



# Psychological Techniques in Crisis Negotiation

Ivana Glavina Jelaš<sup>1</sup>, Franjo Filipović<sup>2</sup>, Ivan Pranjić<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Applied Science of Criminal Investigation and Public Security, Ministry of the Interior, Zagreb, Croatia, <sup>2</sup>Franjo Filipović, Riot Police Command Headquarters, Ministry of the Interior, Zagreb, Croatia, <sup>3</sup>Ivan Pranjić, Special Police Unit, Ministry of the Interior, Zagreb, Croatia

---

## Key words

Negotiating; listening effort; police; crisis intervention

---

## Abstract

**Aim:** Crisis negotiation is a very effective police tool for the successful and peaceful resolution of various types of crisis interventions, with different types of interventions being the focus of this review. **Materials and Methods:** One of the most effective communication skills negotiators use is active listening. Active listening involves focusing attention on what the person is saying without judging, while non-verbally and verbally letting the person know that he is being listened to. In the negotiation context, it calms the perpetrator, encourages him to talk, enables rapport building between the negotiator and the perpetrator, and encourages a change in the perpetrator's behaviour. **Results:** Techniques that are most effective in crisis negotiation are paraphrasing, mirroring, "I" messages, minimal encouragements, pause, open-ended questions and emotion labelling. The paper also describes important factors for the effective use of active listening in crisis negotiation. **Conclusion:** Important factors for the effective use of active listening in crisis negotiation are non-judgmental acceptance, rapport building, maintaining dignity, authenticity, and empathy.

Copyright © 2024 KBCSM, Zagreb  
e-mail: apr.kbcm@gmail.com • www.http://apr.kbcm.hr

## Introduction

### Crisis negotiation

According to Vechhi and associates, crisis negotiation is one of the most significant developmental steps in police and police psychology [1]. It is one of the most effective police tools for the successful and peaceful resolution of various crisis interventions (kidnappings, suicide attempts, hostage crises, etc.) [2,3].

There are two main approaches to crisis negotiation - instrumental and expressive. The instrumental approach implies a rational discourse between two parties, where each party represents its goals and makes decisions based on bargaining over potential gains and losses [4]. However, police officers act more often in situations where subjective factors play a crucial role. Berking and associates state that police officers are daily exposed to situations in which strong emotions are present [5]. According to Royce, high levels of anxiety, insecurity, and fear are present in these situations for everyone involved [6]. Grubb and associates state that the majority of perpetrators in police interventions belong to the expressive profile in which case is more effective to act according to principles different from the instrumental approach [2]. Therefore, an expressive model was developed and built on psychotherapeutic principles and practices. This approach implies working with emotions as key factors in the negotiation process; therefore, the greatest emphasis

is placed on creating a relationship and trust between the perpetrator and the negotiator as factors that lead to a successful resolution of the crisis. It should be emphasized that in real life crises are not simply classified into the two previously described categories. Perpetrator's motives may change during the intervention, and may be ambiguous from the very beginning [7].

One of the most cited and often mentioned negotiation model is the BISM (Behavioural Influence Stairway Model) [8,9]. It was developed by experienced FBI negotiators. This model, together with other recent negotiation models, implies the aforementioned therapeutic approach with an emphasis on calming emotions and creating relationships, as opposed to instrumental models with pragmatic solutions that are not based on solving the emotional state of the perpetrator [2]. One of the key communication skills as well as an important component of the BISM model is active listening.

### Active listening

Active listening implies focusing attention on what the person is saying, without judging, while non-verbally and verbally letting the person know that he is being listened to. There are different definitions, but they are all based on the importance of giving feedback to the person - that we really want to listen and understand him. Levitt defines it as a therapeutic micro-skill that includes careful listening and empathetic responding due to which the client feels that he is being listened to [10]. According to Teniente and Guerra, it implies the listener's effort to hear intellectual and emotional messages, whereby the listener focuses on the content of what is said while checking his understanding of the content and feelings of the speaker [11]. Clawson lists two main components of active listening - a genuine intention to try to understand the person and letting know that we want to understand him [12]. For this reason, some authors call this skill reflective listening or empathic listening [13].

This skill has its roots in Rogers' conceptualization of empathic listening [14]. He formulated it as a psychotherapeutic technique that demonstrates unconditional acceptance and reflection of the client's experience without judgment. According to Rogers and Farson, attentive listening is the most effective way to individually change a person's behaviour [15]. Listening leads to changes in attitudes towards oneself and others, as well as changes in the basic values and perception of the world. People who are listened to according to the principles of active listening become more emotionally mature, more open to their own experiences, and less defensive and authoritarian. When they feel listeners' attention, they begin to pay attention to themselves, their thoughts, and their

feelings. Because this way of listening reduces the threat of criticizing other people's ideas, they are more willing to listen and take other people's points of view into account. Active listening does not pose a threat to the speaker's self-image, so he does not have to justify it. Listening allows him to investigate it, question it, and make a decision about how realistic it is, which altogether leads to the conditions for a behavioural change. Thus, active listening creates a relationship between communicators [15]. With previous, all the key elements for a successful crisis negotiation process are described.

Active listening involves different techniques. Rogers identified them as paraphrasing, reflecting, summarizing, confronting, providing information, self-disclosure, minimal encouragement, exploration, and immediacy [16]. Webster lists paraphrasing, "I" messages, summarizing, confronting, minimal encouragement, mirroring, emotional labelling, open-ended questions, and reappraisal [17]. This paper will describe those techniques that are most often used in crisis negotiation.

### Active Listening and Crisis Negotiation

#### Paraphrasing

Paraphrasing implies the negotiator's repetition of what the perpetrator said, in his own words. It shows that the negotiator is listening and trying to understand the perpetrator [18]. Paraphrasing begins with sentences like: "You want to tell me that...", "Let me see if I understood correctly...", "What I hear is that..."

Paraphrasing has multiple purposes. First, it helps to create a relationship between the perpetrator and the negotiator. The perpetrator realizes that the negotiator understands his situation because by repeating his difficulties in his own words he lets him know that he is truly listening to him. Miller states that listening to one's thoughts spoken by someone else enables additional clarification and a new perspective [19]. Paraphrasing also makes it possible for a negotiator to clarify what the perpetrator is saying. It also encourages the perpetrator to slow down and listen to what the negotiator has to say. Further, by paraphrasing, the negotiator summarizes what the perpetrator has presented to him. For example, if the perpetrator lists several areas with which he is dissatisfied (marriage, work, friendships...) the negotiator can tell him that he seems to be exhausted from difficulties with the people around him. Paraphrasing also ensures that the negotiator has understood the perpetrator well. If he is not sure that he has understood or heard correctly (for example, due to distracting sounds, quiet speech, mumbling, etc.), he can clarify doubts by paraphrasing. In that case, he can ask him, stating that he is not sure that he understood well, which he would like to

be - to repeat or clarify what exactly he wanted to say. According to Miller, clarity is one of the main principles of negotiation in all forms of crisis intervention, and acting in a case where the negotiator is not completely sure that he understood the perpetrator correctly can be very dangerous [19]. In addition, the negotiator's request for additional clarification is a sign of interest, care, and respect – all important concepts for the negotiation process.

The structure of paraphrasing sentences should serve as confirmation of the perpetrator's thoughts and feelings, which can be explicitly achieved by adding the phrase "Right?" at the end of the sentence or more subtly with the tone of voice or a pause, allowing the perpetrator to fulfil it [19].

The negotiator needs to be careful about potentially exaggerating the problem through careless choice of words. The perpetrator could become even more upset if, for example, the negotiator paraphrases to him that he seems to be ridiculed and taken advantage of by his close ones. One of the key goals of negotiation is to calm down the perpetrator, so the negotiator must be very careful and take care not to further anger him with certain expressions.

#### Mirroring

Mirroring implies the negotiator's repetition of the perpetrator's words, phrases, or expressions. By using the same expression, the negotiator leaves the impression of true and careful listening and willingness to understand the perpetrator. The negotiator can repeat the last word spoken by the perpetrator or the word he considers crucial. Most often, this word or phrase is pronounced in the form of a question. For example, if the perpetrator says that everyone who asks him for something makes him nervous, the negotiator can repeat - "They make you nervous?"

According to Miller, this technique enables "buying time" in cases when the negotiator cannot immediately find an appropriate way to paraphrase or label an emotion, despite which mirroring can encourage the perpetrator to think about what he just said [19]. Mirroring also provides information gathering in a non-confrontational way and is generally good for initial relationship building. Noesner and Webster point out that this technique is especially useful in the initial stages of a crisis due to the non-confrontational presence of the negotiator and the rapport building because it gives the impression of interest and understanding [18]. The authors emphasize another advantage of mirroring, which is the decrease of the negotiator's feeling of pressure to constantly direct the conversation. If he is not sure about the answer, mirroring allows him to fully participate in the conversa-

tion without having to be the one who guides and directs it at that moment. According to Noesner, mirroring enables the negotiator to avoid asking questions in a classic interrogative way, which can damage the relationship building process [3]. According to Tinney and associates, mirroring creates the impression of a listener who wants the speaker to continue talking and to talk more or in more detail about what is reflected to him [20].

Miller warns that the negotiator should be careful not to replace the mirroring technique with a complete imitation of the perpetrator's expressions, as this can be awkward and ineffective [19]. He states that people in a state of stress use swear words more often. The negotiator, willing to leave the impression of understanding the perpetrator, may try to mirror even those expressions, which can lead to an unproductive conversation. He points out that the negotiator must model a mature style of speech and behaviour, to calm the situation. Just as, for example, a calm tone of voice has a soothing effect, the same is achieved by using mature expressions that should be less irritable than those of the perpetrator. This does not mean that the negotiator should sound like a professor giving a lecture. A polite and calm way of speaking is also a sign of respect, important for the negotiation process and a good relationship with the perpetrator.

#### Minimal encouragements

This technique implies a simple, short, and at the right moment non-verbal and verbal confirmation to the perpetrator that the negotiator is listening to him.

As Miller states, minimal encouragements are nothing more than small conversational "fillers" of speech that let the person know that we are paying attention to him [19]. With sounds like "aha", and "mhm" the negotiator lets the perpetrator know that he is listening. In addition to sound stimuli, short questions such as "Really?", "When?", "That's what he said?" can be asked. The goal of the technique is to encourage the perpetrator to talk, without the negotiator directly asking him to explain or describe the situation. It makes it possible to leave the impression of sincere interest without interrupting the perpetrator too much.

As with other techniques, the negotiator must be very careful when using minimal encouragement. Tinney and associates point out that caution is needed regarding the use of the term "ok" in certain situations [20]. Sometimes it looks like the speaker is justifying inappropriate behaviour with this expression. If, for example, the perpetrator says that he wants to take his own life, and the negotiator uses the phrase "ok" as minimal encouragement, it can sound awkward and give the impression that the negotiator approves of his suicidal tendencies.

“I” messages

This technique involves starting the message with the phrase “I” instead of “You” and it has three parts: stating the feelings; the cause of those feelings, and the desired outcome [21]. The basic model of composing an „I“ message is “I feel...when you....I’d rather...”. The order can be changed depending on the context of the situation.

There are multiple benefits of this technique. First, the message being sent sounds less threatening if you avoid starting with the term “You”. The perpetrator may feel called out when he hears that phrase and there is a chance that he will not listen to the rest of the message. In addition to reducing the impression of attack, this technique also helps in creating relationships, because the use of the term “I” makes the perpetrator aware that he is not alone in the situation. Therefore, this technique is excellent for the very beginning of negotiations, to calm down the perpetrator.

Miller states that people in a state of extreme stress often become suspicious and take a defensive attitude, and too direct statements can seem offensive or intrusive, but the „I“ message lets the perpetrator know that he influences the negotiator’s perception [19]. At the same time, this technique enables the personalization of the negotiator. Personalization implies the perpetrator’s awareness that the negotiator is also a human being who feels concern and discomfort. For example, through an „I“ message the negotiator can tell the perpetrator that he wants to listen to him, but that it is difficult for him to concentrate while he is holding a weapon in his hand. As Noesner and Webster state, by using the „I“ message, the negotiator leaves the negotiating role and talks to the offender in the way any other caring person would [18]. From the perpetrator’s point of view, this removes the negotiator from the role of a police officer which the perpetrator expects will manipulate him into surrendering. Tinney and associates add that this technique enables the building of a relationship because the perpetrator does not perceive the negotiator as someone wearing a police uniform [20]. In the analysis of the case of an Australian police negotiator negotiating with the perpetrator who threatened to activate the bomb, Royce points out that the negotiator skilfully used this technique to build rapport and create trust [4]. He used the plural when he portrayed himself as a police officer and the singular when he tried to tell the perpetrator that he did not want to endanger him and that he wanted to help him.

Noesner and Webster point out that this is an excellent technique when the perpetrator is unpleasant to the negotiator and if, for example, he insults him [18]. With an „I“ message, the negotiator can let the perpetrator know how he feels in a non-provocative way. For ex-

ample, he may announce that he feels frustrated when the perpetrator insults him because it makes it difficult for him to concentrate on the content of the conversation. Miller adds that this technique enables the calming of strong emotions and helps shift the perpetrator’s focus during verbal attacks on the negotiator [19]. He also points out that the „I“ message is excellent in combination with paraphrasing and classic negotiation techniques of “buying time” in a situation where the perpetrator tries to manipulate the negotiator with unreasonable demands.

Furthermore, the „I“ message can be used regardless of what the perpetrator said. For example, the negotiator can tell the perpetrator that the negotiations have been going on for hours and that he feels dissatisfied because they have not yet managed to agree on anything concrete.

Pauses and silence

According to Davies and Roberts, silence is a component of the communication process as important as all the others, and the situational context of communication determines the use of silence [22]. They state that a police officer who has patience for periods of silence during conversations with disturbed and anxious people is often “rewarded” with their pleasant reactions. Silence allows time to think, recall, and reflect on what has been said and what is to be said next. They point out that the key fact about silence is that it serves as a mechanism for controlling the person’s emotions.

Silence is more often considered as negative reinforcement, i.e. in the context of punishment. It is quite difficult for people to endure the so-called uncomfortable silence and they will try to reduce it by saying anything. Noesner and Webster and Miller point out that on the one hand, in crisis negotiations pauses are used to encourage the perpetrator to “fill the gap”, that is, to continue talking [18,19]. Noesner and Webster state that the negotiator must consciously and deliberately take a break from time to time to encourage the perpetrator to talk, and to gather information useful for continuing negotiations and resolving the crisis [18]. On the other hand, silence is extremely useful as positive reinforcement and can be a very effective response when the perpetrator is extremely upset. According to Davies and Roberts, silence in police communication is generally useful as a calming tool [22]. For example, if a police officer pauses during the questioning of a grieving person as a sign of respect for what she is going through, it simultaneously enables the grieving person to process unpleasant thoughts and emotions.

The negotiator must be very careful and make sure not to give the impression of ignoring the perpetrator



by using this technique so that he does not feel neglected [19]. Improper use of pause can make it counterproductive. Namely, people tend to perceive silence more as a sign of embarrassment and rejection, but with appropriate non-verbal communication, it can also be experienced as something pleasant. A relaxed body position, non-verbal signs of openness and non-intrusiveness, a pleasant gaze, and a facial expression of approval can make silence a therapeutically effective technique.

Furthermore, Noesner and Webster point out that the perpetrators, in anticipation of the negotiator's response, often calm down to check whether the negotiator is still listening [18]. The authors state that often even the most disturbed perpetrators have a hard time enduring a one-sided conversation and try to restore a meaningful dialogue with the negotiator. Therefore, a timely pause allows the negotiator to move the negotiation process forward.

Another advantage of the pause is highlighted by Miller, stating that it allows the negotiator to emphasize the importance of what he said [19]. For example, suppose he tells the perpetrator that he sees that he feels angry, but that everything that starts badly does not necessarily end that way, after which he makes an effective pause. In that case, he emphasizes the importance of what he said and gives the perpetrator time to think about how he can always change his mind. The author also points out that this technique is useful in combination with others, especially with minimal encouragements.

#### Open-ended questions

Open-ended questions are those questions that do not lead to short yes/no answers and which give the person more space for an answer. Such questions most often start with "How", "What", "Where", etc. Open-ended questions also imply a search for a more thorough explanation, for example, the negotiator can ask the perpetrator to tell him in more detail what happened to him that day, what preceded the situation, etc.

This technique, like the others, encourages conversation, but open-ended questions directly put the perpetrator in a situation where an answer is expected. According to Noesner and Webster, effective crisis negotiation involves finding out how the perpetrator thinks and feels, and if the negotiator talks too much, he reduces the chance of learning useful information about the perpetrator [18]. This is precisely why open-ended questions are an excellent technique. According to Miller, in crisis negotiation, it is good to combine this technique with minimal encouragements, mirroring, and pauses [19]. He points out that thanks to open-ended questions, the negotiator does not have to constantly direct the conversation since the questions encourage the offender to talk.

This technique is also effective for calming down. When a negotiator asks questions that require concentration from the perpetrator and time to think about the answer, it leads to an arousal decrease [23]. The perpetrator needs to calm down to even hear the question and be able to answer it. Goulston states that concentrating on listening to questions leads to a shift from a subcortical to a cortical or rational way of thinking [24].

Further, Noesner and Webster warn that the negotiator must be careful when using the question "Why?" because it can seem intrusive and offensive [18].

#### Emotion labelling

Emotion labelling implies the negotiator's recognition and naming of the perpetrator's feelings and letting the perpetrator know that the negotiator sees how he feels. In the context of this technique, a sentence can start with "You seem like...", or "You sound like..."

This is a very effective technique to calm down the perpetrator. In addition to calming, it contributes to perpetrators' concentration and helps those who feel confused and lost. Labelling the key emotion can be enough for a calming effect because by naming the perpetrator's emotional state, the negotiator shows that he is truly listening to and trying to understand, as well as that he notices what the perpetrator is experiencing at that difficult moment. The technique leads to emotional ventilation, which enables the most important thing in crisis negotiations - the perpetrator's change of mind. People who are very emotionally aroused often perceive the situation as hopeless and ignore some of the simplest solutions. Sometimes they ignore that one of the solutions to the situation can be giving up the original intention. Noesner and Webster cite an example in which a negotiator, by paraphrasing and labelling the emotion, tells the perpetrator that he sounds so angry about being fired that he wants his boss to suffer [18]. They state that the perpetrator can agree with that statement, but in a calmer state, he can re-examine it, then modify it and say back that he is angry, but that he does not want to hurt anyone. The authors point out that the negotiator thereby adopted something very important about the perpetrator's emotions, needs, and most importantly about the actions he intends or does not intend to take.

Furthermore, Miller points out that by focusing attention on the perpetrator's emotions, the negotiator moves away from the discussion of demands and problems, thereby showing the perpetrator that he is interested in how he feels, not just in what the negotiator wants from him [19]. He points out that sometimes with agitated perpetrators who talk incoherently, it is not immediately clear what exactly they want, and that sometimes even the perpetrator himself is not clear because of his

agitation. This is precisely why this is an excellent technique for initially clarifying the perpetrator's thoughts and feelings. He states that in those situations it is necessary for the negotiator to first respond to the emotion, not to the content, that is, to adapt his response to the perpetrator's emotional state more than to arguments and demands. However, the author points out that the negotiator must be very careful not to give the impression of ignoring the perpetrator's requests, which should be addressed after indicating the emotion. In this regard, Hammer and Madrigal and associates warn that active listening in certain situations can be counterproductive and that its effectiveness depends on the skilled judgment of the negotiator [25,26]. Forcing a conversation about emotions and questioning about feelings, can anger the offender who clearly and decisively presents his demands, so the negotiator must be very careful.

According to Noesner and Webster, if used correctly, this is one of the most powerful skills of police negotiators because it allows them to identify the feelings and difficulties behind the perpetrator's behaviour and intentions [18].

Miller warns that the negotiator must be careful about expressions that can appear judgmental [19]. For example, telling the perpetrator that he sounds sad seems less "diagnostic" and judgmental compared to telling the perpetrator that he sounds depressed.

### Important Factors of Effective use of Active Listening in Crisis Negotiation

#### Non-judgmental acceptance

Prejudices and stereotypes have a significant effect on the communication process [27]. Instead of careful listening, people often evaluate the content. According to Van der Klift, during a conversation, people often do not listen with full attention but focus on an appropriate answer or counterargument [13].

It is not easy to listen carefully to someone who has a different way of thinking, different experiences, and values, without evaluating and judging the content. It is even more demanding in situations in which police officers act, which involve talking to perpetrators of various crime acts. It is especially demanding in crises, which most often involve extremely disturbed and aggressive perpetrators, often with certain psychological difficulties and disorders. In such situations, the judgment of the perpetrator's behaviour and beliefs is not unexpected, since their actions and ideas are often immoral, illegal, uncommon, and unusual.

However, one of the important preconditions of successful crisis negotiation is the negotiator's ability to listen to the perpetrator without judgment. It is an im-

portant characteristic of active listening, which enables leaving the impression that you are trying to understand the person without criticizing.

Noesner and Webster state that police negotiators achieve a peaceful resolution of a crisis situation after demonstrating a non-threatening, non-judgmental attitude while showing an understanding of the perpetrator's emotions [18]. This gives the impression of a concerned person who wants to help the perpetrator and not an enemy in a police uniform. Rogers found that a non-judgmental attitude creates a sense of security because the threat of evaluation of someone else's behaviour is removed from the communication [28]. Reducing the threat leads to relaxation and enables introspection. Itzchakov and associates showed that non-judgmental listening reduces defensive attitudes and anxiety and increases the possibility of behavioural change [29]. McMains and Mullins recommend a patient, caring, and accepting attitude for all stages of a crisis situation [30]. According to Greenstone, active listening enables the negotiator to learn as much as possible about the perpetrator, that is, to get to know him as well as possible, which is important for avoiding prejudices and judgments that can negatively affect the progress of negotiations [31]. Miller also highlights the important role of a non-judgmental and compassionate attitude of police negotiators [19]. He states that an effective way to bring the desired change in the perpetrator's behaviour is to let the perpetrator know that the negotiator can understand how the specific situation led him to a certain behaviour while emphasizing that he is there for a peaceful and safe resolution of the situation.

#### Building the rapport

Active listening significantly contributes to creating a feeling of trust between people. This is easier to achieve in the psychotherapeutic context in which the skill originally was created, compared to situations in which police officers act. In those situations, the atmosphere is completely different from the calm and pleasant environment during the treatment. In crisis situations, many factors can interfere with the conversation, from the presence of a large number of people - police officers, medical staff, firefighters, media, and the perpetrator's relatives, as well as the perpetrator's extreme agitation and irrationality. In such situations, the possibility of building a relationship between the perpetrator and the police officer as a uniformed symbol of the perpetrator's greatest threat seems almost unimaginable. However, active listening makes it possible to overcome the aforementioned difficulties.

Noesner and Webster state that the negotiator's empathy makes it possible to build rapport that eventually

leads to a change in the perpetrator's behavior [18]. They point out that a skilled and patient negotiator, by actively listening, can bring the expressive perpetrator to surrender. They also state that active listening through relationship building leads to a discussion of non-violent alternatives for resolving the crisis - the negotiator can propose different solutions that the perpetrator did not even think about or did not take into account. Guskowski, states that regardless of his mood, the negotiator must show sincere concern and interest in the perpetrator's perception of the situation because otherwise, a significant and meaningful relationship with the perpetrator will not be possible [32].

According to Grubb and associates, creating a relationship is a key component of the entire negotiation process, and building it in a short time and under stressful conditions is a major challenge [2]. The authors state that the concept of relationship is similar to the therapeutic one, between the client and the psychotherapist. Similar bond is created between the negotiator and the perpetrator, but in a more concise format. They cite empathy and creating trust as two key elements for building a relationship, and emphasize that for this purpose, the negotiator should be honest and avoid lying. Charles (2007) showed that police negotiators use systemic family therapy techniques to peacefully resolve the situation [33]. Cambria and associates state the importance of creating an atmosphere where the negotiator and the perpetrator are "together" in the situation, which leads to the perpetrator's trust and cooperation [34]. Miller emphasizes the importance of asking the perpetrator about how he is comfortable being addressed by the negotiator (for example, by name) to create a relationship [19].

Royce emphasizes mirroring and questions that the negotiator uses to check the perpetrator's understanding of the situation (such as whether he perceives fear in the victims he is threatening) among the techniques of active listening that are important for building relationships [4].

#### Acting with dignity

The negotiator's effort to maintain the perpetrator's dignity may leave the impression that he chooses the perpetrator's side. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that acting toward the perpetrator with dignity does not mean that the negotiator approves the perpetrator's actions. On the contrary, the negotiator lets the perpetrator know that what he did or what he intends to do is not good, but that the reasons and emotions that led him to such ideas and behaviour can be understood.

The feeling of respect is significant for calming down, building rapport, and changing behaviour, as negotiation goals. Action toward the perpetrator will take

place in any case and the crisis will have to be brought to an end, but the choice of police action determines how the intervention will end. For example, whether force will be used or not.

Police work implies the regulation of one's own emotions, meaning it requires appropriate and controlled reactions from police officers [5]. It is normal and first of all, human to feel anger, disgust, or sadness when dealing with difficult cases, which police officers often witness. They must be able to control those emotions to perform police tasks effectively. However, the presence of the mentioned emotions does not necessarily mean the exclusion of acting with dignity toward the perpetrator. Avoiding judging, mocking, or belittling the perpetrator is important in terms of calming down and building rapport as a negotiation prerequisite for changing the perpetrator's behaviour.

Grubb and associates point out how important for negotiation process is to enable the perpetrator to save face [2]. The face-saving concept is part of many existing models of crisis negotiation [26]. It implies different ways in which it can be enabled for the perpetrator to avoid the feeling of humiliation. For example, allowing covering of the face or handcuffs during arrest, etc. As Grubb and associates state - the perpetrator is given the least embarrassing and unpleasant way out of the situation [2]. In the context of face-saving Folger and associates, as a negotiation technique name - the negotiator's presentation of his view of the perpetrator's motives, an apology, control of his judgment, and confession of misunderstanding [13]. The authors state that the perpetrators try to maintain their dignity by recounting the event. Miller points out that if the perpetrator senses moralizing, patronizing, manipulation, or ridiculing by the negotiator, he will refuse to cooperate [19]. Thus, it is extremely important to communicate with the perpetrator directly, honestly, without manipulation, underestimation, and with respect.

#### Authenticity and empathy

Many authors emphasize the importance of the honest and credible performance of the police negotiator, and there are several reasons. Research shows that it is easy to detect an insincere listener, to which people react badly, therefore Miller emphasizes the importance of honesty and credibility of the negotiator [19,35]. He states that, for example, everyone involved in a hostage crisis, including the perpetrator, knows that the main priority is the safety of the hostages/victims. Nevertheless, he says that even then it is possible to demonstrate concern for the perpetrator's safety through direct communication, with respect, and without lying, because the perpetrator will not cooperate if he senses manipu-



lation or deception. According to Drollinger and Warrington, active listening creates a positive perception of the speaker as credible, friendly, and understanding [36].

According to Clawson, active listening is much more than just paying attention to the person [12]. He states that this skill represents a mindset that implies a real desire to understand the way another person experiences the world. Rogers and Farson pointed out that sincere interest in the other person is the main prerequisite for effective active listening and that people always see through feigned interest, consciously or unconsciously [15]. They pointed out that active listening is not an easily mastered skill and that it requires a lot of practice, but what is most important - it requires a change in our attitude. Mayer states that "good communication comes from intention, not a technique" [37].

LeBaron warns that negotiators should not mechanically use active listening, but should have a sincere desire to connect with the perpetrator [13]. Weinstein and associates state that the listener must be authentic and sincere to be perceived as such [28]. They warn that listening should not be reduced to the automated use of techniques according to an imagined scenario, but the techniques should be used with a sincere intention and desire to listen and understand.

Sincere and attentive listening enables the discovery of various details about the person, thereby getting to know him better. Often even with a person who does not arouse sympathy, for example, a perpetrator of a serious crime, attentive listening reveals pieces of information that are not in accordance with his current behaviour and intentions. The above implies the recognition of his interests and experiences, which do not necessar-

ily have to be negative and immoral, such as the behaviour he is currently demonstrating which led to a crisis situation. That content helps the police negotiator to be credible, show empathy, and build rapport. Getting to know the perpetrator does not serve his justification. It enables the negotiator to lead the perpetrator toward behavioural change as well as a peaceful and safe end to the crisis situation.

## Conclusion

Active listening techniques that are most commonly used in crisis negotiation are paraphrasing, mirroring, emotion labelling, pause/silence, "I" messages, open-ended questions, and minimal encouragements. The goal of the techniques is to calm the offender, encourage conversation and gather information, build rapport, and influence the perpetrator's behaviour to change. Important factors for the effective use of active listening in crisis negotiation are non-judgmental acceptance, rapport building, maintaining dignity, authenticity, and empathy.

## Acknowledgements

None.

## Conflict of interest

None to declare.

## Funding Sources

None.

## References

1. Vecchi GM, Van Hasselt VB, Romano SJ. Crisis (hostage) negotiation: Current strategies and issues in high-risk conflict resolution. *Aggress Violent Behav.* 2005;10:533-51.
2. Grubb A, Brown S, Hall, P, Bowen E. From Deployment to Debriefing: Introducing the D.I.A.M.O.N.D. Model of hostage and crisis negotiation. *Police Pract Res.* 2020;30:369-94.
3. Noesner GW. Negotiation concepts for commanders. *FBI Law Enforcement Bull.* 1999;68:6-14.
4. Royce T. The Negotiator and the bomber: analyzing the critical role of active listening in crisis negotiations. *Negot J.* 2005;21:5-27.
5. Berking M, Meier C, Wupperman P. Enhancing emotion-regulation skills in police officers: results of a pilot controlled study. *Behav Ther.* 2010;41:329-39.
6. Royce TD. The analysis of police crisis negotiations: important interactional features. *Int J Leg Discourse.* 2012;2:1-24.
7. Grubb AR. Modern day hostage (crisis) negotiation: the evolution of an art form within the policing arena. *Aggress Violent Behav.* 2010;15:341-8.
8. Ireland CA, Vecchi GM. The Behavioral Influence Stairway Model (BISM): a framework for managing terrorist crisis situations? *Behav Sci Terro Political Aggress.* 2009;1:203-18.
9. Van Hasselt VB, Romano SJ, Vecchi GM. Role-playing: applications in hostage and crisis negotiation skills training. *Behav Modif.* 2008;32:248-63.
10. Levitt DH. Active listening and counselor self-efficacy: emphasis on one micro-skill in beginning counselor training. *Clin Superv.* 2001;20:101-15.
11. Teniente S, Guerra, NS. Active Listening. In: Goldstein S, Naglieri JA, eds. *Encyclopedia of child behavior and development.* New York (USA): Springer; 2011. p. 27-28.



12. Clawson J. Active listening. Virginia (USA): Darden Business Publishing; 2008. p. 397.
13. Van der Klift EC. „Talk to me“: education meets hostage negotiation. [dissertation]. Colwood (CA): Royal Roads University; 2010.
14. Weger H, Castle Bell G, Minei E, Robinson Mc. The relative effectiveness of active listening in initial interactions. *Int J List*. 2014;28:13-31.
15. Rogers C, Farson E. Active listening. In: RG. Newman, MA. Danzinger, M Cohen, eds. *Communicating in Business Today*. Boston (US): D.C. Heath & Company; 1987.p. 1-5.
16. Slatkin AA. Communication in crisis and hostage negotiations: Practical communication techniques, stratagems, and strategies for law enforcement, corrections, and emergency service personnel in managing critical incidents. Springfield (USA): Charles C. Thomas; 2005. p. 412.
17. Webster M. The psychology of managing hostage/barricade incidents: an aide memoire for negotiators and commanders. Hampshire (GB): Centurion Consulting Services Ltd; 2000, p. 324.
18. Noesner, GW, Webster M. Crisis intervention: using active listening skills in negotiations. *FBI Law Enforcement Bull*. 1997;66:1-7.
19. Miller L. Hostage negotiation: Psychological principles and practices. *Int J Emerg Ment Health*. 2005;7:277-98.
20. Tinney M, Rosenbaum N, Magnusson M, Saavedra L, Melendrez, M. Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Training Instructor Guide. Albuquerque (US): Albuquerque Police Department; 2018. p. 10.
21. Classen R, Classen R. Discipline that Restores: strategies to create respect, cooperation, and responsibility in the classroom. BookSurge Publishing. South Carolina (USA): 2008; p. 192.
22. Davies A, Roberts K. Communications in policing. In: Birch P, Herrington V, ed. *Policing in practice*. Melbourne (AU): Palgrave Macmillan; 2011. p. 1-20.
23. Kohlrieser G, Forehand JW. Hostage at the table: how leaders can overcome conflict, influence others, and raise performance. San Francisco (USA): Jossey-Bass; 2006. p. 239.
24. Goulston M. Just listen: Discover the secret of getting through to absolutely anyone. New York (USA): Amacom; 2010; p. 256.
25. Hammer MR. The intercultural conflict style inventory: a conceptual framework and measure of intercultural conflict resolution approaches. *Int J Interc Rel*. 2005;29:675-95.
26. Madrigal DO, Bowman DR, McClain BU. Introducing the four-phase model of hostage negotiation. *J Pol Crisis Negotiations*. 2009;9:119-33.
27. Collins K, Clément R. Language and prejudice direct and moderated effects. *J Lang Soc Psychol*. 2012;31:376-96.
28. Weinstein N, Itzhakov G, Legate N. The motivational value of listening during intimate and difficult conversations. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass*. 2022;1-14.
29. Itzhakov G, DeMarre KG, Kluger AN, Turjeman-Levi Y. The listener sets the tone: high-quality listening increases attitude clarity and behavior-intention consequences. *Pers Soc Psy Bull*. 2018;44:762-78.
30. McMains MJ, Mullins WC. Crisis negotiations: managing critical incidents and hostage situations in law enforcement and corrections. New Providence (USA): Lexis-Nexis/Anderson; 2010.
31. Greenstone, JL. The elements of police hostage and crisis negotiations: critical incidents and how to respond to them. New York (USA): The Hawthorne Press; 2005. p. 270.
32. Guskowski K. Effect of negotiator active listening skills on crisis (hostage) negotiations. [dissertation]. Fort Lauderdale (USA): Nova Southeastern University; 2017.
33. Charlés LL. Disarming people with words: Strategies of interactional communication that crisis (hostage) negotiators share with systemic clinicians. *J Marital Fam Ther*. 2007;33:51-68.
34. Cambria J, DeFilippo RJ, Loudon RJ, McGowan H. Negotiation under extreme pressure. *Negot J*. 2002;18:331-43.
35. Tyler JA. Reclaiming rare listening as a means of organizational re-enchantment. *J Organ Change Manag*. 2011;24:143-57.
36. Drollinger T, Comer LB, Warrington PT. Development and validation of the active empathic listening scale. *Psychol Mark*. 2006;23:161-80.
37. Mayer BS. Beyond neutrality: confronting the crisis in conflict resolution. San Francisco (USA): Jossey-Bass; 2004. p. 284.

