

Influence of Power on Turn-taking in Police and Suspects interactions in Anambra State: an Analytical Discourse

Victoria Chinwe Udoh

Department of English Language and Literature, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka Nigeria.

ABSTRACT

The fundamentality of language to human communication cannot be over-emphasized. As a matter of fact, the use of language for the expression of one's feelings, ideas and thoughts is an attribute that humans do not share with any creature. However, the use of language in human communication encounters is determined by a number of factors, one of which is power. Hence, this study examined the influence of power on turn-taking in police-suspect interaction. Taking turns to talk is essential to conversation, as well as to other speech-exchange systems. In conversation, participants take turns in interaction as they interact on a moment-by-moment and turn-by-turn basis. This is to say that the next turn provides evidence of the party's orientation to the prior turn, there and then. Nonetheless, Police-suspect interaction is such that depicts asymmetrical distribution of power between police officers and suspects. Using descriptive method based on Conversation Analysis approach, the paper explored the relationship between power and turn-taking in Police-Suspect interaction. It further illustrated the turn constructional components of Police-Suspect interaction as well as the various Turn Cues and Transition Relevance Places in Police-Suspect interaction.

Keywords: Power, Police, Suspect, Interaction, Influence, Anambra, Turn-taking

INTRODUCTION

During conversation, humans try to adhere to a "one-at-a-time" approach. [1] suggested a systematic approach, presenting a set of rules to provide next-turn allocation to one interlocutor and thereby minimizing gap and overlap. Conversely, moments of overlapping speech or silences occur repeatedly in human conversation [2]. These silences and moments of overlapping speech are often communicative in their own right [3]; [4]; [5]. Emotions and the stance people take towards each other control turn taking behaviour. Contrary to the dynamic turn-taking behaviour in human conversation, turn-taking behaviour in current natural dialogue systems is often restricted by a "one-at-a-time" rule. Conversational agents (CAs) are limited to listening or speaking and listening is instigated either on a place predetermined by the system or whenever the user makes a sound, resulting in an unnatural human system interaction.

Excluded are the dialogue systems that allow more free turn-taking behaviour [6]. Literature on theoretical frameworks of and results from conversation analysis on turn-taking in police interviews provides some suggestions on which factors influence turn-taking behaviour in police interviews. [7] demonstrated that police officers interrupt suspects to prevent them from turn completion. These deliberate interruptions are considered signs of assertion of power [8]; [9]. Due to the asymmetric question/answer adjacency pairing, a police interview is structured to provide the officer with control over the conversation [10]. [11] claimed that power is under constant negotiation and reported recognition interrupts, minimal responses, taking extended turns, and interruptions of question as techniques used by suspects to access control in police interviews. [12] suggest that truth tellers adopt a "tell all" approach resulting in a talkative mood

Udoh

opposed to liars who adopt the “keep it simple” approach resulting in a less talkative mood. Rapport is considered a critical step in eliciting trust and building a relationship in professional interaction and therefore a stipulation for techniques used in police interviews, e.g., to get cooperation from the interviewee [13]; [14]. Suspects tend to talk more openly in harmonious interactions and cooperation and agreement are increased. Discomfort –considered a lack of rapport– is displayed by stretches, fillers and pauses in the speech of the suspect [15]. In turn-taking, consideration is given to the terminology put forward by [16], differentiating two silences: gap and pause, two overlaps: between and within speaker, and bridged turn transitions: a smooth transition with no discernable silence (less than 0.18s). The type of question can influence the perception of an utterance. For example, a question directly addressing the suspect requires a response while this is not necessary for a statement. Also, an open-ended question is expected to be followed by an extensive response while yes or no are satisfactory responses for a closed question [17]. The type of question asked is related to the

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study adopted the theory of Conversation Analysis. A “Conversation may be taken to be that well-known major kind of talk in which two or more partakers freely alternate in speaking, which usually occurs within specific institutional settings like law courts, classrooms and the likes” [19]. Conversation Analysis (CA) has its primary focus on the chronological organization of any interaction. Ononye as cited in [20], explains that ‘the focal point of CA is to describe the orderliness, structure, and sequential patterns of interactions, either in institutional or casual conversations.’ One vital notion about Conversation Analysis is speaking in turn. In CA, it takes two people to have a turn-taking; still turn taking is more than just defining property of conversation activity. While the talk that participants in any conversation do is

function of a question, e.g., information seeking for open-ended questions and conformation seeking for closed questions [18]. Moreover, case-related question may be more sensitive than small talk. Hence, this paper intends to x-ray the relation between turn-taking behaviour and power.

Objectives of the Study

- i. To ascertain the relationship between power and turn-taking in Police-Suspect interaction.
- ii. To illustrate the turn constructional components of Police-Suspect interaction.
- iii. To establish the various Turn Cues and Transition Relevance Places in Police-Suspect interaction.

Research Questions

- i. What is the relationship between power and turn-taking in police-Suspect interaction?
- ii. What are the constructional components of turns in Police-Suspect interactions?
- iii. What are the various Turn Cues and Transition Relevance Places in Polices-Suspect interactions?

quite variably distributed among participants, the relevant orderliness their talk’s distribution exhibits is the taking of turns at talk.

Turns consist of units known as turn constructional units. These units are variety of grammatical units: words, phrase, clauses and sentences. These are regarded as TCU. [7] state that the compositions of these units are highly context dependent. According to RobbinWooffitt, turn constructional components or turn constructional unit is basically the design a turn has as its structure which could be in terms of syntactic structure, prosody or generally the peculiar context the turn are constructed in. Also, in turn allocation, there are two basic ways in which a speaker can have a turn at talk: either the current speaker selects the next speaker or a next speaker may self-select. There

Udoh

are also other components that are important to CA: they are overlapping, adjacency pair, repairs and sequence expansion. Overlapping is an interaction phenomenon which is produced by speakers together. It occurs when a current speaker continues talking beyond the transition relevant places (TRP). It occurs when the beginning of a speaker's statement coincides with the ending of another speaker. Overlapping is simply seen as a case of where more than one speaker speaks simultaneously. For some purposes, it can be useful to distinguish two specific simultaneous talk. At places where overlap occurs, transition space seems not to exist.

A further central concept to Conversational Analysis is adjacency pair. Conversational actions tend to occur in pairs. Many conversational actions call for a particular kind of conversational response in return. The basic idea is that turns minimally come in pairs and the first of a pair create certain expectations which constrain the possibilities for a second. Some of the examples of adjacency pairs are: questions/answers, complaint/apology, greetings/greetings, accusation/denial etc. Adjacency pair can further be characterized by the occurrence of the preference organization. The phenomena of adjacency pairs in talk also form the basis for the concept of sequential implicativeness; that is, each talk in a conversation is essentially a response to the preceding talk and an anticipation of the kind of talk to follow. In formulating their present turn, speakers show their understanding of the previous turn and reveal their expectations about the next turn to come [11]. Repair is another important concept in conversation analysis. Repairs are the things done to fix a conversational breakdown and restore alignment. Repair organization describes how parties in conversation deal with problems in speaking, hearing or understanding. Repair segments are classified by who initiates repair (self or other), by who resolves the problem (self

www.iaajournals.org

or other), and by how it unfolds within a turn or a sequence of turns. It is a self-righting mechanism in social interaction [3]. Sequences are constructed of two turns at a talk; an FPP (first pair part) and SPP (second pair part). Sequence expansion allows talk which is made up of more than a single adjacency pair to be constructed and understood as performing the same basic action and the various additional elements are seen as doing interactional work related to the basic action underway. According to Meyr, sequence expansion can occur prior to the base FPP, between the base and the FPP and SPP and following the base SPP. With this therefore, sequence expansion is of three types: pre-expansion, insertion expansion and post-expansion.

Pre-expansion serves as a prelude to some other action. It is preliminary to the main course of action. Pre-sequence comes in two basic kinds: generic pre-sequence which are used with any form of following talk and type-specific pre-sequences, which are designed to lead to some particular kind of base sequence. The generic pre-sequence is not designed with reference to the nature of action to which it is prior, but rather it is used to launch a sort of next talk. This is normally summon-answer sequence. [20]. Insertion expansion has to do with sequences which can occur between two turns of an adjacency pair, breaking the continuity turns. These sequences do not challenge the place of the adjacency pair as the basic organizational unit of the sequences to which it belongs. The person towards whom the first part of an adjacency pair has been directed may want to undertake some preliminary action before responding with the second part.

Post-expansion is a turn or adjacency pair that comes after, but is still tied to the base adjacency pair. This is of two types: minimal and non-minimal. Minimal expansion is also termed sequence closing thirds, because it is a single turn after the base SPP (hence third) that does not project any further talk beyond their turn (hence closing).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Nigerian Police

The Nigerian police play important roles in the Nigerian society without which the sustenance of order, legality, development and democracy may be difficult. In Nigeria, the police force had its origin in Lagos, the then Federal Capital, more than a hundred and twenty years ago. Their primary role is policing, which has to do with security in compliance with existing laws and conformity with the precepts of social order. The Nigeria Police Force is a centralized and federally administered institution. It is headed by an Inspector General appointed by and accountable to the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. The constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria vests the overall operational control of the force in the hands of the President.

Power Relationship in Police Interrogation

The centrality of language to human communication cannot be over-emphasized. In fact, the use of language for the expression of one's feelings, ideas and thoughts is an attribute that humans do not share with any creature. However, the use of language in human communication encounters is determined by a number of factors. For instance, the power differential between interlocutors, more often than not, is determined by their social standing which constrains what each interactant contributes or says in interpersonal communication situations. This is more so in a communication encounter that involves unequal interlocutors, example, Police-Suspect interrogations. Such communication situations demonstrate the connection between Language and Power.

[9] explores various dimensions of the relation of power and language. He focuses on two major aspects of the power language relationship: Power in discourse and Power behind discourse. Power in discourse has to do with powerful participants controlling and

constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants. Fairclough believes that this constraint rests on three factors which are (i) contents (on what is said or done); (ii) relations (the social relations people enter into in discourse); (iii) subjects (the subject positions people can occupy). Power in discourse has to do with asymmetrical relationships. One group will be able to control the other group. So power can feature the ability of one person able to control and enforce the other. Power also has to do with the ability of one person able to assert his/her influence and will on the other. According to [9], the exercise of power shows that one affects or coerces another person in a manner contrary to another person's interest. Thus, the discourses of unequal encounter such as-between teacher and student, doctor and patient, police and suspect, lawyer and witness, where the power relationship is overt and institutionalized are all examples of power in discourse. Furthermore, casual conversation such as radio-talk, family discourse, discourse and gender where power is covert and usually contested, also belong to power in discourse. Power behind discourse on the other hand does not belong to face-to-face discourse such as all the examples above. This kind of power is a hidden power. Power behind discourse, according to [16] is the idea that the whole social order of discourse is put together and held together as a hidden effect of power. Institutionalized discourse such as legal discourse, doctor/patient talk, and police-suspect talk are all examples of discourses where power is highly prominent. But the power behind the conventions of these discourses does not belong to these institutions themselves but to the power holders in the institutions. These power-holders are also responsible to some powerful group of people who control and dictate to them. A group of people are behind the scene pulling the strings of power. However, since this study is based on face-to-face discourse, and language can only be analysed on power in

Udoh

discourse, the focus of this study will be on power in discourse.

[10] defines social power as control and holds that groups have power if they are able to control the acts and minds of other groups. Different types of power may be distinguished in accordance with the different resources employed to exercise power. Members of more powerful social groups have the precedence to access and also control, over some public discourse. Thus, professors control scholarly discourse, teachers-educational discourse, Journalists-media discourse, Judges and lawyers-legal discourse, and politicians-policy and other public political discourse [5]. [6] gives the following premises on which power is based which summarise power in all its ramifications:

(1) Power is exercised by individuals and therefore involves choice, agency and intention.

(2) The interests of the powerful and less powerful are likely to differ and therefore, the exercise of power may lead to conflict, resistance, and coercion.

(3) On the other hand, individuals involved in power relations may not always be aware of the power they wield or are subjected to.

(4) Although power can be seen as productive, enabling, and as a positive capacity for achieving social ends, it is very often used negatively, and the literature on language and power has primarily concentrated on this negative aspect and how the powerful exploit the less powerful.

Power can be found in any conversation of everyday life. Ideal dialogue (as coined by scholars such as [5]; [6]; [7] which is supposed to be exempted from power is believed to be unattainable and unrealistic. "Power is coherent in all dialogues, whether in casual conversations or in institutional settings" [14]. Although, the degree of power manifested in different contexts differs greatly. [17] equally hold the opinion that the relation between form and content is not arbitrary or conventional, but form

www.iaajournals.org

signifies content. This apparently denotes that language is a social activity and it is ideologically motivated.

Power is always a key factor in discourse interaction. This is more so in institutional discourses like teacher-student, doctor-patient, barrister-witness, police-suspect etc. [11] substantiates this view with findings from a study he carried out on speech rights manipulation in Nigerian magistrate court talk. He discovers that participants who occupy + HIGHER role and MIDHIGHER role initiate three-slot exchanges in dyadic and triadic speech events in the courtroom. The magistrates occupy the + HIGHER role, the lawyers and the investigating police officers occupy the MIDHIGHER role while the suspects and witnesses occupy the - HIGHER role. The foregoing presents courtroom speech right as grossly asymmetrical. Power is not socially predetermined prior to interaction, but is potentially residing within language, forming part of the interaction.

Asymmetry and Power Relations

Empirical analysis has repeatedly revealed fundamental ways in which institutional forms of discourse indeed exhibit systematic asymmetries that mark them out from ordinary conversation. To take an example, in medical encounters, which have been the subject of a vast amount of research documenting asymmetries in institutional interaction [20], one way of tracing the power relationship between doctors and their patients is by counting the number of questions that are asked by each participant, looking at the type of questions asked by doctors and patients, and/or counting the number of times a doctor interrupts a patient and vice versa. Large-scale asymmetries emerge from such exercises from which it may be concluded that doctors exert control over the concerns expressed within the consultation, and patients defer to the authority of the doctor by refraining from battling for such control themselves. In the same vein, police officers exhibit some measures of power and it is this that helps them in the discharge of their duties. However, some tend to abuse the

Udoh

power bestowed on them as a result of their 'weapons of war'.

Linguistic Perspectives on Police Interview

Like the courtroom [12] and the news interview [8] [9], the context of the police interview is one in which there are clearly defined and unequal roles for the participants: broadly speaking, the interviewer asks questions, and the interviewee answers them, and the interviewer also has the authority to decide what counts as a legitimate answer. Thus, it is generally the interviewer who controls the interaction, possessing as they do the authority, invested in them by the institution they represent, to constrain interviewees' type and length of turn, and to control the topics that are discussed. Up until recently, however, the police interview context was somewhat neglected as an area of study and the recent increase in publications in the area has for the most part focused on suspect interviews [11]; [12]; [13]; [14]; [15]. [7] adopts a critical approach to police/suspect interviews, in which her starting point, as with the current study, is Conversation Analysis (CA) - the type of 'micro analysis' generally regarded as paying little heed to social structure and patterns of inequality. On the basis of this micro analysis, however, she goes on to demonstrate that underlying beliefs held by the police institution are manifested discursively. Furthermore her findings reflect those of Wodak's analysis of doctor-patient interactions, in that suspects were routinely expected to conform to institutional norms with which they had little familiarity, resulting in a conflict of expectations between themselves and interviewing officers.

Question Form

According to the turn-taking model of conversation [3], a question requires an answer. In institutional settings, the types of allowable turn are often pre-allocated (Matoesian, 1993). Thus, questioning as a mechanism of interactional control is a resource that, for the most part, is only available to powerful participants.

www.iaajournals.org

According to Drew & Heritage, the question-and-answer sequence gives members of institutions "a measure of control over the introduction of topics and hence of the 'agenda' for the occasion" (1992:49). Interactions in legal contexts such as police interviews and courtroom trials are of such a nature that many turns on the part of the questioner can be said to function as a question, regardless of their syntactic form [6]. Different syntactic forms exert different degrees of constraints on their responses, and questioners in these contexts often make strategic use of their options. Because of the pre-allocation of turn types, a respondent will usually be powerless to refute any propositions contained within questions, or to elaborate when question form calls for a minimal response. As Matoesian said of the cross examination of a rape victim, put simply; the differential design of question types operates to limit her ability to talk (1993). Question form in legal contexts has received a great deal of academic attention, and accounts for a significant proportion of the advice given in police interview training, that can broadly be described as 'linguistic'. In legal contexts, it has been suggested that there are two main functions of questions; "a genuine process of elicitation of information... [and] to obtain confirmation of a particular version of events that the questioner has in mind" [8]. For example, while the appropriate response to a declarative question - such as 'you were interested in him as a person?' would be a minimal confirmation or a denial of the proposition contained within it, a WH- question like 'who were you there with?' requires the interviewee to provide new information, and is thus less constraining [7]. Newbury & Johnson scale information-seeking questions according to the *amount* of information they request, and confirmation-seeking questions in terms of 'the extent to which they coerce the participant to agree with the proposition contained in the question. [16] analysis of a high profile rape trial in the United States takes question form as

Udoh

one of its key areas of focus, particularly the ways in which defense attorneys make strategic use of question form to register impressions about victims' evidence in the minds of the jury: 'as a result of manipulation of syntactic question form, the jury may register not just the facts, but also the presuppositions and blame implicative imputations'. Thus, all the power to construct the telling of events lies with the attorney, 'the power to define the situation, to define what counts as reality, in sum, the power to make one's account count'. Able to draw on resources inaccessible to the witness, attorneys can successfully manipulate not only the witness herself, but more importantly the 'overhearing audience' - the jury.

There is a large body of literature dealing with the functions of questions prefaced by various discourse markers in institutional language, including 'and' [12] 'well' and 'okay' [15] and 'so' [19]. In other contexts, 'so' is generally treated as a marker that is employed when hearers

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION/ANALYSIS

The method of data analysis is descriptive based on the approach of Conversation Analysis (CA) as proposed by Emmanuel Schegloff, Harvey Sacks and Gail Jefferson including recent modifications that the present scholars in CA have made as they observed new things in the interactions. This was applied to the recorded interactions between the police and suspects in Anambra State. Data was collected from Anambra State Police command. Three police stations located in three local government areas of Anambra State were used for the study. They are Awka police station, Nnewi police station, and Onitsha police station. Samples of police/suspect interaction sequences were purposively selected from 15 hours recording done in seven days visit to the different stations. All the interrogation sessions recorded for the study was conducted in English and the subjects are adults of 20 years and above. The samples were transcribed with some modifications. This is as a result of the need for anonymity. In the excerpts,

www.iaajournals.org

are being offered turn at talk and/or an opportunity to change the topic [9]. However, as [13] notes, Schiffrin and others have neglected to discuss *so* within the specialised context of question and answer sequences. In police interview contexts, Johnson observes two major functions of *so*-prefaced questions. With adult defendants, she presents evidence to suggest that *so* functions to evaluate and challenge prior utterances, often to narrow the focus on to specific evidential details and to direct the interviewee into reformulations of earlier turns. With child witnesses, on the other hand, *so* is a means by which the discourse is supported and rearranged to form a coherent narrative. As such, as well as contributing to a controlling tone in the interaction, *so*- functions, in some environments, as an essentially empowering device. *So*-prefaced questions often simultaneously function as a third-turn strategy to summarize prior talk - that is, as a formulation.

Police officers are identified with the letter P while suspects are identified with the letter S.

Turn Constructional Components in Police-Suspect interaction

Turns in interaction are constructed through a variety of grammatical units: words, phrases, clauses and sentences. The compositions of these units are highly context dependent. Syntactically, words are arranged in the order of subject - verb object: (SVO) syntactic structures entail not just phrases but phrases and clauses and not just clauses but clauses and sentences. The following syntactic structures were collected from the excerpts in the present study:

Simple Sentence

Simple sentences were consistently used in the police - suspect interactions. They constituted greater percentage of the verbal expressions used in the interactions which ranges from affirmative sentences, shortened to 'yes,' ok 'alright' and realized in their full expression; negative sentences shortened

Udoh

to 'no' nothing and their full expressions. This exemplifies the straight forward manner in which investigating officers expect their interlocutors (in this case, the suspect) to respond to statements and questions. The following are some excerpts from the data collected.

Excerpt

P: Now come in

P: Sit down

S: Let me remain like this

P: ↑I sai::d sit down

S: Yes Sir

Interrogative Sentence

Interrogative sentences were constantly used to elicit responses. The use of interrogative sentences is a necessary constructional component of police-suspect interactions as the investigating officers searches for answer to problems. There are so many forms of interrogative statements used. This can be seen in the following excerpt.

Excerpt

P: I'm just going to ask you some questions. Where were you on the 3rd of October, 2017?

S: I was at the restaurant near the stadium

P: Who and who were you with

S: I was by myself, but an old friend from Awka was also having lunch with her girlfriend and we talked about five minutes.

P: And what are their names

S: Goddy and Chioma

P: What did you talk about?

S: So many things Sir

Here, the police initiate the interaction while the suspect takes his turn by providing answer to the questions posed by the police. The answers provided by the suspect paves way for the next turn to be taken by the police. There is no single sequence that is devoid of interrogative sentence in the interactions.

P: Are you Ebuka's brother?

S: Yes Sir

P: Are you her biological brother?

S: No na my cousin

P: How often do you visit them?

S: E don tey when I visit them last

P: What were you doing at the scene of the crime? Do you reside there?

www.iaajournals.org

S:I just dey ther::e ooo. I no dey live their

P: Is the man beside you your friend?

S: Yes he is my friend.

Declarative Sentences

Declaratives are statements / assertions made by the speaker. It can also be used to deny an assertion. So it makes a statement or denies it. The following are some of the declarative sentences used in this study.

P: Where does he live?

S: We live in the same area

Excerpt

P: Is the person you are serving?

S: Yes Sir, but I have mastered the art of trading

P: Did you steal his money?

S: I did not do that Sir

Just like the simple sentences, the declaratives dominate the response pair. Such declaratives were found on the turns of both the police officer and the suspect. It constitutes a greater part of the sentences generated in the excerpts collected.

Vocative Sentences

The reason behind the use of vocatives in police - suspect interactions was to evoke feelings of sympathy from the investigating officer. Some of the vocatives used in this work are: 'Sir', 'you', 'Oga', madam and 'you'.

Excerpt

S: Oga eh...eh Oga

P: Abeg sit down there

S: Yes Sir but ehmehm

P: Wetin be your problem, Oga?

S: Sir, may you help me... l: eh...

P: How you wan make I help you Olodo

Clauses and Phrases

The following clauses and phrases portray the structural complexity of the issues at hand. Below are clauses and phrases used in such interaction.

Excerpt

S: Since I enter that house, she has never allowed me to rest one day or the other Even though the tense form of the verb in the above expression is incorrect, the statement still contains two clauses. Clausal structure is not quite common in police-suspect interactions especially in

Udoh

conversations investigated. Phrases are also minimally used. Other examples are:

Excerpt

P: You have already secured admission into prison ; it is direct entry:

P: On the 20th of February when you sent the girl to buy bread and beans, what happened?

P: I know, you are a hardened criminal
The first line above contains two independent clauses. The police made the statement as a sheer mockery of the suspect and the offence he is alleged to have committed. The second line contains an adverbial clause of time and a main clause. The third line equally contains two clauses: an independent clause and a nominal (noun) clause. However, clauses are not extensively used in the interaction between the two participants.

Compound Sentences

Compound Sentences were equally used by the participants to drive home their points. A compound sentence contains two independent clauses joined by a coordinating conjunction. The following are compound sentences gotten from the excerpts

Excerpt

P: Ok, she request sex or may be the way she dressed seduced you

Excerpt

S: I was by myself, but an old friend walked in with her partner and we chatted for some minutes.

From the data collected, the simple sentences used in all the transactions outnumbered the compound sentences.

Turn-talking Features of the interactions

This involves the observable features and components of turn - taking in the interactions. They include the turn allocation procedures, the turn cues and TRPS in the interactions.

Turn Allocation Procedures: In turn allocation, interactions are designed for the selection of a next speaker. The procedure for giving and talking turns observed in the interactions includes current speaker selecting next speaker and also self selection

Current speaker selects next speaker:

There are different ways through which a current speaker can select next speaker. This can be through the calling of the next speaker's name or by the use of the pronoun 'you'. The current speaker can also select the next speaker through a non-verbal clue.

From the data collected, there are numerous vocative sentences that were used by the two sides of the participants in identifying the addressee. Some of these are illustrated below:

Excerpt

P: What is your name young man?

S: James Sir

P: I hear you

P: We hear say na you rape that small girl

S: No Sir

P: Why you stand up sir

S: I wan stretch my leg

P: Abeg Oga sit down

Through the use of the expression 'young man', the police summoned the next speak, that is the suspect to take his own turn. This is possible because it was just the two of them interacting. It is almost like calling the man by name. The suspect who is the next speaker took the turn at the next available TRP in the sequence. There were observable cases from the data collected where the police used both calling of names and the use of pronouns. In most cases, only some form of talk can select the next speaker. Questions can, but answers do not.

In a multi-party talk, the use of the pronoun 'you' as an address for the selection of a next speaker creates the problem of knowing who exactly is the next speaker. This is as a result of potential vagueness of the reference. There were cases where more than two speakers adopt the procedure of self-selection, however this gave rise to excessive overlap in the sequences. Most of the interaction sequences involved just two participants at a time, a police officer and a suspect. Whether there is name calling or not, the next speaker takes the turn at the next available TRP.

Excerpt

P: You don't sign the paper way I give you Friday

S: Yes Oga, I don't sign am

P: All the questions I asked ...

P: You no wan answer any of them wetin be your problem Stephen

S: Oga me I no get... eh... ehm I no get any problem

P: Two of you are wicked. You did not pity that girl at all at all . . . P: Wh::o first rape am. You

(1.0) (none of the suspects talked)

P:↑I say who rape that girl first. Friday, you no dey hear agai::n

The use of the pronoun here brought a problem here. There is a break in the interaction because the two suspects did not really know who the question has been addressed to. This is as a result of the use of the pronoun 'you'. But with the calling of name, the police selected the next speaker who is 'Friday'.

Self-Selection

Most of the interaction sequences involved just a police and a suspect. Because of this setting, the next speaker takes the turn at the next available TRP without the calling of name or the use of a pronoun. There are cases from the data collected where more than two speakers adopt the procedure of self selection. This gave rise to excessive overlap in the sequences. This is illustrated below.

Excerpt

P: [Who shoot that [man

S¹: [shoot ke]

P: [I bi like say you dey mad]

S¹: Ok::na Festus shoot am fir[st]

S²: ↑[you are lying . . .] ehm - mmm

P: [Answer my question?]

S³:↑[Oga abeg na Festus

It was noticed that in a bid to seize the floor for a turn, participants unconsciously raise their voices and also indulge in a lot of overlaps.

Turn Cues and TRPS

Taking turns in conversation can be done in so many ways. It has to do with how speakers signal that they are ready to stop and let the other person start. Transfer of turn occurs at a transition relevance place by the use of some cues

that indicate to the listener that a speaker is about to finish his turn and to be ready to take the turn, and consequently minimizing the gaps and overlaps between turns.

There are six turn taking cues in interactions, but with regards to the present study, the cues will be analyzed as noticed from the data collected and they are silent pause after grammatically complete utterance, socio-centric sequence and adjacency pairs etc.

Silent pause after grammatically complete utterance

Silence signals the end of an ongoing conversation and also signals the transition relevance place for another to take the turn. In the interactions between police and suspects, silence is common, in most of the interactions, questions are being addressed and when these questions are asked, there must be answers to them. Questions are grammatically complete unit and at the end of it, the next speaker who is the suspect is expected to take a turn. This is illustrated below:

Excerpt

P: Anyway, what happened in your place? eh...ehnn....Because she complained of stomach pain before her death. So what did you gi::ve to her?

(0.3)

S: Ahh:: Si:r↑l did not give her any strange thing

P: Do you know what you have done is wrong?

S: I:: eh... e... hm sir... I:: know

P: Since you know, why did you do it?

(0.3)

P: **You no dey hear**

(0.3)

P: **Why you do am**

S: Sir sorry ...sir

Socio Centric Sequences

Socio centric sequence is one of the turn-taking cues. It is common among the officers participating in interactions. Its use normally signals the other participant to take a turn. In the interactions recorded, the police officers do most of the talking while the suspects respond through terms like yeah, ahhh, mmm etc.

Udoh

Below is an illustration from the data collected:

Excerpt

P: How much were you people paid?
S: Na five million sir
P: You put the money for your account?
abi ::: e e h
S: Na so sir. The mon::eydey my account
P: Na you shoot him? [baa?
S: [Ahhh...eeh]
P: Wetin bi::biiiahheeh
S: No bi me shoot am
P: If you no talk now, I go slap you.
S: Ye:eeh

With the use of the sequences, the suspects takes the turn immediately and continue with the interaction. Here, the police projects TRP but not in a bid to give up, but to make a contribution.

Adjacency Pair

In conversations, many turns at talk occurs in pairs. This includes sequences of greetings / response, inquiry / response question / answers accusation / denial. The end of every first pair signals the TRP. At the transition relevance place, the next speaker takes a turn.

The excerpt below illustrates this:

Excerpt

P: Who did you say you sold it to?
S: Engineer Obiora
P: Who introduced you to Engineer Obiora?
P: How did you know him?
S: Nnaemeka, one of his workers took me to him.
P: Did Nnaemeka help in bringing that machine out?
(0.3)
S: No::: he just showed us where it is.
P: How many of you?
S: We dey two sir.

In each of the lines above, the first turn of the pair initiates some action and makes some next action relevant. The second turn responds to the prior and completes the action which was initiated in the first turn. These two turns together accomplish the action, the basic sequence, then is composed of two ordered turns at talk. There are also other components that are important to conversation analysis that were also

www.iaajournals.org

noticed from the data collected, and they are overlapping, sequence expansion and repairs.

Overlapping

This is an interaction phenomenon which is produced by speakers together. Overlaps occur when speakers initiate their turns at a perceived TRP. In this study, the police occupy the dominant role in initiating the turns in the interactions while the suspects are the subordinate. The suspects perceive the TRP before the last word from the officer's mouth is realized and he responds in his own turn immediately. Illustrations of these are in the excerpt below:

Excerpt

P: Do you know why you are here?
(0.2)
P: You are facing a case of rape, kidnapping [and . . .
S: [Kidna. . . what]? Wetin that one co:me {mean naa}
P: [I said a case of rape, kidnapping and robbery]
S: Hmmm
P: How many of you went to Mr Okafor's house together [with otugo]
S: [↑Ah:: me... I no kno:::w]
P: [Who are they that went?]

In the interactions, there are overlaps. Sometimes suspects introduce these overlaps so as to make the police officer believe them. This is a way of initiating their sequences. Sometimes some of these overlaps cause interruptions in the interaction. Turns in most cases overlap in police-suspect conversations. A speaker could release his/her utterance even before that of the receiver is spoken. Overlapping features predominantly especially when the police officer feels that the suspect is either indirectly dodging his question or fails to speak the truth. On the other hand the suspect could equally indulge in overlapping and interruption acts when he/she feels that he is being accused wrongly. Whenever words/expressions overlap in conversations, interruption invariably creeps in and the basic thing to do at that moment is to call the suspect to order.

Udoh

The investigating officer exercises control over interactions and his suspects.

Sequence Expansion (Pre-sequence)

Pre-sequence is also one of the turn taking cues. It occurs when some preliminary action is taken before initiating the first part of an adjacency pair and the preliminary action itself involves an adjacency pair. Before making a request for instance, it often makes sense to check if the other person has the item or information one needs. This can be seen in the excerpt below:

Excerpt

- P: Who shoot the girl?
S: Na Friday sir
P: Is Friday a member of the gang?
S: Yes sir
P: Do you have his number?
S: Yes Sir
P: Can I have it please
Instead of asking for the number, the police took the preliminary action of first of all trying to find out first before demanding for the number.

Insertion Sequence

This is contained in the following excerpt

Excerpt

- P: When you carried the girl, where did you take her to?
S: I beg sir if I tell you, I hope say you no go tell my gang say
I :... eh::e.hmm. . . [told you
P: ↑[No : : just tell me]
S: Then I go tell you. We take her go patanni push. We:: get hideout for there.
Here the suspect did not answer the question straight. This is a typical example of insertion sequence, the person to whom the first part of an adjacency

The above reveals that the constructional components of turn-taking is basically syntactic structures, and the sequential structure of the interaction is adjacency pairs which is expanded to long talk through insertion sequence and are further elongated in breaks. The various forms of Turn-taking cues and allocation procedures observed in the interaction between police and suspect have been

www.iaajournals.org

pair has been directed may want to undertake some preliminary action before responding with the second part. From the above excerpt, line 1 of the excerpt and line 4 make up one adjacency pair while lines 2 and 3 make up a second adjacency pair inserted between the two parts of the pair.

Repair

Repair mechanisms exist for dealing with turn-taking errors and violations. The various organizations operative in conversation are susceptible to errors, violations, and troubles. Repairs are things done to fix a conversational break down and restore alignment. It is a self-righting mechanism in social interaction. This component of CA can be seen in the lines below:

Excerpt

- P: When did you see Kalu last?
(0.6)
P: You no get ear? When did you see Kalu last?
S: I saw him on [Friday]
P; [Which Friday]
S: Na last Friday Oga
P: Na which cloth he wore that day?
S: Me?
(0.3)
P: Which cloth Kalu wore that day?
S: Me and Kalu no be friend like that
P: ↑if I repeat this question again you no go like wetin I go do you
S: Oga na jean and shirt
From this excerpt, the police kept repeating questions in order to make the interaction go on. Repairs are used to fix a conversational break down and restore alignment.

CONCLUSION

highlighted and analysed. From the data, structural components of the interactions show them as highly institutionalized and power centric. This study has also revealed that the act of police interaction is slanted in favour of the police interrogators. Also discovered is that, there is power asymmetry between the IPO and the suspect, the parties in the conversation.

REFERENCES

1. Abbe, A. and Brandon, S.E. (2013). The Role of Rapport in Investigative Interviewing: A Review. *J. Investig. Psych. Offender Profil.* 10, 237-249
2. Benneworth, K. (2009). Police interviews with suspected paedophiles: a discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society* 20, 5 555-569.
3. Ephratt, M. (2008). The functions of silence. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40, 11 1909-1938.
4. Fair Clough, N. (2001) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
5. Fogarty, K., Augoustinos, M., and Kettler, L. (2013). Rethinking rapport through the lens of progressivity in investigative interviews into child sexual abuse. *Discourse Studies* 15, 4 395-420
6. Gardner, R. (2001) *When Listeners Talk: Response Tokens and Listeners Stance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Press.
7. Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Philadelphia: indicate the place of publication University of Pennsylvania Press.
8. Haworth, K. (2006). The dynamics of power and resistance in police interview discourse. *Discourse & Society* 17, 6 739-759.
9. Heydon, G. (2011). Silence: Civil right or social privilege? A discourse analytic response to a legal problem. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 9 2308-2316
10. Liddicoat, A.J (2007). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Arthenaeums Press Ltd.
11. Kurzon, D. (1995). The right of silence: A socio-pragmatic model of interpretation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23, 55-69.
12. Maat, M. Ter, Truong, K., and Heylen, D. (2010). How Turn-taking Strategies influence Users' impressions of an agent. *Intelligent Virtual Agents*, 441-453.
13. 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
14. OnonyeChuka Fred. " Discourse Strategies and the Pragmatics of Turn -taking in Nigeria Job Interview Session". Articles, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
15. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. A (1974). Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. *Language*, 696-734. 16.
16. Schegloff, E.A. (2000). Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language in Society* 29, 01, 1-63
17. Thórisson, K.R., Gislason, O., Jonsdottir, G.R., and Thorisson, H.T. A. (2010). Multiparty Multimodal Architecture for Realtime Turntaking. *Intelligent Virtual Agents*, 350-356.
18. Vrij, A., Jundi, S., Hope, L.. (2012). Collective interviewing of suspects. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition* 1, 41-44.
19. Walsh, D. and Bull, R. (2011). Examining Rapport in Investigative Interviews with Suspects: Does its Building and Maintenance Work? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology* 27, 1 73-84.
20. Yoong, D. (2010). Interactional norms in the Australian police interrogation room. *Discourse & Society* 21, 6 692-713.