

Development of the Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations (RS3i), Interviewee Version

Misty C. Duke, James M. Wood, and Brock Bollin
University of Texas at El Paso

Matthew Scullin
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Julia LaBianca
University of Texas at El Paso

This article describes the development and psychometric properties of the Rapport Scales for Investigative Interviews and Interrogations, Interviewee Version (RS3i), a multidimensional self-report questionnaire intended to measure interviewees' experience of rapport in forensic and intelligence interviews. Two studies are described. In Study 1, 80 simulated investigative interviews were conducted regarding a supposed case of domestic terrorism. Afterward, the 80 interviewee participants rated the interviews on rapport-related questionnaire items. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) of these ratings was used to construct a 21-item measure, the RS3i, comprising 5 Rapport Scales (Attentiveness, Trust/Respect, Expertise, Cultural Similarity, and Connected Flow) and a sixth scale, Commitment to Communication, that assesses an interviewee's motivation to be cooperative. In Study 2, another 94 simulated investigative interviews were conducted, after which interviewee participants rated the interview using the RS3i. A CFA of the Study 2 data confirmed the factor structure identified in Study 1. Good internal reliability and construct validity were demonstrated for most RS3i scales. Furthermore, scores on several scales were found to be higher when interviewers used rapport-based tactics and to correlate with the amount of information disclosed by interviewees during questioning. The RS3i can be a useful, psychometrically sound tool for use in rapport research and the training of forensic and intelligence interviewers.

Keywords: interrogation, investigative interviewing, rapport, training

Recent research on investigative and intelligence interviewing supports the view that noncoercive “information-gathering” questioning approaches can be more effective than accusatory or coercive methods for obtaining accurate information from intelligence and national security sources (e.g., detainees) and from suspects in law enforcement investigations (Bull & Dando, 2012;

Evans et al., 2014; Oleszkiewicz, Granhag, & Montecinos, 2014; Walsh & Bull, 2012a). Meissner and his colleagues (2014) identified rapport as a key difference between the information-gathering and accusatory approaches: Whereas accusatorial interrogation methods seek to establish control, information-gathering methods seek to establish rapport. Experienced interrogators, such as Kleinman (2006) and Soufan (2011) have also reported that rapport-building can significantly increase the productivity of intelligence interviews.

Neuman and Salinas-Serrano (2006, pp. 207–208) defined *rapport* as “a complex and constant dance between interrogator and suspect . . . Unlike forced and spurious conversation. . . rapport is based on mutual respect and fostered by treating suspects with dignity and humanity.” Kleinman (2006, p. 103) referred to *rapport* as an “operational accord [that] seeks to effectively, albeit subtly, gain the source’s cooperation and maintain that productive relationship for as long as possible without betraying indicators of manipulation or exploitation on the part of the interrogator.” Investigative interviews with uncooperative interviewees are typically characterized by attempts to overcome resistance. Therefore, unlike in psychotherapeutic or intimate relationships, interactions in investigative interviews are often defined by conflicting goals. Because of this, the purpose of rapport in investigative interviews is utilitarian, enabling a relationship that contributes to successful interview outcomes (Vallano & Schreiber Compo, 2015).

This article was published Online First October 16, 2017.

Misty C. Duke, James M. Wood, and Brock Bollin, Department of Psychology, University of Texas at El Paso; Matthew Scullin, John Jay College of Criminal Justice; Julia LaBianca, Department of Psychology, University of Texas at El Paso.

Julia LaBianca is now with Iowa State University.

We thank the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group for their partial financial support of this project. A portion of this work was funded by the High-Value Detainee Interrogation Group contract (J-FBI-10-009) awarded to subcontract James M. Wood through the University of Texas at El Paso. Statements of fact, opinion and analysis in the paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the FBI or the U.S. Government. A portion of this work was presented at the American Psychology and Law Society Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana, October 2014. The data for this project has been archived at Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/3h968/>.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Misty C. Duke, National Security Studies Institute, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX 79968. E-mail: mcduke@utep.edu