Accommodating trauma in police interviews

An exploration of rapport in investigative interviews of traumatized victims

Patrick Risan

Thesis for the degree of philosophiae doctor (PhD)

at the University of Bergen

2017

Date of defence: September 8

Year: 2017

Title: Accommodating trauma in police interviews. An exploration of rapport in investigative interviews of traumatized victims.

      Author: Patrick Risan

Print: AiT Bjerch AS / University of Bergen

Scientific environment

This dissertation is a result of collaboration between the Norwegian Police University College, the Department of Clinical Psychology at the University of Bergen, and the Centre of Forensic Interviewing at the University of Portsmouth. The project was funded by the Norwegian Police University College.

POLITIHØGSKOLEN

4

Acknowledgements

I want to thank my main supervisor, Professor Per-Einar Binder, for his reflections, humor, and for always helping me to see solutions throughout this research project. I also want to thank my co-supervisor, Professor Becky Milne, for her knowledge, enthusiasm and integrity. I want to thank both of them for their generosity and for always being available to answer any of my queries. Their sound and precise advice have been invaluable and contributed to making this research journey comfortable and enlightening. It has been a great learning experience.

I would like to give a special thanks to my wife, Veslemøy, and the kids – Iben, Samson, Benjamin and Robin. They have not really contributed much to the research in itself, but have given me encouragement and great experiences along the way.

I also want to thank friends and colleagues who have provided their assistance and reflections or in other ways contributed to the project: Akiah Berg, Andreas Glass, Arnulf Risan, Aslak Hjeltnes, Anne-Marit Algarheim, Bjørn Barland, Bjørn Rytter, Camilla Pellegrini Meling, Christopher Glass, Cormac McGrath, Erik Fjellheim, Frank Nornberg, Geir Valaker, Hilde Sørum, Hjalmar Styve, Ivar Fahsing, Jasmine Khan, Jessica Risan, Jon Strype, Jonas Sharma-Bakkevig, Knut Tore Sælør, Kristina Kepinska Jakobsen, Lars-Thore Thomassen, Manjeet Singh, Nicolay Puchkov, Nina Sunde, Ole Henrik Øyum, Ole Thomas Bjerknes, Per Håkon Sand, Pål Winnæss, Rune Aaen Jørgensen, Rune Andersson, Rune Stokke, Svein Erik Paulsen, Synnøve Nornberg, Terje Løvstad, Tom Skoglund, Torkil Ramstad, Trond Myklebust, and Øystein Waade.

Finally, I want to thank the participants of the project, the police investigators, for contributing with their experiences and reflections.

Patrick Risan, February 16th, 2017.

Abstract

In the investigation of a criminal offense, the investigative interview is one of the most important methods used by the police. In interviews, the police investigator may encounter suspects, witnesses or victims who experience a wide range of emotional states: states that may get in the way of rapport and the interviewee providing an optimal account. How can a police interviewer approach an interviewee in order to obtain rapport and attend to his or her psychological needs? The aim of this thesis was to explore the psychological processes underpinning rapport in police interviews of traumatized victims. In three qualitative studies, we examined the processes of developing and maintaining rapport with adult traumatized individuals with an emphasis on how police investigators accommodate the emotional state of interviewees.

The studies reported in Papers 1 and 2 were based on interviews of police investigators responsible for interviewing victims after the Utøya massacre on 22 July 2011 in Norway. We employed an explorative–reflexive approach to these research interviews and used a thematic analysis based on a hermeneutic phenomenological epistemology to examine the data. Paper 1 explored factors considered important and useful for facilitating safety, and for developing and maintaining rapport with traumatized interviewees. The findings showed the importance of the investigator's preparatory efforts through planning and finding an approach, in addition to endeavoring to achieve openness for the interviewee and reflecting on potential emotional reactions that could emerge. The findings highlight the importance of different relational and communicative approaches to enhance rapport, such as a strategic use of first impressions and casual conversation, previewing the interview process, showing understanding, and adapting to the expressions of the interviewee.

One of the main findings presented in Paper 1 was the investigators' descriptions of the significance of managing the interviewee's negative emotions to facilitate safety and thus, rapport. This was the basis for Paper 2, which examined useful approaches to regulating and coping with distress in order to maintain rapport and promote

interviewees' psychological well-being. The findings showed the importance of the investigator being attentive to the interviewees' nonverbal communication and his or her capacity to cope with distress before showing acceptance and the ability to handle negative feelings experienced in the interview. To regulate distress, the investigator should respond to the interviewees' emotional needs, help them to feel safe, and promote a positive atmosphere. The findings of Studies 1 and 2 describe different aspects of how police interviewers approach, accommodate, and respond to the state of the interviewee to build rapport and further psychological well-being.

To achieve a further understanding of the emotional processes of police interviews, Paper 3 theoretically examined the concept of emotional intelligence (EI) in investigative interviewing and how EI can be implemented in the training of police interviewers. EI in the context of investigative interviewing was defined, with an emphasis on empathy and emotion regulation. We presented four key considerations for training police interviewers in handling emotions (self-awareness, attention training, communication skills, and emotion regulation) before discussing the usefulness of EI with regard to investigative interviewing.

In summary, the findings demonstrate the importance of police interviewers engaging in relational and emotional processes when interviewing traumatized interviewees. This thesis contributes to the understanding of the underlying psychological processes that facilitate rapport and promote the well-being of traumatized interviewees in police interviews.

List of publications

1. Risan, P., Binder, P.-E., & Milne, R. (Submitted). Establishing and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews of traumatized victims: A qualitative study.

2. Risan, P., Binder, P.-E., & Milne, R. (2016). Regulating and Coping With Distress During Police Interviews of Traumatized Victims. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 8*(6), 736–744. doi:10.1037/tra0000119

3. Risan, P., Binder, P.-E., & Milne, R. (2016). Emotional Intelligence in Police Interviews—Approach, Training and the Usefulness of the Concept. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 16*(05), 410–424. doi:10.1080/15228932.2016.1234143

A revised version of Paper 1 is published in Policing: a Journal of Policy and Practice. Paper 2 is reprinted with permission from Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy / American Psychological Association. Paper 3 is reprinted with permission from Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice / Taylor & Francis Group.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

The field of police science aims to explain and acquire knowledge about the reality of police work in order to generalize and to be able to predict possible scenarios. In order to achieve its goal, police science makes use of experience-knowledge of policing and scientific knowledge from other, related disciplines (Jaschke, Bjørgo, Romero, Mawby, & Pagon, 2007).

After a crime has been committed, one of the main tasks of the police is to investigate the event and obtain information about what happened. One of the main methods of the police to gather information is to interview the key players—the witnesses, victims, and suspects—whereby investigative interviewing is one of the most important tools for obtaining accurate, complete, and detailed accounts from an interviewee (Milne & Powell, 2010). In the last 30 years, a considerable amount of research has been carried out on investigative interviewing (e.g., within the fields of psychology and linguistics). However, there is a need for more research on investigative interviewing pertaining to the variety of different contexts the police may encounter (e.g., different types of events, interviewees, and information required) (Westera & Powell, 2016). One such context is the interviewing of individuals who have experienced a traumatic and emotionally-charged event.

Traumatic events can potentially have a devastating impact on the lives and psychological well-being of interviewees. In police investigative interviewing of traumatized persons, it is important to be aware of how the investigator's approach and the interview process itself may affect the state of the interviewee, either positively or negatively. The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the psychological processes of building rapport in police interviews of traumatized victims; specifically, the overarching research question was: How can a police investigator approach a traumatized interviewee to develop and maintain rapport and at the same time promote the well-being of the individual?

This thesis is comprised of two empirical studies and one theoretical paper. The empirical studies are qualitative, explorative investigations of rapport in the police

interviews of victims that followed the Utøya massacre in Norway in 2011. The third paper is a theoretical study examining the concept of emotional intelligence in the context of investigative interviewing.

1.1 Trauma and vulnerability

On 22 July 2011, Norway experienced two sequential terrorist attacks by the same perpetrator. First, a car bomb exploded outside the executive government quarter in Oslo, killing eight people and injuring ten. After detonating the bomb, the terrorist drove to a small island called Utøya where the traditional summer youth camp of Norway's Labour Party was held. Here, the gunman, disguised as a policeman, went on a shooting spree that led him to kill 69 and injuring another 56 of the 564 people present on the island. Obviously, such a tragic event has had a significant influence on the general population as well as the individuals that survived the attack.

In the Utøya case, the investigation was coordinated by the National Criminal Investigation Service (NCIS/Kripos), which developed an outline or manual together with an aerial photo that the police were instructed to use in the interviews. The manual aimed to motivate the interviewees to provide coherent narratives by thinking back to the event, concentrating on what they had experienced, and to focus on different details, such as how they were feeling, sensory impressions, what they had seen, threats, injuries, actions, clothing and personal belongings, and the terrorist's actions (Langballe & Schultz, 2017).

To undergo an investigative interview after surviving such a horrific incident as Utøya represents a potentially painful situation for the victims. The police's need for detailed information after the event may conflict with the kind of support traumatized persons need in the time following an incident (Jakobsen, Langballe, & Schultz, 2016). Research has shown how exposure to mass violence in particular is likely to have a major influence on victims' lives (Norris et al., 2002), and it is to be expected that this would be the case for the survivors of Utøya. To have lived through a traumatic event may involve experiences of acute stress such as fear, horror,

helplessness, and dissociative symptoms (e.g., detachment or a subjective sense of numbing), placing the individual at risk for developing post-traumatic symptoms (post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD) (Brewin, Andrews, Rose, & Kirk, 1999; Brewin, Andrews, & Valentine, 2000; Halligan, Michael, Clark, & Ehlers, 2003; Kindt & Engelhard, 2005; Ozer, Best, Lipsey, & Weiss, 2008). PTSD involves symptoms such as intrusive experiences (e.g., reliving the experience, nightmares), heightened arousal and reactivity (e.g., hypervigilance, irritable behavior), behavioral avoidance of stimuli associated with the trauma, and negative alternations in cognition and mood (e.g., inability to recall key features of the traumatic event, persistent negative trauma-related emotions such as anger, fear, horror, guilt, or shame) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Traumatized persons may also be at risk for developing comorbid disorders such as anxiety, depression, and substance abuse disorder (Brady, Killeen, Brewerton, & Lucerini, 2000).

Victims of crime encounter challenges to their existing repertoire of coping strategies and psychological equilibrium (Green, Choi, & Kane, 2010). Reactions to trauma are complex and influenced by contextual and individual factors; e.g., type and severity of trauma, peritraumatic psychological processes, social support, and how the individual appraises and copes with the traumatic event (Brewin et al., 2000; Halligan et al., 2003; Jensen, Thoresen, & Dyb, 2015; Kindt & Engelhard, 2005; Meyerson, Grant, Carter, & Kilmer, 2011; Moscardino, Scrimin, Capello, & Altoe, 2010; Ozer et al., 2008; Ozer & Weiss, 2004). In a study conducted by the Norwegian Centre for Violence and Traumatic Stress Studies, the post-traumatic stress reactions of 325 Utøya victims was examined 4–5 months after the incident. The participants reported post-traumatic stress levels more than six times higher than in the general population, and 47% reported clinical levels of PTSD (Dyb et al., 2014; Glad, Aadnanes, & Dyb, 2012), reflecting the severity and impact of what happened on 22 July. Langballe and Schultz (2017) investigated how the victims experienced the investigative interviews following the Utøya terrorist attack. They found that 73% reported the investigative interview was not stressful or stressful only to a small degree, 17% reported the investigative interview as "partly stressful," while 10% perceived the interview as

stressful to a "large extent." It was also noted that 27.4% reported the interview as a negative experience but, at the same time, 88.2% reported to have experienced being listened to and understood.

In police interviews, investigators rely on the interviewees' memory and their ability to communicate details of what happened. This may represent a particular challenge when interviewing traumatized individuals. Memory of trauma can be said to be controversial (McNally, 2005), but research on traumatic recall has found that there is a tendency for involuntary memory (e.g. intrusive memories) to be enhanced in clinical populations whereas voluntary memory is likely to be incomplete, fragmented, and disorganized (Brewin, 2007). However, in the investigative interview context, it is difficult to conclude exactly how trauma or emotional arousal will influence the memory process, for instance, to what degree the interviewee will recall central or peripheral details from the event (Christianson, 1992; Ginet & Verkampt, 2007). Post-traumatic reactions often include experiences of anxiety that in turn may influence cognitive functioning, such as attention and working memory (Derakshan & Eysenck, 2009). Anxiety serves as a competing task to the recall of accurate details from the event and may reduce the interviewees' ability to do a thorough search of memory of what happened (Kieckhaefer, Vallano, & Compo, 2014).

Attending a police interview after having witnessed the brutality on 22 July may be a particularly distressing or difficult situation for the victims who, in a legal context, are defined as vulnerable interviewees (Justis- og Beredskapsdepartementet, 2012). For instance, the interviewee could experience trouble in concentrating, flashbacks, or overwhelming feelings of anxiety or sadness, highlighting the importance of rapport in these interviews. Rapport might also have been particularly important in the Utøya investigative interviews given the fact that the perpetrator was dressed as a police officer. One of the main tasks of the police is to approach these individuals in ways that contribute to minimizing stress and the potential trauma of going through a legal process (UK Ministry of Justice, 2011a, 2011b). This represents a challenging situation for the investigator who must accommodate and adapt to the state of the

interviewee in order to facilitate communication. When interviewing a traumatized person, it is essential that the investigator is conscious of how the interview situation can trigger negative reactions and aims to safeguard the interviewee. This requires the police investigator to be attentive to the psychological needs that may arise in the process to reduce the risk of re-traumatizing or exacerbating the state of the interviewee, demonstrating the significance of the investigator's approach.

1.2 Investigative interviewing

The investigative interview is an interaction between the police investigator and the interviewee where the aim is to elicit and document an accurate, complete, and detailed account of a given event (Milne & Powell, 2010). To provide information, interviewees must initiate a series of cognitively demanding processes to answer the questions posed by the investigator. They need to understand what is being asked of them before searching their long-term memory for information that must be verbalized. In this process, the interviewer's task is to facilitate the interviewees' memory and narrative by asking questions and communicating appropriately (Dando, Geiselman, Macleod, & Griffiths, 2016). The investigator's approach is governed by law (e.g. Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 1950; Criminal Procedure Act of 1981, 2006; Prosecution Instructions, 1985), investigative aims and the interview guide that he/she applies. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge the interview as a dynamic, interpersonal process, where the quality of the interview relationship varies because of social chemistry, the extent to which the parties understand each other, or other contextual or relational factors that influence the individual's state and behavior.

In Norway police officers are trained in the Police University College's model of investigative interviewing: the PHS Model (Bjerknes & Johansen, 2009). Police investigators also have the opportunity to gain further education through the one-week national investigative interviewing training program, KREATIV (Fahsing & Rachlew, 2009; Rachlew & Fahsing, 2015; Riksadvokaten, 2013). In some countries, such as the UK, it has been suggested that "Specialist training should be developed to

interview witnesses with particular needs. This should include interviewing child witnesses, traumatised witnesses and witnesses with a mental disorder …" (UK Ministry of Justice, 2011a, p. 9). In Norway, however, the interviewer training is general, implying that there is no specific emphasis on interviewing traumatized individuals. The training is based on PEACE, the British police training package in investigative interviewing (Clarke & Milne, 2001; Milne & Bull, 1999; Milne, Shaw, & Bull, 2007). PEACE incorporates two main approaches to investigative interviewing, namely the (enhanced) cognitive interview (Fisher, 1995; Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, 2010) and conversation management (Shepherd, 1988; Shepherd & Griffiths, 2013). The acronym PEACE represents the five phases of the interview; 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) Engage and Explain, 3) Account, 4) Closure, and 5) Evaluation. Rapport is part of the engage and explain phase, in which the aim is to explain to the interviewee the purpose of the interview and build a working relationship that contributes to the interviewee generating information (Milne & Bull, 1999). Rapport, however, should be considered a dynamic state that can change over the course of an interaction and is important throughout the interview (Abbe & Brandon, 2013; Fogarty, Augoustinos, & Kettler, 2013; Ord, Shaw, & Green, 2011; Vanderhallen & Vervaeke, 2014; Walsh & Bull, 2012).

1.3 Defining rapport

Rapport is the experience of a relationship and a connection with another person; a connection on a social, cognitive, emotional, and/or behavioral level—the relational context or chemistry that makes us "click" or get along. Tickle-Degnen and Rosenthal (1990) have provided a theoretical framework describing the nature of rapport, emphasizing behavioral aspects in addition to affective dimensions of experience. They describe the concept as consisting of three essential, interrelating components: 1) mutual attentiveness (shared interest and degree of involvement in the interaction), 2) positivity (feelings of mutual friendliness and care in the relationship with the other), and 3) coordination (the balance, harmony or smoothness of the interaction, the experience of being synchronized). The structure of rapport

consists of the same components over time, but the importance or weighting of each component is dynamic. In early phases of an interaction, attentiveness and positivity are weighted more heavily than coordination for the development of rapport, whereas in later stages, coordination and attentiveness are more important for maintaining rapport. The model is not developed specifically for forensic interviewing, but research and theoretical contributions within investigative interviewing often refer to its components to describe rapport building (e.g. Abbe & Brandon, 2014). A somewhat different view on rapport stems from Carl Rogers (1940), who described this as a relationship between therapist and client that consists of warmth, trust, and acceptance— a relational gestalt necessary for therapeutic progress. Rapport requires the therapist to have an open and non-judgmental attitude, and respect and interest for the experience and perspective of the client. In psychotherapy, rapport is a necessary condition for developing a working alliance; an emotional bond, common understanding, and collaborative relationship between therapist and client often considered imperative for reaching therapeutic goals. As stated by Bordin: "… the working alliance between the person who seeks change and the one who offers to be a change agent is one of the keys, if not *the* key, to the change process" (1979, p. 525). The working alliance is part of the therapeutic relationship; a reliable predictor of positive outcomes in therapy (Ardito & Rabellino, 2011; Horvath, Del Re, Fluckiger, & Symonds, 2011; Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Lambert & Barley, 2001).

There is no consensus on a definition of rapport in investigative interviewing (Abbe & Brandon, 2013, 2014; Kieckhaefer et al., 2014; Vallano & Schreiber Compo, 2015), but it concerns the social influence of the interviewer: how he or she approaches the interviewee to develop a relational context that make the individual feel comfortable, maximize his or her cognitive resources (e.g., access to memories), and provide a detailed account. In short, a relationship that facilitates communication and achieves investigative aims. Vanderhallen, Vervaeke, and Holmberg (2011) have provided a conceptual analysis of rapport in forensic settings, suggesting it consists of a relationship that provides warmth, is harmonious and natural, offers trust, and stimulates cooperation. They underline the close relationship between rapport and the

concept of working alliance, for instance with regard to an emotional bond. In a similar fashion to rapport being necessary to develop a working alliance in therapy, rapport in investigative interviewing is essential to develop a working relationship that contributes to the generation of information about a given event. We consider many of these aspects to be relevant for facilitating communication in investigative interviewing of traumatized victims as we define rapport as *a goal-oriented working relationship based on a shared social and emotional understanding.*

1.4 Building and maintaining rapport

"Unfortunately, police cannot control the viewing conditions or the quality of the witness' memory. Of the various factors that police can control, the most productive approach is to concentrate on how they interview witnesses" (Fisher, Ross, & Cahill, 2010, p. 56). How should police investigators develop and maintain rapport with interviewees? There is no straightforward answer to this question. The development of the interview relationship is dynamic and influenced by numerous factors pertaining to context (e.g., type of case, status of the interviewee, what type of information is being sought), the interviewer (e.g., personality, experience, attitudes, training), and the interviewee (e.g., developmental age, vulnerability, motivation, emotional state, ability to communicate). Sometimes interviewees can be motivated, and willing and able to communicate about what has happened, so the investigator is not required to put in much effort to obtain a good account. At other times, it can be more difficult to build rapport if the interviewee experiences reluctance, insecurity, or confusion about the interview process, anxiety or strong emotions, or difficulties communicating.

Theory and research related to rapport has been provided for different investigative contexts, for example the interviewing of children (e.g. K. Collins, Doherty-Sneddon, & Doherty, 2014; Myklebust & Bjorklund, 2010) or suspects (e.g. Kelly, Miller, Redlich, & Kleinman, 2013; Moraes, 2014; Walsh & Bull, 2012). In the following, we will describe the most common approaches to building rapport with adult interviewees based on interview protocols considered comparable to the Norwegian

investigative interviewing training (e.g. Fisher & Geiselman, 1992; Milne & Bull, 1999; Ord et al., 2011; Shepherd & Griffiths, 2013; UK Ministry of Justice, 2011a).

To develop rapport, the interviewer should be non-coercive, non-judgmental and aim to create an informal and relaxed interview context. Initially, the investigator should greet the interviewee in a friendly and respectful manner and show a genuine interest in him/her. The aim of this stage is to make the interviewee socially comfortable and to establish a smooth conversational turn-taking. The interview room should be neutral, without any distractive elements. The interviewer should personalize the interview and use open-ended questions to prepare the interviewee for the style or format of the interview. The interviewee should be given an explanation of the reason for, and purpose of, the interview and the respective roles, rights, and regulations. A vital element of this initial phase is to clarify how the interview will be conducted and if the interviewee has any needs or queries.

In addition to being conscious of investigative aims, the investigator must be observant of the relational processes that occur. This requires that he/she is attentive, flexible, and able to assess the state of the interviewee in order to approach him or her in an appropriate way. For instance, if the interviewee expresses that he/she is nervous about the interview, this should be addressed with an aim to make him/her feel more comfortable. To appraise the state of the interviewee and respond appropriately, the investigator must understand what is happening in the interaction and thus demonstrate the importance of concepts like mentalization and empathy in police work (Risan & Skoglund, 2013). Empathy has been defined in various ways throughout history, depending on academic field and perspective (Duan & Hill, 1996; Wispe, 1986). Even though the concept has not been clearly defined in investigative interviewing (Oxburgh & Ost, 2011), it is still considered important for the development of rapport (Dando & Oxburgh, 2016; Holmberg, 2004; Madsen & Holmberg, 2014; Vanderhallen & Vervaeke, 2014). In the cognitive interview, Fisher and Geiselman (1992) suggest that empathy, in addition to personalizing the interview (e.g., addressing the interviewee by using his/her first name, treating the interviewee as an individual with a unique set of needs), should be one of the guiding

principles for developing rapport. They emphasize the importance of the interviewer taking the interviewees' perspective and communicating their understanding: "… the interviewer must feel and express his/her concern about the victim's plight, as a person who has undergone a potentially life-altering experience" (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010, p. 323). If the interviewee perceives the investigator as empathetic, it makes it possible to experience understanding and trust which may lead to a safe relational atmosphere or climate, making the interviewee more comfortable and thus in a better position to provide a detailed narrative.

In interview guides, empathy and understanding is often connected to active listening—a pathway to detecting what is going on inside the other person. To understand and show empathy for the interviewees' thoughts and feelings, one must observe, perceive, and respond appropriately to his/her expression. This could include not interrupting the interviewee, perceiving the interviewees' level of emotional activation/arousal, or affirming the experience of the interviewee. In the process, the interviewer can use different nonverbal (e.g., proxemics, posture, eye contact, mirroring, paralanguage) and verbal behaviors (e.g., asking neutral and open-ended questions, summarizing and reflecting, querying, echo probing) to enhance communication (Milne & Bull, 1999; Shepherd & Griffiths, 2013).

1.5 Empirical background

Rapport is an important part of the cognitive interview (CI) (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992); a well-established research-based protocol for interviewing witnesses. Many studies have been conducted on the CI (Kohnken, Milne, Memon, & Bull, 1999; Memon, Meissner, & Fraser, 2010), but there is little empirical research available to determine how rapport specifically contributes to interview outcomes (Abbe & Brandon, 2013). Research on rapport has been conducted in various investigative contexts. Examples are military investigations and for the purpose of gathering human intelligence (e.g. Alison, Alison, Noone, Elntib, & Christiansen, 2013; Redlich, Kelly, & Miller, 2014), police investigative interviewing of children (e.g. K. Collins et al., 2014; Lamb, Orbach, Hershkowitz, Esplin, & Horowitz, 2007), and

criminal suspects (e.g. Kelly et al., 2013; Walsh & Bull, 2012). In the current review, however, we emphasize research on cooperative, adult, and vulnerable interviewees who we consider to be most relevant with regard to the current research examining the interviewing of traumatized victims that followed the Utøya massacre.

Even though interview guides generally emphasize the importance of rapport when interviewing witnesses, research has shown this varies in practice. For example, research in the UK on the quality of PEACE investigative interviews showed that no rapport was observed in 47% of the real-life interviews examined (Clarke & Milne, 2001). Even though, another study found that rapport building was one of the components *perceived* to be most frequently used, with 87% of investigators stating that they almost always or always built rapport (Dando, Willcock, & Milne, 2008). There might be several reasons for this discrepancy, one being that what investigators say is not always the same as what they actually do (Walsh & Bull, 2011).

One of the first empirical studies examining rapport per se was by Collins, Lincoln, and Frank (2002) who experimentally studied the influence of three different interviewer-attitude conditions ('rapport', 'neutral' and 'abrupt') on the memory retrieval of mock witnesses after watching a dramatic video. They found that when the interviewer took a rapport-building approach, the participants recalled significantly more accurate and complete information compared to the participants where the interviewer took a neutral or abrupt attitude, showing the importance of rapport for the generation of information. A similar study was conducted by Vallano and Schreiber Compo (2011), in which the aim was to investigate the influence of verbal rapport-building techniques on the accuracy of interviewees' accounts in addition to their susceptibility to post-event information. The study found that rapport building increased the quality of the interviewees recall after watching a short video of a mock crime, and interviewees in a situation where rapport had been built provided less misinformation compared to the participants in situations of no rapport. The authors suggest that rapport building and creating a comfortable environment may be particularly beneficial when the interviewer uses an open-ended interviewing style, and where witnesses have been exposed to post-event misinformation. Vallano

et al state that "Failing to build rapport in the presence of misinformation places the participant at the greatest risk for incorporating false details into their witness report" (2011, p. 966).

Kieckhaefer, Vallano, and Schreiber Compo (2014) extended the research by Collins et al (2002) and Vallano and Schreiber Compo (2011) in their study on witness recall and suggestibility. They examined the effects of rapport building in the presence of misinformation at different times in the investigative process, and whether reported effects are related to experienced anxiety. Participants in the study watched a video of a mock crime and were then interviewed about what they had seen. They were exposed to an interviewer who built high or developed low rapport either before or after they received post-event misinformation, and the participants' anxiety level was measured throughout the study. Kieckhaefer et al (2014) found that participants who experienced high rapport before receiving post-event information provided more accurate information in a subsequent interview compared to the participants in the low rapport condition. One of the main findings of the study was the importance of timing; rapport building was beneficial before and not after the participants received misinformation. Another interesting finding was that high rapport reduced anxiety but did not affect/enhance interviewee recall. As a matter of fact, rapport was even found to have a negative influence on witness recall, as the high-rapport group reported an increase in the amount of other false details. The study failed to replicate the benefits of rapport as presented by Collins et al (2002) and Vallano and Schreiber Compo (2011), and even found a potential increase in other false information due to rapport. Nevertheless, the study also supported and extended the findings of Vallano and Schreiber Compo (2011) by showing; 1) that rapport building is beneficial to witness recall, particularly when suggestive information is provided, and 2) that the timing of when post-event information is given is important and does influence eyewitness memory.

Vallano, Evans, Schreiber Compo, and Kieckhaefer (2015) surveyed law enforcement officers about how they defined and built rapport; whether and how often rapport-building techniques were employed, and how they perceived the effectiveness of the

techniques. Rapport was described as a relationship based on trust and communication, and acknowledged as an essential factor for successful interviewing by most of the participants. A vast majority of the police officers defined rapport as a positive relationship, and others defined it as any relationship, either positive or negative. The most common verbal rapport-building techniques reported were to discuss common interests with the interviewee, to use self-disclosure, and to be direct about the interview to establish a connection. The most commonly-reported nonverbal techniques involved displaying an understanding, having a friendly demeanor, using open body language, and treating the interviewee with respect.

Holmberg (2004) examined how victims of rape and victims of aggravated assault perceived the style, attitudes, and responses of the police interviewer in their respective investigative interviews. In addition, the study investigated the victims' reactions during the interviews and their inclination to provide or omit information. The analysis of written interviews (questionnaires copied from Holmberg and Christianson; 2002), revealed the victims' experience of two police interviewing styles: the dominant and the humanitarian approach. The dominant style was characterized by the interviewer being perceived as impatient, aggressive, rushed, brusque, condemning, and unfriendly, while the humanitarian approach was perceived as accommodating, engaging, positive, emphathetic, cooperative, helpful, friendly, and obliging. The results of the study showed that a dominant approach by an interviewer and the anxiety reported by interviewees were significantly associated with crime victims' omissions of information. The humanitarian interviewing style was significantly related to the victims providing more information in their narratives. Interviewees who felt respected reported less anxiety, and provided more details. The humanitarian style promoted rapport through the interviewer displaying empathy and personalizing the interview. The style encourages the interviewer to be an active listener in an interviewee-led approach, where the interviewee may experience an increased sense of control (e.g., he/she is given time to reflect).

In Vanderhallen, Vervaeke, and Holmberg's (2011) study on witness and suspect perceptions of working alliance and interviewing style, they also found that the

humanitarian interviewing style increased the likelihood of developing a working alliance with interviewees, while the dominant approach was regarded as a predictor of a less favorable working alliance. Further, Holmberg and Madsen (2014) empirically examined how rapport, operationalized as a humanitarian style interview (compared with a dominant, non-rapport interview), had an effect on interview outcome with regard to interviewees' memory performance. The participants were first exposed to memory stimuli through a computer simulation and then interviewed twice with the same approach (after one week and after six months). The results of the study showed that the participants reported more information altogether when subjected to a humanitarian interview style, whereas participants in dominant, non-rapport interviews reported less information. The results can to a certain extent be considered in line with the findings of Collins et al. (2002) and Vallano and Schreiber Compo (2011) described above. In another study by Madsen and Holmberg (2014), the humanitarian interview style was found to have a positive influence on the psychological well-being of the interviewee (see section on therapeutic jurisprudence p. 27 for more details regarding this study).

In a recent study by Jakobsen et al (2016), the authors examined the potential conflict between objectivity and the police interviewer being an information-gatherer within their legal framework, and providing trauma support. They examined 19 videotaped investigative interviews from the Utøya case and interviewed 17 investigators who conducted the interviews. The study investigated the detectives' possibilities and constraints for providing trauma support during the investigative interview process. To different degrees, the participants in the study perceived the relationship between objectivity and support as a challenge. Support was described as phase-bound and was mostly observed at the beginning and the end of the interview. Of particular interest for the current study are the different ways the police interviewers showed support, which was categorized into three types: 1) an indirect form, including planning and preparation, metacommunication, and providing the victims with information; 2) a latent form, as shown through a special way of listening and letting the interviewees control their own narrative and exposure; and 3) a direct form, referring to verbally responding to the to the victim.

Even though many of the mentioned studies have showed some positive results with regard to the benefits of rapport, they are open for discussion. In Abbe and Brandon's (2013) review on the role of rapport in investigative interviewing, they infer that little empirical research is available to determine how rapport contributes to interview outcomes. Vallano and Schreiber Compo (2015) also noted this in their theoretical and empirical review of rapport building stating that: "… the emerging research on rapport-building in the context of adult witness interviewing has yielded an inconclusive pattern of findings regarding its effect on cooperative witness recall" (p. 92). In sum, we have little knowledge of the core characteristics of rapport, how real-world investigators conceptualize rapport building, and what general and specific techniques they may employ in different interview contexts. Furthermore, if we consider the literature on investigative interviewing of vulnerable populations, it is scarce. Research has been conducted on, for instance, children and people with learning disabilities (e.g. Bull, 2010), a few studies have examined the issue of trauma in investigative interviewing (e.g. Jakobsen et al., 2016; Peterson & Biggs, 1997), but to our knowledge, this dissertation is the first empirical study to examine rapport in investigative interviewing of adult traumatized interviewees. Through an emphasis of promoting research in the field in between academics and practitioners (Oxburgh & Dando, 2011), we hope the current project examining interviews of traumatized victims can contribute to reducing the gap in the literature.

1.6 Therapeutic jurisprudence

The scope of therapeutic jurisprudence concerns how knowledge of mental health can bring insights into the development of law as a therapeutic agent; that is, how the legal system, legal processes, and legal actors have an impact on emotional life and psychological well-being. It is about how the law functions as a social force that has consequences that can be therapeutic or anti-therapeutic (Petrucci, Winick, & Wexler, 2003; Winick, 2002). Therapeutic jurisprudence provides a perspective on processes within the legal system that can reduce potential harm and promote the psychological well-being of the individuals involved. In the context of investigative interviewing,

therapeutic jurisprudence is about promoting the well-being of the interviewee prior to, during, and after the interview. With regard to police interviews, it is important to acknowledge the potential damage or harm that may be inflicted on an interviewee. If an interviewee experiences strong negative emotions, the manner in which the interviewer accommodates these states can determine whether the interviewee experiences increased distress or if he/she becomes more at ease, demonstrating how the police interviewer holds the power or potential to influence the well-being of the interviewee. It should be noted that taking a therapeutic jurisprudential approach to investigative interviewing does not undermine investigative aims, but can rather be seen as a consequence of how these aims are achieved.

The cognitive interview has been found to be effective for interviewing witnesses experiencing emotional arousal (Ginet & Verkampt, 2007). Furthermore, Fisher and Geiselman (2010) have described several components of the cognitive interview that have the potential to promote victims' psychological health and thus, therapeutic jurisprudence. Recommendations from the protocol include the fact that the interviewer should develop a meaningful, personal rapport with the interviewee (e.g., develop a trusting relationship, express concern about the victim's plight), treat the interviewee with dignity and respect, preview the interview to reduce uncertainty about the process, adapt his/her communicative approach to the state of the interviewee (e.g., not interrupt the interviewee, use open-ended questions and witness-compatible questioning), accommodate negative thoughts and feelings (e.g., unburden the victim), give empathetic responses and supportive comments when suitable, and transfer control to the interviewee to encourage active participation.

Another perspective on achieving therapeutic effects from investigative interviewing comes from spaced cognitive interview (SCI) (Shepherd, Mortimer, Turner, & Watson, 1999). The SCI combines standard prolonged exposure procedures with explicit memory-retrieval techniques of context reinstatement, and focused and extensive retrieval. The approach emphasizes the therapeutic potential of prolonged experience of distress while narrating the content of traumatic memories, drawing on the benefits of exposure often observed in psychotherapy. The notion is that repeated

recall, or exposure to mental images of traumatic memories, contribute to increased verbalization of what happened and to processing the trauma, making it less fragmented and contributing to the interviewees' healing process. If memories are processed and made tolerable, it shows how the SCI can contribute to achieve both therapeutic and forensic aims (e.g., making it easier for the interviewee to testify in court).

Madsen and Holmberg (2014) in an experimental study aimed to define, describe and measure psychological well-being from a therapeutic jurisprudence perspective in investigative interviewing. In their study, they measured the causal effect of police interviewer style on interviewees' psychological well-being (measured by sense of coherence and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory). The participants participated in an interactive computer simulation and was then interviewed one week later and again six months later about what happened. The participants were assigned to one of two groups with different interviewer styles (humanitarian versus non-rapport, described earlier). The analysis showed how the humanitarian approach to interviewing was related to an increase in the interviewees' psychological well-being. However, the need for more research on therapeutic jurisprudence is acknowledged (Petrucci et al., 2003), and we hope the current research can contribute with further knowledge that can relate to this important issue.

1.7 Aim of the study

The purpose of this program of research was to explore and provide empirical knowledge of the psychological processes of building rapport in police interviews of traumatized victims. Based on interviews of 21 police investigators who interviewed survivors of the Utøya massacre, we aimed to explore the overarching research question: How can a police investigator approach a traumatized interviewee to develop and maintain rapport and at the same time promote the well-being of the individual? The specific aims of each of the three papers are described below.

1.7.1 Aim of Paper 1

There is a gap in the literature on the psychological processes of building rapport in police interviews with traumatized interviewees. The main objective in this study was to explore and describe factors considered important and useful in facilitating safety, and establishing and maintaining rapport with traumatized interviewees. To explore these factors, interviews of police investigators who interviewed victims of the Utøya massacre were conducted. Specifically, we examined the following research questions: (1) What do the investigators consider important and useful when aiming to facilitate an atmosphere of safety in an investigative interview? and (2) What do the investigators consider important and useful in establishing and maintaining rapport with a traumatized interviewee?

1.7.2 Aim of Paper 2

One of the main findings of Paper 1 was how the investigators described the importance of accommodating the interviewees' negative feelings in order to maintain rapport in the investigative interview relationship. This was the point of departure for Paper 2, looking to go one step further by examining the process of *how* the detectives handled interviewees' distress in the interview. The aim of this study was to qualitatively explore approaches to police interviewing of traumatized victims experiencing distress. We investigated the research question: What do police

investigators regard as useful approaches to regulating distress, maintaining rapport, and promoting the well-being of the interviewee?

1.7.3 Aim of Paper 3

There is little research into, or theory relating to, working on an emotional level when conducting investigative interviewing. The scope of this study was to explore how the theoretical concept of emotional intelligence may be of value for police investigators' management of interviewees' emotions in investigative interviews. The aims of the study included defining emotional intelligence in the context of investigative interviewing, present key considerations for training interviewers in managing emotions, and discussing the implications of implementing the concept of emotional intelligence in investigative interviewing.

2. Method

This section outlines the methodological approach of the research, emphasizing the empirical studies reported in Papers 1 and 2. As a final point of this part of the thesis, the process of reflexivity in the research process as well as ethical considerations of the study are discussed.

2.1 Methodological approach

Qualitative research methods are different strategies for collecting, organizing, and interpreting textual material derived from talk or observation. The goal is to explore, describe, and analyze characteristics or qualities of the phenomenon in question while acknowledging the researcher as an active participant in the development of knowledge (Malterud, 2001, 2003).

The material for studies 1 and 2 were based on semi-structured interviews directed toward exploring the lived experiences of police detectives involved in interviewing survivors of the Utøya massacre. These were examined in relation to the research questions through a thematic analysis based on a reflexive hermeneutic phenomenological epistemology. Inspired by the insights of Gadamer and Heidegger, and of hermeneutic phenomenology, Binder, Holgersen, and Moltu (2012) proposed an exploratory–reflexive approach to studying what happens in psychotherapy. The approach emphasizes a combination of phenomenological exploration with hermeneutic interpretation and reflexivity in an attempt to unveil the world as experienced by the subjects through their life-world stories. The aim is to explore both idiosyncratic experiences as well as common themes among multiple participants, and was considered appropriate with regard to the scope of the current study investigating rapport in police interviews.

A phenomenological perspective emphasizes the exploration of structure and organizing principles of experience. In the current research, the phenomenon of rapport is studied in the converging space between the researcher and the participant, providing different perspectives on rapport and generating qualitative material for

further analysis. In this sense, the individual and experience, or subject and object, cannot be separated; they are co-constituting (Heidegger, 1962/1996; Laverty, 2003). Meaning is co-created between the two persons in the interview and between the researcher and data in the analyses. We acknowledge context as an influencing factor in the development of data; a context that should be interpreted to further understand how the material emerged. This necessitates hermeneutic processes of interpretation: processes affected by the individual's background and preconceptions. As stated by Malterud (2001), in qualitative research, it is important to acknowledge that the researcher's position and perspective is a significant influencing factor for what type of knowledge that develops. Acknowledging researchers' subjectivity leads us to the importance of reflexivity—the exploration of *how* subjective and intersubjective contextual dimensions influence the development and transformation of data. It is a way of relating to the research process through continuously reflecting upon the phenomena under study and how they are influenced by subjective and intersubjective interpretative elements (Finlay & Gough, 2003).

In the current research project, reflexivity refers to the continuous dialogue between the motivations and preconceptions of the researchers, the shared interview experience with the participants, and the interview transcripts, thereby creating a dynamic development of data allowing us to move beyond our previous understandings (Finlay, 2003). This explorative–reflexive approach allows data to develop in the interplay between the preconceptions of the researchers, the phenomenological exploration of the interview experience and the transcripts, and reflexivity and interpretations of the material (Binder et al., 2012). The aim of the analysis is to identify patterns of meaning in the material that can be described as themes representing important aspects of the participants' experiences in relation to the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Paper 3 can be regarded as an extension of Papers 1 and 2. This is a theoretical study examining the usefulness of the concept of emotional intelligence in relation to established preconceptions of investigative interviewing. Based on this theoretical

investigation, we also suggest four key considerations for training interviewers in managing emotions.

2.2 Participants

The aim of the sampling was to select participants who had experienced the circumstances of the focus of the study and who are diverse enough to enhance possibilities of rich stories of the particular experience (Laverty, 2003). The Utøya investigative interviews were conducted all over Norway. To obtain an overview of police districts that had carried out high numbers of investigative interviews in the Utøya case, we enquired with the National Criminal Investigation Service, which coordinated the investigation. From there, we recruited study participants by asking investigation leaders in different districts to nominate potential candidates for research interviews. Twenty-one participants (nine men and 12 women) from 13 locations wished to take part in the study. We do not know how many did not accept to participate. The inclusion criteria were that the investigator had; 1) completed the national training program, KREATIV, and 2) conducted at least one investigative interview with a young adult (over 16 years old) in the Utøya case. All the participants but one, who had predominately interviewed individuals aged between 14 and 16 years in the Utøya case, met both criteria. Most of the Utøya investigative interviews took place in the first month following the 22 July, although a few were as late as December 2011. Altogether, the participants in this study interviewed approximately 150–170 victims (constituting approximately 30% of all the interviews) in the Utøya case.

2.3 Researchers

The first author (PR) of all three studies is a teacher of police studies with ten years of clinical experience. The second author (PEB) is a professor of clinical psychology with 20 years of experience. The third author (RM) is a professor of forensic psychology with 20 years of experience. PEB and RM supervised the project. All

authors share an interest in experiential research and clinical phenomena related to vulnerable states and relational processes.

2.4 Data collection

We used semi-structured interviews to generate information to examine the respective research questions. The development of the interview guide followed Kvale and Brinkmann's (2015) guidelines, emphasizing a phenomenological generation of data. The approach aims to develop a relationship with the participant that lays the ground for an investigation of experiences from a first-person perspective and the organizing principles that give form and meaning within the individual's life world (Laverty, 2003). The guide employed terms and concepts from the participants' interview training, the PHS Model (Bjerknes & Johansen, 2009), and KREATIV (Fahsing & Rachlew, 2009; Rachlew & Fahsing, 2015; Riksadvokaten, 2013) to guide, adapt, and sensitize us to the first-person perspective of the investigator.

We conducted two pilot interviews of experienced police detectives to evaluate the interview guide with regard to structure, wording of questions, and pragmatic value. Prior to being interviewed, the participants received information regarding the purpose of the study and the main questions they would be asked in addition to a consent form. The interviews were thematically divided into two parts: the first focused on interviewing traumatized interviewees in general, and the second phase targeted the Utøya case. The rationale for dividing the interview into these two parts was to; 1) obtain richer descriptions of the phenomena under study, and 2) to compare and be able to describe the possible differences between the Utøya interviews and other interviews. Examples of questions in the interview guide are: Can you tell me about one particular time when you have experienced establishing rapport in an investigative interview? What do you need to do in order to establish rapport? When rapport is established, what do you do to maintain it? What was your experience of establishing rapport in the Utøya interviews? What is your experience of traumatized interviewees and how does it influence you in the interview? Did you find that establishing rapport in the Utøya interviews was different from how you

established rapport in other interviews? Did you experience any difficulties with rapport during this interview? Did you experience any emotional challenges in this case?

PR conducted all the interviews. The interviews were voluntary, audio recorded and carried out between February and September 2013 at (or near) the participants' place of work. The average duration of the interviews was 56.7 minutes (range 31–82 minutes, SD = 12.6). All the interviews were transcribed in the days that followed each interview.

2.5 Data analysis

NVivo 10 (QSR, 2012) was used to organize and analyze the transcribed data. An exploratory-reflexive thematic analysis was used to examine the interviews (Binder et al., 2012). In the analysis, the aim was to identify meaning patterns that could be formulated as key thematic categories relevant to the research questions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A meaning pattern is a result of condensing and summing up meaning units in the material considered relevant for the research questions. As stated by Binder et al: "… the identification of a 'meaning pattern' combines the hermeneutic element of interpretation and the empathic use of imagination on the researcher's part with the phenomenological element of commitment to the participants' lived experience" (2012, p. 115). We used quotations from the interviews to give access to the data, explain the content of the themes, and to be transparent in the research process (Binder et al., 2012; Sandelowski & Leeman, 2012). The analysis of the data went through the following four main steps:

(1)   After each interview, notes were made in a journal about the main impressions from the interview to promote reflexive awareness about how the material emerged (e.g., reflections concerning the interpersonal dynamics of the interview, or how the impressions from the interview could challenge the preconceptions of the researcher).

(2)   The interviews were transcribed by PR with the aim of producing text that was, to the greatest possible extent, a faithful reflection of the original material and the utterances (Malterud, 2001). PR and PEB read the transcribed material to obtain a basic sense of the participants' experiences. The material was then examined and assigned meaning codes for separable content units. These were later reviewed by PR and PEB to form an inter-observational agreement between meaning codes and the material. For example, the following utterances from one of the participants was connected to the content unit 'Facilitating safety': *"I tried to prepare myself emotionally and think 'this is my job'; I should get the account and ensure that they feel the safety I talked about earlier. They come here and testify and… yeah, preparing the ground for them."* Other examples of meaning codes include "Showing openness"; "Finding an approach"; 'Interviewer preparations"; and "Relational ruptures".

(3)   The meaning codes were grouped with regard to capturing different aspects of the participants' experience considered important in relation to the aim of the study. In this phase, the search for meaning patterns is a main priority. "A 'meaning pattern' appears when we condense and sum up the meaning units of relevance for a particular research topic and compare the experiences inherent in the narratives of several participants. That is, a pattern emerges when there is convergence between the experiences of different participants, and when there is a moderate degree of divergence between them that makes the pattern thematically rich" (Binder et al., 2012, p. 115). In the analysis, groups of meanings were first interpreted and summarized, and then formulated as themes by PR and PEB. For example, the units connected to the meaning code 'Showing openness' were organized under the theme 'Preparation through reflection and openness: balancing knowing and being receptive'.

(4)   The original data were re-examined by PR, PEB, and RM to form a consensus on themes and to evaluate whether units or themes should be

modified or added. We did not add any units in study 1 or 2, but a few were
renamed in study 1. The results are presented as themes, that is, how some
level of patterned response or meaning in the data captures important
aspects of the participants' experience in relation to the research questions
(Braun & Clarke, 2006).

We emphasize a reflexive evaluation of the research process. This included an
awareness of how the researcher's own pre-understanding and motivation could
influence the research process, reflexivity on the development and interpretation of
data, and reflections on the usefulness of the study with regard to existing policies
and current research on the field of study (Finlay, 2006; B. Stige, Malterud, &
Midtgarden, 2009).

2.6 Reflexivity in the research process

Researcher reflexivity provides an opportunity for the researcher to understand how
her or his own experiences and understanding of the world may affect the research
process (Morrow, 2005). "Reflexivity in research can be described as the use of a
critical, self-aware lens to interrogate both the research process and our interpretation
or representation of participants' lives in our social world. It's a vehicle that
acknowledges the complexity and messiness of our qualitative project. At the same
time, it involves a challenging, uncomfortable, ambiguous process that can run the
risk of solipsistic infinite regress" (Finlay, 2016, p. 1). Reflexivity concerns the
researcher's ability to be self-aware, critical, and to continuously evaluate how
subjective factors and intersubjective dynamics influence the research process. It is
about recognizing how we actively construct knowledge (Finlay, 2002b; Finlay &
Gough, 2003), or how we may embrace subjectivity and use it as data (Morrow,
2005). To conduct trustworthy research requires the researcher to acknowledge
his/her own subjectivity as a part of the research context. "Researchers acknowledge
that they are not separated from the field they study; they are themselves positioned
in it and must therefore reflect on this position, which includes self-inquiry and
examination of the assumptions guiding the research process" (B. Stige et al., 2009,

p. 1512). Reflexivity in this study concerned the researcher acknowledging the contextual dimensions of the interview situation simultaneously with preserving his or her role as researcher. This involved the researcher recognizing his/her own role as an active interpreter through reflecting on own pre-understanding, subjectivity, impressions, motivation, expectations, and experiences with the participants.

From the development of the study to its final presentation, I have sought to be aware of my relationship to the research project; that is, how it developed, my motivation, and my preconceptions and goals. In 2005, I started working as a clinical psychologist in the public health service, where I met several patients with mixed experiences of undergoing police interviews. Some were quite pleased with how the police conducted interviews, while others reported experiencing interviews as being uncomfortable and having a negative impact on their mental health and well-being. In 2008, I began working as a teacher/lecturer in psychology at the Norwegian Police University College (NPUC) while obtaining a part-time position as a clinician at a local hospital. At the NPUC, I taught psychological topics related to operational police work (e.g., stress management, mental illness) and to investigations (e.g., the cognitive interview) to police students. In my first years of working within the police sector, I became aware that clinical knowledge provided a valuable perspective on many aspects of police work, particularly with regard to investigative interviewing and mental health issues, and the parallels to psychotherapy. After numerous discussions with experienced investigators on the topic of interviewing vulnerable persons, my impression was that the police often did a good job when encountering these individuals. However, my impression was also that the stories and opinions I had heard did not necessarily derive from theory or their training, which made me curious about what really goes on in police interviews. Specifically, I developed an interest in how police officers approach individuals experiencing psychological difficulties in interviews: a reasonably unexplored field of study. This led to thoughts of combining clinical experience and knowledge of police work into a research project looking at how police practices influence vulnerable individuals in investigative interviews. The idea was to consider the practices of police investigators

and examine approaches to achieving investigative aims while also attending to the well-being of the interviewee. Focusing on rapport, a well-established concept within forensic interviewing, seemed natural given the premises. The main motivation for the project was to explore preconceptions of police interviewing and to challenge these established conceptions with the aim of developing new knowledge on the topic of investigative interviewing of traumatized interviewees.

The context of the research interviews was a severe and tragic incident, an incident in which many young people lost their lives, families were devastated, and a whole country was in grief. The incident also had victims who survived a mass shooting and police investigators who had a job to do. There is no doubt that working on such a case had the potential of having a major influence on the lives of the police detectives, making the safeguarding of the participants in the study equally important. Furthermore, in the Utøya case, the police received a considerable amount of criticism in the media, particularly considering the operational work. This may have influenced the research process. For instance, by making potential participants reluctant to participate in the study. My motivation was never to evaluate existing practice or the work conducted after Utøya, but to ask, explore, and be open to the police investigators about their practices, experience, and reflections on rapport and on managing interviewees experiencing the investigative interview as difficult or painful.

To be reflexive about the research process concerns being aware of how subjectivity and interpretive acts may influence the generation of data. How could my subjectivity influence the development of material in the research interviews? Our own background and preconceptions, in this case as clinical psychologists (PR and PEB) and a forensic psychologist (RM), will make some aspects of the investigators' experience accessible and relevant for us, and other parts will not be that easily recognized. Our own motivation and conceptual background both helps us understand, and at the same time limits, our understanding. Finlay presented five overlapping types of reflexivity considered relevant for the analysis of research interviews as presented in the current study. These types of reflective practice are

referred to as reflexivity as introspection, reflexivity as intersubjective reflection, reflexivity as mutual cooperation, reflexivity as social critique, and reflexivity as ironic deconstruction (Finlay, 2002a, 2003).

To be self-reflexive about one's own pre-understanding, thoughts, and attitudes is a process that arises through interaction; when listening to another person, one becomes conscious of oneself. The dialogue with the participants and the reading of the transcriptions will always be influenced by the experience of the researcher, which in turn will affect his/her interpretations. The question is who the researcher is as a person, what are his roles, values, and interests. These are all factors that influence interpretation. To be conscious of such issues refers to reflexivity as introspection. In this project, my role as a researcher was not straightforward as I was also a clinician and a teacher working within the police, so posing as a researcher completely free of prejudice and preconceptions was, needless to say, unattainable. The scope and motivation for the project was in many respects a result of these different roles: to explore and challenge established preconceptions of police interviewing. In the research interviews, this motivation made me very eager to ask about relational processes beyond communication techniques, which have not been described to a large extent in the existing literature. Emphasizing interpersonal aspects of the investigative interview might have steered the development of data in a particular direction and led to missing other elements that could be important in the investigative interview (e.g., the use of special measures). However, I would argue that this emphasis provided the opportunity to obtain more views. For instance, through being able to ask the participants to give examples that could generate rich and experience-near descriptions of emotional processes relevant to building rapport.

Reflexivity as social critique refers to how the researcher should be attentive to, and manage, changing positions, tensions, or power imbalance in the research relationship with the participant. In the research, this was relevant for the generation of data on different occasions. An important question became how the participants would relate to me in the interviews. Would the participants react to a psychologist asking them about how they approached a traumatized person? How should I relate to participants

who remembered me as their teacher from when they studied to become a police officer? Sometimes, when the participants were asked about how they perceived the interviewee to be traumatized, they could answer: "You're the psychologist, you know more about those things than I do." In other words, the roles in the interview could contribute to a relational imbalance and the participant withholding information. An awareness concerning these types of interactions made me emphasize an acknowledgment of the participant as an expert on investigative interviewing, to create a more socially balanced and encouraging interview relationship. As a clinician, this made me discover new aspects of what it means to perceive someone as 'traumatized' as the participants described this in the investigative interview setting: a context that potentially could trigger different psychological processes compared to, for instance, psychotherapy.

The interview experience not only gives the researcher an understanding of the expressions of the participant, but also a growing understanding of the phenomenon of study as well as the interview relationship in itself. Reflexivity on the interview relationship becomes important to gain insight into how the relational context influences the generation of data. If the participant challenges the pre-understanding of the researcher, we see the importance of extending being self-reflexive to also include reflexivity concerning oneself in relation to others. This is referred to as reflexivity as intersubjective reflection emphasizing how the encounter with the participant can contribute to transforming the preconceptions and pre-understandings of the researcher. In the current project, this occurred on several occasions, particularly in the relationship between the researcher's academic understanding of rapport and the police investigator's practical experience. I soon discovered that my understanding of rapport was somewhat static and more or less limited to the interpersonal processes of the phenomenon, but when encountering the perspectives of the participants I also discovered the influence of the structure of police interviews. The participants' description of rapport processes varied according to the aims of the different phases of the interview. For example, my impression from the participants was that they approached the interviewees slightly differently in the initial free account-phase compared to later in the interview when they asked more detailed

questions, which to a certain extent can be related to the research of Jakobsen et al (2016) who described the support given by the investigator's as phase-bound. However, this experience contributed to a perception of rapport as a broader concept as I also became increasingly aware of how investigative aims influenced the communicative processes of the investigative interview.

The meeting of different perspectives can also be recognized in reflexivity as mutual cooperation, which describes the reflexivity that arises through common experiences and reflections between the researcher and the participant. Reflexivity entails giving a voice to different perspectives and being open to the participant having other perceptions than oneself. Reflexivity on such processes can contribute to a more nuanced exploration and thus, a facilitation of knowledge. In the current project, such processes were evident, and particularly in parts of the research interviews that almost took form as a discussion between the researcher and the participant. For example, in the interviews, I asked the participants openly about what they thought of the concept 'rapport'. This often led to discussions and the participants providing alternatives and frequently saying "Maybe a better word is…". This resulted in a more nuanced picture and a greater understanding of the concept for me as a researcher, particularly with regard to obtaining new terms that could describe rapport, such as a 'working alliance' or a 'sustainable relationship'. This is further related to reflexivity as ironic deconstruction: highlighting the importance of being open and accepting of the fact that others may have a different perspective or use a different language that may contribute further to the development of meaning connected to different concepts, as described above.

In sum, the interview experience concerns how the utterances of the participant meet the subjectivity, pre-understandings, and interpretations of the researcher in a collaborative and reflexive process that contributes toward developing new knowledge. With regard to interpretative elements in the research process, energy was invested in finding a balance between being loyal to the expressions of the participants and own interpretations influenced by pre-understandings. Throughout the project, my supervisors, who are both leading researchers in their respective fields

(qualitative methodology and clinical psychology, and forensic psychology), contributed to developing this balance by providing their knowledge, perspectives, and ideas and thus influencing the development of the project and the interpretation of the material and the results.

2.7 Ethics

The study was reported to the Regional Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics (Regionale komiteer for medisinsk og helsefaglig forskningsetikk) which stated that the project did not require approval (ref. 2011/2414 D). The study was approved by the Oslo Police District Deputy Chief of Police and the Norwegian Social Sciences Data Services (ref. 32334).

Research ethics look at how scientific work is developed and conducted in relation to norms and morals, and one of the most important questions is: how should we act (Befring, 2014)? Ethical research is about more than following rules; it is about using one's judgment with regard to morality, values, human understanding, and science. As stated by Edwards and Mauthner (2003), ethics is not only a source for absolute norms, but rather a perspective on practice and dilemmas. From the development of the project and all the way through the presentation of the findings, several ethical questions and dilemmas emerged. For example: Can the project contribute to improving the situation of the participants? Is confidentiality adequately preserved? Can the interviews be experienced as stressful for the participants? Is the presentation of the findings conducted in a justifiable manner?

The research interview is a situation that brings up several ethical queries. For instance, an interview focusing on a severe incident such as Utøya could potentially be experienced as distressing or unpleasant for the participant. For this reason, we incorporated a briefing session at the beginning and a debriefing at the end of each research interview.

In the study, we interviewed police investigators about their work. With regard to confidentiality, a few challenges arouse. Examples included when a participant

disclosed information that revealed his/her place of work, or, if he/she described a case or a person that could be identified in relation to the Utøya case (e.g., a known person from the media). This type of information was excluded from the presentation of the findings to preserve confidentiality of both police interviewer and interviewee.

In the presentation of the findings, an ethical question is to what extent we as researchers have provided a fair and accurate picture of the lived experiences of the participants. As researchers, we hold the power to interpret the findings influenced by our own subjectivity, but at the same time we must be loyal to and represent the perspectives of the participants. To enhance trustworthiness of the study, we have tried to be as transparent as possible regarding this process.

3. Results

3.1 Summary of Paper 1

The title of the first paper is "Establishing and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews of traumatized victims: A qualitative study." Based on interviews of police investigators who interviewed victims following the Utøya massacre, we explored factors considered important and useful in facilitating safety, and in establishing and maintaining rapport with traumatized interviewees. Following the analysis, the findings clustered around four themes: (1) Preparation through planning, reflection, and openness: balancing knowing and being receptive; (2) Using first impressions, casual conversation, and communicating expectations to make the interviewee comfortable; (3) Getting closer to the experience of the interviewee through engagement, adaptation, and understanding; and (4) Handling negative feelings and being receptive in the interview relationship. We discuss the findings in relation to current theory and research on investigative interviewing and highlight the importance of working on an emotional level to facilitate rapport when interviewing traumatized interviewees. The paper is submitted to an international journal.

3.2 Summary of Paper 2

One of the main findings from study 1 was that the investigators described the importance of accommodating the interviewees' negative emotions. This was the point of departure for Paper 2, entitled "Regulating and coping with distress during police interviews of traumatized victims." The study aim was to explore approaches to police interviewing of traumatized victims experiencing distress that contribute to facilitating rapport and the well-being of the interviewee. Following the analysis of the study, three main themes emerged: (1) Becoming aware of the interviewees' capacity to cope with distress by attending to nonverbal cues; (2) Interviewers communicating acceptance and modeling how to cope with painful emotions; and (3) Regulating distress by responding to the interviewees' emotional needs, helping them to feel safe, and promoting positivity. We discuss the findings in relation to a clinical

psychology perspective that emphasizes the window of tolerance (Siegel, 1999, 2010) and how the investigative interview can promote interviewees' psychological health. The findings suggest that if the police investigator can provide a safe relational context, or if he/she steers the relational dynamics towards safety in the present moment when distress arises, he/she may facilitate the interviewees' regulation of distress, enhance the interviewees' well-being, and promote rapport. The paper has been published in P*sychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*.

3.3 Summary of Paper 3

The third paper is entitled "Emotional intelligence in police interviews—Approach, training and the usefulness of the concept". This is a theoretical study aimed at exploring how the concept of emotional intelligence can be of value for police management of emotions in investigative interviews. We define emotional intelligence in the context of investigative interviewing, with an emphasis on empathy and emotional regulation, before presenting four key considerations for training interviewers in handling emotions: (1) self-awareness, (2) attention training, (3) communication skills, and, (4) emotion regulation. As a final point, we discuss the implications of implementing the concept of emotional intelligence in investigative interviewing. The paper has been published in *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice.*

4. Discussion

The scope of this dissertation was to explore and develop experience-near knowledge of the psychological processes underpinning rapport in police interviews of traumatized victims. For this purpose, we aimed to investigative the overarching research question: How can a police investigator approach a traumatized interviewee to facilitate rapport and promote the well-being of the individual? To meet the thesis aim, different aspects of this question was examined in three individual papers.

The main objective of the discussion is to consider the findings of the current project in relation to previous research and its contribution to the aim of the dissertation. First, the relationship between the individual papers will be described before outlining the context of the Utøya investigative interviews. Then, the results of the study will be discussed. What do the findings tell us about the processes of building rapport with traumatized interviewees? Do they add new knowledge to what is already known about rapport in the forensic literature? Next, the implications of the study will be addressed. Can the research provide directions for how police interviews of traumatized interviewees should be carried out? Finally, an evaluation of the study emphasizing reflexivity, transferability, limitations, and relevance will be presented before discussing future directions.

4.1 Relationship between the individual papers

The title of the first paper was "Establishing and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews of traumatized victims: A qualitative study". Based on analysis of interviews of police investigators who interviewed victims following the Utøya massacre, we found four themes describing the process of establishing and maintaining rapport. The themes were presented across the different timeline phases of the interview, from the investigator's preparatory efforts prior to the interview process, to different approaches to building and maintaining rapport during the interview.

The findings of the study were in many respects comparable with the existing general theory and research on rapport building in investigative interviewing. However, the study also showed the importance of aspects of rapport that are not often described: aspects considered as particularly important in interviews with traumatized interviewees. This was evident in one of the most important themes of the findings, coined 'Handling feelings and being receptive in the interview relationship.' The theme described how interviewing a traumatized person may require the police interviewer to show that he/she tolerates and shows acceptance for the interviewees' pain in order to maintain rapport, demonstrating the importance of relational processes in investigative interviewing. The theme highlighted the importance of the police interviewer responding to the interviewees' emotions, which made me curious about what exactly happens in this process. This was the basis for the second paper "Regulating and coping with distress during police interviews of traumatized victims".

Based on the interviews of the investigators, the aim of Paper 2 was to further describe how police interviewers handled interviewees' emotional reactions during interviews. Specifically, we examined what the police investigators regarded as useful approaches to regulating distress, maintaining rapport, and promoting the well-being of the interviewees. The findings consisted of three main themes presented in a three-step-model of how to regulate distress when interviewing traumatized interviewees: from becoming aware of the interviewees' capacity to cope with distress, to showing acceptance, and approaching the interviewee in different ways to regulate distress and enhance rapport. In this paper, we discussed the findings in relation to a clinical psychology perspective in an attempt to describe and understand the processes that might occur with traumatized individuals in investigative interviews and avenues that potentially promote their well-being.

In the process of writing Papers 1 and 2, the significance of relational processes in investigative interviewing became increasingly obvious, particularly with regard to the importance of the police interviewer's approaches to interviewees' experiences of emotions. Curiosity with regard to examining different ways of interviewers

accommodating interviewees' emotional arousal led to the development of Paper 3, entitled "Emotional intelligence in police interviews—Approach, training and the usefulness of the concept". This theoretical study aimed to explore the concept of emotional intelligence in the context of investigative interviewing. Inspired by the empirical work and findings of Papers 1 and 2, emotional intelligence was defined with an emphasis on the concepts of empathy and emotion regulation. To go one step further, four key considerations for training police interviewers in handling emotions were presented: (1) self-awareness; (2) attention training; (3) communication skills; and (4) emotion regulation. The implications of implementing the concept of emotional intelligence in investigative interviewing was discussed with an emphasis on whether the concept can contribute to explain what happens in well-conducted police interviews.

The findings of the explorative studies in Papers 1 and 2 should be considered in combination. Whereas the first paper describes the more general aspects of establishing and maintaining rapport in investigative interviewing of traumatized interviewees, Paper 2 goes further into detail on how police interviewers handle interviewees' distress in the same process. Paper 3 is an extension of the previous two; several aspects of the empirical findings were transferred into a theoretical context, in addition to introducing a new concept and perspective on how police interviewers can accommodate interviewees' emotional experiences to facilitate rapport.

4.2 Context: The Utøya interviews

Studies on terrorist attacks has provided valuable knowledge on the impact and consequences for those involved. For instance, after September 11, 2001, in the USA (Neria, DiGrande, & Adams, 2011) or in Beslan, Russian Federation, in 2004 (Moscardino et al., 2010). Research has been conducted on different aspects of the Utøya massacre, such as investigating the experiences of individuals affected by the massacre (Enebakk, Ingierd, & Refsdal, 2016). A few studies have also shed light on the police interviews in this case (Dyb et al., 2014; Glad et al., 2012; Langballe &

Schultz, 2017), primarily looking into the experiences of the survivors. The current research, together with the recently published work of Jakobsen et al (2016), exploring the perspective of the police interviewer, provides another view on these interviews.

On a general level, the participants expressed that the processes of developing and maintaining rapport did not necessarily differ from interviews in other cases, but the context (e.g., the severity of the event) was quite different and most likely had an impact on how they approached the interviewee (e.g., it made them more conscious of the importance of safeguarding the interviewee). For instance, several of the participants stressed the importance of showing compassion in these interviews, which corresponds with the research of Jakobsen et al (2016) who described how the investigators often referred to themselves as "fellow human beings." Another main impression from listening to the participants' accounts is that they to a large extent follow the procedures recommended from their training. Similarly, Jakobsen et al found that the police investigators' understood their role as being method-driven or as being closely linked to the principles of KREATIV.

Many of the participants described that their everyday work was quite hectic, with not much time to either prepare or do follow up-work after the investigative interviews were carried out. In the prioritized Utøya case, however, they were given more time and resources to do a more thorough job. As one of the participants said: "I have never been this prepared for an interview in my whole life." In spite of the tragic circumstances, the Utøya case may have provided the individual police interviewer with an optimal context for conducting investigative interviews. For instance, with regard to preparing for developing rapport with different interviewees.

Interestingly, most of the participants described the Utøya interviews as a great learning experience. Many described their interviews as quite easy to conduct because they were well prepared and the interviewees were quite resourceful (they were often described as robust and motivated to provide an account). Other factors that might have made these interviews "easy" was that the victims received much

public support. It was obvious that they had done nothing wrong and who the perpetrator was, and the investigators were motivated to give the interviewees a safe and positive interview experience.

4.3 Understanding rapport building in police interviews of traumatized victims

What do the findings tell us about the psychological processes of building rapport? The exploration in Paper 1 described the process of establishing and building rapport with traumatized interviewees where the findings were presented as four continuous themes: (1) Preparation through planning, reflection, and openness: balancing knowing and being receptive; (2) Using first impressions, casual conversation, and communicating expectations to make the interviewee comfortable; (3) Getting closer to the experience of the interviewee through engagement, adaptation, and understanding; and (4) Handling negative feelings and being receptive in the interview relationship (Risan, Binder, & Milne, Submitted).

Prior to the investigative interview, the participants explained the importance of preparatory efforts, such as finding a balance between having knowledge of the case and being receptive in the coming interview relationship. This resonates with the research of Jakobsen et al (2016) who described how detectives sought a balanced attitude between being objective and being a supportive fellow human being in these interviews. To initialize the process of rapport, the participants in our study highlighted the importance of establishing a social and communicative relationship with the interviewee. All through the interview process, the participants underline the importance of approaches that increase the interviewees' sense of safety and ability to communicate, such as: previewing the interview, communicating expectations, employing active listening and using open-ended questions, and by showing understanding and interest for the interviewee. These ways of building rapport are in many respects in accord with current interview protocols such as PEACE (Milne & Bull, 1999; Milne et al., 2007) and the cognitive interview (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992, 2010). One surprising finding, however, was how the participants highlighted

the importance of managing emotional states through expressing personal concern, care, and compassion for the victims to enhance rapport. This is not surprising in itself, but the heavy emphasis on these issues in every phase of the interview (and sometimes even before and after) was somewhat unexpected. This supports the notion that rapport should not be regarded as something the interviewer can check off on a list or limit to a certain phase of the interview, but, as mentioned earlier, should be considered an active and dynamic state that can change over the course of an interaction. An awareness of this fact can be considered vital for understanding what is happening in the investigative interview relationship, particularly with regard to accommodating the interviewees' emotional arousal.

Approaching emotions in investigative interviewing have been touched upon in different guidelines. For example, by recommending the investigator to show empathy and understanding for the feelings of the interviewee (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010; Fisher, Milne, & Bull, 2011; Ord et al., 2011), or to be conscious of how transference reactions may influence the interview process (St-Yves, 2006; Vanderhallen & Vervaeke, 2014). However, with the notable exception of Jakobsen et al (2016), who described different ways of police interviewers being supportive when interviewing traumatized interviewees, the relational or socioemotional *processes* are seldom described. The findings of the current research, however, provide further knowledge of the processes of *when* and *how* to approach emotions. One such example comes from one of the participants in the study who describes how to communicate understanding of the interviewees' state when emotions arise:

> …if there are tears, for instance, you can respond to them by saying "Now I can see tears in your eyes", right, so that they can feel that they're being acknowledged. I think they like that (Risan et al., Submitted)

Overall, if we consider the emotional elements of the investigative interview process presented in our findings, they show how it is important that the police interviewer: 1) emotionally prepares for the interview, 2) initially engages in social/communicative approaches that make the interviewee feel comfortable, 3)

previews the interview structure and format to clarify expectations and enhance predictability, 4) prepares the interviewee for the fact that difficult emotions may occur, and 5) appraises the state of the interviewee to accommodate and respond appropriately to psychological needs throughout the interview process. All these different ways of approaching emotional states to facilitate rapport resonates well with a humanitarian interviewing style described earlier (Holmberg, 2004; Holmberg & Christianson, 2002). Such an approach has proved to have a positive impact on the development of a working alliance with interviewees (Vanderhallen & Vervaeke, 2014; Vanderhallen et al., 2011) along with the amount of information generated and the interviewees' personal well-being (Madsen & Holmberg, 2014).

Obviously, there are no straightforward steps, recipes or single techniques for approaching emotional states in investigative interviews. There will always be variation in psychological needs, how emotions are expressed, and how these states should be approached. Nevertheless, the findings of the study suggest that the investigator should put effort into being flexible, open and adapting to the interpersonal dynamics and communication of the interviewee, appraise his/her emotional state, show acceptance of emotions (do not avoid, reject, or ignore), and respond appropriately with regard to the psychological needs that arise in the interview relationship. The aim of such processes should always be twofold: accommodate emotions and facilitate safety to make the interviewee feel comfortable, and create a relational context that increases the likelihood of a communicative flow, that is, rapport.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to describe the processes of rapport in police interviews of traumatized interviewees, which can be considered a contribution to the existing literature in the field. With regard to the aim of the thesis, the main contribution from Paper 1 was in providing knowledge of the basic processes of establishing and maintaining rapport with traumatized interviewees, and forming a basis for Papers 2 and 3.

4.4 Accommodating vulnerability and contributing to the healing process

In a police interview, a traumatized person may be strongly influenced by negative emotions that hinder him or her from providing a detailed and coherent account. Such situations require the police interviewer to engage in approaches that reduce pain or distress. How can the police interviewer reduce the interviewees' distress to enhance rapport? Investigators rely on interviewees' communication of thoughts that may be affected by an emotional activation, so-called 'hot cognitions' (Safran & Greenberg, 1982). Accommodating this type of activation may be essential to reduce pain and facilitate the interviewees' ability to communicate. Reducing interviewees' negative emotions is also emphasized in best practice guidelines. For example, the Achieving best evidence guidance for interviewing victims and witnesses from the UK Ministry of Justice (2011a) states that "One of the reasons for rapport being so important is that the witness's anxiety, whether induced by the crime and/or the interview situation (or otherwise), needs to be reduced for maximum recollection" (p. 70). Fisher and Geiselman also point out the importance of helping witnesses to control heightened arousal in investigative interviews, to be able to enhance the memory process and ability to communicate (Fisher, 1995; Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). Even though guidelines in the forensic literature emphasize the importance of regulating or reducing negative emotions in police interviews, there is little knowledge of exactly how this should be done and how the process may unfold. This was the background and point of departure for Paper 2, which aimed to explore the processes of regulating distress and promoting the well-being of traumatized interviewees (Risan, Binder, & Milne, 2016b).

Following the analysis in Paper 2, three main themes emerged: (1) Becoming aware of the interviewees' capacity to cope with distress by attending to nonverbal cues; (2) Interviewers communicating acceptance and modeling how to cope with painful emotions; and, (3) Regulating distress by responding to the interviewees' emotional needs, helping them to feel safe and promoting the positive. Trauma, emotion regulation, and psychological health are topics which have been studied extensively

within the fields of clinical psychology and psychiatry. This fact played an important part in the motivation for providing a clinical view on forensic rapport in this specific paper.

In interviews of individuals who have survived horrendous events, the interviewee may have to describe details that trigger reactions to trauma which, from a clinical perspective, involve exposure to emotions as described by the window of tolerance (Siegel, 1999, 2010). When the individual is within the boundaries of the window of tolerance, he or she is in a state of optimal emotional arousal for healthy functioning and well-being. Traumatized individuals, on the other hand, may experience intolerable feelings due to dysregulation of affect, which may result in the person moving outside the boundaries of the window and entering a state of hyper- or hypoarousal (Ogden, 2010), or, psychological disequilibrium (Green et al., 2010). Being in such a state can be tremendously painful for the individual and consequently make it difficult for the interviewee to provide a detailed or coherent account. How can a police interviewer regulate interviewees' distress? The findings of our study indicate that the first step is to appraise the interviewees' capacity to cope with turmoil or negative emotions (e.g. from interpreting the interviewees' non-verbal communication). The next step should be the interviewer communicating understanding of the interviewees' plight: a need often experienced by victims in investigative interviews (Fisher & Geiselman, 2010). When distress arose, the participants spoken to in this research expressed that it was important to be open and accepting of emotions in the interview relationship. The occurrence of distress may further require the investigator to regulate negative emotions through fostering a safe relational context and accommodating the interviewees' psychological needs. This could be the need to move attention towards the safety that can be experienced in the present moment when feelings become overwhelming, or to encourage or affirm the efforts of the interviewee if he/she withdraws in the relationship. Experiencing this type of understanding from another person may give rise to a feeling of safety and an awareness of different ways to regulate distress, which in turn may contribute to increase the interviewees' tolerance of previously dysregulated affect in the here and now. In other words, a safe, containing, and compassionate relational context can

help the interviewee to experience difficult emotions without being overwhelmed by anxiety or negative emotions in the process, allowing them to perceive painful feelings as less dangerous (Binder & Hjeltnes, 2013; Frederickson, 2013). If painful memories are experienced in investigative interviewing with less anxiety or distress than when they were first experienced, it may lead to the interviewee articulating details that have been untold and to reappraising the trauma in ways that contribute to developing adaptive feelings toward what happened.

We elaborated further on the topic of managing emotions in Paper 3 describing how interviewees' emotions can be regulated in the here and now through modifying the situation, changing the focus of attention, change in cognition, or changing the response to an emotion (Risan, Binder, & Milne, 2016a). A basic assumption is that the way victims of crime interprets or appraise a stressful situation is closely related to how it is emotionally experienced and, thus, is important for the coping process. This is related to acquiring new emotion-focused strategies for coping with the trauma, for instance, if the interviewee experiences a greater sense of control over the emotional impact of the event. It is important to remember that individuals can emerge from crisis or stressful situations with new coping strategies resulting in better well-being (Green et al., 2010). Paper 2 and 3 may be considered as important with regard to contributing towards the aim of the thesis, particularly with regard to exploring and describing psychological processes of how the police interviewer accommodates and regulates interviewees' negative emotions to enhance rapport.

It should be highlighted that in addition to reducing the potential pain that traumatized interviewees can experience during police interviews, it is important that police detectives are conscious of processes that may promote therapeutic jurisprudence or the health and well-being of the individual in the long run. This was also described by one of the participants in the study saying that:

> They [the interviewees] should be strengthened by it, in a way; they should feel . . . I take part in promoting what's positive. We should receive the grief,

but we should also focus on what is important in the future (Risan et al.,
2016b).

Victims' recovery from trauma is a process, and research has shown how different
factors like increased sense of agency (S. H. Stige, Binder, Rosenvinge, & Træen,
2013), coping, and reappraisal of traumatic memories, (Halligan et al., 2003; Kindt &
Engelhard, 2005; Meyerson et al., 2011) have a positive impact on the healing or
recovery of traumatized individuals. Although the investigative interview is not
primarily a therapeutic context, it is likely that a positive police interview experience
holds the potential of influencing, or taking part in, such processes. For instance, if
the interviewee can experience a sense of mastery during an investigative interview,
it may lead to an increased experience of agency, empowerment and coping with
traumatic memories. With regard to the Utøya interviews, Langballe and Schultz
(2017) studied what factors might lead to positive experiences or increased stress for
the victims in this case. The participants who reported the investigative interview as a
positive situation experienced that they 1) were able to present a coherent narrative,
2) perceived the police as empathetic and professional, and 3) regarded the interview
as meaningful, showing the significance of managing trauma in investigative
interviewing. These types of positive interview experiences can to a certain extent be
related to the use of the communication components and the memory-enhancing
techniques of the CI, which are specifically directed at facilitating the interviewees'
recollection and account. For victims of crime, such an experience may lead to a
sense of control, self-efficacy, and accomplishment. As described by Fisher and
Geiselman (2010, p. 325): "Our guiding framework is that victims may feel a loss of
control over their lives—after all, being victimized implies that one cannot control
one's life. Victims may also experience a sense of inadequacy, which manifests itself
retrospectively as feeling responsible for their own misfortunate and prospectively as
feeling anxious about their ability to "perform" as a good witness during the
interview. Finally, they may experience feelings of outrage of having been victimized
and they need to share those feelings with another person who can understand their
plight". This notion demonstrates the importance of the police interviewer appraising
and accommodating the emotional state and psychological needs of the interviewee to

pursue an optimal relational and communicative context for the generation of an account. In other words, this shows the importance of emotional intelligence in investigative interviewing, as defined in Paper 3: "The interviewer's use of his or her understanding of and approaches to emotional processes that have positive effects on the well-being of the interviewee and the generation of information" (Risan et al., 2016a, p. 413).

4.5 Evaluating qualitative inquiry

Our explorative–reflexive approach allows for the investigation of phenomena in the field between the views of the participants, the interview experience itself, and the background, subjectivity, and preconceptions of the researchers. The research process is built on an interpretative dialogue between these different and complementary perspectives: a dialogue that enables the researchers to get close to the views of the participants and explore idiosyncratic experiences as well as finding the overall more common themes of the accounts (Binder et al., 2012). In the current project, this was emphasized through exhibiting a continuous curiosity towards the perspectives and experiences of the participants on the topic of rapport in relation to own views, pre-understandings, and impressions. The meeting of different voices and views constitutes a unique perspective in the research process: a process that must be evaluated.

Evaluation of qualitative research implies assessing and questioning the knowledge claims and the communication and contextualization of the research findings (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015; B. Stige et al., 2009). A consideration of the quality of the research can be carried out through fixed criteria or an agenda or dialogue on the research process. However, the choice of how and what to evaluate must be appropriate and compatible with the special nature of the research in question: for instance, with regard to paradigm, research aims, or methodology (Finlay, 2006; Morrow, 2005; B. Stige et al., 2009). Validation of research should be based on controlling the quality in all stages of the research process leading to the production of knowledge. In this program of research, this includes questioning the influence of

the context or background of the study, how the interviews were conducted, verified, and analyzed, and how the research was theoretically interpreted and reported. The researcher must act as the devil's advocate when considering the process leading to the findings. This includes being explicit in describing his or her own perspective and questioning the research through considering alternative explanations and limitations of the research (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

In evaluating qualitative research, the key is often in assessing the degree of rigor in the different phases of the research, and reflecting upon the possible contribution of the research findings. In this process, Finlay (2006) emphasizes the importance of clarity and credibility. To what extent is the research coherent and clearly described? Are the findings probable and convincing? These questions will be approached through reflexivity on the research process with an emphasis on transferability and limitations. An important part of evaluating qualitative inquiry is also to assess the value or contribution of the findings and how they are communicated. As a final point in this part of the discussion, the potential contribution or relevance of the study will be examined.

4.5.1 Reflexivity on the research process

Even though the research process in itself is not always experienced as systematic, coherent, and clear by the researchers, we have aimed to provide good and accurate descriptions of the approach. Throughout this process, we emphasized reflexivity and transparency. McLeod (2012) once wrote that "Skilled qualitative researchers are sensitive to the task of explicating the personal stance of the researcher and conveying the distinctive voice or perspective of research participants" (p. 52). Finlay (2002a) adds that "Most qualitative researchers will attempt to be aware of their role in the (co)-construction of knowledge. They will try to make explicit how intersubjective elements impact on data collection and analysis in an effort to enhance the trustworthiness, transparency and accountability of their research" (pp. 211-212). Reflexivity is the use of a critical, self-aware lens to investigate both the research process and our interpretation or representation of the participants' experience

(Finlay, 2016). The reflexive activity of the researcher provides an opportunity to understand how his or her own experiences and understanding of the world influence the research process (Morrow, 2005). In this respect, reflexivity can be used to monitor and audit the research process to increase trustworthiness of the study (Binder et al., 2012; Finlay, 2003).

Reflective practice is about reflection, self-awareness, and critical thinking (Finlay, 2008). From collecting the data and through the analysis leading to the findings, we have aimed to be transparent and self-critical to how we approached and interpreted the material. Being reflexive is a way of being open about the researcher's personal stance and influence on the research process. According to Addison (1999): "… researchers' beginning understandings inevitably influence how researchers carry out their observations, what questions get asked, what data get selected, how data get interpreted, and what findings get reported" (p. 157). We have described our backgrounds and discussed how it may have contributed to the development, understanding, and interpretation of data, and how the researchers and the participants together actively construct knowledge. For example, how the different perspectives together form a context for exploring, interpreting, and discussing different views on how to approach a traumatized person to build rapport, or how we have reflected upon forensic processes from a clinical psychology perspective.

In a broad sense, validity of research refers to whether the methodological approach measures what it aims to measure, or whether our observations reflect the phenomena we wish to examine (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). However, qualitative interviews often encounter the challenge of subjectivity and double hermeneutics in that the researcher interprets situations in which the involved participants are already involved in interpretations of the same situation (B. Stige et al., 2009). Qualitative interviews enable us to get close to and explore the lived experience of the individuals, but at the same time, we can question to what degree there is intersubjective consensus between us and the participants when it comes to key concepts (e.g., rapport, trauma, distress). With several layers of interpretation, one could argue that an emphasis on subjectivity and the interpretative elements creates a

bias or a distance to objective or valid knowledge. On the other hand, we acknowledge how reflexivity through multiple perspectives can contribute to a more nuanced exploration of rapport in ways that generate new knowledge and move us beyond our previous understanding. Within this process, we endeavor to achieve objectivity of subjectivity (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). Nonetheless, this means that other constellations might have prioritized and interpreted the material differently, highlighting how our conceptual background both enables and limits our understanding (Finlay, 2003).

4.5.2 Transferability and limitations

Describing our backgrounds and the research process in a transparent manner is important to demonstrate rigor but also to determine transferability, i.e., the extent to which the research can be applied to other contexts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In qualitative research, transferability replaces the concept of external validity and can be enhanced by the researcher being thorough in describing the research context and the assumptions important to the research (Trochim, 2006). For research to be transferable, the researcher must give a precise and thorough description that enables others to consider if the study can be transferred. In this sense, transferability is developed by the readers of the study. In the presentation of the findings, we used quotations to explain the content of the themes and to be transparent in the research process. The aim was to facilitate a clear communication of our analytic steps, that is, how the meaning patterns and themes developed (Binder et al., 2012; Sandelowski & Leeman, 2012). To provide an example, we used the following two quotes to explain and describe the content of the theme "Interviewers communicating acceptance and modeling how to cope with painful emotions" in Paper 2. The first quote aimed to demonstrate how the investigator emphasized showing understanding and acceptance of the experience of the interviewee:

> I sit there and I think . . . it's hard for them to tell their story and relive it in
> such detail; it was tough for them, and some of them started to cry. Then I just

let him or her cry and let them know I feel for them and I understand that it's difficult but we will get through it. I know it will get better later.

The second quote refers to how the police interviewer could show the interviewee that he could cope with the interviewees' distress, thereby creating a context in which more information could be generated:

... Just the fact that they have a person that can withstand their story. When they get to the police, they are able to talk about it (Risan et al., 2016b).

By including examples from what the participants have said in the interviews, we attempt to show as well as tell, by giving the reader the opportunity to arrive at his or her own interpretation of the material (McLeod, 2012). The aim of this part of the process was to demonstrate "…a clear structure with steps that can be explicitly articulated. In this way, the relationship between the actual utterances in the interview situation and the formulation of results in the form of themes become visible and understandable: to the audience, and last but not least, to oneself" (Binder et al., 2012, p. 115). The aim of being transparent in this process is to invite the reader to judge the coherence between our assumptions, the research process, and the findings.

If the findings of the study are regarded as credible, the next question is, can they be generalized or transferred to other contexts or situations? The participants in the study were responsible for carrying out approximately 30% of all the Utøya interviews, which was considered a fairly good coverage with regard to generalizing findings to the police interviews in this particular case. However, the sampling employed a purposeful approach in recruiting participants, so we do not know how many chose not to participate. This may have created a limitation or a sample bias. For instance, participating in the project may have appealed more to the investigators who had satisfactory perceptions of their own efforts in the Utøya interviews. Another important question is whether the obtained knowledge can be transferred to other police contexts (e.g., the everyday work of police detectives, different types of interviews and status of interviewees), or investigative interviewing in other

countries? To further consider the transferability of the study, we must consider the boundaries or limitations of the study.

An obvious limitation is the timing of the research interviews, which were conducted in 2013. When interviewing participants over a year after the investigative interviews took place, one could ask how good the memory of the participants would be. My impression, however, is that all the participants were well prepared for the research interview and remembered these investigative interviews in great detail, which may be due to the uniqueness of the Utøya incident.

Another limitation of the study is the timing of when the Utøya investigative interviews were conducted. The participants interviewed victims across different time frames after the incident, indicating that they encountered different phases or degrees of influence of traumatic symptoms. This fact may serve as a limitation with regard to the transferability of the study. It should also be mentioned that the study was based on an exploration of the investigators' beliefs concerning what happened, and the degree to which the material can be said to be a reflection of what actually happened is open for discussion (Dando et al., 2008; Walsh & Bull, 2011).

Yet another limitation of the study is the fact that it focused on such an extraordinary event as Utøya, which makes it unclear how broadly these findings can be transferred to the everyday work of police investigators. Even so, from our point of view, we considered the sample of the study to be appropriate for the task of describing experiences of, and perspectives on, rapport and emotional processes in investigative interviewing.

4.5.3 Relevance

The relevance of a study refers to whether the research contributes to a development within in the field (B. Stige et al., 2009) which must be considered in relation to its transferability; an aspect previously discussed. Does the current study add new knowledge to police interviewing? The short answer to this question is yes, particularly with regard to shedding light on concepts and topics which previously

have not been studied extensively within police interviewing (such as emotional intelligence, containing, emotion regulation, rapport per se, etc.).

Throughout this research project, we have elaborated on processes that have the potential of facilitating rapport and promoting the well-being of traumatized interviewees, but how can we consider the usefulness or practical value of our study? To what degree do the findings resonate with the readers' own understanding and experience? In Papers 1 and 2, we endeavored to present the steps of the research in in a clear and transparent fashion. We sought to invite the reader to understand how we reached our conclusions so that our understanding could transfer to the readers. To what degree we have succeeded in demonstrating these steps is up to the individual reader to decide. In the presentation of the findings, we have aimed to be experience-near in our descriptions of different phenomena in ways that hopefully can resonate with the participants' and other police investigators' understanding of investigative interviewing.

The papers touch upon topics that provide new perspectives on investigative interviewing in ways that may bring something new to the table for future practice and research. Nevertheless, it is important to reflect on exactly what is the particular contribution and implications of this research. Can the knowledge gained from this research be transferred to improving the know-how of police interviewers? If so, how do we go from theory to practice? This thesis contributes with theory or knowledge that helps us understand the processes of rapport and how the police can approach traumatized interviewees in investigative interviews. If such an understanding is promoted in police detectives, or police students, via an educational curriculum or practice guidelines, it holds the potential of improving the future practice of police interviewers. For example, if investigators learn more about facilitating safety in interviews as described in Paper 1, or about how to regulate emotions as described in Papers 2 and 3, it may lead to an increased understanding of, and reflections upon, what happens in police interviews and over time, an expansion of the learners' behavioral repertoire. In this respect, a greater understanding can influence practice

and thus show the usefulness and impact of the study in relation to existing policies and real-world problems (B. Stige et al., 2009).

4.6 Future directions

Psychological research has contributed to the development of police interviewing strategies that intend to help interviewees gain full and faithful accounts (Milne et al., 2007). Nevertheless, established models of investigative interviewing need to be examined and challenged by research to obtain a development of the field. One way of contributing to the development of police science or forensic interviewing has been through integrating theoretical concepts and research from other fields of psychology. Examples include how the CI is based on principles of memory retrieval (Fisher & Geiselman, 1992) or how the conceptual properties of working alliance in psychotherapy have been employed to gain insight into the dynamics of rapport (Vanderhallen & Vervaeke, 2014; Vanderhallen et al., 2011). In the current study, we have also elaborated on rapport with the help of concepts and views from other disciplines than police science and forensic psychology (such as taking a clinical perspective or exploring emotional intelligence within investigative interviewing).

According to Fisher et al (2010, pp. 69-70): "Collaboration between scientists and practitioners would benefit both disciplines and our understanding of investigative interviewing at large, as both bring unique perspectives to the task of interviewing cooperative witnesses." Even though research has been extremely important for the relationship between academics and practitioners and the development of police interviewing, it is important to stay ahead of the game (Oxburgh & Dando, 2011). The need for more research on rapport is acknowledged. For example, there is a need for developing reliable and valid measures of rapport in an investigative setting, and examining specific rapport-building techniques and their impact on interview outcomes (Abbe & Brandon, 2013; Vallano & Schreiber Compo, 2015). In relation to the current project, research specifically targeting investigative interviewing of traumatized individuals is scarce. This opens up many questions for future research. For example; Can our findings be supported by quantitative measures? How do

interviewers determine whether interviewees are traumatized? Can we train interviewers in managing interviewees' emotions? How does the interviewer handle his/her own emotional reactions in order to maintain rapport? What is the long-term impact of a positive police interview experience on the psychological health of traumatized interviewees?

In Paper 3, we introduced the concept of emotional intelligence (EI) in the context of police interviews. It would be interesting to empirically examine the usefulness of the concept in investigative interviewing. To our knowledge, EI has not been studied in relation to police interviewing. Even though EI as a concept is controversial (Cherniss, 2010; Conte, 2005), we believe it can be beneficial for the development of police interviewing where managing emotions is important for obtaining an account. We believe the construct can contribute to an increased awareness of emotional processes, and give direction for describing concrete approaches to managing emotions in interviews. However, we need more research to be able to determine the practical value of the construct in police interviewing.

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the lived experiences of 21 police interviewers who interviewed survivors of the Utøya terrorist attack. The scope was to examine the process of how police investigators approach traumatized interviewees to develop and maintain rapport and at the same time attend to the well-being of the individual. The findings of this study drew attention to the importance of the interpersonal aspects when building rapport in police interviewing of traumatized interviewees, particularly with regard to accommodating the emotional experiences that may arise in the interview process. The findings from Paper 1 suggest the significance of the interviewer enhancing safety while being flexible and adaptive to the state of the interviewee, to build rapport. The findings of Paper 2 demonstrated the importance of the interviewer being attentive and accepting to the interviewees' emotional activation as well as regulating distress by responding to emotional needs and facilitating safety. The findings indicate that these approaches have the potential of contributing to the interviewees' self-regulation, to make painful feelings tolerable, and consequently, to facilitate rapport and promote the well-being of the interviewee. Paper 3 presented a conceptualization of emotional intelligence in the context of investigative interviewing and key topics for training police interviewers in managing emotions. This theoretical examination suggests the importance of an increased awareness of emotional processes in investigative interviewing, and how emotional intelligence as a construct can contribute to developing approaches to handling emotions in police interviews.

Overall, the findings of this thesis highlight the importance of police investigators approaching interviewees on a relational and emotional level when interviewing traumatized victims. The ways the interviewer accommodates and responds to the emotional needs of the interviewee is of vital importance for building rapport in these interviews. This indicates that handling emotions appropriately not only has the potential of contributing to the well-being of the interviewee, but may also be a strategic element in the investigative process where the aim is to help the interviewee provide as many details as possible about a given event.

Even though we have described and proposed approaches to accommodating emotional states to facilitate rapport, and how the police should be trained to improve such skills, it is important to be conscious of the x-factor, that we are all fallible human beings. Accommodating and managing another person's emotional state can never be reduced to descriptions of single techniques, skills, or particular behaviors. What we can do, however, is explore the processes of such interactions and, as best we can, describe the meanings we discover, analyze them, and draw our conclusions.

References

Abbe, A., & Brandon, S. E. (2013). The role of rapport in investigative interviewing: A review. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 10*(3), 237-249. doi:10.1002/jip.1386

Abbe, A., & Brandon, S. E. (2014). Building and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews. *Police Practice & Research: An International Journal, 15*(3), 207-220. doi:10.1080/15614263.2013.827835

Addison, R. B. (1999). A Grounded Hermeneutic Editing Approach. In B. F. Crabtree & W. L. Miller (Eds.), *Doing Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 145-162). London: Sage.

Alison, L. J., Alison, E., Noone, G., Elntib, S., & Christiansen, P. (2013). Why tough tactics fail and rapport gets results: Observing Rapport-Based Interpersonal Techniques (ORBIT) to generate useful information from terrorists. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 19*(4), 411-431. doi:10.1037/a0034564

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders : DSM-5* (5th ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.

Ardito, R. B., & Rabellino, D. (2011). Therapeutic alliance and outcome of psychotherapy: historical excursus, measurements, and prospects for research. *Frontiers in Psychology, 2*, 270. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00270

Befring, E. (2014). *Forskningsmetode med etikk og statistikk [Research methods with ethics and statistics]*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Binder, P.-E., & Hjeltnes, A. (2013). To be present in joy and suffering-Mindfulness and therapeutic work with emotions. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening, 50*(8), 814-821.

Binder, P.-E., Holgersen, H., & Moltu, C. (2012). Staying close and reflexive: An explorative and reflexive approach to qualitative research on psychotherapy. *Nordic Psychology, 64*(2), 103-117.

Bjerknes, O. T., & Johansen, A. K. H. (2009). *Etterforskningsmetoder: En innføring [Investigative methods: An introduction]*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 16*(3), 252-260. doi:10.1037/h0085885

Brady, K. T., Killeen, T. K., Brewerton, T., & Lucerini, S. (2000). Comorbidity of psychiatric disorders and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 61*(7), 22-32.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brewin, C. R., Andrews, B., Rose, S., & Kirk, M. (1999). Acute stress disorder and posttraumatic stress disorder in victims of violent crime. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 156*(3), 360-366.

Brewin, C. R., Andrews, B., & Valentine, J. D. (2000). Meta-analysis of risk factors for posttraumatic stress disorder in trauma-exposed adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(5), 748-766. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.68.5.748 11068961

Bull, R. (2010). The investigative interviewing of children and other vulnerable witnesses: Psychological research and working/professional practice. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 15*, 5-23.

Cherniss, C. (2010). Emotional intelligence: Toward clarification of a concept. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice, 3*(2), 110-126. doi:10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01231.x

Christianson, S.-A. (1992). Emotional stress and eyewitness memory: A critical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(2), 284-309. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.2.284 1454896

Clarke, C., & Milne, B. (2001). *National evaluation of the PEACE investigative interviewing course*. Home Office. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/1926581/A_National_Evaluation_of_the_PEACE_Investigative_Interviewing_Course.

Collins, K., Doherty-Sneddon, G., & Doherty, M. (2014). Practitioner perspectives on rapport building during child investigative interviews. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 20*(9), 884-901. doi:10.1080/1068316X.2014.888428

Collins, R., Lincoln, F., & Frank, M. G. (2002). The effect of rapport in forensic interviewing. *Psychiatry, Psychology and the Law, 9*(1), 69-78.

Conte, J. M. (2005). A review and critique of emotional intelligence measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 433-440. doi:10.1002/job.319

Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. (1950). Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/CoERMPublicCommonSearchServices/DisplayDCTMContent?documentId=0900001680063765

Criminal Procedure Act of 1981. (2006). *Criminal Procedure Act: Act of 22 May 1981 No. 25: With subsequent amendments, the latest made by Act of 30 June 2006.* Retrieved from http://app.uio.no/ub/ujur/oversatte-lover/data/lov-19810522-025-eng.pdf

Dando, C. J., Geiselman, R. E., Macleod, N., & Griffiths, A. (2016). Interviewing Adult Witnesses and Victims. In G. E. Oxburgh, T. Myklebust, T. Grant, & R. Milne (Eds.), *Communication in Investigative and Legal Contexts. Integrated Approaches from Forensic Psychology, Linguistics and Law Enforcement* (pp. 79-106). UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Dando, C. J., & Oxburgh, G. (2016). Empathy in the field: Towards a taxonomy of empathic communication in information gathering interviews with suspected sex offenders. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 8*(1), 27-33. doi:10.1016/j.ejpal.2015.10.001

Dando, C. J., Willcock, R., & Milne, R. (2008). The cognitive interview: Inexperienced police officers' perceptions of their witness/victim interviewing practises. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 13*, 59-70.

Derakshan, N., & Eysenck, M. W. (2009). Anxiety, Processing Efficiency, and Cognitive Performance. *European Psychologist, 14*(2), 168-176.

Duan, C., & Hill, C. E. (1996). The current state of empathy research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(3), 261-274. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.3.261

Dyb, G., Jensen, T. K., Nygaard, E., Ekeberg, O., Diseth, T. H., Wentzel-Larsen, T., & Thoresen, S. (2014). Post-traumatic stress reactions in survivors of the 2011 massacre on Utoya Island, Norway. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 204*(5), 361-367. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.133157

Edwards, R., & Mauthner, M. (2003). Ethics and feminist research: Theory and practise. In M. Mauthner, M. Birch, J. Jessop, & T. Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in qualitative research* (pp. 14-31). London: Sage.

Enebakk, V., Ingierd, H., & Refsdal, N. O. (2016). *De berørte etter 22. juli. Forskningsetiske perspektiver [The affected after 22 July. Ethical research perspectives]*: Cappelen Damm Akademisk/NOASP.

Fahsing, I., & Rachlew, A. (2009). Investigative interviewing in the Nordic region. In T. Williamson, R. Milne, & S. P. Savage (Eds.), *International developments in investigative interviewing* (pp. 39-65). UK: Villan Publ.

Finlay, L. (2002a). Negotiating the swamp: the opportunity and challenge of reflexivity in research practise. *Qualitative Research, 2*(2), 209-230.

Finlay, L. (2002b). "Outing" the researcher: The provenance, process and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research, 12*(4), 531-545. doi:10.1177/104973202129120052 11939252

Finlay, L. (2003). The reflexive journey: Mapping multiple routes. In L. Finlay & B. Gough (Eds.), *Reflexivity. A practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences* (pp. 3-20). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Finlay, L. (2006). 'Rigour', 'Ethical Integrity' or 'Artistry'? Reflexively Reviewing Criteria for Evaluating Qualitative Research. *The British Journal of Occupational Therapy*(69), 319-326.

Finlay, L. (2008). *Reflecting on 'Reflective practice'* Retrieved from http://www.sencer.net/Symposia/SSI2015/documents/Finlay-2008-Reflecting-on-reflective-practice-PBPL-paper-52.pdf

Finlay, L. (2016). Championing "Reflexivities". *Qualitative Psychology*, Advance online publication. doi:10.1037/qup0000075 Psychometrics & Statistics & Methodology [2200]

Finlay, L., & Gough, B. (2003). *Reflexivity A Practical Guide for Researchers in Health and Social Sciences*. Oxford: Wiley.

Fisher, R. P. (1995). Interviewing victims and witnesses of crime. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 1*(4), 732-764. doi:10.1037/1076-8971.1.4.732

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory-enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing the cognitive interview*. Springfield, Ill., U.S.A.: Charles C. Thomas.

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (2010). The cognitive interview method of conducting police interviews: Eliciting extensive information and promoting therapeutic jurisprudence. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 33*(5-6), 321-328. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2010.09.004 20875685

Fisher, R. P., Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2011). Interviewing cooperative witnesses. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(1), 16-19. doi:10.1177/0963721410396826

Fisher, R. P., Ross, S. J., & Cahill, B. S. (2010). Interviewing Witnesses and Victims. In P. A. Granhag (Ed.), *Forensic psychology in context: Nordic and international approaches* (pp. 56-74). Uk: Willan Publishing.

Fogarty, K., Augoustinos, M., & Kettler, M. (2013). Re-thinking rapport through the lens of progressivity in investigative interviews into child sexual abuse. *Discourse Studies, 15*(4), 395-420.

Frederickson, J. (2013). *Co-creating change : effective dynamic therapy techniques*. Kansas City, Mo.: Seven Leaves Press.

Ginet, M., & Verkampt, F. (2007). The cognitive interview: is its benefit affected by the level of witness emotion? *Memory, 15*(4), 450-464. doi:10.1080/09658210601092670

Glad, K. A., Aadnanes, M., & Dyb, G. (2012). *Opplevelser og reaksjoner hos de som var på Utøya 22. juli 2011 (deloppsummering 1) [Experiences and reactions of those who were present at Utøya 22 July 2011 (part summary 1)]*. Retrieved from http://www.nkvts.no/fu/Documents/Opplevelser-og-reaksjoner-hos-de-som-var-på-Utoya-22-juli-En-deloppsummering.pdf

Green, D. L., Choi, J. J., & Kane, M. N. (2010). Coping strategies for victims of crime: Effects of the use of emotion-focused, problem-focused, and avoidance-oriented coping. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 20*(6), 732-743. doi:10.1080/10911351003749128

Halligan, S. L., Michael, T., Clark, D. M., & Ehlers, A. (2003). Posttraumatic stress disorder following assault: The role of cognitive processing, trauma memory, and appraisals. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(3), 419-431. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.71.3.419 12795567

Heidegger, M. (1962/1996). *Being and Time*. USA: New York: State University of New York Press.

Holmberg, U. (2004). Crime victims' experiences of police interviews and their inclination to provide or omit information. *International Journal of Police Science and Management, 6*, 155-170.

Holmberg, U., & Christianson, S. A. (2002). Murderers' and sexual offenders' experiences of police interviews and their inclination to admit or deny crimes. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 20*(1-2), 31-45. doi:10.1002/bsl.470

Holmberg, U., & Madsen, K. (2014). Rapport operationalized as a humanitarian interview in investigative interview settings. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 21*(4), 591-610. doi:10.1080/13218719.2013.873975

Horvath, A. O., Del Re, A. C., Fluckiger, C., & Symonds, D. (2011). Alliance in individual psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy (Chic), 48*(1), 9-16. doi:10.1037/a0022186

Horvath, A. O., & Symonds, B. D. (1991). Relation Between Working Alliance and Outcome in Psychotherapy: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(2), 139-149.

Jakobsen, K. K., Langballe, Å., & Schultz, J.-H. (2016). Trauma-exposed young victims: possibilities and constraints for providing trauma support within the investigative interview. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/1068316X.2016.1269903

Jaschke, H.-G., Bjørgo, T., Romero, F. d. B., Mawby, R., & Pagon, M. (2007). *Perspectives of Police Science in Europe*. Bramshill: CEPOL.

Jensen, T. K., Thoresen, S., & Dyb, G. (2015). Coping responses in the midst of terror: The July 22 terror attack at Utoya Island in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 56*(1), 45-52. doi:10.1111/sjop.12182 25431029

Justis- og Beredskapsdepartementet. (2012). *Avhør av særlig sårbare personer i straffesaker [Investigative interviewing of vulnerable persons in criminal proceedings]*. Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/58bdb19885394a5eb28f21279dfb41ea/rapport_dommeravhor.pdf

Kelly, C. E., Miller, J. C., Redlich, A. D., & Kleinman, S. M. (2013). A Taxonomy of Interrogation Methods. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 19*(2), 165-178.

Kieckhaefer, J. M., Vallano, J. P., & Compo, N. S. (2014). Examining the positive effects of rapport building: When and why does rapport building benefit adult eyewitness memory? *Memory, 22*(8), 1010-1023. doi:10.1080/09658211.2013.864313 24304449

Kindt, M., & Engelhard, I. M. (2005). Trauma processing and the development of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 36*(1), 69-76. doi:10.1016/j.jbtep.2004.11.007 15687011

Kohnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999). The cognitive interview: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 5*(1-2), 3-27. doi:10.1080/10683169908414991

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju [Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing]* (3rd ed.). Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Hershkowitz, I., Esplin, P. W., & Horowitz, D. (2007). A structured forensic interview protocol improves the quality and informativeness of investigative interviews with children: a review of research using the NICHD Investigative Interview Protocol. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 31*(11-12), 1201-1231. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.03.021

Lambert, M. J., & Barley, D. E. (2001). Research Summary on the Therapeutic Relationship and Psychotherapy Outcome. *Psychotherapy, 38*(4), 357-361.

Langballe, Å., & Schultz, J.-H. (2017). 'I couldn't tell such things to others': trauma-exposed youth and the investigative interview. *Police Practice and Research, 18*(1), 62-74. doi:10.1080/15614263.2016.1229185

Laverty, S. M. (2003). Hermeneutic phenomenology and phenomenology: A comparison of historical and methodological considerations. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2*(3). Retrieved from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/2_3final/html/laverty.html

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic enquiry*. California: Sage.

Madsen, K., & Holmberg, U. (2014). Interviewees' psychological well-being in investigative interviews: a therapeutic jurisprudential approach. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 22*(1), 60-74. doi:10.1080/13218719.2014.918083

Malterud, K. (2001). Qualitative research: standards, challenges, and guidelines. *Lancet, 358*(9280), 483-488. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05627-6

Malterud, K. (2003). *Kvalitative metoder i medisinsk forskning : en innføring [Qualitative methods in medical research: an introduction]* (2nd ed.). Oslo: Universitetsforl.

McLeod, J. (2012). Qualitative research: methods and contributions. In M. J. Lambert (Ed.), *Bergin and Garfield's Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change* (pp. 49-84). New York: Wiley.

McNally, R. J. (2005). Debunking Myths About Trauma and Memory. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry / La Revue canadienne de psychiatrie, 50*(13), 817-822.

Memon, A., Meissner, C. A., & Fraser, J. (2010). The cognitive interview: A meta-analytic review and study space analysis of the past 25 years. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 16*(4), 340-372.

Meyerson, D. A., Grant, K. E., Carter, J. S., & Kilmer, R. P. (2011). Posttraumatic growth among children and adolescents: A systematic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 31*(6), 949-964. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.06.003 21718663

Milne, R., & Bull, R. (1999). *Investigative interviewing: Psychology and practice*. Chichester: Wiley.

Milne, R., & Powell, M. (2010). Investigative interviewing. In J. M. Brown & E. A. Campbell (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of forensic psychology* (pp. 208-214). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Milne, R., Shaw, G., & Bull, R. (2007). Investigative interviewing: The role of research. In D. Carson, R. Milne, F. Pakes, K. Shalev, & A. Shawyer (Eds.), *Applying psychology to the criminal justice system* (pp. 65-80). England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Moraes, S. L. (2014). The positive relationship between police rapport tactics and investigative interviewing outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 74*(12).

Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 250-260. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250

Moscardino, U., Scrimin, S., Capello, F., & Altoe, G. (2010). Social support, sense of community, collectivistic values, and depressive symptoms in adolescent survivors of the 2004 Beslan terrorist attack. *Social Science & Medicine, 70*(1), 27-34. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.09.035 19828222

Myklebust, T., & Bjorklund, R. A. (2010). Factors affecting the length of responses in field investigative interviews of children (FIIC) in child sexual abuse cases. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 17*(2), 273-289. doi:10.1080/13218710903421290

Neria, Y., DiGrande, L., & Adams, B. G. (2011). Posttraumatic stress disorder following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks: a review of the literature among highly exposed populations. *The American Psychologist, 66*(6), 429-446. doi:10.1037/a0024791

Norris, F. H., Friedman, M. J., Watson, P. J., Byrne, C. M., Diaz, E., & Kaniasty, K. (2002). 60,000 disaster victims speak: Part I. An empirical review of the empirical literature, 1981-2001. *Psychiatry, 65*(3), 207-239.

Ogden, P. (2010). Modulation, mindfulness, and movement in the treatment of trauma-related depression. 2010. In M. Kerman (Ed.), *Clinical pearls of wisdom: Twenty one leading therapists offer their key insights* (pp. 1-13): Norton & Co.

Ord, B., Shaw, G., & Green, T. (2011). *Investigative interviewing explained* (3rd ed.). Chatswood: LexisNexis.

Oxburgh, G. E., & Dando, C. J. (2011). Psychology and interviewing: What direction now in our quest for reliable information? *The British Journal of Forensic Practice, 13*(2), 135-147.

Oxburgh, G. E., & Ost, J. (2011). The use and efficacy of empathy in police interviews with suspects of sexual offences. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 8*(2), 178-188. doi:10.1002/jip.143

Ozer, E. J., Best, S. R., Lipsey, T. L., & Weiss, D. S. (2008). Predictors of posttraumatic stress disorder and symptoms in adults: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, S*(1), 3-36. doi:10.1037/1942-9681.S.1.3

Ozer, E. J., & Weiss, D. S. (2004). Who Develops Posttraumatic Stress Disorder? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*(4), 169-172. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00300.x

Peterson, C., & Biggs, M. (1997). Interviewing Children About Trauma: Problems with "Specific" Questions. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 10*(2), 279-290.

Petrucci, C. J., Winick, B. J., & Wexler, D. B. (2003). Therapeutic Jurisprudence: An Invitation to Social Scientists. In D. Carson & R. Bull (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology in Legal Contexts* (2nd ed., pp. 579-601). Chichester: Wiley.

Prosecution Instructions. (1985). *Prosecution Instructions.* Retrieved from https://lovdata.no/dokument/SF/forskrift/1985-06-28-1679

QSR. (2012). NVivo 10: QSR International Pty Ltd.

Rachlew, A., & Fahsing, I. (2015). Politiavhøret [The investigative interview]. In R. Aarli, M.-A. Hedlund, & S. E. Jebens (Eds.), *Bevis i straffesaker [Evidence in criminal proceedings]* (pp. 225-254). Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.

Redlich, A. D., Kelly, C. E., & Miller, J. C. (2014). The Who, What, and Why of Human Intelligence Gathering: Self-Reported Measures of Interrogation Methods. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28*, 817-828.

Riksadvokaten. (2013). *Avhørmetodikk i politiet [Investigative interviewing method in the police]*. Retrieved from http://www.riksadvokaten.no/filestore/Dokumenter/2013/AvhrsmetodikkiPolitietmed vedlegg2.pdf:

Risan, P., Binder, P.-E., & Milne, R. (2016a). Emotional Intelligence in Police Interviews—Approach, Training and the Usefulness of the Concept. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 16*(5), 410-424. doi:10.1080/15228932.2016.1234143

Risan, P., Binder, P.-E., & Milne, R. (2016b). Regulating and Coping With Distress During Police Interviews of Traumatized Victims. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 8*(6), 736-744. doi:10.1037/tra0000119

Risan, P., Binder, P.-E., & Milne, R. (Submitted). Establishing and maintaining rapport in investigative interviews of traumatized victims: A qualitative study.

Risan, P., & Skoglund, T. H. (2013). *Psykologi i operativ tjeneste. Stress og psykiske lidelser [Psychology in operational work. Stress and mental illness]*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

Rogers, C. R. (1940). The processes of therapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 4*(5), 161-164.

Safran, J. D., & Greenberg, L. S. (1982). Eliciting "hot cognitions" in cognitive behaviour therapy: Rationale and procedural guidelines. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne, 23*(2), 83-87. doi:10.1037/h0081247

Sandelowski, M., & Leeman, J. (2012). Writing usable qualitative health research findings. *Qualitative Health Research, 22*(10), 1404-1413. doi:10.1177/1049732312450368

Shepherd, E. (1988). Developing interview skills. In P. Southgate (Ed.), *New directions in police training* (pp. 170-188). London: HMSO.

Shepherd, E., & Griffiths, A. (2013). *Investigative interviewing: The conversation management approach* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shepherd, E., Mortimer, A., Turner, V., & Watson, J. (1999). Spaced cognitive interviewing: facilitating therapeutic narration of traumatic memories. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 5*(1-2), 117-143. doi:10.1080/10683169908414997

Siegel, D. J. (1999). *The developing mind: toward a neurobiology of interpersonal experience*. New York: Guilford Press.

Siegel, D. J. (2010). *The mindful therapist : a clinician's guide to mindsight and neural integration*. New York: W.W. Norton.

St-Yves, M. (2006). The psychology of rapport: Five basic rules. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research, regulation* (pp. 82-106). Portland: Villan.

Stige, B., Malterud, K., & Midtgarden, T. (2009). Toward an agenda for evaluation of qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research, 19*(10), 1504-1516. doi:10.1177/1049732309348501

Stige, S. H., Binder, P. E., Rosenvinge, J. H., & Træen, B. (2013). Stories from the road of recovery-How adult, female survivors of childhood trauma experience ways to positive change. *Nordic Psychology, 65*(1), 3-18. doi:10.1080/19012276.2013.796083

Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The nature of rapport and its nonverbal correlates. *Psychological Inquiry, 1*(4), 286-293.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). Qualitative Validity. Retrieved from http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualval.php

UK Ministry of Justice. (2011a). *Achieving best evidence in criminal Proceedings. Guidance on interviewing victims and witnesses, and guidance on using special measures*. UK: Home Office Retrieved from https://www.cps.gov.uk/publications/docs/best_evidence_in_criminal_proceedings.pdf.

UK Ministry of Justice. (2011b). *Vulnerable and Intimidated Witnesses. A Police Service Guide*. UK: Ministry of Justice Retrieved from https://so-fi.org/wp-content/uploads/vulnerable-intimidated-witnesses.pdf.

Vallano, J. P., Evans, J. R., Schreiber Compo, N., & Kieckhaefer, J. M. (2015). Rapport-Building During Witness and Suspect Interviews: A Survey of Law Enforcement. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 29*, 369-380.

Vallano, J. P., & Schreiber Compo, N. (2015). Rapport-building with cooperative witnesses and criminal suspects: A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 21*(1), 85-99. doi:10.1037/law0000035

Vallano, J. P., & Schreiber Compo, N. S. (2011). A comfortable witness is a good witness: Rapport-building and susceptibility in an Investigative mock-crime Interveiw. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 25*, 960-970.

Vanderhallen, M., & Vervaeke, G. (2014). Between investigator and suspect: The role of the working alliance in investigative interviewing. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing* (pp. 63-90). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media; US.

Vanderhallen, M., Vervaeke, G., & Holmberg, U. (2011). Witness and suspect perceptions of working alliance and interviewing style. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 8*(2), 110-130. doi:10.1002/jip.138

Walsh, D., & Bull, R. (2011). Benefit fraud investigative interviewing: A self-report study of investigation professionals' beliefs concerning practice. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 8*(2), 131-148. doi:10.1002/jip.137

Walsh, D., & Bull, R. (2012). Examining rapport in investigative interviews with suspects: Does its building and maintenance work? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 27*, 73-84.

Westera, N., & Powell, M. (2016). Improving Communicative Practise: Beyond the Cognitive Interview for Adult Eyewitnesses. In G. Oxburgh, T. Myklebust, T. Grant, & R. Milne (Eds.), *Communication in Investigative and Legal Contexts. Integrated Approaches from Forensic Psychology, Linguistics and Law Enforcement* (pp. 335-358). Chichester: Wiley.

Winick, B. J. (2002). Therapeutic Jurisprudence and Problem Solving Courts. *Fordham Urban Law Journal, 30*(3), 1055-1103.

Wispe, L. (1986). The distinction between sympathy and empathy: To call forth a concept, a word is needed. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(2), 314-321. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.314