word –"Right"– could not be categorised under any of the types proposed by Chandía et al. In order to make the categorisation of these questions possible, a new type labelled as "Active Listening" is proposed. This type would account for instances

where the PI signals to the ACC that he is attentive to the responses provided. Recognizing the distinct role of active listening in the conversational process (Potter, 1995, as cited in Royce, 2005) —and, specifically, in the interrogation context— is crucial, as it serves as a supportive and encouraging discourse tactic to prompt the ACC to continue speaking. This can be seen in example (46).

> **(46)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q. To this day you can´t figure out why?
> A. I have no idea. I have no idea why I started getting the fantasies and thoughts when I was about 16 that´s when it started kicking in. I went over that with you last time. .
> Q. **(uh huh)**
> A. So no, it´s still a mystery to me, I have no idea. And even the psychologists, they have no idea. All they do is name things you know they label them.
> Q. Sure. What about your victims, Was there any specific way you went around to select them or was it a crime of opportunity?
> A. Uh… as I said I was interested in finding the type, the chip and dale type good looking swimmers type build.
> Q. **Right**.
> A. Gymnast type build and it was not a case of hating them it was just.. I uh.. It was the only way I knew of to keep them there and keep them with me. It gave me a sense of total control and increased the sexual thrill I guess. Knowing that I had total control of them. And that I could do with them as I wished. That was the motivation, not.. There was no hatred involved at all.

While Chandía et al.'s taxonomy does not account for these types of turns, the introduction of the category "Active listening" helps to highlight and categorise a specific function performed by the PI during the interrogation. This adaptation demonstrates the importance of capturing singularities in communication strategies, such as the encouragement provided by the PI through non-verbal acknowledgements, to better understand the dynamic of police interrogations. The type proposed might enhance the taxonomy's applicability to scenarios where active listening plays a significant role in eliciting information from the ACC, fostering a cooperative conversational environment. Active listening, in our corpus, is a recurrent element used by the PI where, along with interrogating the ACC about a particular case –Adam Walsh–, he provides a space for the ACC to speak about different aspects of his life –related and not related to his committed crimes–. To not interrupt the ACC's turns, active listening thus, is more prone to be used by the PI. Active listening in the honest confession occurs mostly amidst long responses, as can be seen in example (46), but it can be found in short answers as well.

4.3.2. Non-categorised Responses

As previously mentioned in section 3.1.1, due to our corpus limitations, it was challenging to identify two types of responses: 'Aborted by self' and 'Aborted by other'. The lack of audio or visual elements limited our capacity to analyse nonverbal clues, tone shifts, and disruptions, all of which are essential for 'Aborted responses'. The analysis was made based only on a transcript of the interrogation which did not possess a consistent styling that would allow us to draw conclusions based on the grammar and presentation of turns.

Responses are made up of different types and subtypes that are applied in a similar way in both coerced confessions presented in Chandía et al. (2020). Although some of these types were identified in our corpus, such as 'Short positive responses', or 'Extended negative responses', they do not function in the same way in our corpus as they do in Chandía et al. Others, such as 'Repetition/clarification response' or 'Aborted response', were limited or were not identifiable in our corpus, the latter was mostly because of corpus limitations and the unavailability of audio tapes that could facilitate the classification of this type of response. Along with this, a new type was introduced, which was denominated 'Active listening', where we categorised the responses we could not classify under any type –or subtype– proposed by Chandía et al. We also suggest some modifications to a few of the types that function differently in our corpus.

The next section is dedicated to the presentation and discussion of tables relating to the topics and subtopics that were identified in our corpus. This with the intention of analysing and characterising the way topics are managed throughout the interrogation in relation to the formulation of questions and responses. At the same time, an analysis of the asymmetrical power dynamics present in the interrogation will be presented.

4.4. Topic Management in an Interrogation Leading to an Honest Confession

In this section, we will present and discuss the results of the analysis focused on the topics explored during the interrogation. These findings will be displayed in tables structured around six types that present the key topics developed. Each of these topics, namely 'Sex', 'Modus operandi', 'Personal life', 'Killing', 'Cannibalism', and 'References to crimes',

serves as a focal point for the analysis of our corpus. Within each type, specific subtopics have also been identified.

The decision not to provide extensive definitions of the main topics is intentional as their names explicitly describe the type of content they deal with. This choice is strategic because the subsequent detailed review will thoroughly explore each topic, providing insights into their relevance within the interrogation context. Along the same line, in each table, only two subtopics will be used to exemplify the phenomena found as a way to avoid redundancy and highlight specific particularities.

Initially, a type focused on the interrogation technique 'Rapport' was analysed alongside the 6 main types that will be discussed. It consisted of instances where the PI offered comments or questions focussed on keeping the ACC engaged in the interrogation. However, it was ultimately decided not to incorporate it into the final categorisation since it is a tool used in interrogations and cannot be considered a topic. Nonetheless, the concept of rapport will be duly acknowledged and discussed within the analysis of the results, as it remains an essential factor influencing the interrogation process.

The concepts of resistance and cooperation play a fundamental role in our analysis given that the ACC shows a high degree of cooperation throughout much of the interrogation, resisting only in specific instances. These concepts will be used when analysing the ACC's responsiveness and engagement during the interrogation. Examining shifts in resistance and cooperation will demonstrate the ACC's disposition toward various topics and his willingness (or lack thereof) to share information.

4.4.1. Topics Identified in Dahmer's Honest Confession

Table 7 shows an overview of the topics present in the corpus. It displays all six topics identified, a breakdown of the word count generated by each speaker, the total number of words produced in each topic, as well as stating which speaker was mainly in charge of the introduction of the topics during the interrogation.

The topic with the highest number of words is 'Personal Life,' with a total of 3,450 words. On the contrary, 'Cannibalism' emerged as the one with the fewest words,

comprising only 841. On a similar note, the PI generated approximately 4,000 words out of the 13,563 of the total word count of the transcript. The ACC, instead, produced double the number of words accounting for 8865. Additionally, the PI was identified as the speaker who primarily introduced topics within the interrogation. These findings will be thoroughly discussed in the paragraphs below.

Table 7

Topics identified in Dahmer's confession.

Topic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Introduction of a new topic
	PI	ACC		
Sex	838/3063 27.4%	2225/3063 72.6%	3063/13563 22.6%	ACC
Modus operandi	425/1995 21.3%	1570/1995 78.7%	1995/13563 14.7%	PI
Personal life	1083/3450 31.4%	2367/3450 68.6%	3450/13563 25.4%	PI
Killing	571/1686 33.9%	1115/1686 66.1%	1686/13563 12.4%	PI
Cannibalism	159/841 18.9%	682/841 81.1%	841/13563 6.2%	PI
References to crimes	932/1838 50.7%	906/1838 49.3%	1838/13563 13.6%	PI

Focusing solely on the topics with more words per speaker, the ACC contributes the majority of words in the discussion of the topic 'Sex,' constituting 72.6% of the total words in that section. This shows a clear willingness from the ACC to elaborate on this specific topic. On the other hand, the PI dominates the discussion on 'References to Crimes,' accounting for 50.7% of the words on that particular topic. This might imply that the PI is more interested in getting information about this topic than the ACC is willing to give it.

Concerning the introduction of topics, this variable becomes relevant when analysing the power asymmetrical relationship between speakers. In a police interrogation setting, one

of the ways the interrogator, as the one in charge, assesses his power is through the management of topics, either by introducing a topic or deciding to close it (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011). Nonetheless, as previously mentioned, this pattern changes in the topic 'Sex', where the ACC is identified as the main initiator of topics. It should be noted that the results of this variable were obtained by counting all instances in which each speaker introduced a topic. Subsequently, the speaker with the most instances of topic introduction was marked as the primary initiator. In the specific case of the topic 'Sex', this phenomenon may be attributed to the fact that this is considered a controversial topic for the ACC. While he is usually the one who attempts to introduce it, this is done with the intention to refute claims or add important information for the interrogation. This will be exemplified in the discussion of subsequent tables 8 and 15 which focus on this topic.

Regarding topic closure, this was not finally included as a factor considered in the analysis of our study, since we believe it could be explored in further investigations. However, a noticeable trend emerges: most topics are closed by the ACC through the use of affirmative expressions such as 'uh huh', 'right,' 'yeah,' and similar acknowledgement tokens. This might indicate unwillingness from the ACC to engage with a specific topic, showing persistence in closing it, oftentimes using monosyllables.

4.4.2. Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Sex'

Table 8 presents the seven subtopics in the main topic 'Sex'. Overall, the ACC produced over twice the PI's number of words, with 2,225 and 838, respectively. The subtopic 'Sexual fantasies' encompasses the highest number of words within this topic, accounting for more than 30% of the total word count. Conversely, 'Masturbation' had the lowest number of words, totalling 139. At the same time, concerning the introduction of subtopics, the ACC was identified as the primary initiator. Within the main topic 'Sex', some subtopics, – 'Paraphilia', 'Sexual fantasies', 'Masturbation' and 'Pornography'– are specifically related to themes mainly introduced by the ACC. The reason for this might be that the PI is mostly focused on acquiring evidence-related information rather than discussing subtopics that steer away from this main intention. This could also explain why there is a substantial difference in the number of words produced by the PI within these subtopics.

Table 8

Topic management of subtopics in main topic 'Sex'

Subtopic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Introduction of subtopic
	PI	ACC		
Sexual orientation	143/288 49.7%	145/288 50.3%	288/3063 9.4%	PI
Sexual encounters	77/342 22.5%	265/342 77.5%	342/3063 11.2%	PI
Paraphilia	142/719 19.7%	577/719 80.3%	719/3063 23.5%	ACC
Sexual fantasies	299/1038 28.8%	739/1038 71.2%	1038/3063 33.9%	ACC
Masturbation	35/139 25.2%	104/139 74.8%	139/3063 4.5%	ACC
Attacks on minors	67/227 29.5%	160/227 70.5%	227/3063 7.4%	=
Pornography	75/310 24.2%	235/310 75.8%	310/3063 10.1%	ACC

4.4.2.1. Subtopic 'Sexual fantasies'

Within this subtopic, speakers explore the ACC's sexual desires involving the victims and the sexual activities he wished to engage with them, prior to and after their death. Again, the ACC is identified as the main initiator of topics and subtopics. Nonetheless, although he might appear to control the communicative process by attempting to direct the conversation in a specific way, police interrogations inherently maintain structural rigidity. In terms of power asymmetry, even though power dynamics may be challenged, the PI, as a representative of the institutional setting, will always maintain its superior position in comparison to the ACC (Gudjonsson, 2003; Leo, 2008; Taranilla, 2011; van Dijk, 2015).

As discussed in section 2.1.3, police interrogators, as a way to promote collaboration, might create the illusion of yielding power over the conversation. In reality, interrogators are the ones who decide whether to engage with a topic proposed by the interrogated subject or

not, as the ultimate function of the latter is limited only to providing answers to the questions posed by the former (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011), as can be seen in the following example.

> **(47)** **Bravo et al.**
> A.   Uh… as I said I was interested in finding the type, the chip and dale type good looking swimmers type build.
> Q.   Right.
> A.   **Gymnast type build and it was not a case of hating them it was just.. I uh.. It was the only way I knew of to keep them there and keep them with me. It gave me a sense of total control and increased the sexual thrill I guess. Knowing that I had total control of them. And that I could do with them as I wished. That was the motivation, not.. There was no hatred involved at all.**
> Q.   When you saw that specific person that you desired did you have a plan or..
> A.   Just
> Q.   **How did you pick these people up did you rouse them?**
> A.   In bars, offered them money, that was basically that.

In example (47), the ACC's attempt to introduce a subtopic is unsuccessful, as the PI redirects the conversation towards a more evidence-related topic –Modus Operandi–, avoiding engaging in a deeper exploration of the ACC's sexual desires. This happens in a few other instances across the corpus, where the ACC attempts to discuss his motivations and possible explanations of his actions but, because the PI is focused on acquiring information that can be used as evidence, the conversation is constantly redirected towards a topic that may achieve that. This instance can be identified as one of the strategies speakers may use to close a topic, where the interrogator refocuses the conversation so as to discuss a topic that is more pertinent and suitable to the interrogation (Maynard, 1980; Howe, 1991).

4.4.2.2. Subtopic 'Attacks on minors'

This subtopic represents cases where the ACC addresses a significantly unsettling subject of discussion for him because it deals with instances in which he was, actually or allegedly, implicated in sexual crimes concerning minors. While reluctant to engage in the discussion of this subtopic due to the discomfort of being associated with such offences —yet notably not with others, arguably as unsettling—, the ACC attempts to rationalise and explain his potential connection to them. This can be seen when analysing the word count of each speaker. Although this is one of the least explored subtopics in terms of word count, a majority of the words correspond to answers given by the ACC. As opposed to other

subtopics, there appears to be an equal number of attempts per speaker to introduce this subtopic. These factors might be attributed to the ACC's eagerness to provide a justification and minimise his actions, as seen in the following example (48).

> **(48)**   **Bravo et al.**
> A.   Never went after children my interest was in older adults of bar age and all of them that I met I thought were bar age.. uh.. the uh..
> Q.   (Conrad?)
> A.   Conrad I thought he was of age, so did the police. That's why they let him back out.
> Q.   (I saw the recent pictures of him. Not the pictures of the news with… **He looked like a twelve year old kid on that.. that picture. But when you see the older pictures of him, he looks 19, 20 years old**)
> A.   **Right right**. And there was a 15 year old guy that I brought back that accused me of kidnapping him or something and everything uh, the police didn't believe him cause his story was wrong **but he was working in the 219… cleaning up, you know all through the night and stuff so it's, it's amazing how young how young some of these people are that are in those bars.. and everything.**

Within this subtopic, there is an identifiable pattern of answers in which the majority belong to the response type 'Rationalising involvement'. This shows that within this topic the ACC focuses mostly on justifying and excusing his participation in these offences because it disturbs him being associated with them. Additionally, the PI, by empathising with the ACC and stating that he would have also believed the victim to be of an older age, makes use of a strategy directed at building rapport with the interrogated as a way to encourage him to give more information (Mason & Rock, 2020; College of Policing, 2022).

Simultaneously, while acknowledgement tokens are identifiable within this example (48) –'Right right'–, their purpose deviates from their typical function. As described in section 2.1.3, these utterances are constituted by highly polysemous words typically aimed at signalling a speaker's request to change the topic and, also, to show resistance and less cooperation to further explore the topic being discussed. However, they do not always convey the same meaning, as they can also represent turn-initial prefaces that are common within a conversational context (McCarthy, 2003), as evident in example (48).

The analysis of two of the seven subtopics present in the main topic 'Sex' is illustrative of the different power dynamics that appear in relation to the management of topics. Our findings suggest that, although in some instances it may seem as if the ACC has gained power over the development of the interrogation, the PI is always in control of the

process and may willingly decide to appear to lose power as a way to encourage the ACC to continue speaking (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011).

4.4.3. Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Modus operandi'

Table 9 shows the three subtopics associated with the main topic 'Modus operandi'. Altogether, the ACC produced over three times the number of words generated by the PI, with a total of 1,570 and 425, respectively. Within the subtopics, 'Methods' comprised the highest number of words, nearly 50% of the total word count. On the contrary, 'Hunting of Victims' accounted for less than 13% of the overall total, consequently becoming the least discussed subtopic. Similarly, as shown in Table 8, the primary initiator of subtopics was the ACC. The following examples illustrate phenomena identified in the subtopics 'Methods' and 'Hunting of victims'. The subtopic 'Victims' was not discussed because the other two subtopics –'Methods' and 'Hunting of victims'–- were more appropriate when providing examples to illustrate our findings, thus only those two subtopics will be discussed. However, throughout the discussion of these three subtopics, the ACC shows a tendency to provide extended and detailed responses, this is seen in the number of words he produced which are significantly more than those by the PI.

Table 9
Topic Management of Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Modus Operandi'

Subtopic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Who introduces the subtopic
	PI	ACC		
Methods	237/960 24.7%	723/960 75.3%	960/1995 48.1%	PI
Hunting of victims	64/246 26%	182/246 74%	246/1995 12.3%	=
Victims	124/789 15.7%	665/789 84.3%	789/1995 39.5%	PI

4.4.3.1. Subtopic 'Methods'

This subtopic comprises instances where the speakers discussed certain procedures and techniques the ACC utilised when committing his crimes. Concerning the word count, which is high within this subtopic, there is not a clear pattern of responses to attribute this phenomenon to. Nonetheless, this might be connected to a series of narrative responses from the ACC, wherein he constructs a lengthy and detailed account of his procedures, often exceeding the typical three-sentence criterion suggested by Chandía et al. (2020). The following example (49) illustrates how the formulation of questions and responses might be connected to the discussion and progression of topics and subtopics.

> **(49)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   (What technique is that?)
> A.   **I was getting tired of killing them and uh.. having to deflesh them so I uh.. I uh… wanted to see if it was possible to…**
> Q.   (Unintelligible)
> A.   **I wanted to see if it was possible to make, again it sound really gross, uh, zombies, people that would not have a will of their own but would follow.. no thanks.. but would follow my instructions without resistance.. so uh after I started using the drilling technique I'd keep well with these Conrad case, that's why he ended up burning the whole house up one time, I didn't think he'd have enough coherence to do that but he did.**
> Q.   So you attempted the drilling through their brain?
> A.   **Right and inject some muratic acid into the frontal lobes but it never worked, it either didn't work well enough or it was death so.. one guy Jeramiah Weinberger, he uh, he's the man I met in Carol's bar up in Chicago, he was with me a couple of days before he died but the second day he was in a comatose state and when I came back from work the second night he had died and it kind of struck me as particularly horrifying because he was the only one that died with his eyes, his eyes just wide open.**

Given that this specific subtopic is mostly related to the evidence-building dimension of the investigation, it is fitting for the PI to pose a Wh-Open question. As seen in section 4.2, these questions aim to encourage the interrogated subject to offer a narrative without constraints (Chandía et al., 2020), thus enhancing the chances of giving information that might be relevant (and legally adequate) to the investigation. Subsequently, the ACC offers two turns of responses categorised as 'Extended positive', thereby demonstrating a connection between questions, responses, and topics that illustrates how the use of a particular type of question can prompt the ACC to extensively, or minimally, discuss a topic. This directly impacts the development of topics and subtopics, as claimed in the previous paragraph. Simultaneously, all responses generated by the ACC in this excerpt are also labelled as 'Non-mitigated

certainty', which could be attributed to the ACC's eagerness and confidence in giving responses pertaining to discussing this subtopic. This might be due to the interest he presents during the interrogation to detail the methods and the process he would follow when murdering his victims and the techniques he used when disposing of their bodies.

4.4.3.2. Subtopic 'Hunting of Victims'

This subtopic explores the ACC's process of selection of victims and the various tactics he would use to persuade them. Similarly to Table 8, both the ACC and the PI successfully introduced this subtopic an equal number of times. However, in example (50) the ACC does not aim to justify and rationalise his participation concerning certain crimes. One of the various ways interrogated subjects indicate resistance is through the use of acknowledgement tokens, pauses, or laughter (Maynard, 1980; Howe, 1991). The following example illustrates how the ACC uses acknowledgement tokens and a resistance technique –providing minimal information– to signal to the PI that a change in the topic of the conversation is wanted.

> **(50)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   How did you pick these people up did you rouse them?
> A.   **In bars, offered them money, that was basically that.**
> Q.   They willfully came back to the place with you?
> A.   **Right, right.**
> Q.   You never had to threaten..
> A.   **Never threatened.**
> Q.   A weapon to coerce them back there?
> A.   **No. Never did that.**
> Q   **……. Growing up, tell me, were you involved with, as a Pedophile?**

As the discussion in Table 8 shows, acknowledgement tokens can convey varied meanings. In this instance, they function as linguistic cues signalling the PI the intention to close a topic. In this sense, utterances such as 'Right, right' or 'No' reiterate the PI's statement and indicate the loss of interest in the current topic. Simultaneously, the repetition of phrases ('Never threatened') demonstrates the ACC's comprehension of the information provided by the PI, which might occur before a topic shift (Maynard, 1980; Howe, 1991). Consequently, the PI, as the speaker in control of steering the conversation and determining the progression of topics (Gudjonsson, 2003; Leo, 2008; Taranilla, 2011; van Dijk, 2015), is able to identify the ACC's cues to close this subtopic and chooses to introduce a new one. This demonstrates his control over the management of topics discussed and the overall interrogation process.

Throughout the discussion of the topic 'Modus operandi', it was identified the ACC's tendency and willingness to give more details. This can be observed in the detailed and extended responses he gave where little mitigation can be seen. As this topic is completely related to the ACC's crimes and the process of committing them, the PI tends to aim to formulate question types that are oriented to acquiring evidence, as is the case with the 'Wh-open' question type. Overall, during the discussion of this topic, the PI's dominance on the topic agenda can be seen as he is the one who decides whether to accept or deny the closure of topics proposed by the ACC.

4.4.4. Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Personal life'

Table 10 shows the eight subtopics identified within the topic 'Personal life'. In general, it is the ACC who generates most of the words, reaching a total of 2,367 for all subtopics. The most common subtopic corresponds to that of 'Lifestyle' adding a total of 1,189 words, accounting for 34,5% of the entire corpus, while the least common one was 'Education', with only 103 words, encompassing only 3%. Additionally, in terms of the introduction of subtopics, the PI was the main initiator in six out of the eight. Overall, almost all subtopics, except for 'Addiction' and 'Violence against him', explore less serious themes and are not specifically related to the crimes discussed in the interrogation. It is important to note that the majority of these subtopics –'Work and paid activities', 'Lifestyle', 'Friends', and 'Family'– appear at the beginning of the interrogation. The decision to engage with these types of subtopics might be a deliberate choice made by the PI to generate trust with the ACC, as interrogators are motivated to build rapport during the initial stages of the interrogation (David et al., 2018).

Table 10

Topic Management of Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Personal Life'

Subtopic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Who introduces the subtopic
	PI	ACC		
Family	90/143 62.9%	53/143 37.1%	143/3450 4.1%	PI
Friends	109/316 34.5%	207/316 65.5%	316/3450 9.2%	PI
Education	50/103 48.5%	53/103 51.5%	103/3450 3%	PI
Religion & faith	90/352 25.6%	262/352 74.4%	352/3450 10.2%	PI
Violence against him	22/255 8.6%	233/255 91.4%	255/3450 7.4%	ACC
Addictions	102/411 24.8%	309/411 75.2%	411/3450 11.9%	ACC
Work and paid activities	173/681 25.4%	508/681 74.6%	681/3450 19.7%	PI
Lifestyle	447/1189 37.6%	742/1189 62.4%	1189/3450 34.5%	PI

4.4.4.1. Subtopic 'Family'

Within this subtopic, the speakers discuss themes concerning the ACC's family, focusing on his relationship with his parents and grandmother. In terms of the word count, the PI produced almost double the number of words generated by the ACC. This is important because the subtopic 'Family' is the only one in which the PI is substantially more talkative. This could be attributed to, as explained in the paragraph above, a common police interrogator's strategy which is the building of rapport during the beginning of the interrogation (David et al., 2018), which would imply his willingness to speak more. The following example illustrates a recognized pattern in terms of question formulation.

(51)   Bravo et al.

Q.   **What was your relationships with your parents growing up?**
A.   Uh.. Pretty good. Pretty average.
Q.   **How many siblings are there in the family?**
A.   I have one younger brother six years younger.
Q.   Just the two of you.
A.   Right.

During the analysis of this subtopic, a pattern was identified in the type of questions generated by the PI. Most of the questions, specifically the 'Polar', 'Wh-specific', and 'Declarative statements' types, have the aim to, in general, produce concise responses where the information should be either confirmed or denied (Chandía et al., 2020). Example (51) illustrates the aforementioned identified pattern of questions in which the PI does not aim nor expect a detailed response but rather a concise and specific one. Along this line, it also demonstrates the pattern mentioned in the discussion of Table 9, which explains that the ACC presents a tendency to mainly provide extended and detailed responses to crime-related topics, due to this it can be observed that during this discussion his responses are concise.

It is noteworthy that all questions formulated under this subtopic correspond to the subtype 'Non-guiding', which means that they do not introduce IRI (Farrugia & Gabbert, 2019) nor do they attempt to influence responses given by the ACC (Chandía et al., 2020). This might be due to the fact that this subtopic is strictly related to non-criminal behaviour and activities, thereby the discussion of it does not serve the main purpose of the PI, which is gathering evidence. At the same time, because this subtopic mostly deals with personal information about the ACC, it is understandable for the PI to try not to influence or command the types of responses given.

4.4.4.2. Subtopic 'Religion & faith'

This subtopic consists of instances where the ACC is asked about his view on religion, the rituals, and the satanic activities he would sometimes engage in. It is noteworthy to highlight that contrary to the previous subtopic discussed –'Family'–, in this subtopic, the ACC produces almost three times the number of words generated by the PI. This might be attributed to the ACC's tendency to engage more thoroughly with topics that can be connected to his interests and, in a way, to his personal beliefs.

(52)   Bravo et al.
Q.   Did you have a religious background in the beginning as a child and teenager?
A.   **Not as a child, I tried.. I tried for about two years with my grandma and like I, that's a whole nother tale it.. didn't work.. desires got stronger and stronger.. I just gave up so no, I really haven't had a real deep religious background or anything. Although I always felt that there was something more than just this life, I never just.. I never really wanted to think about a religious background because I was involved in such horrible things and I just didn't want to even think of it. I just figured I'd take the ostrich approach if I don't think of it then I won't ever have to deal with it. Which was stupid.**.

As opposed to example (51), where the ACC gives responses that are brief and straightforward, example (52) illustrates how, when dealing with a subtopic that interests him, the ACC generates 'Extended' type of responses, which are a narration of events. It is worth mentioning that no pattern of responses was identified, as the ACC produces either 'Short-positive' or 'Extended' answers. Nonetheless, this might indicate his intention to provide details related to subtopics that are of interest to him.

During the discussion of the topic 'Personal life' and its eight subtopics, differences in the management of the topic by both speakers were identified. As examples (51) and (52) show, despite the type of questions the PI formulates, the responses given and the engagement with the topic discussed, rely mainly on the ACC's willingness and interest. As previously mentioned, most of the subtopics are mainly related to the ACC's personal life and do not have a relevant role in the process of gathering evidence. As such, throughout most of the instances identified within this topic, the PI does not attempt to influence and guide the ACC.

4.4.5. Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Killing'

Table 11 displays the four subtopics of the main topic 'Killing'. Mainly, it is the ACC who produces the majority of the words, summing a total of 1,115. The most discussed subtopics are 'Self-doubts' and 'Reactions', with 547 and 514 words, respectively. Jointly, these subtopics encompass almost 65% of the total word count. On the contrary, subtopics 'Reasons' and 'Consequences' were the least explored, together accounting for approximately 37% of the total sum. Regarding the introduction of subtopics, it is the PI who predominantly introduces them. Because most of the subtopics within the topic 'Killing', specifically 'Self-doubts', 'Reactions, and 'Consequences', are related to a specific discussion of the ACC's psychological observations regarding the crimes committed, it

seems understandable for the PI to not desire to engage in the further discussion of some of these subtopics. Notably, 'Reasons', as the sole evidence-oriented subtopic, emerges as the only one in which there is an almost equal number of words produced between both speakers.

Table 11
Topic Management of Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Killing'

Subtopic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Who introduces the subtopic
	PI	ACC		
Reasons	115/238 48.3%	123/238 51.7%	238/1686 14.1%	PI
Self-doubts	156/547 28.5%	391/547 71.5%	547/1686 32.4%	PI
Reactions	204/514 39.7%	310/514 60.3%	514/1686 30.5%	PI
Consequences	96/387 24.8%	291/387 75.2%	387/1686 23%	PI

4.4.5.1. Subtopic 'Self-doubts'

This subtopic explores instances where the discussion is mostly focussed on the ACC rationalising his actions and attempting to understand himself. This is the most explored subtopic out of the four belonging to the main topic 'Killing'. In relation to the word count, the ACC produces almost 61% of the overall total, while the PI's word count constitutes approximately 40% of the total number of words generated within this subtopic. The following example (53) indicates a technique used by the PI to introduce the subtopic and when he realises that the ACC seems reluctant to engage in the discussion, he reformulates the question and attempts to regain his interest.

> **(53)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   (You weren't planning on any long range goals?)
> A.   Nope, wasn't good at planning long range goals.
> Q.   **What do you think was your biggest downfall, I mean, was it when you got into pornographic material that escalated to the next stage? Like if you could eliminate that one thing in your life..**
> A.   Uh huh.
> Q.   **Do you think that would of eliminated what the end results?**

A.   If I could eliminate those fantasies, those overwhelming fantasies, starting when I was 15 or 16, short circuited them, not think about them, not, not entertaining them.. then that would probably would of stopped everything. And if I had had some sort of uh.. uh.. strong moral.. uh.. guidelines, that I really you know, believed in following..

The first two turns shown in example (53) correspond to the topic 'Personal life'. Subsequently, the third turn is the first instance in which the PI attempts to introduce the subtopic 'Self-doubts'. As seen in section 2.1.3, topic shifts can be denoted in various ways, one of which is the reiteration of the statement made by a speaker to signal comprehension of what was said (Howe, 1991). In this excerpt, as a way to close the topic, the ACC repeats the statement previously made by the PI and, as a consequence, the PI understands that a topic shift has been demanded.

Subsequently, the PI proceeds to change it and formulates a 'Wh-open' question to prompt the speaker to elaborate on this new topic, as these types of questions are intended to promote the interrogated subject to freely create a narration (Chandía et al., 2020). Nonetheless, the ACC responds with a 'Short-positive interjection'. This subtype of response is used to express agreement (Chandía et al., 2020). Because of this, the PI reformulates the question and instead provides a 'Polar non-guiding' question as a way to encourage the ACC to further develop in this subtopic. As discussed in section 4.1.1.3, this subtype of question aims to generate binary responses –'yes' or 'no'– from the ACC but, given the context of our corpus, 'Polar non-guiding' questions elicit a more detailed and extensive response rather than brief ones, as can be seen in example (53).

4.4.5.2. Subtopic 'Reactions'

The subtopic 'Reactions' focuses on discussing the ACC's feelings and observations toward the crimes he committed, as well as reflecting on the possibility of being imposed the death penalty. In relation to the total word count, this is the second subtopic after 'Self-doubts' with the highest number of words, comprising 30.5% in total. The example below shows the use of a rapport-building technique and illustrates how the PI handles topic shifts.

(54)   Bravo et al.
Q.   You know as an individual even me, I would be embarrassed of something that I've done in life, you know, I might divulge certain things but there are some things that I would keep secret you know maybe take to my grave with me..

A.   Well I don't want to do that. so that's why I spilled everything when I was, I was hopeless to hide anything anymore.
Q.   Right.
A.   So uh..
Q.   And like I said that's why we're up here and you know I had to ask you right out if you had anything to do with the kidnapping and the murder of Adam Walsh.

The first turn of example (54) illustrates an instance of rapport building through the presence of empathy (Mason & Rock, 2020). This is done with the intention of encouraging the ACC to maintain the course of the discussion. However, after a turn, both speakers cue the other to close the topic by formulating monosyllabic responses and an interjection. As a result, the PI, as the one in the position of power, accepts the closure of the topic and introduces a new one, namely 'References to past crimes'. This is a clear example of the asymmetrical power relationship between both speakers as the PI will always assess his control over the interrogation through the management of topics to direct the discussion to the main objective of the interrogation, which is always obtaining evidence (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011).

Throughout the discussion of the topic 'Killing' and its four subtopics, it was identified the different ways the PI controls the topic agenda. The PI may adapt the formulation of questions or even express empathy for the ACC, in order to encourage him to elicit more information.

4.4.6. Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Cannibalism'

Table 12 shows the two subtopics that belong to the main topic 'Cannibalism'. Overall, the ACC produced over four times the PI's number of words, with a total of 682 and 159, respectively. Out of the two subtopics, 'Butchering' was the most discussed one, totalling 656 words and accounting for almost 80% of the total word count. Although the title of the main topic refers to the phenomenon of cannibalism, meaning the consumption of another human's body matter, a majority of turns under this topic refer to the process of dismembering the victims instead of a discussion of the act of eating. Because of this, the subtopic 'Eating' was briefly discussed, constituting only 22% of the overall total. Concerning the introduction of subtopics, the PI was the primary initiator. Nonetheless, it is notable that, in the case of the subtopic 'Eating', both speakers introduced it an equal number of times.

Table 12

Topic Management of Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Cannibalism'

Subtopic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Who introduces the subtopic
	PI	ACC		
Butchering	116/656 17.7%	540/656 82.3%	656/841 78%	PI
Eating	43/185 23.6%	142/185 76.4%	185/841 22%	=

4.4.6.1. Subtopic 'Butchering'

Matters regarding this subtopic are specifically related to, as mentioned in the introductory paragraph, the description of the process the ACC would follow to dismember his victims and, at the same time, a detailed portrayal of the different techniques and tools he would employ when doing so. In terms of the word count, the ACC produces almost five times the number of words produced by the PI, which denotes a clear interest in discussing this specific subtopic. The following example demonstrates this.

> **(55)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   (Maybe if you could detail for me exactly what, the taking of the skin off, was there some…)
> **A.   Uh…I did do that one time… I didn't know if it could be done, I wanted to see if it could be… It's possible. And just keeping mementos, the skulls.**
> Q.   (Any   other   body   parts?)
> **A.   Sometimes genitals, hands…uhhh, that's about it. One time I tried to mummify one of the heads…uh... I uh... took the bone out of the back here, and scooped the brain out and soaked the whole head with the flesh on it in acetone and it worked for a while, that's the one I kept in the locker at work when I was at the work release program... uh... but I just did that one time.**

Example (55) shows the ACC's identified pattern of formulating responses that are extensive and detailed. Although the answer is extensive in length, it differs from the usual type of response he gives. As seen in the discussion of Table 9, when the ACC produces extended responses, they are long narrations that seem to be devoid of pauses. In example (56), instead, there appears to be what could be described as hesitation from the ACC when answering. Nonetheless, and as has been discussed in former sections, the absence of a video or audio

form of the interrogation, made impossible the analysis of extralinguistic elements such as pauses or silences. For this reason, these two types of responses, although seemingly different, cannot be properly distinguished. However, when analysing only its content, they are both identified as 'Extended' type of responses, which implies the formulation of an answer in the form of a detailed narration (Chandía et al., 2020).

4.4.6.2. Subtopic 'Eating'

This subtopic is mainly dedicated to exploring, in detail, his feelings and involvement towards the consumption of human body matters. As stated in the introductory paragraph of the table, this subtopic is far less discussed than 'Butchering'. The reason for this might rely on the fact that this subtopic, although may be of interest to the ACC, steers away from the main objective of the interrogation, which is obtaining evidence against the interrogated subject (Coulthard et al., 2017). This can be seen in the example below.

> **(56)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q. (How did it taste?)
> A. **Uhh…. there's no way of saying it without sounding uh…gruesome..**
> Q. (I don't find it offensive.)
> A. Well it….. I, I don't know how to describe it. You've had filet mignon, haven't you?

Example (56) illustrates one of the few instances in which, in a similar way as in example (55), the ACC shows what could be thought of as a sign of hesitation. However, this excerpt exemplifies another form of reluctance to engage with the subtopic being discussed. The ACC provides a response but does not address completely what is being asked. Nonetheless, as was seen throughout the discussion of the former subtopic, even when the ACC might seem explicit in his hesitation, he later provides the answer. This is important because it coincides with the cooperative nature he has exposed throughout the entire interrogation.

Within this topic and during the analysis of the two subtopics it was identified that the ACC might constantly show signs of hesitation. This could be attributed to the contents discussed. However, due to the absence of the audio and video form of the interrogation, these signs of hesitance cannot be properly analysed as such.

4.4.7. Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'Reference to Crimes'

Table 13 shows the two subtopics in the main topic 'References to crimes'. In general, the PI produced the highest number of words, summing a total of 932, in contrast with the ACC, who produced 906 words. It should be noted that this topic is the only one in which both the PI and the ACC speak an almost equal number of words. Out of the two subtopics, 'Allegedly' has the highest number of words with 1,174 words, constituting almost 64% of the overall word count, while the least prevalent corresponds to 'On record', totalling 664 words and accounting for 36,1%. It is noteworthy to mention that the PI is the main introducer of subtopics.

Table 13
Topic Management of Subtopics Belonging to Main Topic 'References to Crimes'

Subtopic	Words by Speaker		Total number of Words	Who introduces the subtopic
	PI	ACC		
On record	210/664 31.6%	454/664 68.4%	664/1838 36.1%	PI
Allegedly	722/1174 61.5%	452/1174 38.5%	1174/1838 63.9%	PI

4.4.7.1. Subtopic 'On record'

Within this subtopic speakers discuss instances related to committed crimes by the ACC. It is important to note that this subtopic does not delve into the crimes the ACC was being investigated for at the moment of the interrogation. Instead, it is mainly dedicated to exploring some of his criminal record offences that took place before his arrest in July 1991. About the word count, this constitutes the fourth most discussed topic out of the other five. Nonetheless, this subtopic accounts for half of the overall total of the topic. The ACC produced over double the number of words generated by the PI. This could be an indicator of the ACC's intention to talk about crimes he admits having committed, as there was no necessity to deny or defend himself against these accusations, something which he has already mentioned. There is a clear inclination from the ACC to formulate questions

identified as 'Declarative non-guiding statements'. The following example (57) illustrates this sequence.

> **(57)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   **(Some of those incidents were there though, it was detectable catchable if they would have just gone the extra step in picking up the towel..)**
> A.   There was a..
> Q.   **(Or looking in the bag of trash, they could smell the odor..)**
> A.   Uh huh.
> **Q.   (Whatever but it was easier to just..)**
> A.   Looking in the bedroom where the body was, right, or in the closet where the skulls, some of the skulls were.

'Declarative non-guiding statements' while not grammatical, are statements made to acquire a response of agreement or disagreement without being influencing or controlling (Chandía et al., 2020). There is not a clear pattern of responses given by the ACC, they are mostly either 'Short-positive non-mitigated certainty' or 'Short-negative non-mitigated certainty'. The formulation of these subtypes of questions by the PI and the fact that the ACC responds with the aforementioned type of responses, which are characterised to be concise and precise, can be attributed to the already identified tendency of the ACC to engage and provide honest information when discussing matters related to the offences he has committed.

4.4.7.2. Subtopic 'Allegedly'

This subtopic, instead, explores offences the ACC has been accused of committing but cannot be proven because they have not been investigated by the police, therefore there is not enough evidence to formally accuse him of committing them. In terms of word count, the PI produces almost double the number of words generated by the ACC. This could be attributed to the fact that, as previously mentioned, police interrogators' main objective is to gather information that could potentially be used as evidence against the interrogated subject (Coulthard et al., 2017).

> **(58)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   **So this one gentleman came down to Florida from out of state, you know, he lived in Hollywood and the other gentleman still lives there. And I guess they were following your case, from the point of July of uh… (91) last year of 91.**
> A.   Uh   huh.
> Q.   Until the present. And the one gentleman said that he had an encounter there with you.   Did   you   ever   go   up   to   the   Hollywood   mall?
> A.   **The only mall I went to was the omni mall that one time.**

Example (58) shows the PI's intention to obtain a possible confession from the ACC. Within this subtopic, there is a clear pattern of question formulation. 'Declarative guiding statements' in our corpus, as previously discussed, function differently. Besides attempting to influence responses given by the ACC, they also provide him with the chance to deny or question statements made by the PI. In this excerpt, it is observable that the PI is providing information that is new to the ACC and may possibly associate him with a new crime. However, as we have discussed in previous sections, the ACC does not resist or challenge the statements made by the PI but, instead, answers him by clarifying his involvement. This is important because, as will be discussed in the next section when it comes to resistance and cooperation, the ACC is mostly cooperative. While he might give short answers, he is, most of the time, providing relevant information.

This subsection provided a detailed analysis of the ways topics are managed – introduced and changed– throughout the interrogation. Our findings suggest that the subject in charge of the distribution and management of the topic agenda is always the PI. This power over the dynamics of the interrogation is given by him because he constitutes a representative of an institutionalised setting (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011). At the same time, while analysing these power dynamics, we were able to identify how there is a clear connection between the management of topics and the PI's formulation of questions, as they play an important role in the quantity of information ultimately given by the ACC.

Along with this categorisation, it is also necessary to discuss how turn management operates in an interrogation leading to an honest confession, which will be discussed below in section 4.4. The important aspects of this discussion are the ACC's cooperativity and resistance to each subtopic, as well as how the turns are distributed and managed throughout the honest confession. Table 14 will present the number of turns per topic in the interrogation, along with the resistance and cooperativity present in each topic. Then, an analysis of each topic and the corresponding subtopics will be carried out, presenting tables with corresponding information and examples with the most representative aspects of some of the subtopics.

4.5. Turn management in an interrogation leading to an honest confession

This subsection will present and discuss the results of the categorisation of the way turns are managed in a non-coerced interrogation resulting in an honest confession. Observations on the management of turns in different subtopics will be offered while focusing on cooperation, as proposed by Grice (1975), the presence or lack of resistance, and how this might impact the rigid structure of the interrogation. This subsection builds on the discussion of topics and subtopics above since this proved crucial for a comprehension of how the development of conversational turns is affected by the way that topics unfold.

As discussed in section 2.1.4, Grice (1975) posits that when engaging in conversation, participants usually adhere to four categories –namely, Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner (Grice, 1975). Nonetheless, speakers might also choose to deliberately flout one or more of the categories, raising Conversational Implicatures (CI), as a way to indirectly convey meaning. Grice's categories will be reflected in the results taken from the further analysis of the tables and that were contemplated for the connection of cooperativity and resistance with the categorisation of the ACC's responses shown in the tables.

In the upcoming subsection seven tables will be presented. The first one, similarly as in section 4.3, corresponds to a general overview of the information displayed in the other six tables, which are all dedicated to each of the six main topics identified. These remaining tables show the subtopics of each main topic, the number of turns generated by each speaker, the overall total of the turns corresponding to each subtopic, and the degrees of cooperation and resistance (Butler, 1991, as cited in Raby, 2005).

4.5.1. Resistance and Cooperativity in Turns by Topic in an Honest Confession

Table 14 displays a general view of turns within the corpus, along with the categorisation of turns by both speakers and organised according to the topic in which they occurred. As explained in the previous section, it is important to note a discrepancy in the total number of turns presented in the table, this due to the fact that 61 turns were identified as instances of 'Rapport' and added to the overall turn count, but were not represented in the table because, as was mentioned before, this concept corresponds to a tool used in police interrogations

rather than being a topic itself. Consequently, while the corpus consists of 821 turns in total, the table indicates 760 turns between the PI and the ACC.

Table 14

Turn-taking, Resistance, and Cooperativity of Each Topic in an Honest Confession

Topic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
Sex	88/189 46.6%	101/189 53.4%	189/821 23%	-	+
Modus operandi	46/97 47.4%	51/97 52.6%	97/821 11.8%	-	+
Personal life	116/234 49.6%	118/234 50.4%	234/821 28.5%	-	+
Killing	39/84 46.4%	45/84 53.6%	84/821 10.2%	-	+
Cannibalism	29/57 50.9%	28/57 49.1%	57/821 6.9%	-	+
References to crimes	50/99 50.5%	49/99 49.5%	99/821 12%	=	=

Within our corpus, the topic 'Personal life' accounts for more than a quarter of all turns produced. Most instances in which this topic was brought up were either at the beginning or at the end of the interrogation. This might be attributed to the PI's deliberate decision to discuss certain topics that may not appear as severe, harsh, or directly connected to the ACC's suspected crimes, aiming to build and encourage cooperation as the interrogation develops. Subsequently, the least discussed topic was 'Cannibalism', which accounts for less than 10% of the overall turn count. This topic is not extensively explored, but rather briefly developed. This may be because this topic mostly deals with the ACC's inclination towards cannibalism and deviates further from the main objective of the interrogation which is discussing the ACC's implications on a particular crime, so it is not as thoughtful to evolve as other topics that could result in more meaningful information about the main interrogation's objective.

Along the same line, in total, the ACC concentrates most of the turns, totalling 392 turns in comparison with the 368 of the PI. Although not a significant difference, this could indicate the ACC's willingness to cooperate and a lower use of resistance strategies during the interrogation given that, as will be further discussed, the ACC of this corpus does not limit himself to purely responding to what is being asked, but gives more information than

what is required, which is the contrary of what is commonly expected of an interrogation where the accused person, in an attempt of not incriminating themself, does not give details nor more information than necessary.

4.5.2. Resistance and Cooperativity in Turns in the Topic 'Sex'

Table 15 shows the seven corresponding subtopics of the main topic 'Sex' and the number of turns generated by each speaker, as well as the overall total of turns that were produced in each subtopic. 'Sexual fantasies' is the most discussed subtopic, comprising 51 out of the 189 turns and accounting for almost 30%. On the contrary, the least explored topics were 'Attacks on minors' and 'Masturbation', with an equal number of turns, 11 precisely. In terms of degrees of resistance and cooperativity, there is a pattern where in almost all subtopics the ACC is less resistant and more cooperative when giving information. However, the subtopic 'Attacks on minors' represents a peculiarity as it differs from all the other subtopics, this will be further analysed in upcoming paragraphs.

Table 15

Turn-taking, Resistance, and Cooperativity in Topic 'Sex'

Subtopic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
Sexual orientation	16 55.2%	13 44.8%	29/189 15.3%	-	+
Sexual encounters	11 50%	11 50%	22/189 11.6%	-	+
Paraphilia	19 44.1%	24 55.8%	43/189 22.8%	-	+
Sexual fantasies	24 47%	27 53%	51/189 27%	-	+
Masturbation	4 36.4%	7 63.6%	11/189 5.8%	-	+
Attacks on minors	5 45.5%	6 55.5%	11/189 5.8%	+	-
Pornography	9 40.9%	13 59.1%	22/189 11.6%	-	+

Within this topic, PI's turns account for 88 of the 189 in total. The ACC, in comparison, produced the majority of them, with 101 turns and, in general lines, was cooperative at the moment of answering.

4.5.2.1. Subtopic 'Sexual encounters'

In this subtopic, which emerges from the main topic 'Sex', the ACC is very cooperative, showing no resistance. This can be illustrated by the vast and detailed narrative he produces, as he is willing to comply and share all of the necessary information the PI required. The long statement present in example (59) demonstrates this.

> **(59)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   Do you recall when you had your first homosexual act?
> A.   **Uh let's see… well the first time I was approached was uh..   Over in Germany, Lansthole Germany, I was working at a hospital, Lansthole hospital.. And uh one of the sergeant majors I think he was either the type of sergeant with two bars underneath or three..   He had his own apartment and one night I was drinking in the local N.C.O club..   He approached me, said he had a party going on back at his place, asked me if I wanted to go back and (NO and) I said sure..   And we went back, turned out there was nobody in the apartment, just him. And he lights up this bowl of hash, smoked some hash, drank some beer, he goes, takes his shower, comes back and tries to get me to hop in bed with him. I said "no thanks" so I just go walking out staggering out after that hash..   That was good hash..   And uh.. So that was the first, time I'd been approached. The first real encounter was in the uh..   Bookstore, in Milwaukee.**
> Q.   At what age?
> A.   Uh.. Probably 22 or 23. Somewhere around that age.

The extension of this narrative seen in example (59) and its utter lack of resistance to elaborate on this subtopic, shows a cooperative attitude from the part of the ACC to engage in open communication with the PI. This openness facilitates a more productive exchange of information, offering a very long and detailed narrative that indicates a voluntary and proactive approach to disclosing information. When being asked a simple yet inviting polar question, the ACC provides context, details, and additional information without the PI's influence. Regarding Grice's categories (1975), specifically the first one of Quantity along with its second maxim –do not be more informative than required–, the additional information provided by the ACC can be interpreted as an attitude that is more cooperative than necessary. This almost excessive cooperativity, characteristic of specific instances –such as this example– within this honest confession, is an unusual finding that could be driven by the ACC's desire to provide a comprehensive account of details.

4.5.2.2. Subtopic 'Attacks on minors'

The identification of 'Attacks on minors' as the only subtopic where the ACC shows resistance and is less cooperative is a key element of how topic resistance is exerted during the interrogation (Haworth, 2006). The ACC's resistance to discussing this subtopic suggests discomfort or reluctance in addressing it, in rather surprising contrast to the openness he showed when answering questions about previous topics related to other of his equally heinous crimes such as 'Cannibalism'. The lack of cooperation indicates that the ACC is less willing to provide information or engage in a detailed discussion regarding these particular incidents, as he has firmly attempted to clarify every time the topic is brought up, that he did not engage in sexual activities with minors. The reason behind this less cooperative and more resistant attitude towards this subtopic might arise from the ACC's perception of the involvement of minors as morally aggravating to his offences.

The fact that 'Attacks on minors' comprises only eleven turns indicates that the discussion on this topic is brief and not extensively explored. The limited number of turns may be a result of the ACC's resistance prompting the PI to quickly move on to other areas, which may be in order to not interrupt or disturb the ACC's telling of events and, that way, maintain his motivation to keep talking.

> **(60)**   **Bravo et al.**
> Q   ……. **Growing up, tell me, were you involved with, as a Pedophile?**
> A.   **No.**
> Q.   You had no desires towards children at that time either?
> A.   **No….**   In west Dallas there was some lewd and lascivious behavior in a park that I was involved in for about a year.
> Q.   You were arrested then?
> A.   Right. But uh, there was, there was no assault on any children or anything it was just masturbation.

As can be seen in example (60), there exists a clear unwillingness on the ACC's part to further explore this topic, even though the PI tries to further the discussion on this subtopic, the ACC remains in his position and does not show any cooperativity that implies that he wants to pursue this topic. In example (60), the ACC denies having been involved with minors. As was previously discussed in example (48) in regard to the same subtopic within section 4.3, there is also a minimisation of his actions, which might suggest a connection between 'minimisation' and the lack of cooperativity.

Examples shown in the discussion of Table 15, from the subtopics 'Sexual encounters' (59) and 'Attacks on minors' (60), describe the clear difference in cooperativity and lack of resistance identified in both subtopics. In this sense, in the subtopic 'Sexual encounters', the ACC is willing to comply and respond to the questions posed by the PI by providing detailed information. However, in the subtopic 'Attacks on minors', he shows resistance and a lack of cooperation when giving his responses.

4.5.3. Resistance and Cooperativity in Turns in the Topic 'Modus Operandi'

Table 16 offers a description of turns produced by each speaker in the three subtopics within the main topic 'Modus Operandi'. 'Methods' was the most discussed subtopic, accounting for over 50% of the overall turn count. On the contrary, 'Hunting victims' encompasses the least number of turns, comprising only 20.6% of the total. Although upcoming paragraphs will only address and illustrate phenomena identified in two out of the three subtopics – 'Methods' and 'Hunting of victims'– as they present better cases of study within the main topic. Furthermore, within this main topic, the ACC shows a tendency to offer minimal resistance and to cooperate willingly with the provision of information.

Table 16
Turn-taking, Resistance, and Cooperativity in Topic 'Modus Operandi'

Subtopic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
Methods	26 49%	27 51%	53/97 54.6%	-	+
Hunting victims	9 45%	11 55%	20/97 20.6%	-	+
Victims	11 45.8%	13 54.2%	24/97 24.7%	-	+

4.5.3.1. Subtopic 'Methods'

Within this subtopic, there appears to be an almost equal distribution of turns between both speakers, as there is a difference of only one turn between the PI and the ACC. Along the

same line, throughout every turn of this subtopic, the ACC demonstrates a high degree of cooperation while presenting lower resistance. This can be seen in the following example, where the topic is introduced by the PI and the ACC willingly cooperates, producing extended narrative responses with relevant information:

> **(61)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   Would that get rid of it? (would that melt them or..)
> **A.   That, you can buy these gallon jugs of muratic acids, it's the diluted kind of the hydrochloric acid.. I had 16 gallons of it there waiting to use in those three skeletons that were in the blue, blue tub. Year that will acidify it within a couple days you can scoop it out and pour it down the toilet, bones even.. and uh.. stuff..**
> Q.   When you started becoming concerned at that one point where you couldn't fit it in the freezer anymore, what action did you take then?
> **A.   I bought that large 55 gallon blue barrel, put the, put the three skeletons that I wasn't going to keep in that, had the, had the uh, unboiled heads frozen in the freezer and one skeleton that I wasn't going to boil and keep. So I was just going to pour all those jugs of meridic acid in there and acidify them but never did get the chance.**
> Q.   At any time did you ever have to remove any body parts from your apartment and bury them or discard them somewhere?
> **A.   Never did that, Never did that..**

Example (61) demonstrates the ACC's eagerness to elaborate on the subtopic proposed by the PI. Additionally, while the presence of hesitation ('and uh… things…') could be considered a sign of hesitation from the ACC, this cannot be analysed as such due to the absence of the audio version. As aforementioned in other sections, this limited our access only to the transcribed version of the interrogation, thereby their precise nature cannot be confirmed and, thus, be thoroughly analysed. Nonetheless, it is fairly evident that the ACC is open to providing an extensive amount of information as he, even though uses interjections that in other cases can be considered as resistance (Haworth, 2006), ends up offering a complete answer to what is being asked, thus complying with the cooperative categories previously discussed.

4.5.3.2. Subtopic 'Hunting of victims'

Similarly to the previous subtopic, the ACC and the PI generated nearly an equal number of turns, with a slight difference of two turns in favour of the ACC. As stated before, within this subtopic, the ACC presents a higher level of cooperation and minimal resistance. Nonetheless, the following example, which has already been analysed in Table 9 regarding topics and subtopics, shows a particular instance where the ACC is using what might be

considered a resistance strategy while still providing information in relation to the question asked.

(62)   **Bravo et al.**
Q.   How did you pick these people up did you rouse them?
A.   **In bars, offered them money, that was basically that.**
Q.   They willfully came back to the place with you?
A.   **Right, right.**
Q.   You never had to threaten..
A.   **Never threatened.**
Q.   A weapon to coerce them back there?
A.   **No. Never did that.**

Section 2.1.1 explores some of the many ways interrogated subjects use resistance strategies (Haworth, 2006). Example (62) illustrates the ACC's use of one of these strategies, which is offering minimal information, as a way to avoid elaborating on the details, providing only what he might deem as necessary (Haworth, 2006, Taranilla, 2011; Nakane, 2020). In this excerpt, this is evident in his direct but extremely concise and undetailed response to every question asked by the PI, something unusual for the ACC, therefore illustrating how he makes use of resistance strategies to be less cooperative throughout the interrogational process while still addressing the question asked. This stands in contrast to example (61), where the ACC provides lengthy and detailed answers to the formulated queries. In this instance, the ACC opts for concise responses that, while still providing the required information related to the proposed subtopic, function as a signal to the PI about the ACC's intention to close the subtopic, as previously shown in Table 9.

Both examples accurately represent the ACC's relation with cooperation and resistance regarding the questions posed by the PI within this main topic. This demonstrates the fulfilment of Grice's Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975). Concerning the first category of Quantity, the ACC effectively gives valuable and adequate information in both instances, despite variations in length. Something similar happens in relation to the second and third categories, namely Quality and Relevance (Grice, 1975). In these instances, the ACC directly answers the formulated question, remaining focused on the topic and maintaining honesty. Sincerity is crucial for honest confessions to be categorised as such, as the evidence presented –which in most cases, is private and not available to the main public– must align with statements made by the interrogated subject (Leo & Ofshe, 1998; David & Trainum, 2020).

Subsequently, in terms of the fourth category, relating to Manner (Grice, 1975), the information is presented in an eloquent and narrative style (61) that ensures the PI's comprehension and thereby enhances the efficacy of the communication.

4.5.4. Resistance and Cooperativity in Turns in the Topic 'Personal life'

Table 17 displays the eight subtopics that belong to the main topic 'Personal Life' Consisting of 234 turns, the topic 'Personal Life' was divided into eight subtopics: 'Family', 'Friends', 'Education', 'Religion & Faith', 'Violence against him', 'Addictions', 'Work & paid activities', and 'Lifestyle.' This last subtopic emerges as the most extensive subtopic, while 'Violence against him' takes a comparatively more concise form. Notably, the PI dominates the conversational landscape with a higher number of turns.

Table 17
Turn-taking, Resistance and Cooperativity in Topic 'Personal Life'

Subtopic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
Family	10 52.6%	9 47.4%	19/234 8.1%	-	+
Friends	15 51.7%	14 42.3%	29/234 12.4%	-	+
Education	7 50%	7 50%	14/234 6%	-	+
Religion & faith	8 50%	8 50%	16/234 6.8%	-	+
Violence against him	4 40%	6 60%	10/234 4.3%	-	+
Addictions	12 42.9%	16 57.1%	28/234 11.7%	-	+
Work & paid activities	18 50%	18 50%	36/234 15.4%	-	+
Lifestyle	42 51.2%	40 48.8%	82/234 35%	-	+

4.5.4.1. Subtopic 'Friends'

This subtopic shows a different form of cooperation within the corpus. Mitigation of certainty, in this particular case, aligns more with the ACC's most likely genuine difficulty in recalling specific details, instead of serving as a deliberate obstruction as Chandia et al.'s analysis of false confessions demonstrates.

> **(63)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   Do you remember her name?
> A.   Her name **I don't remember no**.
> Q.   How old was she?
> A.   **Probably around** 28… **I know she said** she was from England, she had an English accent.

This distinction suggests a cooperative disposition on the part of the ACC, further reinforced by the lack of outright resistance. The ACC's willingness to engage in discussions on personal topics contributes to fostering an environment conducive to information sharing fulfilling the cooperative principles as proposed by Grice (1975). As can be seen in example (63), even when the ACC does not contribute with IRI he shows willingness to cooperate with the PI.

4.5.4.2. Subtopic 'Work & paid activities'

In the specific case of the ACC, recognizing and addressing memory limitations emerges as a crucial factor in shaping the dynamics of the interrogation. The ACC's overall cooperation appears to reflect a potentially genuine effort to share information. However, his difficulty in recalling specific events, which can be a common occurrence among individuals, might pose a limitation on the ACC's ability to provide the information demanded by the PI, which ultimately affects his cooperativity. The PI, as the one in control over the interrogation, should consider these constraints and adapt the questioning strategies to accommodate the ACC's memory-related challenges.

> **(64)** **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   What office you were collecting your unemployment at?
> A.   Uh the downtown Miami office **I guess.**
> Q.   Miami beach or down in the city of Miami?
> A.   **I think** the city cause I had to take the bus to get there…

The ACC's openness in acknowledging memory lapses as presented in example (64) adds to the information shared, suggesting a sincere attempt to recall details rather than a deliberate avoidance of certain topics. This credibility, however, is contingent upon the characteristics of a true confession. It is important to note that even when the ACC honestly admits to not remembering, such a confession can serve a dual purpose—both as a genuine acknowledgement and as a potential strategy to sidestep discussing incriminating details.

Throughout the totality of subtopics from the topic 'Personal life', the ACC shows cooperativity and no resistance to providing information about them. The development of the topic of 'Personal life' is, for the most part, strategically placed at the introductory stage of the interrogation. This is done because, as has been previously stated, throughout the initial stages of the interrogation, police interrogators should aim to generate rapport (David et al., 2018). In any of the subtopics that belong to this topic does the ACC show resistance to speak, therefore indicating his intention to cooperate from the beginning. In this topic, the presence of hesitations constitutes an aspect of analysis based on a possible and genuine hesitation related to actually not remembering an event instead of the resistance of consciously avoiding the topic.

4.5.5. Resistance and Cooperativity in Turns in Topic 'Killing'

Table 18 presents all of the subtopics under the general topic of 'Killing'. Overall, this topic has 84 turns, and it is divided into four subtopics: 'Reasons', 'Self-doubts', 'Reactions', and 'Consequences'. The subtopic that sums up more turns corresponds to 'Reactions', which adds a total of 31 turns, while 'Reasons' has the least, with only 11 turns. Additionally, the ACC, who has the most turns, accounts for 45 of 84 turns.

Table 18

Turn-taking, Resistance and Cooperativity in Topic 'Killing'

Subtopic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
Reasons	5 45.5%	6 54.5%	11/84 13.1%	-	+
Self-doubts	11 45.8%	13 54.2%	24/84 28.6%	-	+
Reactions	14 45.2%	17 54.8%	31/84 36.9%	-	+
Consequences	9 50%	9 50%	18/84 21.4%	-	+

4.5.5.1. Subtopic 'Reasons'

This subtopic, essentially, shows a high presence of cooperation and absence of resistance by the ACC's part, which aligns with his initial stance of being honest about the details he offers when speaking about his crimes, as seen in example (65). The ACC is willing to share the reason behind he started to commit crimes, without requiring further insistence from the PI.

> **(65)**   **Bravo et al.**
> Q.   (One of the things that did impress me last week when we were talking was your openness and honesty about this, you remember we've talked about this and then I'd ask you and I shared this with [REDACTED] if you would have done that, would you tell us and you said "absolutely" and then I said "why?" and you had a good reason, it's like you said..)
> A.   **No secret, there's no point in trying to hide it anymore you know**.

In example (65) it can be seen as one of the ACC's statements in regard to his honesty. Within this excerpt, he explicitly declares openness and establishes his aim to cooperate in the interrogation because, as he states, there is no reason for him to not tell the truth. The ACC presents information that even when it does not constitute IRI, it does help to comprehend the levels of cooperation that characterise the confession. There is an inherent need of the ACC to try to comprehend himself and to understand his actions. Consequently, he is given the opportunity to do so in a series of turns that he uses to rationalise his actions.

4.5.5.2. Subtopic 'Reactions'

Within this subtopic, the PI tries to obtain more information about the ACC's feelings regarding one of the first crimes he committed. As it will be shown in example (66), the ACC is cooperative and provides an answer where, despite responding in a way that could be deemed as negative and dubitative, he shares his feelings towards the situation.

(66)   Bravo et al.
Q.   After they just wrote you a ticket and let you go, **what did you think**?
A.   **I couldn't believe it, I thought I was dreaming**.. so I went back home and that was the first time.. the second time in the hotel where I woke up and the guy was dead underneath me.. I **didn't know how, how I was going to handle that.. never had that happen**..

In example (66), it is the PI who introduces the subtopic of 'Reactions' giving the ACC space to question himself about the motives and feelings that lead him to commit the crimes. In particular, the question formulated by the PI is aimed at prompting the ACC to elaborate on the possibility of having been captured by the police and what his feelings were during that occurrence. In this sense, even when the answer of the ACC does not provide IRI, it offers an insight into his thought process, which can be used by the PI through the interrogation to foster a sense of proximity with the ACC.

Despite the contents of this topic, the ACC responds to everything he is being asked, even when he does not understand his own actions and feelings, cooperating with the PI and showing no resistance. This is because as stated in example (65), he has no desire to hide the crimes he committed from the PI, and this is proved by his statements and responses.

4.5.6. Resistance and cooperativity in turns in the topic 'Cannibalism'

Table 19 presents a general view of the topic 'Cannibalism', this being the least used topic. In this topic, only two subtopics were encountered. 'Butchering' accounts for the most turns, accounting for 42 out of 57, and the remaining 15 turns correspond to 'Eating'. Both subtopics present little resistance and a great degree of cooperation.

Table 19

Turn-taking, Resistance and Cooperativity in Topic 'Cannibalism'

Subtopic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
Butchering	21 50%	21 50%	42/57 73.7%	-	+
Eating	8 53.3%	7 46.7%	15/57 26.3%	-	+

4.5.6.1. Subtopic 'Butchering'

In this subtopic, resistance can be seen in instances where the ACC actively rejects to further discuss it and, as a consequence, attempts to close it. In example (67) the ACC displays discomfort with the topic, attempting to close it on multiple occasions. It should be noted that, despite the ACC's attempts to avoid delving into the details of this subtopic, the PI persists in pursuing the subject for additional information.

> **(67)   Bravo et al.**
> A.   **No just uh... I feel uncomfortable talking about it on tape** not knowing who's going to be listening to the tape, this part... do you guys really need this on tape?
> Q.   Yeah, it's like I say, it's for behavioral science for teaching... (I would be willing, to take notes if you want to turn the tape off.)
> A.   I'll just give you a **general description.**
> Q.   Sure.
> A.   Just **slit from the sternum to the you know, pubic area**, removed the internal organs and then cut the flesh **starting from the calves, legs, and then up, removed the head and put that in the freezer, and uh... the bone,** the skeleton that was defleshed I would put in that large **80 gallon cooking pot that I had pour in the box of that wall cleaning solution**, **I'd strip the remaining flesh off, turn up to boil... and did the same with the heads so I had a clean skeleton**, a big clean skeleton and uh... sometimes I would saved portions of the flesh with consumption, most of it went out in the garbage or in the acid bath and a lot of the unused skeletons went into the acid bath too. Or were flushed down the toilet... so that's how it was done.

Cooperativity in example (67) is remarkable, because, even when the ACC expresses an initial hesitance to talk about this specific topic, he then proceeds to give a longer and detailed explanation. Here, the ACC does not show discomfort nor reluctance in regard to the subtopic, as he drifts away from the 'general description' he promised to give.

The shift from resistance to cooperation in this subtopic aligns with the categories of the cooperative principle. The ACC complies with the category of Relevance (Grice, 1975). The ACC shifts from the resistance of a topic to the cooperation needed to also fulfil the category of Quality (Grice, 1975). Even when the ACC is uncomfortable with the topic and its subtopics, there is a tendency to offer the information being asked. This cooperative stance, even in the face of uncomfortable topics, contributes to the overall effectiveness of the interrogation by facilitating a more thorough understanding of the events under investigation.

4.5.6.2. Subtopic 'Eating'

Within this subtopic, when the ACC responds, a subtle instance of resistance becomes apparent, specifically at the beginning of the questioning. This can be identified in example (68) as the ACC is reluctant to give a direct answer. However, as the topic progresses, the ACC ultimately responds to the questions. Overall, this exemplifies an identified pattern where the ACC might show some degree of resistance at times. Nonetheless, the cooperative nature he has shown throughout the entire interrogation implies that he will still provide information in the end.

> **(68)   Bravo et al.**
> Q.   (How did it taste?)
> A.   **Uhh… there's no way of saying it without sounding uh…gruesome…**
> Q.   (I don't find it offensive.)
> A.   Well it… I, I don't know how to describe it. You've had filet mignon, haven't you?

In example (68), as previously mentioned, the ACC presents a degree of resistance from the beginning, which might be attributed to the feeling of discomfort when talking about the 'Eating' subtopic. In this case, the PI wants to pursue further the topic but notices the ACC's discomfort, so instead of dropping the subtopic, he encourages the ACC to continue speaking, as seen in the example (68), where the PI states how 'he does not find it offensive' in order to motivate the conversation.

Within the subtopics of 'Cannibalism', a prevailing trend is the absence of resistance, with the ACC generally exhibiting open cooperation. However, certain responses formulated by the ACC deviate from this pattern, where direct answers are withheld due to evident

discomfort with the topic. In these instances, it is the PI who actively encourages the ACC to overcome this discomfort and give responses.

4.5.7. Resistance and Cooperativity in Turns in Topic 'References to crimes'

Table 20 presents a general overview of the topic 'References of Crimes'. In this topic, only two subtopics were identified. 'Allegedly' accounts for the most turns, comprising 60 out of the 99 in total. On the contrary, 'On record' is the least explored subtopic, consisting only of 39. Within both subtopics, there is a clear presence of resistance and cooperation which will be further analysed and illustrated in the paragraphs below.

Table 20
Turn-taking, Resistance and Cooperativity in Topic 'References to Crimes'

Subtopic	Turns by Speaker		Total number of Turns	Resistance	Cooperativity
	PI	ACC			
On record	19 48.7%	20 51.3%	39/99 39.4%	-	+
Allegedly	31 51.7%	29 48.3%	60/99 60.6%	+	-

4.5.7.1. Subtopic 'On record'

This subtopic involves the discussion of some of the crimes the ACC either has already admitted to having committed or has been prosecuted for. In this context, and as stated by him, there is no reason for him to deny or not talk about them. As such, it makes sense for the ACC not to show resistance and, instead, be more cooperative when providing information. The ACC's apparent transparency and lack of motivation to conceal information about crimes 'On record' aligns with the cooperative stance he has shown throughout the interrogation, which might encourage the proper environment to provide a detailed account of these specific incidents. Example (69) illustrates this.

(69)   Bravo et al.
Q.   (And you had the skull)
A.   **That was uh.. even before that there was a time, well I'm not going to say that on tape… that was the time I had that mummified head and that was after, yeah that was after the time I got arrested for taking pictures. They searched my apartment, I had an apartment on 24 street and they looked, they just didn't pull a towel up, that's why they didn't see the skull.**
Q.   (They had tunnel vision they were looking for photographs and drugs but they totally missed the skull)
A.   **Right. And another time I had that mummified head in the uh… small metal chest I had in the closet and I took that to work that's were I kept it at work… for about a year. And then the time that the police came around asking questions about the guy that was shot upstairs or strangled upstairs, he came into my apartment and looked around and didn't see anything.**

As previously mentioned, in example (69), the ACC has no motivation to hide the crimes he has committed, thereby he shows no resistance when he gives responses. The PI formulates two 'Declarative non-guiding statements' questions which, as already discussed in previous sections, are aimed at eliciting an answer that denotes agreement or disagreement with the claims made. The ACC, in return, gives a detailed and extensive response that denotes his efforts to be cooperative. This can be contrasted with the excerpt shown in the following subtopic, in which the ACC's non-resistant and cooperative response style changes.

4.5.7.2. Subtopic 'Allegedly'

As discussed in the previous paragraph, the ACC is mostly cooperative and shows no resistance to elaborate on some of the crimes he has committed. However, within this subtopic, a change occurs. This could be attributed to the fact that here, the ACC denies involvement and is reluctant to continue engaging with the subtopic. The ACC's responses predominantly reveal a pattern of attempting to decrease the discussion, demonstrating resistance by an apparent unwillingness to expand on the topic. The following example (70) demonstrates this.

(70)   Bravo et al.
Q.   I asked this gentleman I said "what was the encounter that you are speaking about?" and he said "well I was uh, at this store inside the mall" … and uh, the person that he believed to be you…
A.   **Uh huh.**
Q.   Came up to him and tried to pick him up, had conversation, asked him isn't it a beautiful day outside and started following this gentleman, he got a little leary and he continued to walk through the mall and you followed him and eventually he lost you somewhere inside the Sears mall.

A.   **Uh huh.**

In this excerpt, the PI, as the subject holding power within the interrogation setting, takes on an assertive role in steering the interaction. Despite the ACC's resistance to elaborate on the topic proposed by the PI, persists in leading the interaction and pressing for additional information. However, the ACC's use of brief and concise positive affirmations might be a strategy to avoid elaborating on this subtopic. The resistance shown in this context, as illustrated in example (70), may emerge from a desire to avoid self-incrimination or legal consequences.

In the context of 'References to crimes', the use of guiding questions takes on added significance due to the possibility of the ACC either admitting to or denying involvement in offences not previously disclosed. The parallel with Chandía et al.'s case highlights the importance of precision and ethical considerations in the formulation of questions, especially when   dealing   with   potential   admissions   of   guilt.

Turn management in an honest confession is heavily marked by the cooperativity and lack of resistance from the ACC. Even when discussing uncomfortable subtopics such as 'Attacks on minors', where the ACC shows resistance to answering the questions posed by the PI, he finally ends up complying with the four cooperative principles (Grice, 1975). In most of the sequences of responses generated by the ACC, he adhered to at least two of the four of Grice's categories: Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner, establishing a confession where the information being provided is informative, true, relevant and clear.

5. Conclusions

This section presents a concise summary of our research, highlighting essential elements and key findings of the investigation. Subsequently, the limitations of this study will be discussed. The last subsection is dedicated to projections for further research.

5.1. General summary

Honest confessions continue to be an aspect within police interrogations that has been scarcely investigated. This type of confession is usually characterised as the expected result during the context of a police interrogation, and is typically distinguished by its voluntary

nature. Honest confessions are usually made by individuals experiencing guilt, a sense of remorse upon becoming aware of their committed offences, or when they gain knowledge about the substantial evidence gathered against them by law enforcement (Leo & Ofshe, 1997; Gudjonsson, 2003; Malloy et al., 2014; David & Trainum, 2020; Goodman-Delahunty & Martschuk, 2020).

Due to this gap in the studies within the police interrogation field, this study aimed to respond (1) how can the question and response types proposed for coerced confessions in police interrogations be compared/contrasted with the questions and responses of a non-coerced interrogation resulting in an honest confession, and (2) how can the power-asymmetrical interactional nature of a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession be characterised and interpreted.

As an objective, this study focused on analysing and comparing Chandía et al.'s (2020) proposed taxonomy of questions and responses in a coerced false confession setting with our corpus, consisting of a non-coerced honest one. This with the objective to identify and explain potential variations that may arise from the difference in grammatical and pragmatic functions that may occur in an honest confession. Other objectives were the characterization of relevant aspects of the topic and turn management in a non-coerced police interrogation resulting in an honest confession.

In relation to the comparison of Chandía et al.'s taxonomy with our corpus, certain types of questions were identified to serve similar functions in both contexts. Due to this, a pattern was recognised regarding the way in which these questions elicit responses from interrogated subjects which might highlight their adaptability to other interrogation contexts as a way to prompt honest information. It is significant to mention that 'Polar Questions' exhibit the highest frequency in terms of question formulation, while 'Short positive responses' dominate in answer realisation.

That being said, as already discussed, not every type of question and response was identified in our corpus; some were entirely absent or served different pragmatic functions. For instance, 'Guiding' questions, commonly found in false confessions according to Chandía et al.'s taxonomy, were not prevalent in the analysed corpus. Notably, this limited

presence resulted in minimal instances of IRI (Farrugia & Gabbert, 2019) within this type of confession. Simultaneously, the examination of the cooperative characteristics (Grice, 1975) and vulnerability (Haworth, 2006) of the ACC reveals that in instances where the ACC demonstrates less resistance and more cooperativity, being imperatively prompted by the PI to produce information may not be necessary. Additionally, his non-vulnerable status obviates the need for continuous clarification from the interrogator.

This study also aimed to further the comprehension of power-asymmetrical dynamics inherent to police interrogations in an honest confession (Gudjonsson, 2003; Leo, 2008; Taranilla, 2011; van Dijk, 2015). A significant finding of this study was the observation that, despite potential variations in both topic and turn management within honest and false confessions, the power-asymmetrical dynamic between interrogator and interrogated subject remains largely consistent in both contexts (Ainsworth, 1993; Haworth, 2006; Taranilla, 2011; David et al., 2018). Even in instances where there appears to be a negotiation of power dynamics during the interrogation, the interrogator, whether in a false or honest confession, will constantly assert their power (Taranilla, 2011). This negotiation becomes evident when the ACC frequently attempts to introduce a topic. However, this does not imply a loss of power by the interrogator, but rather a strategy to prompt the interrogated subject to provide more information. It is crucial to note that the interrogator is the ultimate arbiter in deciding whether to engage in a suggested topic by the interrogated. Simultaneously, when the ACC steers away from relevant forensic matters, the interrogator consistently redirects the conversation back to the appropriate focus.

In relation to the management of turns, observations about honest confessions reveal that the interrogated subject may exhibit less resistance and be more cooperative in providing information. Typically, the ACC responses take a narrative form but, in cases where he is unwilling to supply details, resistance becomes evident in the types and the length of answers given, which become more concise and brief, which is highly unusual for this type of subject. Similarly, in instances where the ACC is notably collaborative, it aligns with the Cooperative Principle (CP) (Grice, 1975). Although the ACC might use strategies of resistance (Butler, 1991, as cited in Raby, 2005), he still provides information that is adequate to the queries.

5.2. Limitations

The limitations of this investigation are mostly related to the corpus analysed. As discussed in section 3.1.1, one of the main limitations was the unavailability of the interrogation in other forms besides the already transcribed text. This implied a lack of clarity regarding which of the two interrogators in the room, each turn belonged to. Additionally, due to the absence of video or audio recording, crucial elements, such as body language, facial expressions, gestures, pauses, tone and pitch of voice, which are a significant part of communicating with others, were not available for analysis. As a consequence, certain turns could not be categorised or further examined because they were marked as '[UNINTELLIGIBLE]' or '[REDACTED]'. Another limitation is also the fact that the confession used for our analysis only lasted 70 minutes, thus, leaving the confession with only a grasp of the phenomena that could occur in an honest confession.

Another significant limitation arose from the fact that the honest confession analysed in this investigation was not Dahmer's first interrogation by law enforcement officers regarding these particular offences. The Milwaukee Police Department had previously questioned him upon his arrest. Consequently, certain topics within this interrogation may not have been thoroughly discussed, as they might have already been covered in other instances with different interrogators.

One of the main limitations regarding the theory of our analysis resides in the difficulty of finding literature and studies focused exclusively on honest confessions. Thus, with little to no literature available, the definition of an honest confession was, per se one, of the difficulties faced. The limited literature about honest confessions is closely related to the fact that an honest confession is difficult to prove. Our analysis focused on the case of Jeffrey Dahmer because all the crimes that he confessed were proven to have happened in the way he described, and this a big anomaly in the police interrogation context.

5.3. Projections

As this study brings forth valuable insights into the nature of honest confessions, it also creates opportunities for further research on this topic that has been almost disregarded by researchers because of the complexity that proposes to prove an honest confession. Due to

this, crucial elements of the police interrogation setting remain unexplored specifically in the context of the aforementioned type of confession.

Therefore, in the pursuit of a deeper understanding of non-coerced honest confessions, developing a taxonomy that outlines distinct types of questions and responses that is exclusively tailored to this context is necessary. This arises from the observation that the taxonomy proposed by Chandía et al. (2020), as has been extensively discussed and analysed throughout this research, may not consistently align with the particularities of questions and responses that stem from this type of confession. At the same time, future taxonomies, while essential for understanding the nature of forensic interrogations, should widen their scope into diverse contexts, such as trial interrogations. This could be essential for investigating disparities that may arise within different communication contexts and understanding the potential influence that interrogator's professional roles might have on the formulation of questions and responses.

Since this research's findings are restricted to one honest confession, future research can explore this subject more through the management of turn and topic within the singular context of an honest confession. By doing so, not only would contributions be made to the current literature regarding this type of confession, but it would also enable the formulation of generalisations, aiming to establish a distinct and more comprehensive contrast between false and honest confessions. Similarly, future studies could focus on the nature of topic and subtopic closure, providing insights into how power asymmetry operates in non-coerced interrogations and the strategies employed to manage and signal the closure of conversational topics.

References

Ainsworth, J. (1993). In a different register: The pragmatics of powerlessness in police interrogation. *The Yale Law Journal, 103*(2), 259-322.

Angus, D., & Wiles, J. (2018). Social semantic networks: Measuring topic management in discourse using a pyramid of conceptual recurrence metrics. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, *28*(8), 085723.

Apriyanto, S. (2020). A Forensic Linguistic Point of View of Implicational Conversations in a Police Interrogation: A Review. *International Research Association for Talent Development and Excellence*, *12*(1), 3370-84.

Apriyanto, S., & Santoso, D. (2020). Pragmatics implicature analysis of police interrogation: Forensic linguistics analysis. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, *24*(6), 115-124.

Aubry, A. S., Caputo, R. R. (1980). *Criminal interrogation*. Charles C Thomas.

Baldwin, J. (1993). Police interview techniques: Establishing truth or proof?. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *33*(3), 325-352.

Chandía, C., Herrera, N., Mella, L., Pérez, B., Pardo, F., Zuñiga, A., Valenzuela, K., & Soto, V. (2020). *Categorization of Questions and Responses Types in Intellectually Disabled Witnesses' False Confessions: An Analysis of Four Statements from Central Park Five and West Memphis Three*. [Undergraduate Thesis]. Universidad de Chile.

Coulthard, M,; Johnson, A.; Wright, David. (2017). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. Routledge.

Dahmer, L. (1995). *A Father's Story: One Man's Anguish at Confronting the Evil in His Son*. Sphere.

David, G. C., & Trainum, J. (2020). "Now the Rest of the Story: The Collaborative Production of Confession Narratives in Police Interrogations". In M. Manson & F. Rock (Eds.), *The Discourse of Police Interviews,* (pp. 113-135). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226647821.001.0001

David, G. C., Rawls, A. W., & Trainum, J. (2018). Playing the interview Game: Rapport, Coercion, and Confessions in Police Interrogations. *Symbolic Interaction*, *41*(1), 3–24.

Downing, A., Neff van Aertselaer, J., Carretero Lapeyre, M. B., Martínez Caro, E., Pérez de Ayala Becerril, S., Marín Arrese, J. I., & Simón Granda, J. F. (1998). Structuring and signalling topic management. In *Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States (LACUS) Forum XXIV* (pp. 267-279).

Duncan, S. (1972). Some signals and rules for taking speaking turns in conversations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *23*(2), 283-292.

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and powe*r. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.

Farrugia L, & Gabbert, F. (2019). Vulnerable suspects in police interviews: Exploring current practice in England and Wales. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *17*(1), 1-14.

Gibbons, J. (Ed.). (1994). *Language and the law*. Harlow: Longman.

Gibbons, J. (2003). *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gibbons, J., & Turrell, M.T. (Ed.). (2008). *Dimensions of Forensic Linguistics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Godsey, M. A. (2008). Shining the bright light on police interrogation in America. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, *6*, 711-801.

Goodman-Delahunty, J., & Martschuk, N. (2020). Securing reliable information in investigative interviews: Coercive and noncoercive strategies preceding turning points. *Police Practice and Research*, *21*(2), 152-171.

Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. Academic Press.

Goutsos, D. (1997). *Modelling Discourse Topic. Sequential Relations and Strategies in Expository Text*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex

Greatbatch, D. (1986) 'Aspects of Topical Organization in News Interviews: The Use of Agenda-shifting Procedures by Interviewees'. *Media, Culture & Society*, *8*(4), 441–55.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58).

Gudjonsson, G. (2003). *The Psychology of Interrogations and Confessions*. Wiley.

Gudjonsson, G., & Bownes, I. (1992). The Reasons Why Suspects Confess during Custodial Interrogation: Data for Northern Ireland. *Medicine, Science and the Law*, *32*(3), 204-212. doi:10.1177/002580249203200304

Gudjonsson, G., & Pearse, J. (2011). Suspect Interviews and False Confessions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(1), 33-37. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721410396824

Gudjonsson, G., & Petursson, H. (1991). Custodial interrogation: Why do suspects confess and how does it relate to their crime, attitude and personality? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*(3), 295-306. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90116-S.

Harris, S. (1995). Pragmatics and power. *Journal of pragmatics*, *23*(2), 117-135.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., & Vrij, A. (2005). Police Interrogation from a Social Psychology Perspective. *Policing and Society*, *15*(4), 379-399.

Haworth, K. (2006). The dynamics of power and resistance in police interview discourse. *Discourse & society*, *17*(6), 739-759.

Haworth, K. (2013). Language of police interview. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, (pp. 1-6).

Heritage, J. (2017). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing distinctive turn-taking. *Dialoganalyse, VI*(2), 3-18.

Holmberg, U., Christianson, S. Å. (2002). Murderers' and sexual offenders' experiences of police interviews and their inclination to admit or deny crimes. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, *20*, 31-45.

Houston, K. A., Meissner, C. A, & Evans, J. R. (2014). Psychological Processes Underlying True and False Confessions. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative Interviewing* (19-34). Springer Science + Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9642-7_2

Howe, M. (1991). Collaboration on topic change in conversation. *Kansas working papers in linguistics*, *16*, 1-14.

Investigative interviewing. (2022). College of Policing. Online. Available HTTP: <https://www.college.police.uk/app/investigation/investigative-interviewing/investigative-interviewing#peace-framework> (accessed 5 October 2023)

Janzen, K. (2019). Coerced Fate: How Negotiation Models Lead To False Confessions. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *109*(1), 71–102.

Kassin, S. (2005). On the Psychology of Confessions: Does Innocence put Innocents at Risk. *American Psychologists, 60*(3), 215-228.

Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S. A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G. H., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. D. (2010). Police-Induced Confessions: Risk Factors and Recommendations. *Law and Human Behavior*, *34*(1), 3–38.

Kennedy, P., & Maharaj, R. (2021). *Grilling Dahmer: The interview Of "The Milwaukee Cannibal."* WildBlue Press.

Leo, R. (2008). False Confessions. In *Police Interrogation and American Justice* (pp. 195-236). Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press.

Leo, R. (2009). False Confessions: Causes, Consequences, and Implications. *The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law. 11*, 332-343.

Leo, R. A., & Ofshe, R. J. (1997). The Social Psychology of Police Interrogation: The Theory and Classification of True and False Confessions. *Studies in Law, Politics, and Society. 16*, 189-251.

Leo, R. A., & Ofshe, R. J. (1998). Consequences of False Confessions: Deprivations of Liberty and Miscarriages of Justice in the Age of Psychological Interrogation. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 88*(2), 429-496.

Malloy, C., Shulman, E., & Cauffman, E. (2014). Interrogations, Confessions, and Guilty Pleas Among Serious Adolescent Offenders. *American Psychological Association. 38*(2), 181-193.

Mason, M., & Rock, F. (2020). The Discourse of Police Interviews. The University of Chicago Press

Mason, M. (2016). The 'preparatory' and 'argumentation' stages of police interrogation: A linguistic analysis of a criminal investigation. *Language & Communication*, *48*, 79-87.

Masters, B. (1993). *The Shrine of Jeffrey Dahmer*. Hodder and Stoughton.

Maynard, D. W. (1980). Placement of topic changes in conversation. *Semiotica*, *30*(3/4), 263-290.

McCarthy, M. (2003). Talking Back: "Small" Interactional Response Tokens in Everyday Conversation. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 36*(1)*, 33–63.*

Memon, A. A., Vrij, A., & Bull, R. (2003). *Psychology and law: Truthfulness, accuracy and credibility*. John Wiley & Sons.

Miller, J. C., Redlich, A. D., & Kelly, C. E. (2018). Accusatorial and information-gathering interview and interrogation methods: a multi-country comparison. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *24*(9), 935-956.

Momeni, N. (2011). Police genre: Interruption and its classification as a sign of asymmetry in police interview/interrogation. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, *4*(1), 615-625.

Oyanedel, M., & Samaniego, J. L. (2001). Aplicación de la Lingüística al campo legal. *Onomázein*, (6), 251–261. https://doi.org/10.7764/onomazein.6.14

Raby, R. (2005). What is Resistance?. *Journal of Youth Studies,* 8(2), 151–171. doi:10.1080/13676260500149246

Rock, F. (2015). Police interview discourse. In K. Tracy, T. Sandel, & C. Ilie (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, (pp. 1-6).

Rogal, L. (2017). Protecting Persons with Mental Disabilities from Making False Confessions: The Americans with Disabilites Act as a Safeguard. *New Mexico Law Review, 47*(1), 64-98.

Royce, T. (2005). The Negotiator and the Bomber: Analyzing the Critical Role of Active Listening in Crisis Negotiations. *Negotiation Journal, 21*(1), 5-27.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696–735.

Schatz, S. (2018). Interrogated with Intellectual Disabilities: The Risks of False Confession. *Stanford Law Review, 70*, 643-690.

Schegloff, E. A. (2000). Overlapping Talk and the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language in Society*, *29*(1), 1–63. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4168983

Schwartz, A. E. (2021). *Monster: The True Story of the Jeffrey Dahmer Murders*. Sterling.

Shuy, R. (1998). The Language of Confession, Interrogation, and Deception. Sage Publications.

Simpson, P., & Mayr, A. (2010). Exploration: Analysing language and power. In *Language and Power: A Resource Book for Students* (1st ed, 167-221). Routledge.

Siregar, A. F., & Murni, S. M. (2021, November). Conversational Maxims of Operation Targets in Police Investigative Interviews. In *6th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership* (AISTEEL 2021) (pp. 165-172). Atlantis Press.

Slobogin, C. (2017). Manipulation of suspects and unrecorded questioning: After fifty years of Miranda jurisprudence, still two (or maybe three) burning issues. Boston University Law Review, *97*, 1157-1196

Taranilla, R. (2011). Análisis lingüístico de la transcripción del relato de los hechos en el interrogatorio policial. ELUA, *25*, 101-134.

ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing Conversational Analysis: A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Thomas, K. V. (2017). Interrogation/police interview: Myth, realities and challenges. *Misión Jurídica: Revista de derecho y ciencias sociales*, *13*, 423-429.

Tithecott, R. (1997). *Of Men and Monsters: Jeffrey Dahmer and the Construction of the Serial Killer*. Univ of Wisconsin Press.

Transcript of Jeffrey Dahmer's interview (1992). Scribd, Online. Available HTTP: <https://www.scribd.com/document/405736454/Transcript-of-Jeffrey-Dahmer-Interview> (accessed 17 March 2023)

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. The handbook of discourse analysis, 466-485.

Waara, E., & Shaw, P. (2006). Male and Female Witnesses' Speech in Swedish Criminal Trials. *HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, *36*, 129–156.

Wallace, D. B., & Kassin, S. M. (2012). Harmless error analysis: How do judges respond to confession errors? *Law and Human Behavior*, *36*(2), 151–157.

Appendix

Transcript Jeffrey Dahmer's Confession

The following will be a taped interview, the date is going to be 8-13-92 and it's going to be at 1330 hours. This interview is going to be taken from Jeffrey Lionel Dahmer, W/M, DOB 5-21-60, he is presently incarcerated at the Columbia Correctional Facility in Wisconsin. Also present at this time is agent —-- —-- of the Milwaukee F.B.I. Office.

Q.   As I told you earlier Jeffrey my main purposes of coming up here was to speak to you about your activities after you were discharged from the service and upon your arrival into South Florida. Basically what I would like to cover, when did you first arrive in South Florida and how did you get there?

A.   Ok, I was discharged six months early from the.. the service for uh, drinking too much.. Uh, I didn't want to be discharged early but they, they did. So when I arrived in I think it was South from Germany they.. they processed me out and told me that they'd give me a plane ticket to anywhere in the United States that I wanted to go.

And I didn't want to.. I didn't want to go home right away because I didn't feel comfortable explaining to my folks why I was out six months early. So I decided that Miami, Florida would be a nice warm place to go. They flew me down there. I stayed, I arrived I think at the end of... The very end of March I think.

Q.   March of what year?

A.   Of uh, eighty... eighty one I think, I'm not real sure.

Q.   And you flew into where, Miami or FT. Lauderdale?

A.   Miami. Got a hotel for a week right on the coast, right in view of the ocean.

Q.   Do you remember the name of it?

A.   Along Collins Avenue. No I don't remember the name of that hotel.

Q.   It was on Collins Avenue in Miami Beach?

A.   On Collins Avenue in Miami Beach. Stayed there for a week ended up running out of money, didn't think very well ahead, didn't plan ahead very well. And so for about a month or two months I had to live most of the days sleep on the.. sleep under the literally under the mangroves on the beach and take a shower once or twice a week in a hotel room. I finally got a job after two months there in sunshine subs…

Q.   Where was that?the sunshine subs?

A.   That's on Collins Avenue also. It's on one of these, in one of these uh.. Mall type... Situations right off the avenue. It had a driveway that went like this and there different shops all around.. the place…

Q.   How long did you work for them?

A.   Uh, from about.. April to …September I think.

Q.   What position did you have?

A.   Just uh.. I had all types of positions, a cashier, cook, cleaner.. And the guy was paying me under the table so he wouldn't have to you know... (unintellligible). And at the same time I was collecting unemployment so the whole situation was..

Q.   Do you recall what office you were collecting your unemployment at?

A.   What?

Q.   What office you were collecting your unemployment at?

A.   Uh the downtown Miami office I guess.

Q.   Miami beach or down in the city of Miami?

A.   I think the city cause I had to take the bus to get there…

Q.   At that time did you find housing for yourself when you got this job at Sunshine?

A.   I.. I built up enough bank account to get housing sometime in May… and I had a one room uh place at the Bimini bay, it's a motel type set up.

Q.   Is that on Miami beach also?

A.   Right on Collins Avenue it was about uh.. Maybe a third of a mile from where I worked, I could walk there. And I just had one room, small, short fridge, bathroom.. TV.

Q.   Did you still have your army clothing with you? your fatigues and stuff?

A.   I had a suitcase with some of my uh, with my army discharge papers, civilian clothes, as far as having any army clothes I threw them away I wanted nothing more to do with the greens.

Q.   Bad memories.

A.   Right. So I didn't go walking around in army fatigues or anything like that no.

Q.   You didn't keep anything from your army days?

A.   No boots, nothing.

Q.   (What was your bank account at?)

A.   The highest it was out was about uh.. A little over a thousand.

Q.   (Ok, a thousand. And what bank do you remember?)

A.   The bank that was right next to the sub shop and I don't know the name of that anymore. But I was working uh.. Every day, almost every day, once in a while i'd get one day off on the weekend. I'd be working ten, twelve shift.. Uh, days from morning to night… And uh.. Didn't leave any time frame recreation at all.

Q.   Do you remember your supervisor's name?

A.   Yeah, he was uh.. Let 's see… Ken, Ken Houleb I think his name was.

Q.   What was his last name?

A.   Houleb I think, H.O.U.L.E.B. Ken Houleb.

Q.   About how old was Kim?

A.   Uh he was about 65 when I was down there.

Q.   (W/M?)

A.   Yeah. Family owned business.

Q.   Do you remember any of your co-workers that you worked with?

A.   Yeah there was this one lady about a few years older than me came from England, and she was working there even before I was.. And uh we got along pretty well, had a little friendship, talked.. And she was always worried about being discovered, it being discovered that she didn't have a green card though. So she was always worrying about that.

Q.   Do you remember her name?

A.   Her name I don't remember no.

Q.   How old was she?

A.   Probably around 28… I know she said she was from England, she had an English accent.

Q.   You're only means of transportation at the time was just.. Public?

A.   Bus, that's it.

Q.   Public transportation.

A.   And uh like I said I was working ten, twelve hours a day most of the time so I didn't have much recreation time. Uh.. and uh.. Let's see what else? The only time I really went to any malls was the omni mall that's in downtown Miami.

Q.   Right.

A.   I went there once. And looked around. One thing that struck me about that mall was that.. Most of the jewelry stores here in Wisconsin, you know, the highest priced jewelry you'll see on display is maybe 5000 or something like that. Down there I remember seeing this 250,000 dollar uh, ruby broach right on display in the mall.

Q.   It was impressive?

A.   Yeah you don't see things like that up here. But I just walked around. Other than that, that was about all I did.. When taking the bus.

Q.   Other than it being a warm climate and everything, was that the specific reason you chose to go down to Florida?

A.   That was the only reason.

Q.   You had never been there before?

A.   Never been there before no.

Q.   Do you have any friends or family staying down there?

A.   Nobody.

Q.   What about in your free time, what did you do in your free time down there?

A.   Walk along the beach along Collins Avenue. Uh..   Drink, too much, I used to drink in excessive after work because when I didn't have the uh, my, the apartment, I.. I would hate going back to the beach to sleep on the beach and so I'd stay up drinking till maybe 3 in the morning and this one time I got mugged. The guy took a hundred from me.

Q.   Did you report it to the police?

A.   No. Another time I remember going back to the beach and there was..   Going back to the place where I had you know my sleeping area set up and there were some other guys there and they, I almost got knifed cause they didn't know who I was. They thought I was trying to rob them or something..   Another time I tripped over an opossum in the middle of the night. Scared the hell out of me.

Q.   (Lucky you didn't get bit)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   Right…. What about while you were down there did you ever have to seek medical attention? Did you ever get hurt or sick enough that you needed medical attention in a hospital?

A.   Well the closest I came to doing that was the first week I was there I drank a whole bottle of that grasshopper, uh..   Liquor, you know liquor and I got sick as a dog on that and I called the hotel doctor.

Q.   Did he come to help..

A.   Yeah he came, he came.

Q.   Do you remember his name?

A.   No I don't.

Q.   And you say at that time you also were having a problem with alcohol?

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   That's stems from..

A.   All the excess yeah.

Q.   (Was that every day?)

A.   Not every day cause I'd have to work but on the weekends and it got worse towards the end because I ended up drinking on my bank account. And that's why I moved back to..

147

Q.   (would you have to drink more and more to get the same high?)

A.   I, I can hold an awful lot of liquor, it takes an awful lot to get me passed drunk so yeah, I have a big tolerance for alcohol.

Q.   (tolerance, yeah, see I don't, you know? I'm a cheap date.) When you're consuming large amounts of alcohol, do you recall what you do? Do you have control of your faculties?

A.   99% of the time I do. The one time that I was robbed I don't remember walking back to the.. Place where you know, lying on the front of the store missing my wallet. That time I don't remember.

Q.   Sometime last year on two separate occasions I had two independent witnesses that came forward and came up to Hollywood police department to meet with me. And uh.. One..

A.   I remember lying in a hotel room that was one of the times I had a hotel room and I remember seeing on the news that, that you know, missing boy Adam Walsh and that was the same time the president was shot around that time too so I remember both those stories.

Q.   So this one gentleman came down to Florida from out of state, you know, he lived in Hollywood and the other gentleman still lives there. And I guess they were following your case, from the point of July of uh… (91) last year of 91.

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   Until the present. And the one gentleman said that he had an encounter there with you. Did you ever go up to the Hollywood mall?

A.   The only mall I went to was the omni mall that one time.

Q.   The omni.

A.   Never went, wouldn't even know where to find the Hollywood mall.

Q.   I asked this gentleman I said "what was the encounter that you are speaking about?" and he said "well I was uh, at this store inside the mall"… and uh, the person that he believed to be you..

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   Came up to him and tried to pick him up, had conversation, asked him isn't it a beautiful day outside and started following this gentleman, he got a little leary and he continued to walk through the mall and you followed him and eventually he lost you somewhere inside the Sears mall.

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   That's my purpose for being here. You at no time were never in Sears? Or even in Hollywood, Florida?

A.   Absolutely not and I wasn't, I wasn't.. I didn't have the.. a place to go back with anyone where I felt comfortable with anyway, I remember sitting after work one night right on Collins Avenue and there was this guy from Canada and uh.. he tried to pick me up.. which is a switch.. and I didn't, I didn't want anything to do with him cause my place was a mess and I just didn't feel like going back. So no I wasn't into picking up people or starting relationships with anyone then.

Q.   Then this gentleman that came in from out of state had spoke to us. He also after seeing accounts of you on the news and also in the newspaper he brought down this newspaper from Alabama with him.. and he said that he remembered that he parked his vehicle in the parking lot and he was approaching the store, he saw some child apparently having problem with a male.

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   He described the male you know, similar to you.. and the one..

A.   Coincident..

Q.   Excuse me?

A.   What a coincidence huh?

Q.   And uh, the thing that stuck out in his mind is that here it was the middle of July and this gentleman was wearing an army fatigue jacket.

A.   What year was this supposed to be?

Q.   81 when you were down there.

A.   Oh 81, down in Alabama.. the only time I was in Alabama..

Q.   No, not Alabama.. Hollywood, Florida. He came down from Alabama to tell me about this incident while he was living in Hollywood, Florida.

A.   Oh I see. Alright.

Q.   And he said that the boy was saying "I don't want to go, I don't want to go" and this man was struggling with him and eventually threw him in a vehicle.

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   And the vehicle took off. I said "did you see this gentleman's face and everything?" All he said "I saw his profile" Because he saw you from an angle. I said well "who do you believe it to be" and he said "I saw this article on the news and I saw the newspaper and I got a flashback and I believe it to be Jeffrey" …

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   I said "well we'll have to follow this up".

A.   Right.

Q.   That was purpose for coming here.

A.   Right.

Q.   And uh.. Now we want to know if you had anything to do with the abduction of Adam Walsh?

A.   I didn't. you heard all the false leads about I supposedly had done something to some women in Germany, that was proven to be just bunk.

Q.   No I didn't hear that..

A.   Talk to [REDACTED] he knows all about that stuff.

Q.   Right I spoke to him.

A.   And people said they seen me in Arizona and in California.. Never been there. And uh.. but the.. I can't prove that I didn't do anything to them but the biggest, the biggest thing I can.. I can say is why I would have admitted to half of them that they would OF known nothing about and then leave him out?

Q.   That's what [REDACTED] was explaining.

A.   I told [REDACTED] that I wanted to clear my conscious of everyone. So uh it wouldn't make, it wouldn't make any sense to be trying to hide that.

Q.   You know as an individual even me, I would be embarrassed OF something that I've done in life, you know, I might divulge certain things but there are some things that I would keep secret you know maybe take to my grave with me..

A.   Well I don't want to do that. so that's why I spilled everything when I was, I was hopeless to hide anything anymore.

Q.   Right.

A.   So uh..

Q.   And like I said that's why we're up here and you know I had to ask you right out if you had anything to do with the kidnapping and the murder of Adam Walsh.

A.   Nothing.. Nothing.

Q.   (One of the things that DID impress me last week when we were talking was your openess and honesty about this, you remember we've talked about this and then I'd ask you

and I shared this with [REDACTED] if you would have done that, would you tell us and you said "absolutely" and then I said "why?" and you had a good reason, it's like you said..)

A.   No secret, there's no point in trying to hide it anymore you know.

Q.   (The devil's advocate I mean, white shirts, those people that we always have to answer to they said "well, he's afraid of the death penalty" Florida has the death penalty)

A.   I would welcome the death penalty.

Q.   (I know we talked a little bit about that last week.)

A.   In fact if I, if uh.. If that would get me the death penalty I'd, I'd admit to it, you think it would? I'll be fine, that'll be fine with me.

Q.   No we don't want you to..

A.   I don't want to go on rotting away in this place.

Q.   We want..

A.   I'd be more than happy to get it over like that.

Q.   We want the right person that's responsible for his murder, you know, we don't want somebody just copping out just for the sake of copping out so he could receive the death penalty as in your case.

A.   Uh huh

A.   Never went after children my interest was in older adults of bar age and all of them that I met I thought were bar age.. uh.. the uh..

Q.   (Conrad?)

A.   Conrad I thought he was of age, so did the police. That's why they let him back out.

Q.   (I saw the recent pictures of him. Not the pictures of the news with… He looked like a twelve year old kid on that.. that picture. But when you see the older pictures of him, he looks 19, 20 years old)

A.   Right right. And there was a 15 year old guy that I brought back that accused me of kidnapping him or something and everything uh, the police didn't believe him cause his story was wrong but he was working in the 219… cleaning up, you know all through the night and stuff so it's, it's amazing how young how young some of these people are that are in those bars.. and everything.

Q.   (I handled a bad case last week, I don't know if you get the news up here or anything but that little missing child in Wilwaukee, a 6 year old girl..)

A.   I didn't hear about that.

Q.   (Yeah. She was abducted and then we ended up finding her three days later dead and it was, sad, you know what did a 6 year old do to anybody..)

A.   Right, right. No I have no interest in younger children.

Q.   What was your relationships with your parents growing up?

A.   Uh.. Pretty good. Pretty average.

Q.   How many siblings are there in the family?

A.   I have one younger brother six years younger.

Q.   Just the two of you.

A.   Right.

Q.   At what age in your life did you feel that there was something different about you?

A.   Oh I knew I, I knew what my orientation was around 13.

Q.   That's preferably homosexual?

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   That was at 13 you say?

A.   Right.

Q.   Was it some specific incident that made you realize that there was something different about you?

A.   No it just seemed to be the way things were and… There was no specific incident that triggered it.. you know, they say people are molested by someone that's what makes them become homosexual that never was in my case.

Q.   You were never a victim of child abuse?

A.   No. So it just seemed to be inborn whether that's true or not I don't know. But that's the way it seems to me.

Q.   Right. (I've read some things recently about that, you know *that* (NO that) the hypothalamus you know being born nature as opposed to nurture..)

A.   I don't know which is true or not so..

Q.   (all you can do is speak for own)

A.   Right.

Q.   Do you feel you were an underachiever then? In your high school years?

A.   I was, yeah.

Q.   At what age did you first get involved in crime?

A.   Uh, drunken disorderly's started, uhh I was about 18

Q.   You were doing drinking in your teenage years?

A.   Uh huh yeah.

Q.   How about drugs?

A.   No, not drugs, just marijuana during high school, that was it.

Q.   Your drinking consume all of your time?

A.   Yeah. That's when I started drinking, I started drinking my junior year of high school.

Q.   Did you graduate from highschool?

A.   Oh yeah.

Q.   So it probably didn't have an affect with your uh..

A.   No it didn't really affect the grades too much.

Q.   (How were your grades?)

A.   Average c, b.

Q.   Did you participate in any after school activities?

A.   Uh, they had a tennis team I was in that for about a year my junior.. But uh, didn't stick with it.

Q.   Did you go onto college then?

A.   For three months. (FULL STOP)

Q.   Where was that at?

A.   Ohio state. And drank, literally drank my way out of that.

Q.   (when you'd drink what would you drink?)

A.   Uh, beer, beer. Those hueblien mixed drinks.. Uh, hard liquor.. At the local bars… wine.

Q.   Do you recall when you had your first homosexual act?

A.   Uh let's see… well the first time I was approached was uh..   Over in Germany, Lansthole Germany, I was working at a hospital, Lansthole hospital.. And uh one of the sergeant majors I think he was either the type of sergeant with two bars underneath or three.. He had his own apartment and one night I was drinking in the local N.C.O club..   He

153

approached me, said he had a party going on back at his place, asked me if I wanted to go back *and* (NO and) I said sure..   And we went back, turned out there was nobody in the apartment, just him. And he lights up this bowl of hash, smoked some hash, drank some beer, he goes, takes his shower, comes back and tries to get me to hop in bed with him. I said "no thanks" so I just go walking out staggering out after that hash..   That was good hash..   And uh.. So that was the first, time I'd been approached. The first real encounter was in the uh.. Bookstore, in Milwaukee.

Q.   At what age?

A.   Uh.. Probably 22 or 23. Somewhere around that age

Q.   Were you into pornographic material?

A.   Oh yeah, I spent thousands of dollars on that over the years, yeah.

Q.   Nothing in your teenage years?

A.   No. Nothing then. First time I picked up a..

Q.   What caught your interest towards the pornographic materials?

A.   What?

Q.   What caught your interest specifically?

A.   Oh the pornography they had over in Germany.

Q.   Is it different than the United States?

A.   Uh that was the first time I ever saw any pornography with the orientation that I have. It was over in Germany and since I couldn´t, didn't have the time or the place to develop any relationships with anybody I just satisfied myself with pornography so I continued buying it down when I was in Florida. Probably for the same reason everybody else buys pornography you know.

Q.   When would it have been that you ended up picking up your first victim?

A.   That was Steven hicks.

Q.   That was up here in Milwaukee?

A.   Right and I've gone..

Q.   (That would of been Ohio.)

A.   Ohio, right, right.. And that´s been gone over many times before so all you have to do is ask for. .

Q.   Right.

A.   And you´ll get a complete run down of that one.

Q.   Were there any events in your childhood that you attribute to you for becoming a serial murderer?

A.   No, none.

Q.   The alcohol?

A.   It´s still a mystery to me, you know, lots of people are big drinkers and they don´t go out and do this no. I don´t know.

Q.   To this day you can´t figure out why?

A.   I have no idea. I have no idea why I started getting the fantasies and thoughts when I was about 16 that´s when it started kicking in. I went over that with you last time. .

Q.   (uh huh)

A.   So no, it´s still a mystery to me, I have no idea. And even the psychologists, they have no idea. All they do is name things you know they label them.

Q.   Sure. What about your victims, Was there any specific way you went around to select them or was it a crime of opportunity?

A.   Uh… as I said I was interested in finding the type, the chip and dale type good looking swimmers type build.

Q.   Right.

A.   Gymnast type build and it was not a case of hating them it was just..   I uh..   It was the only way I knew of to keep them there and keep them with me. It gave me a sense of total control and increased the sexual thrill I guess. Knowing that I had total control of them. And that I could do with them as I wished. That was the motivation, not.. There was no hatred involved at all.

Q.   When you saw that specific person that you desired did you have a plan or..

A.   Just

Q.   How did you pick these people up did you rouse them?

A.   In bars, offered them money, that was basically that.

Q.   They willfully came back to the place with you?

A.   Right, right.

Q.   You never had to threaten..

A.   Never threatened.

Q.   A weapon to coerce them back there?

A.   No. Never did that.

Q   ……. Growing up, tell me, were you involved with, as a Pedophile?

A.   No.

Q.   You had no desires towards children at that time either?

A.   No….   In west Dallas there was some lewd and lascivious behavior in a park that I was involved in for about a year.

Q.   You were arrested then?

A.   Right. But uh, there was, there was no assault on any children or anything it was just masturbation.

Q.   Speaking with [REDACTED] I guess his interviews with you he said you were really heavy into masturbation?

A.   Right.

Q.   When did that start in your life?

A.   Uhhh, I don´t know, 13 something like that.

Q.   And the obsession just grew?

A.   Yeah and grew, all the obsessions. Uh, I made a mistake the first encounter I had with anyone was the kid across the street, we were both about the same age, [REDACTED] it was consensual in a fort..

Q.   (in Ohio?)

A.   Yeah that was really the first time but it was just very light sex, kissing, holding that type of thing.

Q.   How old were you at that time?

A.   I was 14, I think he was 14 something like that. It was consensual.

Q.   And the next time after that wasn´t until you were in..

A.   Right..

Q.   In the service.

A.   That was not.. That was not until the hicks incident. That was not consensual.

Q.   Right.. This obsession that you speak about, I mean, how were you able to control yourself while you were in the service and going through high school and on into the service?

A.   Heavy drinking, pornography, masturbation.

Q.   That satisfied your needs at the time.

A.   Right. But once I had the opportunity and the uh.. A place where I could actually make these fantasies come true then trying to hold them back was, just seemed to be too much, I went through that with you too.. (unintelligible).. Desire grew and grew more constant stronger.

Q.   So once you were able to obtain your own apartment, your own place.

A.   Even before that..

Q.   Even before?

A.   I was driven enough to try to.. To do, actually do it in west Dallas, before I got the apartment that´s how driven and how strong the desire was.

Q.   When did you first ever think about killing somebody? When did that enter your mind?

A.   When I was six, six, when I was about 15 or 16 those fantasies started entering my head, why they did I don´t know. I never thought it would really happen but everything was set up so perfectly that one time in Ohio..

Q.   (with the hitchhiker?)

A.   Yeah, yeah. That´s no excuse for it but it´s just weird how everything was just perfect that one time.

Q.   (what did, Jeffrey, we didn't talk in great detail about that fantasy, what was it that you... You'd be (space) seeing when you closed your eyes or the, arousal, would you be feeling? What exactly was that?

A.   Yea.. Thoughts of a good looking well built young guy, having total control over him.. Uh.. Uh... I don´t know if killing ever came into it, came into play but if that was the only way to keep him then that would be done.

Q.   (So then the total domination, total..)

A.   Right.

Q.   (Love slave?)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   (ok.. What about the dismembering?)

A.   That, that happened more as uh.. necessity, the first time I didn't know how to dispose of the remains and so but once I started doing it, it became sexually exciting to me.

Q.   (We talked about the road kill..)

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   (And you bringing it back and dissecting it..)

A.   Right.

Q.   (And taking the skin off it..)

A.   There was nothing sexual about that, that was just..

Q.   (Curiosity)

A.   Morbid curiosity.

Q.   (What about with the humans and, and..)

A. That did become sexual as the years went by..

Q. (Maybe if you could detail for me exactly what, the taking of the skin off, was there some…)

A. Uh.. I did do that one time.. I didn't know if it could be done, I wanted to see if it could be.. It's possible. And just keeping mementos, the skulls.

Q. (Any other body parts?)

A. Sometimes genitals, hands.. uhhh, that's about it. One time I tried to mummify one of the heads…. uh.. I uh.. took the bone out of the back here, and scooped the brain out and soaked the whole head with the flesh on it in acetone and it worked for a while, that's the one I kept in the locker at work when I was at the work release program.. uh.. but I just did that one time.

Q. Where did you learn about the, so much about the anatomy, did you have books on this?

A. No it was trial and error, I really didn't know that much about the anatomy at that time.

Q. (You were a medic)

A. Right but that was just general field.. real general knowledge.. probably had as much knowledge as either of you would about..

Q. What about, how did you learn about what chemicals to use?

A. That was trial and error too, I had called a couple taxidermistspretended that I was, wanted to uh.. dry out rabbit skins or something like that. And there was this pharmacy right next to my apartment that had, where you could but gallons of choloraform, either, formaldehyde, so it's pretty convenient.

Q. Right. Is that how you would control some of your victims with choloraform or either?

A. I tried that but it never worked. For some reason those two chemicals do not work, whether I had the wrong type I don't know. It was just the sleeping pills that were most effective.

Q. You never had to use physical force to keep them there?

A. One, A couple times I did. I never wanted to I wanted to.. to make it as quick and painless as possible, right. And the one time that there was a physical fight I was out of pills, that was the time I told you the guy rolled on the floor and knocked the table over, (comma not full stop) there's a march statutes, those Griffins..

Q. Griffins.

A. And the other time was when that 15 year old went back with me, he was working the bar, the 219 bar?

Q. uh huh.

A.   And uh.. uh.. didn't have any pills so I whacked him with a rubber mallet in the back of the head. He left, came back asked for some money, got into a fight, and ended up letting him go in the morning.. then he went and told the police a wild tale they didn't believe him and so.. but that was about the only two times.

Q.   What types of tools did you use for dismembering these victims?

A.   Large hunting knife with a rubber grip, very large.. bought it at the knife store in the Grand Mall..

Q.   (Serrated?)

A.   No, no serrated it was just large, the blade was about that big, thick.. very sharp..

Q.   Would that work?

A.   Yeah.

Q.   Was it easy to, to do?

A.   That worked, right. Right.

Q.   Any order you would go in?

A.   No just uh.. I feel uncomfortable talking about it on tape not knowing who's going to be listening to the tape, this part.. do you guys really need this on tape?

Q.   Yeah, it's like I say, it's for behavioral science for teaching.. (I would be willing, to take notes if you want to turn the tape off.)

A.   I'll just give you a general description.

Q.   Sure.

A.   Just slit from the sternum to the you know, pubic area, removed the internal organs and then cut the flesh starting from the calves, legs, and then up, removed the head and put that in the freezer, and uh.. the bone, the skeleton that was defleshed I would put in that large 80 gallon cooking pot that I had pour in the box of that wall cleaning solution, I'd strip the remaining flesh off, turn up to a boil.. and did the same with the heads so I had a clean skeleton, a big clean skeleton and uh.. sometimes I would saved portions of the flesh with consumption, most of it went out in the garbage or in the acid bath and a lot of the unused skeletons went into the acid bath too. Or were flushed down the toilet.. so that's how it was done.

Q.   This ritual you had with your victims, how long of a period of time did this go on with just one victim until you were totally satisfied?

A.   It's, for a long time it was just once every two months, near the end it was once every week.

Q.   Once a week?

A.   Yeah just really got completely out of control.

Q.   Now as the skeletons started filling up in your apartment there were you concerned about detection? or about the police?

A.   Not until a point where it got to the point where I couldn't even fit them in the freezer and I had to buy that large barrel that had heavier plastic so that I could acidify them without any leakage or smell. And it would get..

Q.   Would that get rid of it? (would that melt them or..)

A.   That, you can buy these gallon jugs of muratic acids, it's the diluted kind of the hydrochloric acid.. I had 16 gallons of it there waiting to use in those three skeletons that were in the blue, blue tub. Year that will acidify it within a couple days you can scoop it out and pour it down the toilet, bones even.. and uh.. stuff..

Q.   When you started becoming concerned at that one point where you couldn't fit it in the freezer anymore, what action did you take then?

A.   I bought that large 55 gallon blue barrel, put the, put the three skeletons that I wasn't going to keep in that, had the, had the uh, unboiled heads frozen in the freezer and one skeleton that I wasn't going to boil and keep. So I was just going to pour all those jugs of meridic acid in there and acidify them but never did get the chance.

Q.   At any time did you ever have to remove any body parts from your apartment and bury them or discard them somewhere?

A.   Never did that, Never did that..

Q.   So everything was right in your apartment.

A.   Everything was right in the apartment. Nothing, flesh did go out sometimes in the garbage but it was tightly wrapped and it was undetected, nobody ever detected it.

Q.   Now your victims, you had sex with them prior to their deaths?

A.   Prior and afterwards.

Q.   And after.

A.   Right.

Q.   You're into necrophilia.

A.   Right and that led to the cannibalism, just one thing led to another.

Q.   The obsession?

A.   Right.

Q.   (The cannibalism would you cook it?)

A.   Yeah. Yeah.

Q.   (Something I didn't ask last week that I just thought of now, When you had sex with them, would it be penis to anus?)

A.   Sometimes.

Q.   (What other?)

A.   Uhh.. sometimes just masturbating over them.. sometimes uh.. penis to the mouth…other times I'd make a slit right here in the front, a small slit, I know it sounds horrible and it was uh.. do it that way.

Q.   (Did you find that..)

A.   Then I did.. yeah.

Q.   (Arousing)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   (Hope there not looking) Not with each victim would you progress to something different?

A.   Yeah it was a progressive thing like I was saying the last time, when I started up again there was a many year period when I was doing nothing. Between the Hicks incident and the accident in the, in the ambassador hotel which I never meant to have happen but it did. And uh, between that time I was trying everything from grave robbing to actually stealing a mannequin out of a Boston store at south Ridge to placate the desire without having to hurt anybody. But it didn't never worked and one thing led to another..

Q.   Increased level of intensity.

A.   Right, just increased it.

Q.   (Now when you talked to me about the masturbation and uh, how many times a day did you?)

A.   Two, three.

Q.   (And it still wouldn't sexually satisfy you?)

A.   It satisfied me for a short time but it never, it never drove the desire from ultimate fulfillment and satisfaction away. That could only be done I thought through actually having control of someone.

Q.   (That was the mind setting, we talked about last week that it would just grow..)

A.   Right, I mean it was the main focus of my life.. after I got off work that's the first thing I'd did was head to the porno shops, make plans to go into Chicago watch the strip tease acts, uh.. my whole life revolved around that schedule.

Q.   Did you ever keep a diary of these incidents?

A.   I was never one for writing letters or keeping diaries.

Q.   So your diary was basically your fantasy that you kept in your mind and your rehashed over the..

A.   Used the pictures that I took.

Q.   Oh you took pictures of them?

A.   Yeah polaroid pictures. If I had had a video camera I would of probably used that but I never went that far.

Q.   Did you have to secure some of your victims I mean with bondage or handcuffs or anything to keep them totally under control?

A.   I started doing that uh.. with uh.. let's see.. Straughter, Mr. Straughter, and yeah, I bought handcuffs at the army supply and uh.. did that after theu were drugged I handcuff them.. (unintelligible) I'd handcuff them and… I wasn't interested in torture, that's not what interested me, all I wanted to do was make it quick and painless for them. I know it sounds ridiculous for me to say that but that's what my goal was so I'd have complete control over them so I wouldn't have to worry about them leaving in the morning and I could fulfill my fantasies.

Q.   So you apparently did have a conscious about these people experiencing pain.

A.   That's why I gave them the sleeping pills before…yeah, and uh.. it usually worked I mean I would usually use seven sleeping pills.

Q.   (What kind?)

A.   Halcium.

Q.   How did you get them to take it?

A.   Just mix, mix, I'd say I wanted, "let's have some coffee" with some Irish crème in it so the coffee would dissolve the pills, you know, they'd never see the pills in there.. and that would be it, within a half an hour they'd be asleep.

Q.   Was there one particular victim that was the most sexual satisfying experience you had?

A.   Uhh… the one I took most pictures of uh… black guy, met in front of the bookstore on 27th street, you know what bookstore that is, (unintelligible) total, total coincidence, I was, just 3 o'clock in the morning, I hadn't met anybody interesting at the bars downtown, I was just going to go in and look at some pornography and go back to sleep and as I was approaching the bookstore I saw him walking out, nice looking guy, asked him whether he wanted to go back and he said "yes" and uh.. so he's the one I took most pictures of.

Q.   (Is that how you memorialized..)

A.   Pictures and the skulls.. yeah.

Q.   (That was your mementos?)

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   Did you evolve into any satanic activities?

A.   It, it was leading towards that way.

Q.   At what stage?

A.   Towards the middle and the later parts.. I never, never was involved with any group but I was reading a lot of literature on it and wondering whether it was possible to gain even more power through rituals and stuff. I didn't know, I was just experimenting..

Q.   Did you dabble in these rituals? In your own apartment?

A.   Sometimes yeah, in the bedroom, that's why I had the alters set up and everything..

Q.   (You hide the smoke while these guards come by) You had an alter set up in your bedroom?

A.   Right. With the painted skulls.

Q.   How would the ritual go?

A.   I didn't really have any set..

END OF SIDE A

A.   So after the hicks incident the first time… and uh.. after that it seemed like my conscience was just seared. Where as they became more objects that people and I didn't think of the families, didn't think of what they'd go through, no, my conscience was just…

Q.   (It became easier to actualize?)

A.   Yeah, the.. the desire to fulfill the fantasies became the all consuming thing..

Q.   So these intended targets were just lifeless people eventually, just objects?

A.   That's how I visualize them yeah.. that's why I never got to know any of them real well, it made it easier.. just sexual objects.

Q.   Would you feel, the black victim that you spoke of, did you have feelings for him since you felt like he was the..

A.   I didn't like the way I had to go about keeping him, I had to stab him in the throat with a knife cause he wasn't completely out so no I didn't like doing that.. uh..

Q.   (How long would you keep a victim before you had to…)

A.   That.. well I had the freezer so I could keep it indefinitely if I wanted to.. usually in about in flesh form two or three days.

Q.   You wouldn't kill your, after having a sexual experience with these people, did you kill them that day or could you leave them in your apartment as you went on to do your activities the next day?

A.   During, during the night after I picked them up that's when I would kill them. Except when I started, started using the drilling technique.

Q.   (What technique is that?)

A.   I was getting tired of killing them and uh.. having to deflesh them so I uh.. I uh…
wanted to see if it was possible to…

Q.   (Unintelligible)

A.   I wanted to see if it was possible to make, again *I know* (doesn't go here) it sound
really gross, uh, zombies, people that would not have a will of their own but would follow..
no thanks.. but would follow my instructions without resistance.. so uh after I started using
the drilling technique I'd keep well with these Conrad case, that's why he ended up burning
the whole house up one time, I didn't think he'd have enough coherence to do that but he did.

Q.   So you attempted the drilling through their brain?

A.   Right and inject some muratic acid into the frontal lobes but it never worked, it either
didn't work well enough or it was death so.. one guy Jeramiah Weinberger, he uh, he's the
man I met in Carol's bar up in Chicago, he was with me a couple of days before he died but
the second day he was in a comatose state and when I came back from work the second night
he had died and it kind of struck me as particularly horrifying because he was the only one
that died with his eyes, his eyes just wide open.

Q.   That bothered you?

A.   Yeah, nobody else had died like that before.

Q.   Some type of interpersonal reaction between the two of you?

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   The result was his death with his eyes open.

A.   Yeah his eyes were just wide open, I don't know why, what caused that to happen but
uh..

Q.   What about at any time was the police a concern for you?

A.   Yeah many times

Q.   Being caught.. many times?

A.   The time in the middle of the night, 3 o'clock on a deserted road where I was pulled
over by two policemen in a bath *in* (doesn´t go here) Ohio and had the body parts in the back
seat and they gave me a ticket for driving left of *the* (doesn´t go here) center.. had to take the
drunk test and everything and they asked me "what's this stuff" and I said "it's just garbage
that I hadn't gotten around to drop off at the city dump earlier today"..

Q.   They inquired about the bags?

A.   Yeah they said about the bags, I thought they were going to look in them..

Q.   (Smell them)

A.   They could smell them.. both of them.. scared the hell out of me..

Q.   After they just wrote you a ticket and let you go, what did you think?

A.   I couldn't believe it, I thought I was dreaming.. so I went back home and that was the first time.. the second time in the hotel.. where I woke up and the guy was dead underneath me.. I didn't know how, how I was going to handle that.. never had that happen..

Q.   (Unintelligible)

A.   Yeah. (full stop)

Q.   (And that was when you had to go out and buy the suitcase and then get him out?)

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   (Did you dismember him?)

A.   No he fit in the suitcase.

Q.   (He did?)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   (But that cabby helped you..)

A.   Lift it in the trunk yeah.

Q.   You took him back to your home?

A.   Right, my grandpa's house… I had no intentions of doing anything like that, never have done that on purpose. (full stop) but after that it all started again.

Q.   (There was another incident that you told us about last week with the uh.. in 88 where the police came which was after the arrest for uh.. sinthasomphone brother and they searched your apartment..)

A.   Uh huh. (full stop)

Q.   (And you had the skull)

A.   That was uh.. even before that there was a time, well I'm not going to say that on tape… that was the time I had that mummified head and that was after, yeah that was after the time I got arrested for taking pictures. They searched my apartment, I had an apartment on 24 street and they looked, they just didn't pull a towel up, that's why they didn't see the skull.

Q.   (They had tunnel vision they were looking for photographs and drugs but they totally missed the skull)

A.   Right. And another time I had that mummified head in the uh.. small metal chest I had in the closet and I took that to work that's were I kept it at work.. for about a year. And then the time that the police came around asking questions about the guy that was shot upstairs or strangled upstairs, he came into my apartment and looked around and didn't see anything.

Q.   (Detective?)

A.   And what else..

Q.   As he was looking around what was going through your head?

A.   I thought it was because of one of the guys, you know, but then he said "no, somebody had been strangled upstairs" and he was just asking everybody in the apartment building if they knew anything.

Q.   You had nothing to do with that guy who was strangled?

A.   Nothing, absolutely nothing. Uh uh.

A.   Right. Then the time that 15 year old guy I met working at the gay bar.. he ran and told the police that I had assaulted him and they didn't believe him..

Q.   (Yeah the story was so bizarre that they just didn't believe him)

A.   Then the Sinthasomphone time you know, where the body was lying in the bedroom and all they would of had to do is look in the bedroom and that would have been it. So there's been lots of strange close calls.

Q.   (A lot of contacts with police but you were always able to just avoid detection)

A.   Right.

Q.   (Bluff, talk your way out of it). But then at no time I guess because of your obsession with this you ever wished that you were caught.

A.   Never, absolutely never. No there was no subconscious secret desire to ever be caught. That I'm sure of. But that's how powerful the desire was even though I was coming so close these times I still was driven to feel that that was the only way I could get any satisfaction.. in life, that's what it seemed.

Q.   Did you get more satisfaction out of the sex act or out of the controlling the individual?

A.   Half and half.

Q.   Half and half. (It would build up the control and help build up and the gratification and the sext act)

A.   Yeah right, right. In fact just going out and.. and uh, and hunting was in itself a thrill, never knowing who I'd met, how nice looking they'd be, how much fun we'd have or whatever. That itself was part of the fun.. uh..

Q.   (Dumb question but had you ever tried heterosexual like Conrad… any time with a female…)

A.   Never did, never had any interest.

Q.   (No desire, cause you knew ever since 13 that..)

A.   Right.

Q.   (Your interest lied elsewhere.)

A. Could of done it a lot over in Germany they have prostitution hotels over there where you just pay your money and you know..

Q. But you didn't want to experiment?

A. No.

Q. And your victims you didn't discriminate them, they were white and black.

A. No that's one thing we were talking about before. Milwaukee journal tried to make it sound like it was racial. Absolutely not. I mean if I had had my way they, the guys would have all looked like the chip and dale dancers, that's the type I was going after. The type you know did the strip tease acts in Chicago and stuff. But uh, no there's nothing racial about it. Absolutely nothing. How could it be? I mean the first guy was white, the second guy was white, the third guy was American Indian, the fourth guy was Hispanic, then some black guys, the Asian, Jewish, Puerto Rican, another white guy.. it's not racial…

Q. What victim did you first become involved with in the cannibalism?

A. Uhh.. that would be.. Rick Beeks, his, his nickname was Cash he had it tattooed on his chest, he was around 30 years old, he was working the bars and stuff, male prostitute.. that was the first time with the heart… and then afterwards the second guy was the guy that I met at that bookstore on 27th street.. and the most pleasurable..

Q. Was the cannibalism a sexual gratification too?

A. It was. It started out as experimentation.. made me feel like they were more apart of me..

Q. (That's interesting)

A. So it did give me some satisfaction and there was some gratification.

Q. (How would you prepare it?)

A. Uhh.. on the stove, on the skillet, uh, just like you prepare a regular piece of meat, they'd be uh, cut into you know, sizes that were small enough to eat.

Q. (Any other organs?)

A. Hearts, liver, thigh meat, biceps, biceps..

Q. (How did it taste?)

A. Uhh…. there's no way of saying it without sounding uh…gruesome..

Q. (I don't find it offensive.)

A. Well it….. I, I don't know how to describe it. You've had filet mignon, haven't you?

Q. (Uh huh, that's one of my favorites)

A. Yeah. Very tender…

Q.   When you finally were arrested, ok, was there any type of relief? That you said "god it's finally over"?

A.   Just for.. in terror

Q.   Or you regretted that you were caught.

A.   I don't regret it. That's the funny thing, part of me regrets it.. no it's ok..

Q.   You sure?

A.   Yeah… intellectually I know this is the best thing that could of happened for me and everybody else involved because I could not stop myself. Uh.. so I know intellectually this is the best thing for everybody.. On the emotional level there's still a lot of wanting to be able to have the freedom to go to Chicago, drink, spend the nights at the nightclub.. you know.. the nightlife. So it causes tension. Causes a lot of tension sometimes. Sometimes I handle it better than others. Weekends are the worst.

Q.   (Why is that? because that was your pattern?)

A.   Right.

Q.   (Right, that's what I thought.)

A.   It was a lot of fun, I have to admit, it's a lot of excitement..

Q.   Stalking and preying..

A.   Not necessarily the gruesome part but just being out in the crowd in that type of atmosphere.

Q.   The freedom to..

A.   Not having to pretend that I was something that I wasn't. You know.. and watching the strip tease acts, there's some pretty good ones.

Q.   These were male strippers.

A.   Right.

Q.   Right…

Q.   Is there anything different the police could of done to catch you before?

A.   Nothing.

Q.   Nothing.

A.   Except look in the car, look in the bags.. (2 DO TS)look in the bedroom.

Q.   (Be more thorough)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   Be more thorough when they come in and investigate maybe just, a normal complaint.

A.   Well they would of had to open, unlock the freezer.. and they would of had me to uh.. they would of had to go through my closets.. I had everything locked up.

Q.   (Some of those incidents were there though, it was detectable catchable if they would have just gone the extra step in picking up the towel..)

A.   There was a..

Q.   (Or looking in the bag of trash, they could smell the odor..)

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   (Whatever but it was easier to just..)

A.   Looking in the bedroom where the body was, right, or in the closet where the skulls, some of the skulls were.

Q.   What did you do with the blood?

A.   It was all done in the bathroom so that just went down the bathroom drain.

Q.   Down the drains?

A.   Right.

Q.   Is there anything different your victims could have done to get away?

A.   Not after they were drugged.

Q.   Once you drugged them they were yours?

A.   And the only, the only reason the last guy got away was because I was completely unconscious for at least 6 hours according to what he said, I have no memory of anything that happened but I was still functioning..

Q.   Right. (That was [redacted] (unintelligible))

A.   Yeah..

Q.   (How many sleeping pills would you give at a time?)

A.   Uh, 5 or 6.

Q.   (5 or 6?)

A.   I didn't have any sleeping pills that time.

Q.   (What were they?)

A.   Halcium. 125… milagram

Q.   So you did something out of the norm that you usually didn't do that you lost control of your victim.

A.   Right I had planned on getting him real drunk but it didn't work. I was not drunk. I was carefully just having a couple of beers that day, I was not drunk, I don't know why I blanked out like that.

169

Q.   (Were you over tired or anything?)

A.   I was tired but I don't blank out for getting overly tired.

Q.   (Especially if you're in the mind set)

A.   Right.

Q.   (But that's..)

A.   Right that's something you have to keep your, keep on your toes.. I have no idea why half of my brain just turned itself off. That's what it seems like. And uh, I came back to consciousness 5 minutes before I heard the knock on the door and there were the police. I didn't have any time for a cover story or anything, it was just..

Q.   (You knew at that point..) Right.

A.   Right.

Q.   Did you have a religious background in the beginning as a child and teenager?

A.   Not as a child, I tried.. I tried for about two years with my grandma and like I, that's a whole nother tale it.. didn't work.. desires got stronger and stronger.. I just gave up so no, I really haven't had a real deep religious background or anything. Although I always felt that there was something more than just this life, I never just.. I never really wanted to think about a religious background because I was involved in such horrible things and I just didn't want to even think of it. I just figured I'd take the ostrich approach if I don't think of it then I won't ever have to deal with it. Which was stupid..

Q.   Did you believe in reincarnation, or do you believe in reincarnation?

A.   No, I know that's a bunch of bunk, you know.. But I just, like I said, I was taking the ostrich approach, I felt well, maybe if I don't think of it or think of it seriously I'll never have to deal with it, you know, maybe if I don't worry about getting caught I will never get caught. Stupid self blew it.

Q.   (Yeah but it's common, it's really common the denial or the head in the sand, the ostrich approach as you call it)

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   (Who's the one person in your life that you'd consider the most significant?)

A.   Well my mom and dad are significant and my grandma is.. those three I guess.

Q.   (It wasn't like you were going to follow in your father's footsteps?)

A.   No

Q.   (Or your grandfather's?)

A.   No, no

Q.   What do you think was your biggest downfall, I mean, was it when you got into pornographic material that escalated to the next stage? Like if you could eliminate that one thing in your life..

A.   Uh huh.

Q.   Do you think that would of eliminated what the end results *here* (doesn't go here)?

A.   If I could eliminate those fantasies, those overwhelming fantasies, starting when I was 15 or 16, short circuited them, not think about them, not, not entertaining them..   then that probably would of stopped everything. And if I had had some sort of uh.. uh.. strong moral.. uh.. guidelines, that I really you know, believed in following..

Q.   Right (personal)

A.   Right. And I thought I didn't have either so the rest of it was a disaster…. As far as pornography? No, no that doesn't cause anybody to do this.

Q.   No but you were so engrossed in pornography..

A.   It just fueled the fantasies. But I don't think it would of stopped it, from happening.

Q.   So you must of had a lot of idle time, that you had these fantasies that constantly occupied your life instead of having other distractions.

A.   Right cause I didn't have any pornography material before the Hicks incident.

Q.   (That was interesting and I wanted to ask that is what came first the fantasies or the pornography)

A.   The fantasies.

Q.   (Unintelligible) So then there would of been nothing that you could of done?)

A.   No. It's something that just..

Q.   (Came about and the pornography was a way of trying to satisfy the..)

A.   Right.

Q.   (The curiosity of looking and fueling and it..)

A.   Right.

Q.   So these fantasies started at 14 or 15?

A.   14 or 15 yeah.

Q.   That would have been after that incident with your neighbor, the child?

A.   Right. Right. But that didn't trigger anything either.. that, that was just uhh.. I bet that happens a lot probably you know just..

Q.   Oh, yeah.

A.   Two people experimenting..

Q.   Opportunity (even heterosexual)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   (Young males can experiment you know, at those ages with you know..)

A.   The only time I was ever attacked was when I was about 13 or 14 I was walking home from a friend's house one night and these three guys, these three seniors from high school and whacked me for no reason with a black jack in the back of the neck.. and uh.. I went home pretty scared after that.

Q.   (It hurt too)

A.   Yeah it did. And for no reason, you know, I didn't do anything to them or anything they were just looking for someone to hit.

Q.   (There's people out there that do that.)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   (No doubt about that.) Were your parents discipliners?

A.   They gave pretty good discipline. Yeah.

Q.   Did either of them have any problems with alcohol?

A.   None. Neither were drinkers or smokers. Nothing. Could I sneak another one from you?..

Q.   (Or next time if I want to come up here you know but uh.. do you have any more questions or anything?) Uhh, just looking back now, regressing.. Do you have any remorse for what you did?

A.   A great deal of remorse. I, I would hope, I mean uh.. one thing that I've.. that's puzzled me is why I can't seem to generate more feeling.. I mean if I had, had been able to uh.. feel more emotion uh, this may not have happened.. but it just seems like my emotion, my emotional side has been deadened..

Q.   (Numb?)

A.   Yeah.

Q.   (Numb. But that's normal, I mean that's uh, a normal reaction to an abnormal you know situation) but if you did become emotionally involved with one of your people..

A.   I would of never..

Q.   You probably would of never have killed them.

A.   Right. No.

Q.   Or if they would of hit something, you know..

A.   Right. Right. Uh, as far as feeling badly of what I've done, yes I do feel bad, I know it's wrong but it doesn't do anyone good any good to cry a crocodile tears and put on the big act.. I mean..

Q.   Sure. Before killing a human, did you experiment ever killing animals?

A.   No I never killed animals. Never did that. I always used dead ones just for experimentation.

Q.   And I appreciate your candidness with us and uh.. just to reiterate my main purpose of coming here for you know, the investigation of Adam Walsh and you go on the record to say that you had nothing to do with it.

A.   Nothing to do with it.

Q.   That murder or kidnapping.

A.   I heard it on the news but I had nothing to do with it, no.

Q.   And if you did have something to do with it, you would, (you want another one?) you would admit to it.

A.   Uh.. right. Yeah. Uh yeah I guess I will take one more.

Q.   ([REDACTED] will be happy that you liked her muffins)..

This interview is going to be concluded on Thursday, 8-13-92, at approximately 14.45 hours. Thank you.