

**A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF
INTERROGATION IN POLICE/CRIMINAL
INVESTIGATIONS IN THE KANO METROPOLIS**

By

**MOHAMMED TAJUDEEN SADIQ
MA/ART/07286/2006-2007**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
AND LITERARY STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA. IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE (MA)
ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

JULY, 2011

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this work was carried by me and it is a document of academic enquiry made by me, in the Department of English and Literary Studies under the joint supervision of Dr. Shade F. Akale and Dr. Gbenga Ibileye. The sources from which the researchers have drawn references are duly acknowledged. With all modesty, I am affirming that no part of this thesis was earlier presented for another degree or diploma at any university.

MAL. M.T. SADIQ
MA/ART/07286/2006-2007

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled: **“A Discourse Analysis of the Language of Interrogation in Police/Criminal Investigations in the Kano Metropolis”** by Muhammed Tajudeen Sadiq meets the regulations governing the award of the Master’s of Arts degree (MA) in English Language of Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge specifically in the field of discourse analysis.

.....
Chairman, Supervisory Committee
Dr. Shade Frank Akale

.....
Date

.....
Member Supervisory Committee
Dr. Gbenga Ibileye

.....
Date

.....
Acting Head of Department
Professor Adebayo Joshua

.....
Date

.....
Dean Postgraduate School
Professor Adebayo A. Joshua

.....
Date

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my late father, Alhaji Surakat Sadiq (Imam), and Aishat Surakat for their parental love and struggle in making me acquire knowledge.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The expression of the profound indebtedness and appreciation of the researcher goes to the Almighty God, the Uncreated Creator from whom alone all knowledge flows. Also appreciation is splendidly due to my indefatigable supervisors, Dr. Shade Frank Akale and Dr. Gbenga Ibileye, who in spite of their ever tight schedule, always found time to go through the drafts of this thesis promptly and thoroughly. I thank them for always insisting on the best.

For their contributions towards the success of the entire postgraduate programme, I want to thank Professors J.S Aliyu and Adebayo A. Joshua, the Dean, Postgraduate School, Drs.Tajudeen Y. Surakat, Taiwo G. Ikilama, Dili Ofokwu, and A. Abaya.

I am very grateful to Drs. M.O. Dare, Musa M. Dogara and Gabriel Ogwuche; Mallam A.A Kundila and Mr. Jacob Aloba, for offering very useful pieces of advice and inspiring me while the programme was on.

The Kano State Police Commissioner, the PPRO, the DPOS of Sabon Gari (Normansland), Fagge and Nassarawa Police Divisions, Kano state were very helpful and considerate during data collection. I am grateful.

I should also place on record the contributions of my fellow students (the unique class) in making the entire postgraduate programme worthwhile

and a memorable one. During our programme, we enjoyed good interactions, which served as a good catalyst for our academic development. May God in His Infinite mercy continue to bless all of us.

I also acknowledge the love, understanding and support of the members of my family; my lovely wife, Amidat, and daughters, Aisha, Asmau and Aminat. They really missed my company during the programme

Lastly, I glorify Allah the uncreated creator for His infinite mercies, which have seen me through this and would continue to guide me through future endeavours.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title page	i
Declaration	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Table of content	vii
Abstract	ix

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Background to the study	4
1.2	Statement of the Problem	7
1.3	General Aim and Objectives of the Study	9
1.4	Scope/Delimitation of the Study	9
1.5	Justification for the Study	10

CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0	Introduction	12
2.1	A Short history of the Police Force in Nigeria	12
2.1.1	General Duties of the Police	15
2.2	The Language of the Police Force	16
2.3	The Different Approaches to Linguistic Analysis of Connected Text	27

2.3.1	Conversation Analysis (CA)	28
2.3.2	Discourse Analysis (DA)	36
2.3.3	Critical Discourse Analysis	62
2.4	Theoretical Framework	67

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.0	Introduction	71
3.1	Sources of Data	71
3.2	Data Collection Method	72
3.3	Test Application of the Analytical Model	73

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0	Preamble	77
4.1	Presentation of Data	77
4.2.1	Data Analysis and Interpretation	78

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, CONSTRAINTS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1	Findings	110
5.2	Conclusion	114
5.3	Limitations of the Study	116
5.4	Suggestions for Further Research	116
	References	117
	Appendices: Police Interaction with the Accused Persons	125

ABSTRACT

This study is an attempt to examine the language of the police personnel in the Kano metropolis. The work intends to focus specifically on the language of interrogation which is a technique in police force communication. The study was aimed at, among other things, describing the structure and organization of the content of police/accused discourse and observing the communication strategies and motivation of the participants in negotiating the interaction. Three Police Divisions were selected for the collection of data; these Divisions are Fagge, Normansland and Nassarawa. Tape recordings of Police interactions with accused persons were made; personal observation of Police interactions was also undertaken. The data were analyzed using the eclectic model of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles; Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) discourse analytic framework and Bruton's (1981) work. The model is an all inclusive descriptive framework for the analysis of connected text. The data analysis focuses on the examination of the structure of interaction between the Investigating Police Officer and the accused person during interrogations and explicates the multidimensional functions of language, that is, whether it is a question, statement or command based on their grammatical structure and location in discourse. The study reveals that the prototypical patterns of discourse acts in Police criminal investigations are the question/answer sequences, which are indeed common to much institutional discourse, and that questioning forms are used to control the flow of discourse in Police/accused interrogation. Further to this, it was observed that one big factor that makes police personnel successful in their crime investigation is the asymmetrical relationship that exists between the Investigating Police Officer and the suspect. During interrogation, the IPO, occupies a higher position than the accused person. It is the IPO that initiate the talk, control the turns and also has the right to ask questions from the suspects. The research reveals that police/accused discourse is highly organized with predictable structures. The structural harmony achieved in the discourse is premised upon the linguistic 'acts' employed by the IPO during the interrogation of accused persons, since it is on all these act forms that the success of the interrogation lies.

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This chapter introduces a discourse analysis of an institutional interaction, that is, the language of interrogation in police/criminal investigations. Its major preoccupation is providing an insight into the structure and organization of police/accused interaction

Language is a means of communicating thoughts and social control. It is a means of individual self-expression, which makes it possible for individuals to live in a society. Language has been described by various scholars as the core of the communication process and is the pivot around which man's social, political, economic and environmental endeavours revolve (Barber, 1967; Langacker, 1967; Ibileye, 1993; etc). Attempts have been made to define language by various scholars. Such attempts include that of Chomsky (1986:16) who conceives language as "the totality of utterances that can be made in a speech community". In the view of Cruse (1990:140), "it is a system of conventional signs, all aspects of whose structure serve the sovereign function of meaning".

Language is a system of communication. It is what communication hinges on. That means communication cannot take place without the use of language. Osisanwo (2003:1) posits that "language is a human vocal noise or the graphic representation of this noise, used systematically and

conventionally by members of a speech community for purposes of communication”. Communication has to do with the process of expressing ideas and feelings or of conveying information to people. In this process, two things occur – information and ideas are expressed, shared and disseminated between two or more people. The shared information (ideas) elicits reaction, whether negative or positive from the receiver. Before there can be any reaction from the receiver, the information shared must have content. This ‘sense making’ phenomenon has to do with meaning, which is a very vital part of human language that makes it a nucleus of communication.

As much as language is a system of meaning, it cannot achieve this meaning on its own as an abstract system of signs. It has to intermingle with the life of the society in order to achieve its essence. Language does not exist in a vacuum; there must be an environment in which it is situated it to function. This is the reason why language and society cannot be separated from each other. Each is “an integral part of the other” (Oyebade 2007:2). Words are not neutral, they convey the feelings and emotions; of their users they, as well, indicate their conviction whether intentionally uttered by the speaker or not. Individuals use language to manipulate discourse and organize frames of information, legitimizing them in order to champion their course or interest.

Language cannot be divorced from the theory of human behaviour; it is the focus of human communication and interaction. Social interaction is as well a reciprocal process involving communication as most human communication requires the use of language. Therefore, one major way to look at language is in its social context. This is because it is the means by which people interact, and the output of a language at the verbal level is the speech form. Gumperz (1972) defines verbal interaction as “A social process in which utterances are selected in accordance with socially recognized norms and expectations.”

Language is very sensitive; it is as well social, functional and also international. It is the way in which humans use language to achieve life's goals and objectives in society that discourse analysis is all about. Recently linguists are directing their attention to the realities and complexities of interactions in other professional fields of enquiry. One of such is forensic linguistics, which is the study of language and the law. Language and law are interwoven and inseparable. To show the relationship between them, Gibbons (2003) asserts that the law is an overwhelmingly linguistic institution. Laws are coded in language and the concepts that are used to construct the law are accessible only through language. Legal processes, such as police investigations, court cases and their management take place through the use of language.

In forensic linguistics, discourse analysis is applied in the styles identified of the authors of written documents, in the patterns of language use of voice identification, in the discovery of systematic language patterns that serve as the profiles of suspects and in the identification of crucial passages in civil cases, such as disputes over contracts and police investigations.

Police/accused discourse is an institutional interaction goal-focused event, the primary aim of which is the collection and synthesis of evidence into a written statement for use in any subsequent court hearing.

1.1 Background to the study

Discourse Analysis, which is the theoretical base of this study, grew out of the works in different disciplines in the 1960's and early 1970's, including Linguistics, Psychology, Anthropology and Sociology. In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in analyzing the way sentences work in sequence to produce coherent stretches of language. Two main approaches have developed: 'Discourse Analysis', which focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language as found in such discourses as conversations, interviews, commentaries and spoken words, and 'Texts Analysis', which focuses on the structure of written language as found in such texts as essays, notices, road signs and chapters.

Discourse Analysis is concerned with “the analysis of language that looks at patterns of language across texts, as well as the social and cultural contexts in which the texts occur” (Paltridge 2006). The thrust of this submission is that Discourse Analysis focuses on language in use. The scope of Discourse Analysis does not only cover the description and analysis of spoken interaction, but also covers the organization of written discourse. Recently, more attention has been paid to communication in policing and this has led to the new field of linguistics called “Forensic Linguistics” in Britain and the United States. The studies of Coulthard (1992) and Fox (1993) are foundational works in this direction. Like most studies in forensic linguistic and discourse analysis, the thematic focus of this study is to highlight the functions of language in police/accused discourse and demonstrate those features that make the discourse a whole unit of language by employing discourse analytical concepts and principles. The study seeks to analyze the structure and organization of police/accused interrogation.

Certain forms of communicative behaviour exist in the Nigeria Police Force. The prominent ones are police-suspect interaction, police-criminal interaction, police-accused interaction and police-police interaction. In all these forms of communicative behaviours, the nature of language use differs. For instance, there are certain linguistic features that characterize police-police interaction, such as the use of honorifics or difference

markers, which are however not found in police-criminal interaction. This study exemplifies and analyses the communicative structure of police-criminal interaction. The study is an analysis of the structure of the spoken form of discourse and presents a general outlook of how police personnel use interrogation, that is, the skillful questioning of suspects during criminal investigation. Criminal investigation can be described as a thorough or detailed inquiry into or examination of acts of commission that are punishable by the law of the state or the land. Interrogation as a linguistic phenomenon is carried out with language, both spoken, unspoken and gesture.

Language either spoken or written from creation has helped humans to meet certain needs, sometimes making them have a sense of fulfilment. Very often, people have used language to shape, inform, educate and even rebuke. Such utterances have usually indicated what functions they perform either by the ordering of the words, which makes up the utterances or by the mood and tonal markers used (in a situation where an utterance is spoken). The characteristics of the utterance, therefore, suggest the function it performs, what J.L. Austin (1971) refers to “as the subject or the way in which it (i.e utterance) is to be taken.”

The police, during the investigation of a crime, depend on information obtained from suspects and witnesses in their cases for the success of the inquiry. It is assumed that human beings, not always

impeccable, leave some traces of their acts of omission that will lead to their being identified as the perpetrators of certain deeds or misdeeds. Similarly, people's use of language may also leave clues that might betray their attitudes, however hard they might have tried to conceal them.

By the very nature of the society, it is difficult or impossible for every citizen to abide by the laws of the society. Some members are bound to break the law or commit crimes of various dimensions. When the laws of the land are broken, the offenders in most cases would attempt to escape from judgment. The police is tasked with the difficult and technical responsibility of tracing the culprits and proving beyond every reasonable doubt that the accused have actually committed the crime.

This study seeks to analyze the structure of police/accused discourse, the circumstances surrounding each speech event and the effect of the discourse/text on the participants.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

This study describes police/accused as a speech event or interaction. It adopts a model of discourse analysis, which could be used to account for connected speech. The discourse acts proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) coupled with the cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975) are adopted as the eclectic framework for analysis for this study. Different features of interrogation between the investigating police

officer and the accused person are analysed in terms of the different acts of discourse in the eclectic framework proposed for the study.

This study examines the unique feature and structure of police/accused discourse and gives insight into language usage in police communication. The questions this study attempts to answer are:

1. What is the organization of the structure of police/accused discourse?
2. What are the communication strategies and motivations of the participants in negotiating the interaction?
3. What are the effects of the utterances by participants in police/accused interaction?
4. What is the degree of power embedded in the interaction between the IPO and the accused person?

These questions are pertinent in view of the fact that the police institutional role in police/accused discourse is anchored on collecting minute details surrounding the commission of alleged offence(s) by interrogating the accused person through well planned and intelligible interview; and in police/accused interaction, the accused persons always respond to elicitation by the investigating police officer. For instance, the investigating police officer always cautions suspects to say only those things which they can substantiate, as whatever is said will be used against them in the court of law.

1.3 General Aim and Objectives of the Study

The study investigates some discourse features in selected police/accused discourse of the Nigeria Police Force in the Kano Metropolis. It focuses on the language of interrogation, which, like questioning, is a technique of police force communication.

The specific objectives of this research include:

- 1) To describe the structure and organization of the content of police/accused discourse.
- 2) To observe the communication strategies and motivations of the participants in negotiating the interaction.
- 3) To highlight the effects of utterances by participants in police/accused interaction.
- 4) To show the degree of power that is embedded in the interaction between the IPO and the accused person.

1.4 Scope/Delimitation of the Study

The major focus of this research is an analysis of police/accused interaction during crime investigation. Of peculiar interest to this study is the aspect of linguistic acts performed by investigating police officers and accused persons during police/accused interrogation in crime investigation. The study is limited to an inquiry into some discourse features in selected police/accused discourse of the Nigeria police force.

The study focuses on interrogations between the police and some accused persons in three police divisions in the Kano metropolis. These divisions are: Fagge Police Station, Sabon Gari (Normansland) Police Station and Nassarawa Police Station.

1.5 Justification for the Study

There have been many scholarly works on various discourse events. But sparse attempts have been made to study police/accused discourse. Coulthard (1972) is a study of police/accused discourse using forensic discourse analysis, which is from the pragmatic and psycholinguistic perspectives. Oyebade (2007) attempts a pragmatic study of English usage in police communication. Fox (1993) also compares police speak with normal speak.

There is the need to focus on some specific aspects of such discourse with particular attention to discourse structure and acts in police/accused interaction. Specifically the study examines the uniqueness of the language employed by interactants in police/accused interrogation setting.

The work is situated within 'discourse acts', an aspect of discourse analysis. An act in discourse analysis is different from Austin's acts or Searle's speech acts. To Austin (1962), the saying of a word in a performative utterance constitutes the performance of an action. To this

end, Coulthard (1977) defined acts as the lowest on the rank scale of discourse that could be sentences, phrases or words, depending on the type of conversation. Acts in discourse are defined mainly by their functions.

The analysis done in this work takes the general definition of the concept of acts into consideration. The relative positions of different language functions, such as questions, statements and commands, are identified through their grammatical structures and analyzed into their discourse functions. This enables us to understand fully the structure of police/accused discourse.

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first and preliminary section contains an historical perspective of the Nigeria Police Force; the second part deals with a comprehensive review of related literature, while the third outlines a theoretical framework for the study.

2.3 A Short history of the Police Force in Nigeria

The word 'police' originates from French; it came into French from Latin 'politia' (civil administration) that was taken from the ancient Greek word 'polis', which means 'city'. The word 'police' was first found in French in 1250 and its sense was that of the preservation of law and order in the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century, with the "Treatise of the Police" published between 1705 and 1738 by Nicholas de la Mare. As a result of this, the police force was created by the government of King Louis XIV in 1667 to police the city of Paris that was then the largest in Europe. Thereafter, the concept of the police force developed and spread throughout Europe and the Americas.

In Nigeria, the police force had its origin in Lagos, the then federal capital, more than a hundred and twenty years ago. The British Councillor charged with the administration of the colony of Lagos complained that he

had numerous duties assigned to him among which was the maintenance of law and order. And in April 1861, permission was obtained from his principals in London to establish a consular guard comprising of 30 men.

Two years later in 1863, this small body of men became known as the "Hausa Guard". It was further regularized in 1879 by an ordinance creating a constabulary from the colony of Lagos. This force recruited mainly from Hausas and known as the "Hausa Constabulary" was commanded by an Inspector-General of Police. The force was mainly military in character, although the men performed some civil police duties.

On 1st January, 1896, the Lagos police force was established and armed like the "Hausa Constabulary". It was headed by a commissioner of police who was also a sheriff, an inspector of weights and measures and the officer in charge of prisons. In 1898, a criminal investigating department-forerunner of the present force Criminal Investigation Department at Alagbom close, Ikoyi was created. Also, the areas now known as Delta, Edo, Rivers, Bayelsa, Cross River and Akwa-Ibom states were declared the Oil Rivers Protectorate in 1891 with the headquarters at Calabar where an armed constabulary was formed. In 1893, the area was proclaimed the Nigeria Coast Protectorate and in 1894, the Niger Coast Constabulary, modeled on the Hausa Constabulary was formed. It existed for six years and featured prominently in the British expedition to Benin in 1896.

In the Northern parts of the country, the Royal Niger Company, which was granted a Royal Charter in 1886 by the British government, set up the Royal Nigeria Constabulary in 1888 with headquarters at Lokoja to protect its installations along the banks of the River Niger. It had a mounted company known as “Carol’s Horses”. When the protectorate of Northern and Southern Nigeria were proclaimed by the British Government in 1900, following the transfer of administration from the Royal Niger Company, the Royal Niger Constabulary was split into the Northern Nigeria Police Force and the Northern Nigerian Regiment. In the south, the Lagos Police Force and part of the Niger Coast Constabulary became the Southern Nigerian Police Force in 1906, while the bulk of the Niger Coast Constabulary formed the Southern Nigeria Regiment.

After the amalgamation of Northern and Southern Nigeria in 1914, both police forces continued to operate separately until 1st April, 1930, when they were merged to form the present Nigerian Police Force with headquarters in Lagos, commanded by an inspector-general. Nigerians assumed overall leadership of the force in 1964 when the late Mr. Louis Orok Edet was appointed the first indigenous Inspector-General of Police.

The police play important roles in the Nigerian society without which the sustenance of order, legality, development and democracy may be difficult. Their primary role is policing, which has to do with securing

compliance with existing laws and conformity with the precepts of social order.

2.3.1 The General Duties of the Police

The following are the general duties of the police as provided for in the various laws of the federation and the Nigeria Constitution.

- a. The prevention and detection of crime
- b. The apprehension of offenders
- c. The preservation of law and order
- d. The protection of life and property
- e. The due enforcement of laws and regulations with which they are directly charged
- f. The preservation of the liberty of subject
- g. The control and regulations of traffic
- h. The performance of such military duties within or outside Nigeria as may be required of them by or under the authority of the Police Act or any other act (The Nigerian Police force Training Manual, 1976)

Criminal investigation is a means of the prevention and detection of crime in the country. When a crime is committed, the investigation of such crime hinges on information procured from the accused person for the success of the inquiry. In fact, it becomes very important, therefore, that the law enforcement personnel should know where to seek information, the type of information to look for, and how to assess, preserve and utilize it for

optimum result. In order to obtain relevant information in respect of a crime, the IPO who is the crime investigator will have to interrogate the suspect(s)/witness(es). The interrogation is done skillfully through questioning in order to collect facts and information that will lead to among other things:

1. identify the guilty person or perpetrator,
2. locate him; and
3. provide evidence of the accused person's guilt.

(Danbazau, 2007: 17).

2.4 The Language of the Police Force

Before any meaningful literature review is made in the present research, it is pertinent to discuss the kernel of the studies that have been made on police communication. Linguists like Bamgbose (1971), Adekunle (1978), Oyeleye (1985), Ayodele (1988), Ogunsiji (1989), Coulthard (1992), Fox (1993) and Oyebade (2007) have all made worthwhile and insightful enquiries into the language of the police force. Notably among these works are Fox's 'police speak' and 'Normal speak', Coulthard's Forensic Discourse Analysis, Ogunsiji's (1989) and Oyebade's (2007) thesis on 'police language in Nigeria'.

Bamgbose (1971) in his observation of the language of the police force in Nigeria noticed that Pidgin English serves as the semi-lingua-

franca in that it features prominently in police communication. But presently the situation is different. There is another variety of English in police communication in Nigeria. This variety is what Bamgbose (1995) identifies as Broken English. It occurs both in the written and spoken forms of communication in the country. The use of this variety of English in the Nigeria Police Force can be traced to the fact that English is used as the language of official communication in the force and not many police officers can converse fluently in Standard English. Thus, the incompetence of these officers has given rise to this variety of English.

Oyeleye (1985) identified some elements of the peculiarities in the language of the police force in utterances like: “Your particulars?”, “Where your roadworthiness?”, “What you want here?”, “Go away!” He posits that the non-standard grammatical constructions reveal the communicative incompetence of the policemen. Furthermore, he explained that ‘particulars’ and ‘roadworthiness’ identify the policeman as a professional member of the police. But in present day Nigeria, taking into cognizance the sociolinguistic realities, one will note that the non-standard grammatical construction is not only peculiar to the rank and file in the police force, but also to officers and other segments of the society. One striking feature about this is that the levels at which this incompetence occurs in the force varies, because there are varieties of English that are not only

Nigerianisms because of the adaptation of English in Nigeria, but a deviation from the norm.

While commenting on some lexical peculiarities of the language of the police in Nigeria, Ayodele (1988) observed that lexical items, such as 'papers' and 'particulars', feature predominantly in police communication. He posits that the pragmatic context of utterance must be invoked in assigning meanings to these lexical items. Ayodele's observation gives suggestion for Discourse Analysis and pragmatic studies of police communication in Nigeria. This is very apt because associating some lexical items as peculiar to police communication is not enough at describing police communication. The reason is that lexical items or sentences are not the only linguistic properties that give meaning in discourse; the context of use, which contributes to our understanding of how language is used in a particular situation, can exert meaning on linguistic structures.

Ogunsiji's (1989) study of police language in Ila Local Government area of Osun State is also of some valuable significance to the present study. Using a discourse analytical approach to police communication in Nigeria, he posits that language is functional and social – a kind of inter-organism. He disagrees with the view that Pidgin English is the language of Nigeria Police Force. To him, police English is an occupational variety of the Nigeria English. Citing example of Nigerian English, its characteristics

and those factors that contribute to its growth and developments, Ogunsifi's (1989) application of the principles of Speech Acts, Pragmatics, Semiotics and Sociolinguistics to police communication in Nigeria proves beyond any doubt that the variety of English used in the police force is, first, an occupational variety of Nigerian English, and, second, it helps the organization in achieving its linguistic and communicative goals.

Furthermore, Ogunsiji (1989) also points out that, by using the notion of coherence and cohesion, police language is a complete genre of communication. He submits that the users know those principles they are to employ in using the language they use to negotiate meaning. Despite the fact that the study has made some insightful comments on police language, what is lacking is the context, which is not consciously applied in which police communication is used. The non-application of the principles of context in the study fails to bring to the fore some salient features of police communication.

One outstanding work in police communication is Coulthard's (1992) *Forensic Discourse Analysis*. It is a new area of linguistics that studies language as used by the police, especially in criminal cases. The major focus of Coulthard (1992) is in the area of 'substance', that is, comparison of samples of hand written contemporaneous records made by police officers of interviews with witness and suspects, and statements dictated by witnesses and suspects to police officers. The text is supposed to be a

complete record of what was said during the interview and with the caution:

You are not obliged to say anything unless you wish to do so, but what you say will be put into writing and given in evidence. Do you understand?

This system of interrogating the accused person cuts across all police stations all over the world and the cautionary words too are the same.

Coulthard's (1992) view is that the forensic discourse analyst is to take one or more interview records or statements and comment on their likely authenticity. As Farinde (2008) notes, the already convicted offender claims that police officers have fabricated a part or the whole of an interview or statement against him and is looking for linguistic evidence of fabrication. And what the defence hopes is that the discourse analyst will be able to demonstrate that some or all of the 'content' of the interview is untrue.

Coulthard (1992) believes that what the forensic discourse analyst is asked to do is to take one or more interview records or statements and comment on their authenticity. He also observes that the mistakes the fabricator of interviews and statements makes can be grouped into three headings, which he identifies as 'psycholinguistic consideration', 'quantity' and 'discourse structure'. Under psycholinguistic considerations, he believes that people have the misconception that they can remember verbatim, what was said to them, but this is not true. Secondly, speakers

do not remember even their own contribution, as verbally transmitted information is not stored in the brain.

Coulthard (1992) affirms that 'quantity', and 'discourse structure' can also be used against the fabricator of interviews and statements. One of the maxims in 'the cooperative principle' evolved by Grice (1975) is the quantity maxim, which specifies the conventions, participants adhere to in making their contribution in discourse. The maxim of quantity is summarized thus:

Give the right amount of information, that is:

- a) Make your contribution as is required
- b) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required

(Brown and Yule, 1984: 32).

When we consider the act of the fabricator of forensic texts vis-à-vis the quantity maxim, we can see that the fabricator is in a tight corner, since the police function is to provide the court with unambiguous evidence of what was said. Thus, the fabricator has broken the maxim of quantity and this could be used against him.

Although Coulthard's Forensic Discourse Analysis is a big stride at describing police communication, its shortcoming is that it only attempts to study fabrications in the use of the language of police interviews and the statements of criminals and not how the police use language in communication. Fox (1993) contains a section within Forensic Discourse

Analysis dealing with the comparison of 'police speak' and 'normal speak'. His work is based on the analysis of co-build corpus data, and he discovered that there are linguistic peculiarities that differentiate police discourse from normal day-to-day discourse. Lexical items such as 'then', again, 'at first' and 'continually', which are time and frequency adjuncts used in post subject positions to clauses, which are introduced by adverbials of time like 'as', 'when', 'while' and 'whilst', are some of the linguistic peculiarities discovered by Fox (1993). The following examples, where two police officers at Normansland are talking to each other, illustrate this:

1. Detective Jariri then left the room.
2. He then started talking to the man

Fox (1993) claims that in normal ordinary day-to-day speech, these peculiarities are not found. He also notes that police officers are absorbed by time. In their statements actual times are often given: 'at 1:15pm' at 4:30 pm' 'at 10.15pm', etc. These show the time at which questioning begins and ends. Also, there are many approximate times, 'at approximately 2:10am' 'at 12:20pm'. This feature is extended to the statements given by witnesses because the police, when taking down statements, fashion it out like their communicative structure, which describe the time and setting of occurrences. In the view of Fox (1993),

ordinary people are not as precise with the time of incidents as peculiar with the police.

The setting of the scene of events, according to Fox (1993), is equally precise. These include, among other things, where the interview is taking place, where they were at the time of arrest, and so on. This is quite understandable, but it does lead to some unnatural over-specification. For example:

1. In an interview room at Metro Police Station
2. In New Road at the entrance to Mr. Biggs
3. We returned to the yard of Normansland Police Station.

In normal conversation, one would probably say 'We returned to the police station' rather than mentioning the actual part of the station. None of the features mentioned so far is particularly unusual in itself, although it might not be very common.

What gives 'statement speak' its very distinctive flavour is the juxtaposition of two or three of these in a very close proximity: 'Later at 1:10pm on that day', 'Later the same day at 8:15pm', 'In a cell at Metro police station', 'On Friday 12th June, 2008, at about 3:10pm', 'Later, at approximately 12:30pm', 'At approximately 9:50am on Friday 13th February, 2009'. The accumulation of adjuncts in this way is unusual; however, it is important for police records that all events are carefully timed and located, as they might be challenged by defence lawyers in law courts.

Another observation made by Fox (1993) is that the passive voice is more frequently used in police statements than in normal writing. This paints a scenario that things seem to happen without human intervention, for example:

1. The police were called and a search was commenced
2. The car was removed to Metro Police Station where it was technically examined.
3. Mallam Isa was served a meal in his cell'.

He further observed that there are also a large number of prepositional phrases starting with 'by', which shows who did something and which could in many cases have been expressed in the active, rather than in the passive:

1. The bank premises was probed by five armed and masked men.
2. Isa was taken to an interview room at 5:00pm by detective Sergeant Hassan,
3. Prior to that he was supplied with a meal by detective Sergeant Hassan, etc.

This feature gives an impersonal and highly formal tone to most police statements. Also, there are some words that are used to refer to the names of offences, all of which have a precise meaning in law, and yet mean very little to the innocent layman. For instance, any case of death caused by another man is 'murder' to the layman. But in the police force,

there is a clear difference between 'murder' and 'manslaughter', yet both are caused by a human agent.

Fox (1993) also explains that there is a formality in some of the vocabulary in the written police statements, which is unusual in laymen's account of incidents or events. For example, shots are not 'fired' but 'discharged'; money is 'recovered' rather than 'found' or 'got back', the police 'retain possession' of property, they do not 'keep it'; prisoners are 'conveyed back to prison', they are not 'taken back' etc. Furthermore, he pointed out that the verb which is frequently repeated in police statements is the verb 'continue'. For example, police 'continue with enquiries', they 'continue to question', etc. Another is 'tender', which is found in the declaration signed by all police witness.

I declare that this statement..., is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it known that, if it is tendered in evidence at a preliminary enquiry..., I shall be liable to prosecution. If I have willfully stated in its anything which I know to be false.
(Nigeria Police Force Training Manual, 1976).

Although Fox and Coulthard's works provide a good general introduction to the nature and form of police communication, it has two shortcomings, especially when considered relative to the needs of the present research:

- a) The works do not treat naturally occurring conversation in the context of police/accused interaction. Rather, then focus

predominantly on written police texts that reflect the ancient nature of police vocabulary, and

- b) The works do not have any concrete framework on which they are based and from which further research could be made. In other words, the works are substantially theoretical.

Oyebade's (2007) linguistic study of the pragmatics of English usage in police communication is also significant to the present study. She adopted a pragmatic analytical approach. In doing this, she applied some principles of pragmatics like dietetics, context and contextual beliefs. The co-operative principle conversational maxims and presuppositions highlight their application to the natural data of English usage in the Nigeria police force. Like previous works in forensic linguistics, the study emphasizes the functions of language and takes a look at police use of language.

The study takes a wholistic look at police language, using relevant pragmatic theory and concepts as its model of analysis and on another level taking police language as a register. The work interprets those principles of language use that apply in the use of English language by the police in Nigeria. Her recognition of police English usage was located under register within Pragmatics. Oyebade (2007) also exemplifies how mood, context, speech acts, dietics, contextual beliefs, implicative and presupposition interplay to give a complete depiction of the standard that

guides communicative events in the police force in all the categories of police interactions.

Although Oyebode made some shrewd comments on the language of the police, the structure surrounding police communication is not applied. Another area not divulged by the work is the adequate application of some discourse analysis theory and concepts. This is principally because the approach is not typically discourse analytical, but pragmatic in nature. In the present research, where the approach is discourse analytical, we shall be looking at particularly the structure and organization of police/accused interrogation, observing the communication strategies and motivations, the orientation of participants towards each other and towards the subject matter of the interrogation.

The above review of literature has allowed us to place our study within the perspective of earlier research works in the field of Discourse Analysis; and this has led to the conviction that the Discourse Analysis Approach within Systemic Functional Linguistics is the best option for the description of police interrogation data.

2.3 The Different Approaches to Linguistic Analysis of Connected Text

Olateju (2004) identified three broad approaches to the study of conversation. These are Conversation Analysis; Discourse Analysis and

Critical Discourse Analysis. The major focus of these approaches include how coherence and sequential organization in discourse are produced and understood and the investigation of language functions. Yet, there are elements of peculiarities in their styles of analysis.

2.3.1 Conversation Analysis (CA)

The first major notable concern with Conversation Analysis – the study of recorded, naturally occurring talk in interaction, was pioneered by a school of Sociology known as Ethnomethodology, which became popular in the early 1980s. According to Jaworski and Coupland (2002), ethnomethodology means studying the link between what social actors ‘do’ in interaction and what they ‘know’ about interaction. Ethnomethodologists have been basically concerned with how to make social actors’ knowledge about their everyday interaction explicit, and find an understanding of how society is organized and how it functions (Heritage 1984). Every human society or social structure has been described as a form of order, and that order is partly achieved through talk, which is itself structured and orderly.

Conversational Analysis is generally concerned with the organization of how people make meaningful conduct in society; that is, how events and actions are produced. In other words, CA has been concerned with how conduct and practice in whatever form are accomplished. In Conversation Analysis, any sort of interaction may be studied, for example, chats among peers, consultation with physicians, family discourse, job interviews,

broadcast news, commentaries, political speeches, market discourse, interactions at school, etc. In each case, the analyst is interested in explaining the methods or procedures people employ to make sense and be understood by others.

Some early researchers discriminate between formal and informal talk, thinking that everyday talk in informal settings is what Conversation Analysis should be concerned with because they feel that formal discourse (which they refer to as institutional talk) is governed by different orders of constraints. Anita Pomerantz and B.J. Fellir (1997) see the distinction as analytically unnecessary as Conversation Analysis is concerned with conduct or action in both contexts. Other researchers see the term “Conversation Analysis” as referring only to the verbal aspects of interaction, but Conversation Analysis has been concerned right from the beginning with both the verbal, non-verbal, and the paralinguistic features of talk (sound quality pauses, gaps, restarts, starts, etc). Some other researchers have even expanded the scope of Conversation Analysis to include the visually available features of conduct, such as appropriate orientation, hand-arm gestures, postures, etc. (see for instance, M. Goodwin, 1980; C. Goodwin 1981; 1986; Heath, 1986).

A key issue in Conversation Analysis, according to Paltridge (2006), is the view of ordinary conversation as the most basic form of talk. She is of the opinion that:

Conversation is the main way in which people come together, exchange information, negotiate and maintain social relations. All other forms of talk-in-interaction are thus derived from this basic form of talk. It is not the case that other forms of talks are the same as ordinary conversation. They do, however, exploit the same kinds of resources as 'ordinary conversation' to achieve their social and interaction goals. (Paltridge 2006: 107)

One central concept within Conversation Analysis is the speaking turn. In conversation, it takes two interactants to have a turn-taking. However, turn-taking is more than just a defining property of conversational activity. The study of its patterns allows one to describe contextual variation (examining, for instance, the structural organization of turns, how speakers manage sequences as well as the internal design of turns). Also, the principle of taking turns in speech is claimed to be universal to talk and it is something that speakers attend to in interaction.

A further central concept is that of the adjacency pair. The basic idea is that turns minimally come in pairs and the first of a pair creates certain expectations, which constrain the possibilities for a second. Examples of adjacency pairs are question/answer, complaint/apology, greeting/greeting, accusation/denial, etc. Adjacency pairs can further be characterized by the occurrence of preference organization. The phenomenon of adjacency pairs in talk also forms the basis for the concept of 'sequential implicativeness', that is, each in a conversation is essentially a response to the preceding talk and an anticipation of the kind of talk to follow. In

formulating their present turn, speakers show their understanding of the previous turn and reveal their expectations about the next turn to come (Gardner 1994: 102). This is often singled out as Conversation Analysis's most important insight, viz: that actors, in the course of interaction, display to each other their understanding of what they are doing – an insight which can be traced to phenomenology's belief that actors maintain an awareness of their own actions, and it is this awareness that is displayed to the other party.

Despite the fact that Conversational Analysis has strengths it has also its weaknesses. The approach is not a self-sufficient research tool to analyze discourse; that is, the view that Conversation Analysis does not need any other data than conversation to justify its claim. Hammersley (2003, cited in Paltridge 2006) argues that when we analyze data from the Conversation Analysis perspective, we are working as 'spectators' not 'participants' in the interaction, and this makes it impossible for us to know how the participants view their conversation unless we ask them. Conversation Analysis on its own does not tell us all there is to know about human social life. However, the amalgamation of Conversation Analysis with other qualitative, and even quantitative, approaches to Discourse Analyses can further help us understand how people use conversation to engage in, and construct their, social lives.

The work of Grice (1975) is mostly associated with the theory of the “cooperative principle” and its attendant maxims, which together regulate the exchange of information between individuals involved in interaction. The concept of cooperative principles is based on the assumption that language users willingly agree to cooperate by making their contributions to the talk as is required by the current stage of the talk or the direction into which it develops. Presenting the principles, Grice, (1975) says:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Grice, 1975: 45).

Adherence to this principle entails that talkers simultaneously observe four (4) maxims:

Quality Maxim:

Make your contribution truthful and sincere. Within the conversation context, the speaker should not claim to know more than he does so as not to mislead co-participants.

Quantity Maxim:

Provide sufficient information. This like other maxims requires the participant to be as brief as possible. Also, the speaker should make his contribution as informative as required and he/she should not make his/her contribution more informative than is required.

Manner Maxim:

Make your contribution brief, present it in an orderly fashion and remove ambiguities. This maxim relates to ‘the how’ and not ‘the what’ of what is said. The speaker is expected to be perspicuous, avoid ambiguity and prolixity; and be orderly.

Relation Maxim:

Make your contribution as relevant as possible. The participants are expected to concentrate on the subject being handled at a particular stage and not to introduce extraneous items into the conversation (Brown and Yule, 1984: 32).

An important view in Pragmatics, which has connectors for both the production and interpretation of discourse, is the concept of **conversational implicature**, which, according to Paltridge (2006), refers to the inference a hearer makes about the intended meaning that arises from the literal meaning of what the speaker says, the conversational principle and its maxims. Grice (1975), also shows the contrast between what he calls **conversational** and **particularized conversational implicatures**. In conventional implicatures, no specific context is required in order to obtain the implicature. For example,

- 1) A: How are we traveling to Kano tomorrow?
- 2) B: Well ... I'm going with Mike.

The use of 'well' in the above example can conventionally implicate that what the speaker is about to say is not what the hearer is hoping to hear. Particularized conversational implicatures, however, are derived from a specific context, rather than from the use of words alone. These stem from the maxim of relation; that is, the speaker expects that the hearer will search for the relevance of what they are saying and derive an intended meaning. For example in:

1. A: I am hungry
2. B: Don't worry there's a restaurant on the corner.

'A' derives from 'B's answer that they will be able to buy food from the restaurant on the corner. Nearly all implicatures are particularized conversational implicatures.

Another type of implicature is scalar implicature. In the view of Paltridge (2006), it emanates from a speaker's usage of a word from a set that expresses some kind of scale of values. Examples of such words are 'all', 'most', 'something' and 'nothing'. In the following conversation 'B' is in a bar, talking on his mobile phone to 'A'. 'A' asks, 'B' about his academic work:

- 1) A: How is your thesis? Have you been up to something interesting lately?
- 2) B: Not really, well... nothing I can tell you about in the bar.

Here 'B' has cancelled out 'nothing' from which 'B' derives 'A' has been doing 'something' interesting in his academic life.

A speaker may choose one item from a scale, then correct it while he is speaking to cancel out another item in the scale. The following exchange where fans of a football club that lost a match give a post match analysis of the game is an example:

(1) A: Looking at the game, do you think the coach is responsible for the team's defeat?

(2) B: The coach should take full responsibility. On a second thought, he should take some responsibility or rather take half of it because it takes the coach and the team to lose a match.

Here speaker 'B' cancels out 'full' with 'some', then cancels 'some' with 'half of' adding an explanation as to why he has done this.

The estimation of implicature, in the view of Grice (1975), hinges on the hearer drawing on the conventional meaning of words, the cooperative principle and its maxims, the linguistic and non-linguistic the context of the utterance, background knowledge and the fact that there is availability of the aforementioned to the interactants, and both of them share the same belief. When these fundamental systems are met, implicature can be produced in one of three ways. A maxim can be accompanied in a clear-cut manner and the hearer implicates what the speaker intends. The following examples, where a customer orders for food, illustrates this:

1) A: What would you like?

2) B: A plate of rice.

With the reply of 'B', he/she has observed the maxim of quality by saying what he wants; the manner maxim by giving a clear answer to the question; the quantity maxim by giving only the needed information, and the relation maxim by supplying a relevant answer to the question. The utterance of the speaker and hearer in the above example did not generate any implicature that warrants any interpretation.

2.3.2 Discourse Analysis (DA)

The first known attempt at Discourse Analysis was that of Zellig Harris in 1952. He introduced the term "Discourse Analysis" as a system of analyzing connected speech and writing. In doing this, Harris in his article 'Discourse Analysis' (1952) tried to examine language beyond the level of the sentence and the relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour. He carried out a detailed examination of both with the aim of providing a method of describing the distribution of language features within texts and its combination in particular kinds and styles of texts. A vital and early observation made by Harris, which is germane to Discourse Analysis and aptly cited in Paltridge (2006), is that:

Connected discourse occurs within a particular situation – whether of a person speaking, or of a conversation, or of someone sitting down occasionally over the period of months to write a particular kind of book in a particular literary or scientific tradition. (Harris 1952: 3).

Discourse Analysis then accounts for what people do when they use language; linguistic features are examined as the means employed in what people are doing. Harris' (1952) attempt at Discourse Analysis was the earliest known, but Harris his approach lacked a sufficient analytic method compared with the way and manner Discourse Analysis is studied today. Scholars who came after him in the field have broadened and enriched the scope of research Harris (1952) commenced. Today, Discourse Analysis has become a very important field in the study of language.

Stubs (1983) defines Discourse Analysis as:

Linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected speech or written discourse... It refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts... discourse analysis is also concerned with language use in social contexts. (Stubs, 1983: 1).

Similarly, Brown and Yule (1998) posit that:

The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions, which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs. (Brown and Yule, 1998: 1)

Other linguists, for instance Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 3), see Discourse Analysis as not only language reflecting social order, but also language shaping social order shaping individual interaction with the society. Buttressing the view, Paltridge (2006) posits that:

Discourse Analysis focuses on knowledge about language beyond the word, clause, phrase and sentence that is needed for communication. It looks at patterns of language across texts and considers the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it is used. (Paltridge, 2006: 2).

The implication of all the views considered above is that through Discourse Analysis it is observed that language use is constrained by situational factors, which serve as the keys for its understanding and proper interpretation.

Discourse shapes and constraints our identities, relationships, knowledge and beliefs the same way social structures also shape and constrain a discourse. The object of study in Discourse Analysis, as it developed in the field of linguistics, is the structure and function of language in use; Discourse Analysis pays particular attention to the ways language in context is organized and above the level of the sentence. Discourse Analysis also investigates aspects of language that are complex and abstract – for example, how speakers and writers use language in institutional settings, or how socio-cultural perspectives affect the production and interpretation of language.

Though Discourse Analysis is not entirely separated from the study of grammar and phonology, Discourse Analysts are interested in a lot more than linguistic forms. Their concerns include how it is that two speakers interpret each other's grammar appropriately, how it is that the dialogue between two speakers is coherent, what roles they are in relation to each other and what sort of rules or conventions they follow as they converse with one another. Most of us take part in a wide range of different types of spoken interaction: phone calls, buying things in shops, job interviews or medical interviews with a doctor, formal talk at meetings or in classrooms, or intimate talk with our friends and loved ones. These situations have different settings and ways of opening and closing. Discourse Analysis is interested in all these factors and tries to account for them in dynamic fashions with a separate set of descriptive labels from those used by the conventional grammarians.

Stubbs (1983) examines the structure of conversation from two perspectives, i.e. the linguistic and the philosophical. He discussed the relationship between Discourse Analysis, Semantics and Syntax. Adopting the linguistic approach in his studies, he argued that several linguistic devices could be and are often used to structure discourse, adding that an utterance conditions or predicts what comes after it.

Stubbs (1983) employs for the purpose of analysis classroom recorded data. The analysis showed that various contexts demand

different language use and that language performs different functions from one social situation to another. Using ample examples, he explicated how teachers manipulate language to guide the teaching process. The teacher controls and shapes the direction of the classroom discourse by virtue of his position as a transmitter of knowledge. He actualizes this by asking questions:

To constantly check-up to see if they are on the same wavelengths as their pupils, if at least most of their pupils are following what they are saying in addition to monitoring, editing and correcting the actual language which pupils use. Teachers therefore constantly exert different kinds of control over an ongoing state of talk in the classroom (Stubbs, 1983: 56).

The question and answer features of Stubbs's findings conform with what is tenable within the police station context. Thus, the question and answer sequence in police/accused interaction can be equated, especially in terms of structural arrangement, to the structure of teacher-pupil interaction. It is envisaged that in police/accused interrogation, the investigating police officer will ask the accused person questions to ascertain whether the accused is guilty or not, and provide evidence of the accused person's guilt. This structure can be compared to the "initiation and response" pairing suggested by Stubbs (1983).

Stubbs also argues that several linguistic devices could be used to structure discourse, adding that an utterance pattern vaticinate what comes after it, as all speech has some metacommunicative function. For

instance, a question precedes an answer and this corresponds with the “initiation/response” grouping proposed by Sinclair and Courthard (1975). Since Stubbs’ (1983) work is identical with that of Sinclair and Courthard (1975), it is presumed that both have the same weakness, as each of the design is not applicable to all talks.

Brown and Yule’s (1983) work, which is a general introduction to Discourse Analysis, explicates the circumstances for the successful analysis of discourse. These linguists classified language according to the function it performs, which is a classification that correlates with the earlier linguists like Halliday (1970). Brown and Yule (1983) posit that the transactional function of language is message-oriented. The transactional nature of language is brought to the fore when language is used purposely for the transference of factual and propositional information. They maintain that for the effective performance of a transaction to be achieved there must be clarity – the speaker should make what he says as clear as possible, because failure to do so often results in unpleasant consequences in the real world.

In addition to this function, Brown and Yule (1983) observe that a lot of language use on a daily basis is not essentially for information dissemination; but for the maintenance of social relations through interpersonal contacts. They also distinguished between two forms of discourse (that is written and spoken forms); pointing out that different

things are taken into consideration in the analysis of each. While written discourse is used purposely for the transference of information, the spoken is used for the establishment and maintenance of social relations. Context of situation was significantly highlighted by Brown and Yule (1983), who argued that lexical items or sentences are not the only entities in language that give meaning; the context of use can as well exert meaning on linguistic structures.

Brown and Yule (1983), apart from being an introductory work on Discourse Analysis, which provided an extensive overview of the many and diverse approaches to the study of discourse, is an approach based principally on the subject.

Frank (1989) examines the features of the language of interviews in terms of the manipulation of the question and answer style with the purpose of seeing how these features could be described vis-à-vis a general model of Discourse Analysis. She described the radio interview as a speech event or interaction carried out to give an explanation for connected speech in other situations than the interview. She gave a detailed analysis of the characteristics of features interviews between two participants – the interviewer and the interviewee, bringing to the fore the question/answer style of interview. Furthermore, she highlighted the types and distributions of questions interviewers use to collect information,

strategies for gaining control and monitoring the speech event and the functions performed by the utterances of the interactants.

Frank (1989) relies heavily on the version of the linguistic model proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and Halliday's (1975) functional model. The theoretical framework adopted by her is that of Systemic Functional Linguistics. This is based on the conviction that the system, according to her;

...enhances understanding of what a speaker is talking about and how the interaction is maintained to achieve effective communication. It also brings out how language performs different functions depending on the situation people are involved and the reason for the talk (Frank, 1989: 74).

Frank (1989) posits that the two broad approaches to the study of conversation, Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis, are mainly pre-occupied with how coherence and sequential organization in discourse are produced and understood. Using data from real life situations for her analysis, Frank (1989) showed that out of the sixteen (16) questions asked by the interviewer in her data, seven (7) were polar questions, six (6) were 'wh' questions and the last three (3) were disjunctive questions.

Frank adopted an heterogenous framework based on the study of Coulthard and Sinclair (1975), Burton (1981), Stubbs (1983) and Berry (1981). She synthesized the authors work and came up with what she described as an 'eclectic approach', which, according to her, 'aims at a

comprehensive descriptive framework for the analysis of connected text'. The basic features of analyses were the five discourse ranks of interaction, transaction, exchange, move and act, as developed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975).

The question dimension of Frank (1989) is synonymous to what transpires within the context of police/accused interrogation. In police/accused interrogation, it is expected that the investigating police officer usually asks questions that the accused person in turn responds to usually with answers. However, the work has its limitations, since it cannot account for all kinds of talk for a comprehensive descriptive model of discourse.

Ibibleye's (1993) major preoccupation is the discourse structure of court room conversation. The research sought to study the structure of courtroom interaction and how conversation is organized in court to achieve diverse purposes. He gave an account of the legal discourse as a naturally occurring speech event with a fairly clear-out structure. Ibibleye's (1993) application of the principles of speech acts and pragmatics to courtroom interaction dispels the notion that legal language is rigid. He argued that legal language like any other discourse has also a flexible structure. Despite the fact that it is institutionalized, its flexibility gives ample opportunity for linguistic manipulation. Relating Stubbs' (1983) work to what obtains in a courtroom context, Ibibleye (1993) posits that a

question and answer series in court would be seen to be the same, especially in terms of structural harmony. He asserted that:

It will be expected that in cross examination, the prosecutor and/or the defence will characteristically ask questions of either the accused or the witness, who respond with answers. This structure we can roughly correlate with the 'initiation and response' pairing suggested by Stubbs... The question and answer sessions in court, rather than being used to test understanding are more often used to evaluate the case under trial (Ibibleye 1993: 42).

The question and answer session in court performs different functions when compared to that of the classroom. The application of questions in the classroom by the teacher is to test the pupils' understanding of the lesson. Similarly, the persecutor or defence counsel uses the same structure to examine the nature of a particular case, such that the presiding judge can come to an understanding of the merits or demerits of the case (Ibibleye, 1993). Ibibleye's view correlates with the submission of Stubbs (1983) referred to above that *the kind of language used by speakers reflects who is talking to whom and what the point of talk is* (Stubbs, 1983: 80).

Ibibleye (1993) avers that Discourse Analysis can be broadly studied from four different angles; Ethnomethodology, Linguistics, Philosophy and Pragmatics. He inclined towards the Speech Acts based framework developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) and the pragmatic-based Cooperative Principle of Grice (1975) arguing that the consideration of

these models is quite relevant to his research, as it gives the researcher the opportunity to understand the linguistic features of the courtroom situation as akin to the present study. While Ibileye's major pre-occupation was how legal practitioners in law courts use language to make a thorough or detailed inquiry or examination of acts of omission that are punishable by the law of the land; the focus of the present study is how police personnel interrogate accused persons to unravel the case under investigation. The distinct feature in Ibileye (1993) and the present study is the language used by court and police personnel. Legalese, which is highly institutionalized, is employed as a medium of communication, while in the police station the Investigating police officer even code-switches and code-mixes from English to an indigenous language to interrogate a suspect. Furthermore, the present study is focused on Discourse Analysis unlike that of Ibileye, which is pragmatic.

Olateju (2004) analysed discourse in the English as Second Language classroom (ESL). She synthesized the work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Stubbs (1981), Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) in her study. She also introduced new acts due to the elements of the peculiarities of ESL classroom discourse. Unlike the work of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), which was designed to handle discourse produced in one type of classroom, Olateju's (2004) was designed to handle discourse in different types of classroom situations. The work consists of analysed

texts from various schools in three states of the country, namely: Oyo, Ondo and Osun. Lessons covered by the research included: Biology theory lesson, Chemistry practical lesson, Economics and English language lessons. The focus of the study is the interactional exchange in the classroom. The structure of the work presented is both pedagogical and linguistic. Some of the acts introduced by Olateju (2004) include: hearing check (h/c), re-initiation (re-in), restate (rest), expatiate (exp), repetition (rep).

According to her, hearing checks are realized by words such as 'Hen?' 'Abi' or other expressions in the indigenous language, which were used to check whether the pupils are following the teacher or not. Re-initiation acts serve to bring the discourse back to its original focus. Restate (rest) acts are used to emphasize or reiterate a point or an idea earlier mentioned; expatiate (exp) is realized by adding more information to what is already given; repetitions (rep) are realized by statements that repeat an earlier point made during the classroom discourse.

One notable finding in Olateju (2004) is that some teachers in ESL situations code-switch frequently from English to indigenous languages during the course of their lessons, as they believe that there is no way effective learning can take place without code-switching. Interestingly, Olateju (2004) also applied the Systemic Functional Approach to the analysis of classroom discourse. Equally instructive is the fact that she

presented quite an outstanding number of live data, which is a commendable shift from some other works in Discourse Analysis, which simply seek materials based on the imaginative creation of the author.

The discourse pattern described by Olateju cannot suit all talk situations, as the major preoccupation of her work is on the classroom situation. But the question and answer series in Olateju (2004) correlates with that of police/accused discourse, especially in terms of structural conformity. It is expected that in interrogation the investigating police officers will ask questions of either the accused or the witness, who respond with answers. The question and answer sessions during police interrogations, rather than being used to test understanding, are more often used to unravel a case. Our research will also benefit immensely from Olateju's (2004) treatment of acts in English as a Second Language (ESL) context, as the crux of our study is situated in an English as Second Language (ESL) context.

Paltridge (2006) is a basic introduction to Discourse Analysis. The work introduces readers to basic concepts in Discourse Analysis and focuses on the conditions for the effective analysis of discourse. Like Brown and Yule (1983), the author distinguished between written and spoken discourse, but believes that there are no absolute differences between spoken and written language in terms of predominance of certain linguistic features but that spoken and written language are rather

'multidimensional constructs' with some spoken and written genres having a number of characteristics, which show them to be quite different. Paltridge (2006) argues that speaking and writing draw on the same underlying grammatical system, but in general they encode meanings in different ways depending on what they wish to represent. Following Biber (1988), Paltridge asserts that there is no single absolute difference between speech and writing in English, but rather dimensions of variation where linguistic features tend to cluster, all of which vary for different kinds of texts or genres.

Context as a fundamental concept in Discourse Analysis, according to Paltridge (2006), is central to an understanding of the relationship between what is said and what is understood in spoken and written discourse. Thus, the context of situation of what someone says is crucial to understanding and interpreting the meaning of what is being said. Toeing the line of other discourse analysts, Paltridge (2006) posited that there are a number of key aspects of context that are crucial to the production and interpretation of discourse. These are the situational contexts in terms of what people "know about what they can see around them", the background knowledge context in terms of what people 'know about each other and the world' and the co-textual context in terms of what people 'know about what they have been saying' (Paltridge, 2006: 2).

It is reasonable to refer the features of Paltridge's (2006) context to corresponding works done by Brown and Yule (1983) and therefore conclude that it is extremely difficult to proceed with any reasonable search for meaning in discourse without considering contextual pressure on word usage. Paltridge (2006) identified some concepts, which are very vital for the ongoing research, as such concepts enable us to see how and to what extent the context of situation influences police/accused interaction. Paltridge's text is an ideal introduction to Discourse Analysis. Researchers who are new to Discourse Analysis could use the book to survey the field, identify topics of interest, and provide background for the research literature.

Discourse Analysis as an area of study has its merits and demerits. One of the weaknesses is undeniably the failure to be explicit about how to engage with the analysis of actual instances of text or social interaction in context. Another weakness also, as rightly observed by Jarworski and Coupland (1999, in Olateju 2004: 131), is that the report of single case analysis may have full validity relative to their aims and objectives, but may not be able to stand as alternatives to large scale projects based on sampled instances designed to answer questions about social differences or social change. The observed shortcomings of Discourse Analysis led to the emergence of Critical Discourse Analysis, which is a reaction to its perceived or observed lapses, lacuna or vacuum. Based on the

understanding of the concepts of discourse, thus far, we can infer that the field of Discourse Analysis is universal, encompassing language, communication and the society.

The Speech Act Theory: A Critique

The Speech Act Theory was developed by John Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969) with the notion that language usage is synonymous to performing some actions. They argued that in the same way that we perform physical acts, we perform speech acts by using language. That is, we use language to give orders, to make requests, to give warnings or to give advice. Also, in the view of Paltridge (2006), 'to do things that go beyond the literal meaning of what we say'.

Austin's Speech Act Theory emerged as a result of the posthumous publication of his lecture notes titled: **How to do things with words**. A pioneering work on speech acts, Austin (1962) distinguishes between constatives and "performatives". According to him, constatives are statements that traditionally have truth or falsity; for example, 'I love my daughter' could either be true or false. To Austin, constatives are expressions we use to state acts, report or describe the state of the world'. These pass information around, but do not really move things forward. On the other hand, a performative cannot be said to have the property of truth or falsity; its utterance implies the performance of an action. Performatives get their meaningfulness from the actions they express as they cannot be

verified for their truth. For example, utterances like 'I name this child Usman', 'I bequeath my handset on you' change the pace of things when they are uttered as the child becomes Usman from then on, and my handset becomes my brother's or whoever I said that to. Thus, the difference between Austin's constatives and performative is the same as the one between saying and doing.

Austin also says that performatives could be "felicitous" or "infelicitous" (appropriate or inappropriate within the context). For a performative to be felicitous, there must be an acceptable conventional procedure which should include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances and this must be followed correctly and completely. Also, the particular persons and circumstances must be appropriate for the procedure being invoked.

Austin went further to distinguish the types of performatives that exist in language. They are implicit (primary) and explicit performatives. Implicit performatives lack what Austin calls performative verbs, e.g. promise, accuse, declare, warn, predict, swear, etc. On the other hand, the explicit performatives contain performative verbs and reflect the actions being carried out. Ogunsiiji (2002) observes that explicit performatives are utterances whose verbs are in their "first person singular present indicative active form". But when Austin discovered the insufficiency of the formula, he introduced the insertion of the adverb 'hereby' between the subject of

the utterance and the performative verb, e.g. 'I hereby name this child Ahmed'.

Austin later dumped the performatives/constative dichotomy and moved on to introduce the concepts of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts, which, according to Frank (1989), are separable, but have mutually dependent manifestations. In his explication of the concepts Odebumni (2006: 73) defines locution as "the exact utterance of a speaker", illocution as the "intention the speaker has to utter in the statement" and perlocution as "the effect of the utterance on the hearer". He posited that words uttered can imply to serve as warning, a request or an appeal, etc with the speaker expecting that what the hearer will do corresponds to what he intends. For example, at a road block, if a police officer utters the word 'Park!', the locution is the exact word uttered, that is 'park'. The illocution is what the police officer intends, that is, "bring out your 'particulars' or "a certain amount of money". Perlocution is realized if the driver or car owner brings out a 'certain amount of money' or his 'particulars', as the case may be.

The contrast between the illocutionary and perlocutionary acts is germane to the present research. Austin (1962) identifies the two acts as unconstrained elements of the multiple acts of utterance, which are linked in inescapable ways. The illocutionary force of an utterance, has its distinction as a promise, a threat, a request, a statement, an exhortation,

etc while its perlocutionary effect has to do with the effect of the utterances of a speaker on his audience, that is, how it affects the audience's beliefs and attitudes to behaviour. These effects are peculiar to the circumstances of utterance.

The illocutionary act is what is directly achieved by a conventional force, associated with the issuance of a certain kind of utterance in accord with a conventional procedure; and consequently determinates in principles. The perlocutionary act is specific to the circumstances of issuance.

The Locutionary Act

A major notion in the speech act theory is the concept of felicity conditions. In Austin's view, an illocutionary act must meet some basic felicity conditions before it becomes successful. These basic felicity conditions, in the view of Osisanwo (2003), are: preparatory condition, sincerity condition, executive condition and fulfilment condition.

- a. Preparatory Conditions:** There must be an enabling procedure for successfully carrying out the speech act. Furthermore, the context must be appropriate for the use of the speech act, and the person who performs the speech act must have the right or be vested with the power to do so.
- b. Sincerity Conditions:** In Austin's view, the sincerity of the person performing the speech act in the process of his performing it is very

vital to the success of that act. That is, the person performing the act must (in most situations) have the required thoughts, feelings and intentions for the speech act to be 'felicitous'.

- c. Executive Condition:** This has to do with the realization and concretization of the speech act. Has the act been properly put into effect? If yes, then on this ground it is 'felicitous'.
- d. Fulfilment Condition:** Does the consequential effect of the speech act have any desired result on the hearer? If it does, then it is 'felicitous'.

Apart from the above, an utterance in Austin's view is naturally controlled by what is referred to as a "general condition of meaningfulness". That is, the communication must be carried out by the right person, in the right place, at the right time and with a certain intention.

Speech Acts Theory provided an approach to Discourse Analysis with what is divided into entities that have communicative roles that can be recognized and classified.

Schiffrin (1994) posits that:

Acts specify (to a certain degree) what kind of response is expected: they create options for a next utterance each time they are performed, and thus provide a local, sequentially emergent basis for discourse. Since an utterance can also perform more than one act at a time, a single utterance creates different response options for next utterance (Schiffrin, 1994: 91)

A number of further important elaborations of the Speech Act Theory lies in the work of John Searle (1969). Searle's theory is based on the hypothesis that "speaking a language is engaging in a rule governed form of behaviour" (p.22). This indicates that speaking a language is performing acts based on a set of rules. He allocates a central place to "communicative intension" (this is based on the assumption that a speaker has wants, beliefs and intentions, which are indexed in the performance of utterances).

He also developed a typology of speech acts, which, for him, is rooted in the range of illocutionary verbs that occur in a given language. The five classes of performative verbs, according to Searle (1969), are: 'assertives', 'directives', commissives, 'expressives' and 'declaratives'. Assertives commit the speaker to the truth of a proposition and examples of performative verbs under the class of assertives include: 'believe', 'conclude', 'deny', 'report', 'state', 'affirm', 'claim' and 'report'. Commissives consist of performative verbs, such as 'pledge', 'promise', 'guarantee', 'swear' and 'offer'. Such performative verbs get the speaker committed in varying degrees to some future action. 'Promise' is an outstanding act in this category. As an act, the speaker must be committed to an intention to actually doing (fulfilling) what his utterance names.

The class of performative verbs tagged expressive has to do with the expression of some psychological state. Such verbs include: 'apologize',

'deplore', 'thank', 'congratulate' and 'welcome', while declaratives effect an alteration in the status of an objective or situation. Performative verbs under this category are 'declare', 'name', 'sacked', 'resign,' etc. Directives consist of such performative verbs as 'order', 'challenge', 'result', 'urge' and 'command' and with their use the speaker tries to get the hearer to do something.

Another contribution of Searle (1969) to the Speech Act Theory is the development of a concept of "indirect speech acts". This concept is based on the observation that by uttering what appears to be a statement, for example, "it's hot in here", language users often indirectly perform another type of illocutionary act (in the case of that example voicing a request to open the window), that is, a meaning which goes beyond what someone, in a literal sense, has said. The undeniable merit of Speech Act Theory lies in advancing a view of language use as action. In Searle's words:

A theory of language is part of a theory of action, simply because speaking is a rule-governed form of behaviour. Now, being rule-governed it has formal features which admit of independent study. But a study purely of those formal features, without a study of their role in speech acts would be like a formal study of the currency and credit systems of economies without a study of the role of currency and credit in economic transactions (1969: 17).

Searle (1977) suggested four kinds of conditions that must be met before an illocutionary act can be successful. These are propositional

content condition, preparatory condition, sincerity condition and essential condition.

- i. **Propositional Content Condition:** According to Odebumi (2003), it is stating the specific factor that should be considered in dealing with the meaning of an utterance. He claims that requests require that one looks forward, that is, to the future, but apologies on many occasions take one backwards, that is, to the past.
- ii. **Preparatory condition:** This condition stipulates the requirements of the speech act to the successful performance of the act.
- iii. **Sincerity Condition:** This condition, as posited by Levinson (1983), is associated with the mandatory beliefs, feelings and intentions of the speaker, as appropriate and relevant to the action.
- iv. **Essential Condition:** This has to do with the proper way in which every utterance made by a speaker is an attempt at getting the hearer to do something.

The vital revelation of Speech Act Theory is that language performs communicative acts. In Searle's (1969) words:

The hypothesis that the speech act is the basic unit of communication, taken together with the principle of expressibility (whatever can be meant can be said), suggests that there are a series of analytic connections between the notion of speech acts, what the speaker, means, what the speaker intends, what the hearer understands, and what the rules governing the linguistic elements are. (Searle, 1969: 21).

Work in the area of speech acts was a significant step forward towards understanding unspoken aspects of what people mean by what they say (Paltridge, 2006: 60). Despite their contributions to the study of Speech Acts, Austin and Searle did not take into cognizance that meaning is not derived from words alone. Scholars like Thomas (1995) is of the opinion that speech act analyses also need to take account of the physical and social contexts of use, as well as the fact that meaning is not based on words only, but involves negotiation and interaction between users of a language. That is, it needs to take account of the different contributions that language users make to the meaning of interactions.

Regardless of its shortcomings, the Speech Act Theory is appropriate for the present research, as an act constitutes a basic unit for any analysis of discourse. The study is also convinced that the distinctions of the locutionary, the illocutionary and the perlocutionary acts are significant in our understanding of the police/accused interaction.

Leech (1983) chose a wholistic approach to the study of language. He adopted elements of the Speech Act Theory of Austin and Searle and also embraced Grice's Cooperative Principles. Leech argued that the aforementioned approaches be improved. As a result, he came up with what he calls 'politeness principle' and the 'irony principle'. The robustness of Leech's work rests in the effort to create a multifarious framework from the works of Austin, Searle, Grice and his politeness and Irony principles.

In doing this, his main focus was on the illocutionary acts of Austin and Searle and their pragmatic relationship with the cooperative principles. He asserted that if a speaker asserts a proposition as true, as stated by the illocutionary verb of an utterance, he/she equally validates Grice's cooperative principle's maxim of quality. Also, if a speaker contributes to a talk in a suitable context to conform with an ongoing exchange, it is believed that the speaker is being relevant, as postulated by Grice's maxim of relevance. Leech believes we can do many things with words without ever having to resort to a specific verb or verb phrase. This is what he calls the "illocutionary verb fallacy". Leech's (1983) combination of the Speech Acts model of Austin (1962) and Grice (1975) Cooperative Principle makes the work very apt to the present research.

Sinclair and Courlthard's (1975) study of classroom discourse is the first substantial attempt to produce "a structural linguistic analysis of naturally occurring discourse". They described classroom interaction in terms of the functions of utterances; that is, in terms of whether an utterance is used to evoke a response, or is a response or to mark discourse boundary, e.t.c. They maintained that they modeled their system on Halliday's (1961) categories of a theory of Grammar. All the terms used: 'structure', 'system', 'rank', 'level', 'delicacy', 'realization', 'marked' and 'unmarked' – are Halliday's. They then proposed that discourse is a linguistic level higher than grammar, which, however, displays a

hierarchical rank-scale, which corresponds to those in more explored levels of grammar, phonology and lexis.

Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) classroom discourse consists of hierarchical elements namely, 'lesson', 'transaction', 'exchange', 'move' and 'act', and identify three levels of language: non-linguistic, at the ranks of course, period and topic; the discourse, at the ranks of lessons, transaction, exchange, move and acts and grammar at the ranks of sentence, clause, word and morpheme. In classroom discourse, the lesson is seen as the highest unit and the act is seen as the smallest. In-between these two are transactions, exchanges and moves. To Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), a lesson in the classroom is realized by transaction. Transaction in turn is realized by exchanges, which are analyzed as boundary and teaching exchanges. These exchanges are realized by moves that are labeled opening (otherwise known as initiation), answering (also referred to as response) and follow-up (also referred to as feedback). Boundary exchanges are realized by framing and focusing moves, while teaching exchanges are realized by initiation, response and feedback moves. Moves are realized by classes of acts, which are the units at the lowest rank of discourse.

It is very obvious that the pattern described by Sinclair and Coulthard cannot be applied to all talk situations as the thesis of their work is on discourse in the classroom situation. Other genres outside the

classroom may not require some of the units on their discourse rank scale, especially 'lesson', which is the highest unit. However, discourse analysts have worked on the same ranks proposed by Sunclair and Coulthard and come up with some few modifications of the label and symbols for the acts.

2.3.3 Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a method of Discourse Analysis that reveals the way discourses are used everyday for signification, power relations and the development of new knowledge. Words, whether spoken or written, according to Luke (1997), have power. As observed by Toolan (2002), the emergence of Critical Discourse Analysis presupposes prima facie that Discourse Analysis is not critical and pragmatic enough and that the vast areas of the focus of Discourse Analysis have left an issue like politics to be treated like others. The major focus of CDA is linguistic communication as an instrument or discourse employed to construct and champion either individual or group interest like personal ideology, politics, sexism and social class. Critical Discourse Analysis views man as essentially a political animal instinct is always manifesting in his words and deeds. As a result, a conscious attempt must be made to critically assess the political undertone behind his utterances (Van Dijk, 1988). Wodak (1992:19) calls this approach 'Critical Linguistics' and describes it as "an inter-disciplinary approach to language study with a critical point of view for

the purpose of studying language behaviours in natural speech situations of social relevance”.

Fairclough (2000: 13) identifies three central tenets of CDA, namely: social structure (class, status, age, ethnic identity and gender); culture (the generally accepted norms of behaviour in the society); and discourse (the words we use). The goal of CDA is to determine the relationship between these three central tenets. Our discourses reflect the societal norms and beliefs, i.e. we say things in conformity with the way they should normally be said in our society, and there are certain things we do not say because the society has constrained us not to say them.

Likewise, our identity in the social structure is shown in the way we think, act and speak. A text is a record of communication, which involves the presentation of facts, beliefs and the construction of the identities of participants. It is produced by socially – situated speakers. It is therefore more than just words spoken or written on the pages of books, but how such words are used in particular social contexts (Huckin, 1997). McGregor (2003) identifies an aspect of CDA, which she calls the discursive practices. These are rules, norms and mental models of socially acceptable behaviour in specific roles or relationships used to produce, receive, and interpret the message. Discursive practices then are the processes involved in speaking, writing, hearing and reading texts.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an analytical technique is aimed at critically investigating social inequalities as manifest in and legitimized by language use (Wodak, 2001). It is a type of analysis of discourse which contributes to social and cultural research by examining how language functions in specific social contexts. Attention is paid to language behaviours by examining discourse texts that have actually occurred in specific contexts and identifying how language use in any text is reflective of social identities, social relations and the systems of culture and beliefs. This is important because it shows how social process affects individuals and their actions in the complex social dynamism that ultimately leads to the production of given discourses. Fairclough (1989) argues that language is a social practice and a part of social processes and, as such, the ideological nature of language should be one of the major concerns of social or linguistic analysis.

In CDA, inferences are primarily drawn from language, but analyses of spoken or written discourse do not dwell solely on pure linguistic matters. Rather, the perspective taken is a sociolinguistic one that subscribes to the view of language as a potent tool for achieving several purposes other than communicative ones. Language in the form of texts or speech is not just an attempt to report facts or express feelings, but is also a dynamic phenomenon laden with socially conditioned emotions and motivated by a desire to achieve certain ends. Critical Discourse Analysis

as a multidisciplinary approach to the study of spoken or written texts considers 'language as a form of social practice' (Fairclough, 1989: 24), and thus endeavours to reveal the ideological underpinnings of discourse that have become so naturalized over time that they are treated as common, acceptable and natural features of discourse (Teo, 2000: 12). CDA unmask hidden socio-psychological elements in the spoken or written word in order to 'bring about a different perspective and deeper understanding of whose interest is being served' in the text in question (McGregor, 2003). In CDA, therefore, discourse is analyzed to uncover hidden or implied meanings, knowing fully well that words are potent, sometimes fatal, tools for representing the stands, feelings, interest and worldviews of its users. In this connection, McGregor (2003) concurs that:

CDA is concerned with studying and analyzing written texts and spoken words to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias and how these sources are initiated, maintained, reproduced and transformed within specific social, economic, political and historical contexts. (McGregor, 2003).

Critical Discourse Analysis adopts a more socio-political attitude to show how language, through its discursive elements, is central to the formation of subjectivity and structures of inequality. CDA views language as social constructs, showing how society influences language use. It also holds that discursive events influence the context in which they occur and

the context in turn influences the discursive events. The approach emphasizes the cultural and historical dimension of meaning.

Critical Discourse Analysis has not been without its shortcomings. One major weakness of CDA, as observed by Paltridge (2006), is its non-inclusion in the discussion of text, the communicative interaction and consumers of texts, and not just rest on the analyst's view of what a text might mean alone. Also in the view of Schegloff (1997), CDA is weak for not always providing sufficiently detailed and systematic analyses of the texts that it examines,

After perusing the different approaches to the analysis of connected text, this study opines that it is going to be burdensome to adopt Conversation Analysis or Critical Discourse Analysis as our framework for analysis. The reason for not adopting the two approaches is that in the first place our research data is not a 'conversation' per se in the sense in which the term was earlier defined. Secondly, the work is not the use of language in the social and political context. The theoretical goal for the present research, which proposes to use an institutionally-based naturally occurring conversation as a basis for discussion, is only limited to the question/answer structure. The structure of the present study renders Conversation Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis less favourable for the work. The Discourse Analysis approach is therefore considered as a better option. Its suitability hinges on the fact that it is a better way of

describing how questions and answers are manipulated in interaction/interrogation. The approach therefore is very significant for the goal of realizing the intention of this study.

2.4 Theoretical Framework

The framework chosen for the analysis of data in this study combines a good number of nomenclatures: Grice's (1975) cooperative principles; Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) discourse analytical framework and Burton's (1981) work, which from several angles is appropriate for the analysis of naturally occurring discourse. The model is an all inclusive descriptive framework for the analysis of connected text. The framework takes its root from Sinclair and Coulthard's model to give rise to a precise illustrative apparatus. Due to its versatility, the model can be used to account for any discourse piece and all kinds of speech interaction. The data analysis focuses on the examination of the structure of interaction and explicates the multidimensional functions of language, that is, whether it is a question, statement or command based on their grammatical structure and location in discourse. The model places priority on the structure of discourse pieces or their proportion in the discourse, highlighting its features, whether such utterance is proposed to elicit response or it is a response itself, or how boundary marker is realized in discourse.

The major focus of the model deals with analysis at the discourse level of language and this comprises transaction, exchange, move and act. Act is used predominantly in the study because it is more relevant to the analysis of the data, in the sense that it shows who initiates and controls discourse and what strategies are used by the IPO in collecting information from the accused person. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) propose many forms of 'act', which include marker, starter, elicitation, check, directive, informative, response, comment, accept, etc. Burton (1981) makes some modifications of the categories proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard and suggests fewer ones. The ones modified are 'inform', 'comment' and 'accept'. The new ones introduced are 'summons', 'accuse', 'excuse' and 'preface'. Burton's model generally emphasizes elicit, inform and direct acts, as they are acts that are likely to feature in all forms of everyday discourse.

A further important feature of the model of analysis in the eclectic model adopted for this research is the pragmatic approach, which is based on Grice's (1975) cooperative principle. The choice of this model is informed by the submission of Traugott and Pratt (1980) who posit that the cooperative principle can be seen as a large scale appropriateness condition governing all language use. Grice bases his cooperative principle on four maxims. These are the maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner. The maxim of quality says people should only say what they

believe to be true and what they have evidence for. The maxim of quantity says interactants should make their contribution as informative as is required for the particular purpose and not make it more informative than is required. The maxim of relation says the speaker should make his contribution relevant to the interaction, while the maxim of manner says the speaker should be clear in what he says and should avoid ambiguity or obscurity. Of the four maxims proposed by Grice's (1975) cooperative principle, the data in the present research on police/accused discourse accommodate only three: the maxims of quality, quantity and relation. Relevant aspects of this theory are applied to the analysis of the recorded data with the aim of establishing the discourse structure of such conversational exchanges. The integration of the various discourse acts with the three selected maxims can obviously state what is involved in the making of a discourse act and how that act comes to mean what it does in the context of police/accused discourse.

In the proposed model, the researcher wishes to state that: for discourse acts to succeed in police/accused discourse, the following conditions need to be met:

- a) The institutional speaker, that is, the IPO directs and controls the discourse
- b) The context of utterance must be appropriate to the act performed.

- c) The act must be relevant in subject matter to the particular stage at which it comes.
- d) The act must contain the right amount of information.
- e) The speaker must not say what he believes to be false.

Broadening these provisions to a certain extent will provide the instruments to distinguish the various acts performed during police/accused interrogation as either appropriate or not.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The major preoccupation of this chapter is to synthesize the instruments applicable to the analysis of police/accused interrogation. For this research purpose, Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975), Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle and Burton's (1981) models have been adopted. The harmonization of the three models provides a suitable framework for analysis for the present study. Furthermore, sources of data for the study were identified and the instruments for data collection mentioned. Also, the framework adopted for the analysis in the study is explicated and the test application of the model was carried out to show its suitability for the study.

3.1 Sources of Data

Data for the study were collected during interrogation sessions of some accused persons by investigating police officers from three police divisions in the Kano metropolis. The divisions are Fagge Police Station, Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station and Nassarawa Police Station. In all, six investigations were recorded; two in each police station. In Fagge Police Division, cases of deceit and manslaughter were recorded; in Nomansland Police division cases of theft and 'two fighting' were

observed, while in Nassarawa Police Division cases of fraud and cheating were studied.

3.2 Data Collection Method

The data collection instruments used for this study are:

- a) Audio-tape recording (ATR)** - a concealed cell phone was used to do surreptitious recording of the interrogation sessions at different police stations, as the researcher was not allowed to record interrogation proceedings with an audio tape recorder.
- b)** The researcher also employed the diary method, that is, jotting down records of the interrogation sessions. The records were used by the researcher to explicate indiscernible parts of the tape recorded data.

For satisfactory transcripts to be obtained, the researcher played over several times the tape recorded data during the field work. Statements were written out verbatim on the premise of the turns taken by the interactants. Sentence boundaries, prosodic and paralinguistic features were not taken into cognizance, since the research is predisposed towards an understanding of the effects of police/accused discourse. The handwritten records also complemented the tape recorded data, as they provided clarification for examples in which the tape recording was not very distinct. In addition, the researcher made a translation of the utterances of the IPO and the accused person.

3.3 Test Application of the Analytical Model

A short police/accused interaction is analyzed by applying the eclectic model of analysis. By so doing, the suitability of the model to the research data is being tested. At the beginning of interrogation the following interaction took place between the investigating police officer and the accused person:

IPO: What is your name?

AP: Hassan Mudi

IPO: Where do you live?

AP: No. 49 Church Road, Sabon Gari Kano

IPO: How old are you?

AP: 21 years

IPO: What is your religion?

AP: Islam.

Table 3.1: Interrogation of the 1st Accused Person (API) by the Investigating Police Officer Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station

Speaker	Utterance	Translation	Act Forms	Quality	Quantity	Relevance
IPO	Wetin be your name?	What is your name?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the name of accused person	The act is relevant for the fact that the IPO will like to know the personal identity of the accused person
AP 1	Hassan Mudi.	Hassan Mudi	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Na where you dey live?	Where do you live?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know where the accused person lives	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know where the accused person resides
AP 1	I dey live for No. 49 Church Road Sabon Gari Kano	No. 49 Church Road Sabon Gari Kano	Reply/ informative	The answers if the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Wetin be your age?	How old are you?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the age of the accused person	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know the age of the accused person
AP 1	Abi 21 years old	21 years	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the providing question
IPO	Na which kind work you de do?	What is your occupation?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the occupation of the accused person	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know the occupation of the accused person.
AP 1	Abi Dan-Achaba	I am a motorcyclist	Reply/ informative	The answer is truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	which kind religion you de practice?	What is your religion?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the religion of the accused person	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know the religion of the accused person
AP 1	Abi Muslim	Islam	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question.

Interpretation

The analysis above shows that the IPO graded his elicitation act form in ascending order to illustrate the cooperative/ uncooperative pattern in police interrogations of the accused person. Table 4.2.1 above shows that the elicitation acts employed by the IPO are the ones seeking personal information about the accused person. The table further reveals that the conversational maxims of 'Quality', 'Quantity' and 'Relation' were observed, thus implying that the accused person gave information that is true or that could be evidently proved. The personal elicitations gave the IPO a clue on the psychological/attitudinal background of the accused person, which in turn could lead to the eventual determination of his involvement or innocence.

The examples cited below explain the above information:

IPO: What is your name?

1st accused person: Hassan Mudi

IPO: Where do you live?

API: I live at No.49 church road Sabon Gari Kano

IPO: How old are you?

API: 21 years

IPO: What is your occupation?

API: I am a motorcyclist.

This explains why the elicitations employed by IPO are graded and seek personal information about the accused person before moving into the interrogation proper.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

4.0 Preamble

This chapter contains the presentation and analysis of the data. We intend to apply insights gained from the analytical model discussed in chapter three for the analysis of data. Further to this, the analysis of the data is followed by a discussion and interpretation.

4.1 Presentation of Data

The tables below present the data collected during the interrogation of three accused persons involved in a case of burglary at the Normansland Sabon Gari Police Station.

4.2.1 Data Analysis and Interpretation

Table 4.2.1: Interrogation of the 1st Accused Person (API) by the Investigating Police Officer Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station

Speaker	Utterance	Translation	Act Forms	Quality	Quantity	Relevance
IPO	Wetin be your name?	What is your name?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the name of accused person	The act is relevant for the fact that the IPO will like to know the personal identity of the accused person
AP 1	Hassan Mudi.	Hassan Mudi	Reply/informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Na where you dey live?	Where do you live?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know where the accused person lives	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know where the accused person resides
AP 1	I dey live for No. 49 Church Road Sabon Gari Kano	No. 49 Church Road Sabon Gari Kano	Reply/informative	The answers if the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Wetin be your age?	How old are you?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the age of the accused person	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know the age of the accused person
AP 1	Abi 21 years old	21 years	Reply/informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the providing question
IPO	Na which kind work you de do?	What is your occupation?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the occupation of the accused person	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know the occupation of the accused person.
AP 1	Abi Dan-Achaba	I am a motorcyclist	Reply/informative	The answer is truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Which kind religion you de practice?	What is your religion?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires to know the religion of the accused person	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know the religion of the accused person
AP 1	Abi Muslim	Islam	Reply/informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question.

Interpretation

Our analysis shows that the IPO graded his elicitation act form in ascending order to illustrate the cooperative/uncooperative pattern in police interrogations of the accused person. Table 4.2.1 above shows that the elicitation acts employed by the IPO are the ones seeking personal information about the accused person. The table further reveals that the conversational maxims of 'Quality', 'Quantity' and 'Relation' were observed, implying that the accused person gave information that is true or that could be evidently proved. The personal elicitations gave the IPO a clue on the psychological/attitudinal background of the accused person, which in turn could lead to the eventual determination of his involvement or innocence.

The examples cited below explain the above information:

IPO: What is your name?

1st accused person: Hassan Mudi

IPO: Where do you live?

API: I live at No.49 church road Sabon Gari Kano

IPO: How old are you?

API: 21 years

IPO: What is your occupation?

API: I am a motorcyclist.

This explains why the elicitations employed by IPO are graded and seek personal information about the accused person before moving into the interrogation proper.

Discussion

Table 4.2.1 above illustrates the co-operative pattern at the initial stage in the interrogation of the accused person by the investigating police officer. Considering the observance of conversational maxims, the table shows the three maxims of quality, quantity and relevance were observed in 100% respectively in the interactions. It is quite apparent therefore that the three maxims record the highest percentage of observance, thus implying that the accused person gives information that is true or that could be manifestly proved. The table also reveals that the discourse act form of elicitation and reply/informative featured predominantly. This is so since police/accused interrogation is characterized by questioning, and questions naturally compel a response. Also in police stations questions are fundamentally defined as a summon to reply. Furthermore, questions may be used as weapon to test or challenge claims made by the accused person.

**Table 4.2.2: Interrogation of the First Accused Person by the Investigating Police Officer
Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station**

Speaker	Utterance	Translation	Act Forms	Quality	Quantity	Relevance
IPO	I beg tell me who thief the property for the man house?	Now, tell me who stole the items?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires information on the actual person who stole the items	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know person who stole the missing items
AP 1	I no know who thief am	I don't know who stole the items	Reply/ informative	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not directly related to the preceding question
IPO	make you think of any body who fit thief the property	Can you think of anybody who could have stolen	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	Requires information on the person whose stole the items	The act is relevant as the IPO is ken in revealing the identity of the person who stole the items
AP 1	I no know Oga	I don't know sir.	Reply/ informative	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not directly related to the preceding question
IPO	no when you don see Jangwarzo last?	When did you see Jangwarzo last? Is he not friend?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires information about the accused person's friend Jangwarzo	The act is relevant especially as Jangwarzo is related to the case being investigated
AP 1	I no see am?	I didn't see him	Reply/ informative	The answer is not the truth	The accused person has given less information than is required	The utterance is not relevant to the preceding question as it does not answer the question
IPO	If me and you see Jangwarzo and he tell me say una de together yesterday for night na wetin I go do for you?	If we see Jangwarzo and he confess that you were together yesterday night, what will I do to you?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires the accused person to give relevant quantity of information	The IPO wants the accused person to give information which is directly relevant to the question.
AP 1	I know see am, anything you like do am for me.	I didn't see him. You can do anything you like to me	Reply/ Informative	The answer is not the truth	The accused person has not given the required information	The act is not directly related to the preceding question

Interpretation

In Table 4.2.1 the demand of the IPO for precision and relevance of information is not adhered to by the accused person. Quite a number of reasons may be responsible for this. First, it is the belief of the accused person that non-compliance to the elicitation of the IPO means that he is given an excuse for his act and, secondly, the accused person believes that it is the best way to exculpate himself from the crime he is being accused of. But because of the significance the IPO during interrogation attached to relevance; if the accused person either deliberately or ignorantly fails to observe this important requirement, he is coerced to do so through reiteration. The IPO's elicitation and the accused person's reply in the table instantiates this:

IPO: Now tell me who stole the items?

API: I don't know who stole the items

IPO: Can you think of anybody who could have stolen it?

API: I don't know, sir.

The table also illustrates the uncooperative pattern in the interrogation of the accused person by the IPO. The maxims of quality and quantity were deliberately flouted by the accused person by giving less information than is required and also by giving false information. A vivid example of this can be found in the exchange above.

IPO: If we see Jangwarzo and he confess that you were together yesterday night, what will I do to you?

API: I didn't see him. You can do anything you like to me

Discussion

In the interactional exchanges in Table 4.2.1, the accused person flouts the three maxims of quality, quantity and relevance in his response by 100%. The answers given by the 1st accused person to each of the question asked by the IPO in the table are largely irrelevant. Reasons adduced for violating these maxims to a large extent is that the accused believes that non-compliance to the elicitation of the IPO is the best technique to give an excuse for his act and the best way to prove his innocence of the crime he is being accused of. The accused person's response in the table instantiates thus:

IPO: Can you think of any who could have stolen them?

API: I don't know sir.

IPO: When did you see Jangwarzo last?

Is he not your friend?

API: I didn't see him.

The table reveals further that the linguistic act forms of elicitation and reply/informative are employed by the IPO and 1st accused person. This is obvious because much of the power the police personnel have during investigation and interrogation rest on the power of questions. In police

discourse, only the IPO can ask questions, while the suspects' role is to answer them. That is why IPOs during interrogation usually exploit the various forms of questions to allow the culprit confess his guilt.

The analysis above reveals the effects of the utterances by participants in police/accused interaction. The non-compliance the elicitations of the IPO by the accused person prompted the IPO to employ another linguistic acts that will force the accused to confess his involvement in the crime.

**Table 4.2.3: Interrogation of the First Accused Person by the Investigating Police Officer
Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station**

Speaker	Utterance	Translation	Act Forms	Quality	Quantity	Relevance
IPO	(After torturing him). You go tell me the truth or you want make I still beat you?	Will you tell us the truth now? (After torturing him)	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires the right amount of information about the theft	The act is relevant as the IPO want to know who stole the missing items
AP 1	I will talk true Oga. No be me alone thief the property, na me and my friend.	I am not the only person who stole the property; it is me and my friend	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The response is the relevant quantity of information	The utterance is relevant to the question asked as the accused person is confessing his crime
IPO	Which of your friend?	Which of your friends?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	A precise quantity of information is sought	The act is relevant as the IPO wanted to know the friend of the accused person with whom he committed the crime
AP 1	Jangwarzo my friend na im enter the house, he open the gate and the door and he bring all the property out.	Jangwarzo, my friend who entered the house, opened the gate and the door and brought out all the property	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains more information than is required. The 1 st accused person was asked to name his friend who opened the gate. Information on what he brought out not called for.	The utterance is relevant to the preceding question as the accused person is confessing his crime by naming his friend who opened the gate and entered the house
IPO	Na wetin he use to break open the house?	What did you use to break the gate?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	A precise quantity of information is sought	The act is relevant as the IPO would like to know how the accused gained entrance into the house.
AP 1	I know no how he manage open the house and he enter. He enter the house through the Window and come	The house is having an aluminum glass window. I don't know how my friend opened it. He gained entrance to the	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The accused person offers more information than is required. Gives an explanation which is not requested for.	The act is not relevant as the accused person did not state the object his friend used to break the gate.

	start to they bring the property out by one	house through the window and started bringing the property to me while I was collecting them from him.				
IPO	Wetin be the property wey he bring out?	What did he bring out?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	The IPO requires a precise quantity of information	The act is relevant to determine the number of items stole from the house.
AP 1	He bring out one laptop, one DVD player, one television set and two handsets	He brought out one laptop, one DVD player, one television set and two handsets	Reply/informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Na only one laptop he carry comot or he pass one?	One laptop?	Elicitation	Requires a truthful response	A precise quantity of information is sought	The act is relevant as the IPO wanted to ascertain the response of the accused person
AP 1	Na only one. My friend tell me say he go sell all the property by himself. He say I should not worry, he will settle me after he sell the property. Make I just help am thief the property.	Yes, because my friend told me that he was going to sell these items himself. He just requested me to assist in the stealing. He informed me that he was in full control. He even told me that when he sold the property, he would give me my own share from the proceed.	Reply/informative	The answer is the truth	The accused person gave more information than is required. He included information on how the property will be disposed off.	The act is relevant to the question asked by the IPO
IPO	You fit carry me go the place when Jangwarzo dey live	Will you show me the residence of this Jangwarzo	Elicitation	Requires a positive response	A precise quantity of information is sought	The act is relevant since the question is related to the case

AP 1	Oga I go carry you go	Yes, I will show you	Reply/ informative	The response is positive	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant to the question asked
SO		IPO, are you back? Have you recovered the properties?	Elicitation	Requires truthful response	A precise quantity of information is sought	The act is relevant to enable the SO know if the property has been recovered
IPO		Yes sir, all the stolen property have been recovered	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The quantity of information in the utterance is precise	The act is relevant to the preceding question

Interpretation

We can infer from the table that power and control lie with the IPO during interrogation and that the accused persons have no control over their testimonies. Also, the power base for the control of accused persons by the IPO is by questioning, a powerful technique element being used strategically by the IPO. Powerful coercive and leading questions are favoured during interrogation because of their hostile nature. Further to this, threatening and torturing are institutionalized in the interrogation of accused persons by the Police. Table 4.2.3 above shows that it is after much threatening and torturing that the accused person finally confessed. It is observed that it was when the accused person was tortured that he revealed the person in his company when he committed the offence. The accused person even obliged to take the IPO to his friend's residence. For example, the response of the 1st accused person to the elicitation of the IPO illustrates this fact:

IPO: Will you tell us the truth now?

(After torturing the accused person)

API: I am not the only person who stole the properties; it is me and my friend.

IPO: Which of your friends?

API: Jangwarzo, my friend who entered the house, opened the gate and the door and brought out all the property

IPO: What did he bring out?

API: He brought out one laptop, one DVD player, one television set and two handsets

IPO: Will you show me the residence of this Jangwarzo?

API: Yes, I will show you.

Here the 1st accused person is responding to the elicitation of the IPO willingly after he has been battered and brutalized. Furthermore, the 1st accused person through his response observed the maxims of Quality, Quantity and Relevance.

Discussion

In table 4.2.3, the 1st accused person flouts the maxim of quantity by giving more than the required information. An example is presented below to show flouts of the maxim.

IPO: Which of your friend?

API: Jangwarzo, my friend who entered the house, opened the gate and the door and brought out all the properties.

IPO: What did he use to break the gate?

API: The house is having an aluminum glass window. I don't know how my friend opened it. He gained entrance to the house through the window and started bringing the properties to me while I was collecting them for him.

Apart from giving more than the required information, the 1st accused person can also be said to be confessing his crime. Based on the inference that could be drawn from the response above, it could be said that the 1st accused person has been tortured, battered and brutalized, a trait that is characteristic of hardened criminals who always refuse to confess involvement in a crime willingly.

The table shows further that the accused persons under interrogation when battered and brutalized generally observe the maxim of quality and that of relation in most of their interactional exchanges. This is evident in the 100% observance of the two maxims. This invariably implies that the accused persons divulge information in respect of the case in the question posed by the IPO. This, in effect, enhances the smooth interaction and meaningful exchange of information between the interactants. Below is an exchange where the 1st accused person observes the maxims of quality and relevance:

IPO: Will you tell us the truth now?

API: I am not the only person who stole the properties: it is me and my friend.

IPO: Which of your friend?

API: Jangwarzo, my friend

IPO: Will you show me the residence of this Jangwarzo?

API: Yes I will show you.

Besides, the table also shows that the discourse acts adopted by the IPO and 1st accused person are “elicitation” and “reply informative”

**Table 4.2.4: Interrogation of the Second Accused Person by the Investigating Police Officer
Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station**

Speaker	Utterance	Translation	Act Forms	Quality	Quantity	Relevance
IPO	We don arrest Hassan Mudi and he dey for cell now, na im tell us say na you and him go steal for that house. Make you talk true now, if you no talk true you go join am for cell.	Hassan Mudi arrested and interrogated; and he had confessed that both of you burgled together; he is in the cell already. Now won't you tell me the truth? If you don't tell me the truth you will join him in the cell.	Prompt	Requires positive response	The IPO requires the second accused person to give the right amount of information of his involvement in the crime.	The act is relevant to enable the accused person confess his guilt
AP 2	Oga I no dey this town for some time. I don travel he don tey, I just come back yesterday. He won put me for trouble.	He just wants to implicate me. I was not involved in the theft	Excuse	The answer is not the truth, based on the confession of the 2 nd accused person	Not as informative as required. The quantity of information offered is not appropriate to the request.	The act is not relevant to the preceding question. The accused person is still denying his involvement the theft.
IPO	(To another policeman). Go and bring (Bulala) whip. He think say na joke I dey joke?	Go and bring (bulala) whip. May be he taught I am joking	Prompt	Requires truthful response		The act is relevant; it reinforced a preceding directive. The IPO is asking another officer to bring whip to flog the accused person.
AP 2	Oga sir, you say make I give you my statement, I will give you	Oga sir, you are requesting for my statement, I will give it to you	Reply/ informative	The answer is not the truth.	Not as informative as required. The required information is to establish the involvement of the accused person in the crime.	The act is not directly related to the preceding utterance directive. The accused person did not confirm the allegations leveled against him.
IPO	Na wen we hang you before you no say you go tell us true	Until we crucify you before you tell us the truth	Prompt	Requires a truthful response		The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive based on the inappropriacy of the

						utterance of the accused person
AP 2	I no know anything about the stealing	I am innocent of the offence you want to punish me for	Excuse	The answer is not the truth, as the 1 st accused person has made a confessional statement about the 2 nd accused person's involvement in the crime.	Not as informative as required. The required information is to establish the involvement of the accused person in the crime.	The act is not related to the proceeding utterance. The second accused persons did not confirm the allegation leveled against him.
SO	if he no go cooperate with you let me go and bring tear gas. So that we go put am for in eye. He go tell us the truth.	If he is not cooperating, let me go and bring tear gas and spray it in his eye. He will quickly confess	Prompt	Request a truthful response	The SO wants the accused person to confirm his involvement in the crime.	The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive of the IPO to ensure that the accused person confess his guilt.
AP 2	Oga sir, I no know anything. No be me do am	Oga Sir, I am innocent. I did not commit the offence. I was not involved in it.	Excuse	The answer is not the truth, as the 2 nd accused person is being evasive of the request made by the IPO.	Not as informative as required. The required information is to establish the involvement of the accused person in the crime.	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance
IPO	if you no tell me the truth now I go break your legs and your hands	Are you not going to tell me the truth? If not I will break your legs and hands	Prompt	Requires a truthful response, as the 2 nd accused person is being evasive of the request made by the IPO		The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	I no dey for the people who go steal for the house.	I am not among the people who committed the theft	Excuse	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required. The required information is to establish the involvement of the	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance

					accused person in the crime.	
IPO	(Talking to another police) bring rope make we tie his hand and legs. He will tell us the truth	(Talking to another police) bring rope to tie his hands and legs and let us handcuff him. He will confess	Prompt	Requires a truthful response, as the 2 nd accused person is being evasive of the request made by the IPO		The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	Oga sir, I go tell you the truth	Oga Sir, I will tell you the truth now	Reply/informative	The answer is a logical truth.	It contains a precise quantity of information	The act is relevant to the preceding utterance
IPO	Jangwarzo you better confess now and tell me whether you take part for the stealing or make you explain how the thing happened make we no how we go take help you	Jangwarzo, now make your confessional statement and tell us whether you are responsible for the theft or explain to us how the thing happened so that we will know how we can help you.	Prompt	Requires a truthful response	The IPO want the accused person to confirm his involvement in the crime.	The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	No be me steal the property	I am not the person who stole the goods	Excuse	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance
IPO	Talk truth now, we go help you. If we see the property when den steal we no go take you to court we go just bury the matter	Tell us the truth, we are going to help you. If the stolen goods are recovered, you will not be charged to court. Tell us the actual truth of how we can recover the stolen items.	Prompt	Requires a truthful response	The SO request the IPO to force the second accused person to confess his involvement in the crime.	The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	Oga sir, no be me steal those things	Oga Sir, I was not the person that stole the items	Excuse	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance
SO	You go use iron hand to deal with am or this one no go make any	You will have to be hard and with him seriously, otherwise he will not	Prompt	Requires a truthful response	The IPO command the second accused person to be candid and confess	The act if relevant to reinforce a preceding directive

	confession about the stealing.	confess his involvement in the theft			his involvement in the crime	
AP 2	Oga sir, I no know anything about the stealing	Oga Sir, I am not responsible for the staling	Excuse	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance
IPO	Shuru-up! (Slapped) him twice, shur-up! I what!! Shut-up!!! Na so you go talk I go make sure say then torture you so that you go confess say no you steal the property	Shut up! (slapped him twice) Shut Up!! Idiot! Shut up!!! This is what you will be saying. I must make sure I torture you so that you confess your involvement in the burglary	Prompt	Requires a truthful response	The IPO wants the 2 nd accused person to confirm his involvement in the case.	The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	you dey punish me for the offence I no do	You are punishing me for an offence I didn't commit	Excuse	The answer is not the truth, based on the confession of the 1 st accused person.	Not as informative as required	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance
IPO	(Started slapping, beating and torturing the accused person), beating you for wetin, na so you go dey talk after you don thief finish	(Started slapping, beating and torturing the accused person) beat you for what! That is what you will be saying after you have committed an offence	Prompt	Requires a truthful response		The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	Haba! No be me steal the goods	Haba! I am not the person who stole the property.	Excuse	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not relevant preceding utterance
IPO	(Beating the accused person) I go show you today. Make you talk the truth now. You better talk truth now!	(Beating the accused person) I will show you today. You better say the truth! Say the truth now!	Prompt	Requires a truthful response		The act is relevant to reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	(Groaning in pain) Woyo Allah, Yeeh, oh,	(Groaning in pain) yeeh, oh, oh, oh, please sir, I	Excuse	The answer is not the truth	Not as informative as required	The act is not relevant to the preceding utterance

	oh, oh, I beg sir, i dey beg you sir, he don do sir	am begging you sir, it is enough sir				
IPO	I don tell you before. as you no talk the truth before you don suffer yourself. For say you don talk the truth since I for no beat you like this. See how blood dey comot for your body. You better talk truth now. Tell me wetin happen. Nobody go beat you again. I dey promise you, if you go cooperate with me I no go take you to court. Make you just tell me the thurth	You were told before. See how you have suffered yourself. Had it been that you told me the truth from the beginning I wouldn't have beaten you like this. See how you are bleeding. Now be honest to yourself. Tell me the actual thing that happened. Nobody is going to torture you any longer. I promise you if you cooperate you will not be charged to court. Just tell me exactly what happened.	Prompt	Requires a truthful response		The act is relevant to the reinforce a preceding directive
AP 2	Oga sir, na Wednesday night when we dey leave cinema house and my friend called me say make we go one house...	Oga Sir, it is on Wednesday night when we were leaving the cinema house and a friend of mine called Hassan Mudi told me...	Reply/ informative	The response is the truth	The response contains the rights amount of information	The act is relevant to the preceding directive

Interpretation

The speech act of prompt, which is used to reinforce a directive or an elicitation, is another linguistic act employed by the IPO during the interrogation of the accused person. It is an act in police/accused discourse that is used to ensure that the accused person confesses his crime. The act is characterized by coercion, intimidation, threatening and instilling fear in the accused person, and this in turn forces the latter to speak the truth. This is established by the utterance of the station officer, while the accused person on his part uses the linguistic act of 'excuse' to exonerate himself from the allegations

Examples are:

IPO: Go and bring (bulala) whip. Maybe he thought I am
joking

AP2: He just wishes to implicate me

IPO: Until we crucify you before you tell us the truth

AP2: I am innocent of the offence you want to punish me for

SO: If he is not cooperating, let me go and bring teargas and
spray it in his eye. He will quickly confess

AP2: Oga Sir, I am innocent. I did not commit the offence, I
was not involved in it.

IPO: Are you not going to tell me the truth? If not, I will break
your legs and hands

AP2: I am not among the people who committed the theft

In the above exchange, the IPO threatened the accused person through the act of prompt to make the latter confess. This is done by reinforcing an earlier directive. The accused person in the data in turn kept on excusing himself with an excuse act, is a defence mechanism employed by the accused person to provide an appropriate response to a preceding accusation. The exchange below instantiates this highlight:

IPO: Jangwarzo, now make your confessional statement and tell us wether you are responsible for the theft or explain to us how the thing happened, so that we will know how we can help you.

AP2: I am not the person who stole the goods

SO: You will have to be hard and deal with him seriously; otherwise he will not confess his involvement in the theft.

AP2: Oga Sir, I am not responsible for the stealing.

IPO: Shut up! (Slapped him twice). Shut up!! Idiot! Shut up!!!
This is what you will be saying. I must make sure I torture you so that you confess your involvement in the burglary.

AP2: You are punishing me for an offence I didn't commit.

Also, in the table the data shows that the accused person consciously flouted the maxims of quality, quantity and relevance in his responses. All the answers the 2nd accused person gave were not relevant in terms of the existing context and are not factual truth. The accused person's flouting of these maxims hinged on his intention to exonerate himself from the charges of theft leveled against him.

Discussion

In table 4.2.4, the study also reveals that the 2nd accused at the initial stage of the interrogation flouts the maxim of quality, quantity and relevance with impunity. This leads to the observance of these maxims as against non-observance. This apparently shows that in most cases, in police/accused discourse hardened criminal don't willingly disclose their involvement in the crime being investigated except when they are coerced, intimidated, threatened or even battered. Two instances are cited below to support the above information;

IPO: Tell us the truth; we are going to help you. If the stolen goods are recovered, you will not be charged to court.
Tell us the actual truth of how we can recover the stolen items.

AP2: Oga sir, I was not the person that stole the items.

IPO: Shut up! (Slapped him twice) shut up!! Idiot! Shut up!!!

This is what you will be saying. I must torture you so that you confess your involvement in the burglary.

AP2: Oga sir, it is Wednesday night when we were leaving the cinema house and a friend of mine called me and told me...

In the interactional exchanges in 1 above, the second accused person flouts the quantity, quality and relation maxims in his response. The answer given to the question in 1 is not the truth and is largely irrelevant. As earlier pointed out, flouting these maxims by the second accused person is a ploy to absolve himself from the charges against him. The second accused person's response in 2 shows that he observed the three maxims. This is a result of the rough treatment given to him by the IPO.

It is also observed in the table that 'prompt' and 'excuse' acts are widely used by the IPO and the second accused person. This apparently shows that the IPO uses the 'prompt' act to threaten the second accused person, while the second accused person on the other hand uses the 'excuse' act to exonerate himself. This reveals that the IPO presumes that the reiteration of the 'prompt' act will enable the second accused person to acknowledge his culpability in the case, while the second accused person on his own part assumes that the 'excuse' act is a subterfuge to exculpate himself from the charges leveled against him.

It is also inferred from the table that the authority implicit in police/accused interrogation turns the request for information by the IPO into commands to which the accused person must respond even with an evasive reply.

**Table 4.2.5: Interrogation of the Third Accused Person by the Investigating Police Officer
Sabon Gari (Nomansland) Police Station**

Speaker	Utterance	Translation	Act Forms	Quality	Quantity	Relevance
IPO	You be one of the thief wey steal those properties	You are one of the theft that stole those properties	Accusation	Requires truthful information		The act is relevant. The IPO is using the act to ascertain whether the accused person is involved in the theft
AP 3	Oga Sir, I no know any thing about the property wey den steal.	Oga Sir, I am not the person that stole the properties. I don't know anything about the theft	Excuse	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant. It enables the accused person provide appropriate response to a preceding accusation
IPO	Why the properties com dey your place?	Why are you in possession of these stolen items?	Elicitation	Requires truthful information	Requires information on why on why the accused person is in possession of the stole items	The act is relevant. It enables the IPO know why the accused person is in possession of the stolen properties
AP 3	Na Jangwarzo come sell the property for me	It was Jangwarzo who came and sold them to me	Reply/ informative	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is not directly relevant to the preceding question
IPO	Why you no go company go buy new one, wey be say na second hand goods you dey buy?	Why don't you buy the new items from the company rather than buying the used ones	Elicitation	Requires truthful information	Requires information on why they accused person didn't buy the goods from the company selling them	The act is relevant. It enables the IPO to know the circumstances surrounding the purchase of stolen goods by the accused person.
AP 3	make you no mine am na so him go dey talk to dey pretend say in dey buy Belgium goods and he go dey steal property here and there.	Oga sir, I am not a thief, he only brought these items for me to buy	Excuse	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is not relevant to the proceeding utterance as the AP 3 did not explain why he did not buy the new items from the company.
SO	make you no mine am na so him go dey talk to dey pretend say in dey buy Belgium goods and he go dey steal	Don't mind him. That is how he will be saying; pretending to be buying second-hand goods where as you are stealing	Accusation	Requires truthful information		The act is relevant. The IPO is using the act to make the accused person confess his crime.

	property here and there.	properties all over the place				
AP 3	Oga Sir a no be thief, my shop dey there.	Oga Sir, I am not a thief, my shop is over there	Excuse	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant. It enables the accused person to provide appropriate response to a preceding accusation.
IPO	Make you keep quiet! Keep quiet !	Will you keep quiet! Keep quiet!	Directive			The act is relevant. It allows the IPO to proceed further in his interrogation of the accused person
AP 3	Oga sir, I swear to God who made me a no be thief, I dey only sell Belgium goods in my shop.	Oga Sir, I swear to God who made me I am not a thief. I am only selling second-hand goods in my chop.	Excuse	The answer is the truth	The response contains the right amount of information	The act is relevant. It enables the accused person to provide appropriate response to a preceding accusation
IPO	I say make you keep quiet!.	Will you keep quiet I said!	Directive			The act is relevant. It allows the IPO to proceed further in his interrogation of the accused person
SO	The man dey talk lies, make you go lock am inside cell make he go join im friends wey den steal together	This man is telling lies. You better allow him to join his crime partners in the cell	Evaluate			The act is relevant. It enables the SO to decide whether the accused person is speaking the truth or not.
AP 3	Oga sir, I no know say na steal dem steal the property, he just bring them to me for my shop say make I buy	Oga Sir, I don't know that the items were stolen goods, he brought them to me in my shop to buy	Excuse	The is the truth	The response contain the right amount of information	The act is relevant. It enable the accused person provide appropriate response to a preceding accusation
IPO	You no go shut up!.	Shut up!	Directive			The act is relevant. It allows the IPO to proceed further in his interrogation of the accused person
SO	The man dey buy stolen goods you better charge am to court	This man is a receiver of stolen goods. He need to be charged to court	Evaluate			The act is relevant it enable the SO to decide whether the accused person is speaking the truth or not.

Interpretation

The analysis revealed that linguistic acts such as accusation, directive and evaluate also feature to some extent in police/accuse discourse. For instance, in Table 4.2.6, these acts feature prominently in the interaction between the IPO and the accused person. A vivid example of this can be found in the above table as in exchange below:

IPO: You are one of the thieves that stole those properties

AP3: Oga sir, I am not the person that stole the properties. I don't know anything about the theft

SO: Don't mind him. That is how he will be saying; pretending to be buying second-hand goods whereas you are stealing properties all over the place.

AP3: Oga Sir, I am not a thief, my shop is over there.

IPO: Will you keep quiet I said!

SO: This man is telling lies. You better allow him to join his crime partners in the cell.

AP3: Oga Sir, I don't know that the items were stolen goods, he brought them to me in my shop to buy.

IPO: Shut up!

SO: This man is a receiver of stolen goods. He needs to be charged to court.

The IPO and the SO in the above exchange make use of accusation, directive and evaluate acts to accuse or indict the accused person. This is done to get the accused person to confess his crime willingly. Also, the IPO used the directive act form to suppress the accused person and thereby instill fear in him. In police/accused discourse, the IPO often used the directive act form to suppress the accused person. In fact, this confirms that the language of the police is always characterized by the directive act form because their voices are always very tough and harsh so as to instill fear in the accused person. The IPO uses the directive act form 'keep quiet', 'shut up', several times in the recorded data with the tough voice of the police, and these prevented the interruption of the interrogation of the accused person as can be seen in 4.6.

The study also reveals that SO is using the evaluate act form, i.e. exploiting the questioning section to counter the accuse person's excuse and reply/informative to decide whether the latter is speaking the truth or not. Based on this, he arrives at a decision to be taken.

In the data analyzed, elicitation and reply/inform act form has the widest distribution. The reasons why they were used predominantly throughout the data is that the interrogation situation is an interaction between the IPO and the accused persons, whereby the question asked by the IPO stimulate responses from the accused person.

These linguistic act forms are graded hierarchically in ascending order, ranging from the personal elicitation to the elicitation about the crime committed. Since the police always want to get to the truth of the matter, they always repeat frequently this act form until the intricacies surrounding the case are unfolded. The accused person on the other hand uses the reply/informative act form throughout the data with the exception of when the IPO is replying the Station Officer (SO). In the process, the accused person is giving information concerning the case until the truth of the matter is revealed.

It is also observed in the data that the accused persons, especially accused persons 1 and 2, blatantly flout the quality, quantity and relation maxims. The answers given to the questions of the IPO in 4.2, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 are typical examples. Flouts of these maxims are generally characteristic of accused person, as they use them to temporarily cover their crime during interrogation. This explains why the AP1 and AP2 in the data are compelled by the IPO to be relevant when they made contributions considered irrelevant

As an institutional discourse, police/accused discourse is typically asymmetrical, since the power and control of the discourse is located in the institutional participant, that is, the Investigating Police Officer, rather than being equally distributed. This results in the institutional speaker directing and controlling the discourse. Dominance, facilitation and

restriction in institutional discourse have, therefore, to be viewed in terms of who is speaking, when and for what purpose.

In police/accused interrogation, before a discourse act can conform to the cooperative maxims, the person performing the act must have power to do so and in an appropriate context of situation. The relevance of the maxim of quantity at this stage is apparent in that when one makes his contribution to an ongoing discourse, the basic assumptions are that the individual is making it in such a way that his contribution is as informative as required for the particular purpose and not more informative than is required. The maxim of relation obliged interactants to be relevant, that is, relevant in terms of the existing framework. The import of the quality maxim hinges on the fact that interactants should only say what they believe to be true and what they have evidence for.

The data analyses authenticate the fact that police/accused discourse is a highly organized discourse with predictable structures.

It is pertinent to state that not all the 'act' forms are relevant to the data. Only those acts that are significant to the research are utilized. Notable among the acts with wide distribution in the work are elicitation, directive, prompt, accusation, evaluation, reply/informative and excuse. This is obvious in that the focus of this research is police/accused discourse. The task of the investigating police officer is to extract

information from the suspect in order to get to the root cause of the crime being investigated. To achieve this task, the Investigating Police Officer employs such 'acts' as prompt, elicitation, directive, accusation and evaluation. In the view of Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), 'prompt' as an act form is used to reinforce a directive or elicitation. In police/suspect interrogation, the Investigation Police Officer uses it while interacting with the accused person to make the suspect 'voluntarily' confess his/her guilt. The act includes threats, persuasion and torture.

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) aver that an act form used to demand an answer from the respondent is elicitation. The main focus of police/accused interaction is a proper examination of a case through skillful questioning of a suspect to extract information from him/her to unravel a case. The prototypical patterns of discourse acts in police-criminal investigation, are the question/answer sequences, which are indeed common to much institutional discourse. Thus, elicitation is the proper linguistic act to use in this context. For the purpose of the data of this research, reply act form and informative act form are viewed as being one. This is so because when the accused person is replying to elicitation of the IPO, he is also giving information concerning the case being investigated. Also elicitation and reply/inform forms of act are adjacency pairs. That is, the presence of one predicts the other. The elicitation act form belongs to the first pair part, while reply/informative act form belongs to the second.

KEY: For the interpretation of abbreviations in the table

IPO	Investigating Police Officer
SO	Station Officer
AP 1	1 st Accused Person
AP 2	2 nd Accused Person
AP 3	3 rd Accused Person

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.0 Introduction

This chapter gives an explication of the findings, conclusion and constraints of the study. It also makes some suggestions for further research.

5.1 Findings

The research work examines the structure and organization of police/accuse interaction using a suitable analytical model. The study was informed by the need to shed light on the nature of language utilized during the interrogation of accused persons by police personnel in crime investigations, which are assumed by many as a process intended to coerce suspects to confess.

The data show that discourse in police/accused interrogation is organized into various linguistic 'act' forms, such as elicitation, directive, prompt, evaluation, accuse and reply/informative; and each of these act forms have its peculiar linguistic function. The study reveals that to a great extent, elicitation and reply/informative are largely used by accused persons and investigating police officers. The reasons for these are that the IPO uses elicitation as a linguistic act form to secure information from the accused person and the latter in turn uses reply/informative linguistic

act to supply the information requested throughout the interrogation, concerning the case under investigation. The analysis further reveals that linguistic acts such as 'prompt', 'directive' and 'accuse' are not ordinarily used during interrogation; but their usage becomes absolutely necessary and acceptable when the accused person fails to confess his crime. This is so when the IPO is interrogating a hardened or habitual criminal.

Closely related to this is the fact that in police/accused discourse, there are two types of criminals; the hardened and the first-offender. Hardened criminals are always very hard and tough; first-offenders are usually feeble-minded, soft and easy to manipulate. Before they are threatened or tortured by the IPO they confess their crime.

The analysis also reveals that 'excuse' as a linguistic act form is largely used as a weapon or defence mechanism by the accused person during interrogation. It is the belief of the accused person that this is the only means he can use to exonerate himself of the crime he is being accused of. The most predominant act that features prominently in police/accused interrogation is the directive act form, which is constantly used by the investigating police officer to inculcate fear in the accused person and force him to confess their guilt. Accusation and evaluation are also act forms used in police discourse. Accusation is used by the investigating police officer to pre-indict suspects so that they will be psychologically intimidated. This makes them confess their guilt

unintentionally. While evaluation as an act is employed by the investigating police officer to ascertain the authenticity of the utterance of the accused person.

The suspect/accused person is always at the receiving end during interrogation and crime investigation. The major linguistic acts used by the accused person for self-defense mechanism are reply/informative and excuse act forms. Through these act forms the accused either gives answers to the questions thrown to him/her by the investigating police officer or excuses himself/herself from the crime prior to absolute confession.

The research shows further that the accused persons, especially hardened criminals, to some extent do not conform with 'the cooperative principle' (CP). It is observed that they flout and violate the 'quality', 'quantity' and 'relation' maxims during interrogation. This is characterized by giving irrelevant answers, giving more than the required answer and giving untrue information. Thus, the accused person believes in a subterfuge to exculpate himself from the charges leveled against him. But since successful crime investigation hinges on the cooperative pattern in the interactions between the IPO and the accused person; it is quite apparent therefore that these maxims must be observed during police/accused discourse. In fact, if the accused person fails to observe

any of these maxims in his response, he is compelled/coerced to observe them by the IPO.

Our analysis also reveals that one factor that makes police personnel successful in their interrogation of the accused person is the asymmetrical relationship that exists between the IPO and the accused person. During interrogation, it is observed the IPO occupies a higher position than the accused person. It is the IPO that initiates the talk, controls the terms and also has the right to ask questions from the suspects. Closely related to this is the fact that power and control lie with the IPO during interrogations, and that the accused persons have no control over their testimonies. The power base for the control of accused persons by IPO is the questioning technique, which is a powerful element being used strategically by the IPO.

Another very important finding analysis reveals is that the questioning form can be used to control the flow of discourse in police/accused interrogations. Also, some questions are more coercive, powerful and leading questions than others. Powerful, coercive and leading questions are declarative questions, yes/no questions and alternative questions. They are powerful and coercive because, relatively, they contain some propositions, which influence and convince the suspects. They are also greatly favoured during interrogations because of

their hostile nature. For example, 58.7% of the questions asked during interrogation in the study are leading questions.

On the whole, the research reveals that police/accused discourse is a highly organized discourse with predictable structures. The structural harmony achieved in police/accused discourse is premised upon the linguistic 'acts' employed by the IPO during the interrogation of accused persons, since it is on all these act forms that the success of the interrogation lies.

5.5 Conclusion

The study examined the interactions of accused person by the Investigating Police Officers in some police stations in the Kano metropolis. The recorded interrogation sessions were used as the data for the main analysis.

In order to locate our research relatively to previous works done in the same area, we reviewed literature relevant to discourse analyses and especially police discourse. We also designed an analytical framework based on Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) discourse analytical framework coupled with Bruton's modification and Grice's co-operatives principle, which from several angles is appropriate for the analysis of naturally occurring discourse. The analytical model used in this research has helped us to gain insight into questions raised earlier regarding the nature of police or accused discourse. The research has revealed that it is feasible

to synthesize insight from various models in analyzing a peculiar speech event by either modifying them or selecting significant aspects of the models and utilizing them for the data. We have seen how the IPO makes use of elicitation, prompt, evaluate, accused and directive acts in eliciting information from the accused person concerning the case under investigation, and also how the accused person makes use of reply/informative and excuse acts in giving the police the information concerning the case under investigation.

As an institutional discourse, police/accused discourse is typically asymmetrical, since the power and control of the discourse are located in the institutional participant, that is, the IPO, rather than being equally distributed. This results in the institutional speaker directing and controlling the discourse, rather than the suspects and the institutional transactive goals being pursued at the expense of social or phatic ones. This implies that the authority implicit in police/accused discourse turns the request for information by the IPO into commands to which the accused person even responds with an evasive reply.

One big factor that makes IPOs successful in their interrogation of the accused person is the asymmetrical relationship that exists between them and the suspect. During interrogation, we observed that the IPO occupied a higher position than the accused person. It is the IPO that

initiated the talk, controlled the turns and also had the right to ask questions of the accused person.

5.6 Constraints of the Study

The major constraint of this study is that the analysis may not be ample enough as to permit emphatic generalizations to be made on the structure of police/accused discourse. This is because only data collected from three police stations in the Kano metropolis were used as the basis for analysis. Another constraint of this research is that prosodic features of police/accused discourse were not taken into cognizance in the data. The effect of these features on communication is significant to some extent. But these effects are not examined, since they did not form part of the analytical aim of the study.

5.7 Suggestions for Further Research

The focal point of this research is notably on police/accused discourse, especially as it applies to the language of interrogation. The study is mostly discourse. Nonetheless, there are several untapped possibilities in the area of police language. There is the need to conduct research on various aspects of police communication. Such areas are the linguistic factors associated with the police exercise of power and authority in law enforcement, that is, the prosodic features of police discourse. Another area that could be addressed is the area of linguistic appraisal of police crime control.

REFERENCES

- Adegbija, E. (1999), "Titbits On Discourse Analysis And Pragmatics" In E. Adegbija (Ed.), *The English Language And Literature In English: An Introductory Handbook*. Ilorin: The Department Of Modern European Languages, 186-204
- Adegbite, W. (2006), "A Stylistic Analysis of Conflict Mediation Discourse in a Literary Text". *Ife Studies in English Language*, Vol.6, 1, 139-154.
- Adeleke, A.F. (2006), "The Functions of *The Article* in the Classroom Discourse In English". *Ife Studies in English Language*. Vol.6, 1, 35-47
- Adeyemi, A.A. (1989), "Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders". Paper Presented At The United Nations Economic Commission For Africa. Addis Ababa, June 5th – 9th.
- Ajibola, M.A. (2001), "A Discourse Analysis of the 'Eye Witness News' On NTA" Unpublished M.A. Dissertation. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Alabi, V.A. (2003), "Scale and Category Grammar In Stylistic Studies". In Lawal, B. (Ed.) *Stylistics In Theory And Practice*. Ilorin: Paragon Books, 48-69.
- Amechi, N. (2005), "The Effectiveness Of Police Crime Control In Nigeria: A Psychological Appraisal". *Nigerian Journal Of Psychological Research*, Vol.4, 1-8
- Asiyanbola, A.A. (2006), "The Systemic Rank Scale, Sentence Formation and Textual Meaning Among Nigerian ESL Learners". *Ife Studies in English Language*, Vol.6, 1, 81-105.
- Austin, J. (1962), *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ayodele, A. (1988), "Beyond Aesthetics: A Linguistic Enquiry into the Language of Nigerian Newspaper Cartoons. MA English Dissertation, University of Ibadan.
- Bamgbose, A. (1971), "The English Language in Nigeria". in *West African* (Ed) Spencer, J. London: Longman

- Bamgbose, A. (1995), "English in the Nigerian Environment". in *New English: A West African Perspective* (Eds) Bamgbose, A., Banjko, A. and Thomas, A. Ibadan: Mosuro
- Berry, M. (1981), "Polarity, Elicit, Elicitation and Propositional Development, their Relevance to the Well-Formedness of an Exchange". *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, Vol.10: 1
- Berry, M. (1981), "Systematic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: A Multilayered Approach to Exchange Structure: in Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (Eds). *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 120-145.
- Berry, M. (1981), "Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis: A Multi-Layered Approach to Exchange Structure". in Coulthard, R.M. and Montgomery, M.M. (Eds) *Studies in Discourse*. London: Rutledge.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, D. (1981), "Analyzing Spoken Discourse". in Coulthard, M. and Montgomery, M. (Eds), *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul.
- Burton, D. (1981), "The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Spoken Discourse". In French, P. and Maclure, M (Eds) *Adult-Child Conversation*. London: Croom Helm
- Coulthard, R.M. (1992), "Forensic Discourse Analysis". in Coulthard, R.M. (Ed), *Advances In Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London: Rutledge.
- Coulthard, M. and Johnson, A. (2007), *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language In Evidence*. London: Rutledge
- Dambazau, A.B. (2007), *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- Daramola, A. (2005), "Towards An Understanding Of Systemic Functional Theory (SFT) for Teachers of English In Nigerian Secondary Schools. *Journal Of The Nigeria English Studies Association*, Vol.11, No.1, 65-76

- Egins, S. (1994), *An Introduction To Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter.
- Fairclough, N. (1992), "Discourse And Text: Linguistic and Inter-Textual Analysis Within Discourse Analysis", *Discourse and Society* 3 (2): 193-217
- Fairclough, N. (2000), *Language and Power*. (2nd edition). Longman.
- Farinde, R.O. (2008), *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to the Study of Language and the Law*. Ago Iwoye: Olabisi Onabanjo University Press
- Farinde, R.O. (2009), "Power in Discourse Situations: A Review". In *Languages, Literature and Culture in the Current Technological World* (ed) Akorede, Y.O. et al., Portonovo, 261-267
- Firth, J.R. (1957), "Personality and Language in Society". In *Papers in Linguistics* (1934-1951). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fox, G. (1993), "A Comparison of 'Police Speak' and Normal Speak: A Preliminary Study". Techniques of Description; *Spoken and Written Discourse*. in Sinclair, J., Hoey, M. and Fox, G. (Eds), London and New York: Rutledge.
- Frank, F.A. (1989), "A Discourse Analysis of Feature Radio Interview: Shifts In Interactions Manipulation Of Language". Unpublished MA English Dissertation. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Frank, F.A. (2000), "Systemic Functional Linguistics And The Study Of How Language Works: An Overview". *Work In Progress*. Zaria: Department of English, Ahmadu Bello University, No.11, 119-133.
- Goodwin, C. (1981), *Conversational Organization Interaction Between Speakers And Hearers*. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodwin, C. (1986), "Gesture As A Resource For The Organization Of Mutual Orientation". *Semiotica*, 62 (1/2): 29-49
- Goodwin, M.H. (1990), *He Said – She – Said: Talk As Social Organization Among Black Children*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Grice, H. (1975), "Logic and Conversation". in Peter Cole and Jerry Lee Morgan (Eds). *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 3, 41-58.
- Gruse, A. (2000), *Meaning In Language: An Introduction To Semantics And Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1970), "Language Structure and Language Function: in Lyons (Ed) *New Horizons in Linguistics* Harmon Worth. Middx: Penguin Books.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1973), *Exploration in the Functions of Language*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978), *Language as a Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold
- Harris, S. (1989), "Fragmented Narratives And Multiple Tellers: Witness And Defendant Accounts In Trials', *Discourse Studies*, 3, 1, 53-74
- Heritage, J. (1984), *Garfinkel and Ethno Methodology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heydon, G. (2005), *The Language Of Police Interviewing: A Critical Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffih, R. (1998), *Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hymes, D. (1971), "Towards Ethnographies of Communication: The Analysis of Communicative Events". In Giglioli, P. (Ed) *Language and Social Context*. England: Pengium Books Ltd.
- Ibibleye, G.S. (1993), "The Structure Of Courtroom Conversation". Unpublished MA Dissertation Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. (2002), "Discourse Analysis And Conversational Analysis" In Malinkjer Kirsten (Ed), *The Linguistic Encyclopedia* 2nd Ed. USA Rutledge, 114-119
- Johnson, A.J. (2006), "Police Questioning", In Brown, K. (Ed), *The Encyclopedia Of Language And Linguistics*, 2nd Ed. Vol.9, Oxford: Elsevier, 661-72

- Joworki, A. and Coupland, N. (Eds.) (1999), *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (1990) "Critical Discourse Analysis" In Robert Kaplan (Ed.) *Annual Review Of Applied Linguistics II*.
- Linfort-Ham, K. (2006), "Conversational Maxim In Encounters With Law Enforcement Officers". *International Journal Of Speech, Language And The Law*, 13, 1, 23-45. D Lotbiniere, M (21.07.06), *The Guardian Weekly*, Learning English Online. Available At <http://educationguardian.co.uk/tefl/story/o.,1825851,00.html> > (Accessed 12th May, 2009).
- Luke, A. (1996), Genres Of Power? Literacy Education and the Production Of Capital'. In R. Hasan and G. Williams (Eds), *Literacy In Society*. London: Longman, 308-38.
- Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. (2003), *Working With Discourse. Meaning Beyond The Clause*. London: Continuum
- McGregor, S. (2003), "Critical Science Approach – A Primer". <http://www/kon.org/cfp/criticalscienceprimer.pdf> (Accessed 15th June, 2009)
- Mele, L.M. and Bello, M.B. (2007), "Coaxing And Coercion In Roadblock Encounters On Nigerian Highways". *Discourse And Society* 18 (4): 437-425
- Nigeria Police Force (1976), *Training Manual*
- Odebunmi, A. (2002), "The Pragmatics of Face Acts in a Nigerian University Administration". in Babatunde, S.T. and Adeyanju, D.S. (Eds), *Language, Meaning and Society: Papers in Honour of E. Adegbija At 50*. Ilorin: Haytee Press, 1791-192
- Odebunmi, A. (2006), *Meaning in English: An Introduction*. Ogbomosho: Critical Sphere.
- Ogunsiji, A. (1989), "The Language of the Police in Ila Local Government Area of Oyo State: A Discourse Analysis Approach". MA English Dissertation University of Ibadan.

- Ogunsiji, A. (1999), "Aspects of the Lexical Designs of the Language of Nigeria Police Context: *Journal of Social and Cultural Studies*. Vol.6: 135-143.
- Ogunsiji, A. (2002), "A Speech Act Analysis of Soyinka's 'ETIKE REVOWETIN?' in Babatunde, S.T. and Adeyanju, D.S. (Eds) *Language, Meaning and Society*. Papers in Honour of E. Adegbija at 50. Ilorin: Haytee Press.
- Oktar, L. (2001), "The Ideological Organization Of Representational Process In The Presentation Of US And Them". *Discourse And Society*, 12 (3): 313-346.
- Olaniyan, K.K. (2006), "Cooperation in Conversation: An Analysis Of Selected Published Interviews". In *Tell and The News Magazines*, Ibadan, Vol.3, 100-117
- Olateju, M. (2003), "Conversation Analysis And The Understanding Of Discourse". In Oyeleye, L. And Olateju, M. (Ed.) *Reading In Language And Literature*. Ife: OAU Press Ltd.
- Olateju, M. (2004), *Discourse Analysis: Analyzing Discourse In The ESL Classroom*. Ife: OAU Press Ltd.
- Oyebade, T.A. (2007), "The Pragmatics Of English Usage In Police Communication In Ibadan Metropolis". Unpublished MA English Dissertation, University Of Ibadan.
- Oyeleye, A. (1985), "The Language of Achebe's Early Novels (in the Context Of Nigerian English): A Study in Literary Stylistics. Ph.D English Language Thesis. University of Ife.
- Paltridge, B. (2006), *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Continuum.
- Pomerantz, A. and Felhr, B.J. (1997) *Conversation Analysis: An Approach To The Study Of Social Action As Sense Making Practices*, In Teun, A. Van Dijk (Eds): *Discourse As Social Interaction*. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* Vol.2 London: SAGE Publications, 64-92
- Rasheed, A. (2001), 'Language, Discourse And Academic Literacy: A Challenge To Educational Linguistics". *Huda-Huda Journal Of Language And Literature*. Vol.1, 201-209

- Sculffrin, D. (1994), *Approaches To Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Searle, J.R. (1969), *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1969), *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1979), "Indirect Speech Acts". in Cole, P. and Morgan, J.L. (Eds), *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol.3, 41-58
- Sinclair, I.M. and Coulthard, R.M. (1975), *Towards An Analysis Of Discourse: The English Used By Teachers And Pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, M. (1983), *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Surakat, T.Y. (2000), "Proverbial Language In Zaynab Alkali's The Stillborn: A Systematic Linguistic Analysis". *Work In Progress*. Zaria: The Department Of English, Ahmadu Bello University, 135-153
- Takoya, A. (2005), "Topic Management In Instructional Discourse". *Papers In English And Linguistics (PEL)* 6: 115-129.
- Tamuno, T. (1970), *The Police in Modern Nigeria 1861-1965: Origins, Development and Role*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.
- Teo, P. (2000), 'Racism In The News: A Critical Discourse Analysis Of News Reporting In Two Australian Newspapers', *Discourse And Society*, 11: 7-49.
- Thomas, J. (1995), *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Thomas, J. (1995), *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Tomori, S.H.O. (1977), *An Introduction To The Morphology And Syntax Of Present-Day English*. Ibadan: Macmillan.
- Toolan, M. (2002), *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vol.1. London: Rutledge

Van Dijk, T. (1998), *News as Discourse Hillside*, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Verschueren, J. (2003), *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York: Arnold.

Wodak, R. (1996), *Language Behaviour in Therapy Groups*. Los Angeles, University of California Press.

APPENDICES

POLICE INTERACTION WITH THE ACCUSED PERSONS

APPENDIX I

NIGERIA POLICE NOMANSLAND DIVISION KANO INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE OF BURGLARY AND STEALING

Prior to the investigation proper, the complainant initially came to the charge room and lodge his complain to the officer in charge known as C.I.O (criminal investigating officer). The officer listened to his complaint and registered it in the crime diary as follows:

“today being the Friday the 6th day of March 2009 at about 07.00 hours, one Abdul Rahaman Isa, male of no 49 Freetown Street, Sabon Gari Kano, came to the station and reported the he left his house under lock for work at Sharada Phase 11, Kano, yester night: on get home this morning he discovered that his house has been burgled and he found that the following properties had been stolen:

1. One Acer laptop valued at #140,000.00.
2. One L.G 21” television set valued at #37,000.00
3. One L.G DVD player valued at #17,000.00
4. Two Nokia handsets valued at #35,000.00

By unknown thieves, hence this report.

Thus, the case was incedented and referred to the divisional crime officer (DCO) for further investigation.

Inspector Zaiyanu Ali, the charge officer after incedenting the case took room the crime diary to the DCO who appointed an Investigating Police Officer (IPO) Sergeant Umar Lawal who copied out the incedented case from the crime diary into the DCO dispatch book:

Station Officer (SO): Sergeant Umar Lawal investigate that case of burglary and stealing.

Sergeant Umar Lawal: Oga where the complaint dey?

SO: the complainant dey for charge room

IPO: Na you be complainant?

Complainant: Oga na me o

IPO: wetin happen. Explain to me, before I know the action when I go take.

Complainant: Oga na when I go work, n aim the incident of theft happen in my absence. Before I come back in the morning I find out say them don break my window and steal my important properties.

IPO: they stole your properties?

Complainant: Yes, oga.

IPO: na which person you dey suspect?

Complainant: I dey suspect some boys around the area wey I dey live.

IPO: Okay, wait first, let me give you a statement sheet, so that you give me your statement to let me begin investigation

Complainant: yes sir,

The IPO produced a statement sheet and give it to the complainant to make his statement. This sheet contains; Name, Address, Occupation, religion, tribe, nationality, age, sex and date.

After taking the statement of the complainant the IPO further asks.

IPO: who be the person when you dey suspect?

Complainant: na one (yan Daba) boy wey de the area I am leaving

IPO: why you dey suspect am?

Complainant: den don they catch the boy for many stealing we they happen for the area.

IPO: you suspect am because you think the boy don dey steal before?

Complainant: Yes

IPO: Wetin be the name of the boy?

Complainant: Hassan Mudi

IPO: where the boy dey live?

Complainant: I don't know where he dey sleep but he dey always stay with his gangs in our area.

I.P.O: you known where den stay for the area?

Complainant: yes, I know the place.

I.P.O: you think say if we go there now we go see am?

Complement: we go meet am?

IPO: we go met am?

Complainant: if we no meet am self, his friends wey than be the same gang go dey there.

I..P.O: you sure say in gang go dey there?

Complainant: then go dey there.

I.P.O: Okay, make we look for them.

The arrest of Hassan Mude was made and he was brought to the police station

Station officer: This the Hassan Mudi?

I.P.O: yes sir.

S.O: he is a notorious criminal in Sabon Gari here.

I.P.O: he was resisting arrest initially but I have to over power him.

S.O: you will have to deal with him or else he will not tell you the truth.

I.P.O: Okay, sir.

The IPO brought out a statement sheet and started questioning the first accused person.

I.P.O: Wetin be your name?

API: Hassan Mudi.

I.P.O: Na where you dey live?

1st accused person: I dey live for Kanar Jaba.

I.P.O: Na for which area foe Kanar Jaba?

1st accused person: I dey live for Yan Isire area of Kanar Jaba.

I.P.O: Wetin be your age?

1st accused person: Abi 21 years old.

I.P.O: Na which kind work you de do?

1st accused person: Abi Dan-Achaba.

I.P.O: which kind religion you de practice?

1st accused person: Abi Muslim.

I.P.O: I beg tell me who thief the property for the man house?

1st accused person: I no know who thief am.

I.P.O: make you think of any body who fit thief the property?

1st accused person: I no know Oga.

I.P.O: no when you don see Jangwarzo last?

1st accused person: I no see am?

I.P.O: If me and you see Jangwarzo and he tell me say una de together
yesterday for night na wetin I go do for you?

1st accused person: I know see am, anything you like do am for me.

Sensing that the 1st accused person will not speak the truth the I.P.O
started torturing him. Will you keep quit! (giving him a dirty slap). Keep quit!
idiot keep quiet! You are the person who stole the properties. I will make
sure I torture you until you tell me the truth.

The first accused person in trying to defined himself (crying) said, Oga no
be me do this thing now. I know no anything about it.(still crying from
beating) Oga no be me do this thing na o.

I.P.O: (after torturing him). You go tell me the truth or you want make I still beat you?

1st accused person: Oga no be me do this thing.

I.P.O:Na so you go dey talk no be you do am. Who come do am?

1st accused person: Oga I swear no be me do am.

S.O: It was not long they brought the accused to this station for a case of theft.

I.P.O: this time around no inside cell you go die.

1st accused person: Oga na lie them dey talk o, I no dey steal.

I.P.O: (still beating the accused person). You go tell me the truth now or not?

1st accused person: I will talk true Oga. No be me alone thief the property, na me and my friend.

I.P.O: which of your friend?

1st accused person: Jangwarzo my friend na im enter the house, he open the gate and the door and he bring all the property out.

I.P.O: Na wetin he use to break open the house?

1st accused person: I know no how he manage open the house and he enter. He enter the house through the. Window and come start to they bring the property out by one.

I.P.O: wetin be the property wey he bring out?

1st accused person: he bring out one laptop, one DVD player, one television set and two handsets.

I.P.O: Na only one laptop he carry comot or he pass one?

1st accused person: Na only one. My friend tell me say he go sell all the property by himself. He say I should not worry, he will settle me after he sell the property. Make I just help am thief the property.

I.P.O: after una thief the property na where una keep the property?

1st accused person: Na Jangwarzo carry the property go, I know no the place where he carry am go.

I.P.O: you fit carry me go the place when Jangwarzo dey live?

1st accused person: Oga I go u go carry you go

SO: has he made a confessional statement?

I.P.O: He has almost made a confessional statement. In that he has disclose to me his connection and that of his friend the co-accused person who is at large. We shall soon effect his arrest since Hassan Mudi promised to take me to his house. I want to read the statement to his hearing and then let him sign it before we shall go to his friends house.

The IPO read the statement to the hearing of the 1st accused person and after some complain he later sign the statement.

I.P.O: you go sign two time

1st accused person: (sign) Oga you help me o.

I.P.O: I go help you

S.O: I.P.O, has he told you where he kept those properties?

I.P.O: yes sir, he said...

S.O: prepare a search warrant for a search to be conducted at his friend's house so that the properties will not be sold.

I.P.O: Inspector Ibrahim I need a search warrant.

Inspector Ibrahim: take

I.P.O: where is corporal John?

Corporal John: I am here sir?

I.P.O: corporal John, you will follow me to the scene of a crime.

Corporal John: Okay sir, hope the place is not far.

I.P.O: it is not far.

Corporal Gabe: make sure you are armed as the accused person is a hardened criminal.

I.P.O: I will hand cuff him after all because he is dangerous.

API: Oga sir, you talk say you want help me. I will take you to the place.

IPO: I no say you no go run.

API: I no go run.

IPO: you no go run? But if you run I will just shoot you for leg. I will not put handcuff for your hand.

API I no go run

The IPO left the station with the first accused person with the intention of effecting the arrest of Jangwarzo the second accused person.

S.O: are you back IPO? Have you recovered the properties?

I.P.O: we have not recovered the properties yet but we have arrested the second accused person Jangwarzo.

S.O: Okay. Take his statement for further investigation.

The rituals of taking the accused statement was commenced by I.P.O by asking his personal particulars, that is where the accuse person is living, his occupation, age and religion.

I.P.O: we don arrest Hassan Mudi and he dey for cell now, na im tell us say na you and him go steal for that house. Make you talk true now, if you no talk true you go join am for cell.

AP2: Na im no dat one o, I no know anything about am.

IPO: make you talk true o?

AP2: Oga I no dey this town for some time. I don travel he don tey, I just come back yesterday. He won put me for trouble.

IPO: Na wen we hang you before you no say you go tell us true.

AP2: Oga sir, you say make I give you my statement, I will give you.

IPO: (to another policeman). Go and bring (Bulala) whip. He think say na joke I dey joke?

AP2: I no know anything about the stealing.

S.O: if he no go cooperate with you let me go and bring tear gas. So that we go put am for in eye. He go tell us the truth.

AP2: Oga sir, I no know anything. No be me do am.

IPO: if you no tell me the truth now I go break your legs and your hands.

AP2: I no dey for the people who go steal for the house.

IPO: (talking to another police) bring rope make we tie his hand and legs. He will tell us the truth.

IPO: come make I tell you one thing, if you corporate and tell me the truth I will cooperate with you too.

AP2: Oga sir, I go tell you the truth.

IPO: Jangwarzo you better confess now and tell me whether you take part for the stealing or make you explain how the thing happened make we no how we go take help you.

AP2: no be me steal the property.

IPO: talk truth now, we go help you. If we see the property when den steal we no go take you to court we go just bury the matter.

AP2: Oga sir, no be me steal those things.

S.O: you go use iron hand to deal with am or this one no go make any confession about the stealing.

AP2: Oga sir, I no know anything about the stealing.

IPO: Shuru-up! (Slapped) him twice, shur-up! I what!! Shut-up!!! Na so you go talk I go make sure say then torture you so that you go confess say no you steal the property.

AP2: you dey punish me for the offence I no do.

IPO: (started slapping, beating and torturing the accused person), beating you for wetin, na so you go dey talk after you don thief finish.

AP2: Haba! No be me steal the goods.

IPO: (beating the accused person) I go show you today. Make you talk the truth now. You better talk truth now!

AP2: (groaning in pain) Woyo Allah, Yeeh, oh, oh, oh, I beg sir, i dey beg you sir, he don do sir.

I.P.O: I don tell you before. as you no talk the truth before you don suffer yourself. For say you don talk the truth since I for no beat you like this. See how blood dey comot for your body. You better talk truth now. Tell me wetin happen. Nobody go beat you again. I dey promise you, if you go cooperate with me I no go take you to court. Make you just tell me the thurth.

AP2: Oga sir, na Wednesday night when we dey leave cinema house and my friend called me say make we go one house...

Interrogation of the third accused person by the investigating police officer

I.P.O :you be one of the thief wey steal those properties

A.P.3 : Sir, I no know any thing about the property wey den steal.

I.P.O: why the properties com dey your place?

A.P.3 Na Jangwarzo come sell the property for me.

I.P.O: why you no go company go buy new one, wey be say na second
hand goods you dey buy?

S.O: make you no mine am na so him go dey talk to dey pretend say in
dey buy Belgium goods and he go dey steal property here and there.

A.P.3: Oga Sir a no be thief, my shop dey there.

I.P.O: make you keep quiet! Keep quiet !

A.P.3 Oga sir, I swear to God who made me a no be thief, I dey only sell
Belgium goods in my shop.

I.P.O: I say make you keep quiet!.

S.O: the man dey talk lies, make you go lock am inside cell make he go
join im friends wey den steal together.

A.P.3 : Oga sir, I no know say na steal dem steal the property, he just
bring them to me for my shop say make I buy .

I.P.O: you no go shut up!.

S.O the man dey buy stolen goods you better charge am to court.

APPENDIX II

NIGERIA POLICE FAGGE DIVISION, KANO INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE IN A CASE OF DECEIT

- Police officer: Madam, what is your problem? What do you want?
- Complainant: I am here to lodge a complaint sir.
- Police officer: What is your complaint?
- Complainant: It was one Hotel man yesterday night he invited me into his hotel to sleep with one lodger who lodged in his hotel. The man promised to give me \$25 dollars. He actually gave me \$25 dollars in the morning, he sneaked out of the hotel room when I was in the toilet and took away my handset. Later I now discovered that the \$25 dollars he gave me was a fake one.
- Police officer: He gave you a fake \$25 dollars and stole your handset after sleeping with you?
- Complainant: Yes sir
- Police officer: What is your name?
- Complainant: I am Elizabeth John
- Police Officer: Where are you living?
- Complainant: I am living at Badawa
- Police officer: Wait, let me enter the case into the crime diary.
- Couple Sanni: Yes sir
- Police officer: Follow this Madam to the suspect's place and effect his arrest.

Couple Sanni: Yes sir

Couple Sanni: Sir we are back. This is the suspect.

Police officer: Is this the man?

Complainant: Yes sir

Police Officer: Couple Sanni, take the complainant and the suspect to the IPO so that he can obtain their statement

Couple Sanni: Good morning sir, Oga said I should bring this two people to your place. The woman is the complainant and the man is the suspect. They have a case.

IPO: What is the case?

Couple Sanni: Deceit

IPO: Where is the suspect?

Couple Sanni: This is the suspect sir

IPO: Madam you are the complainant of this case.

Complainant: Yes sir

IPO: Come and explain to me what really happened so that I can take your statement.

Complainant: Narrated exactly what she said when she came and lodged her complain

IPO: How did you know that it is a fake \$25 dollars note?

Complainant: I went to WAPA where foreign currency is exchanged and confirmed and they told me it is a fake one.

IPO: You said the man also stole your handset?

Complainant: Yes

IPO: What is the make of the handset the man stole?

Complainant: It is a Nokia E series

IPO: How much does it cost?

Complainant: N17,000

IPO: Did you know the man before?

Complainant: No

IPO: How did you go to the hotel and sleep with the man?

Complainant: It was the hotelman who invited me to the hotel and introduced me to the man

IPO: Was there any negotiation between you and the man before you slept with him?

Complainant: I asked him how much he will give me, that my asking price is N3,000 and he replied that I should not worry he will give me more than the amount I am asking for. He said moreover he will pay me in Dollars.

IPO: During your discussion with the man he did not tell you where he is staying.

Complainant: No

IPO: Madam, come and sign your statement

Complainant: Yes sir

(Turning to the suspect)

IPO: What is your name?

Suspect: Josiah Audu

IPO: What is your address?

Suspect: I am staying at No. 60 Kawaji New layout.

IPO: What is your occupation?

Suspect: I am an Hotel Attendant

IPO: What is your age?

Suspect: I am 31 years old

IPO: Listen to me as I read the oath of statement taking to you – that you Josiah Audu male, having been duly cautioned that you are not obliged to say anything unless you wish to do so, but whatever you say will be written down and will be given as an evidence. Do you understand?

Suspect: Yes

IPO: Did you know this Madam?

Suspect: Yes

IPO: Where did you know her?

Suspect: In our hotel

IPO: How did you know her?

Suspect: She use to come to our bar. And on Saturday night one of the guest who lodged in our Hotel asked me to look for a woman he will sleep with for him; and I approached the woman and informed her of the intention of the man which she consented to

IPO: Did you know the man before?

Suspect: No, he only lodged in our Hotel

IPO: Did you negotiate for the amount to be paid to the woman with the man

Suspect: No

IPO: Did the woman sleep with the man?

Suspect: Yes

IPO: did you know what happened between the man and the Madam?

Suspect: Yes, the man stole the Madam's handset and gave her a fake \$25 dollars

IPO: Where were you when the man was leaving the Hotel?

Suspect: I was at the reception

IPO: Did you see the man leaving the Hotel?

Suspect: Really I saw him then but he told us he was going to buy some items outside the Hotel premises

IPO: Are you assigned by the Hotel management to bring women to guests who lodged in the Hotel?

Suspect: No

IPO: You better tell us the truth, you have known the man before.

Suspect: I don't know him before, he only came to lodge in our Hotel

SO: If he is lodging in your Hotel that is the reason why you must invite the woman to sleep him. You know where to look for the man. You must fish him out.

IPO: You said you don't know the man but the man has cheated the woman after sleeping with her he stole her handset and gave her a fake 25 dollars note.

Suspect: Oga sir I am ready to settle with the woman so that I will not lose my job.

IPO: Are you ready to pay her the cost of the handset and the Naira equivalent of the 25 dollars fake note.

Suspect: Oga Sir, the cost of the handset is not up to amount she is claiming. Let me negotiate with her and let me know how much I will pay her.

APPENDIX III

NIGERIA POLICE NASSARAWA DIVISION, KANO INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE IN A CASE OF CHEATING

Counter officer: What can I do for you gentleman?

Complainant: I am here to lodge a complain about a parent who has children in my school and refuse to pay their school fees.

Counter officer: Did you know where the parent lives?

Complaint: Yes sir

Counter officer: Let me inform the CIO so that he can give us a policeman that will accompany you and invite the man to the station

The CIO detailed a police constable to follow the complainant and invite the parent to the station

Counter officer: Are you back constable?

Constable: Yes sir.

Counter officer: Let me register the case in the crime diary before you take them to the CIO

Constable: Sir, we are back.

CIO: Take them to Sergeant Umar for proper investigation of the case.

Constable: Oga Umar, the CIO said that I should bring these people to you for the investigation of their case.

IPO: Okay. Who is the complainant and who the offender?

Constable: The main in Caftan is the complainant while the man in shirt and trouser is the offender

IPO: To complainant; what is your problem with the man?

Complainant: Sir, I am the proprietor of Sorters International School Airport Road. Two children of the man are in my school and he refused to pay their school fees despite making some appeals to him to pay the fees. I wrote a letter to him to that effect.

IPO: How much is the man owing as school fees of his children?

Compliment: The amount is N14,00

IPO: For how long is the man owing you the amount?

Complainant: Since last term

IPO: Come and sign your statement

Turning to the offender

IPO: Read the pre-statement oath to the offender and asked him if he understand, which the offender reply in affirmative.

IPO: What is your name?

Offender: My name is Christian Nwachukwu

IPO: Where do you live?

Offender: I live at 57 airport road

IPO: What is your occupation?

Offender: I am a roving printer

IPO: What do you mean by a roving printer?

Offender: I mean I don't have a shop of my own; I go about looking for work from people and offices

IPO: How many children do you have in the school?

Offender: Two children

IPO: What are their names?

Offender: David and Praise

IPO: For how long have they been attending the school?

Offender: For four (4) years

IPO: How old are they?

Offender: David is nine (9) years and Praise 7 years

IPO: How much are you owing the man as school fees?

Offender: N14,000

IPO: Since when have you been owing him?

Offender: Since last term?

IPO: Did the man write a letter reminding you to pay the money?

Offender: Yes

IPO: When?

Offender: On 27th February, 2009 and in the letter he stated that he will take a serious measure against me.

IPO: Why are you not paying your children school fees?

Offender: It is my condition. Life is becoming more difficult for me as my printing business is not moving fine.

IPO: Are your children still attending the school?

Offender: No. the man had sent them home since last term

IPO: How are you planning to pay the man?

Offender: I am finding a way of resolving the debt issue with the man but to my surprise he brought me to the Police Station. He knows my condition that is why he is dealing with me this way.

IPO: When precisely do you hope to pay the man?

Offender: By May ending

IPO: You will pay this money by May ending?

Offender: Yes

IPO: If you fail to pay the money, what shall we do to you?

Offender: I should be arrested by the police and legal action taken against me.

IPO: What guarantee are you giving me that you will pay this money?

Offender: I will write a letter of undertaking to show that I am committed to the promise I made to you.