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Abstract

Police interrogations are one-sided conversations between suspects and the police in which the police accuse a suspect of committing a crime and employ a series of sophisticated psychological tactics to obtain a confession. This study cataloged participants' perceptions of different police interrogation tactics. One hundred fifty six participants read one of three interrogation transcripts that contained 10 distinct interrogation tactics. The three different interrogation scenarios were murder, hit-and-run, and sexual assault. The results of this study demonstrated that participants believed the police interrogation tactics were more coercive when the suspect confessed. The implications of the results are discussed.
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Evaluating Police Interviews

In the 18th century, British jurist Sir William Blackstone wrote: “All presumptive evidence of felony should be admitted cautiously; for the law holds it better that ten guilty persons escape, than that one innocent party suffer.” Blackstone’s ratio, as this formulation has come to be known, reflects the justice system’s core mission of distinguishing the guilty from the innocent—a difficult task given that the guilty are highly motivated to lie and avoid punishment. On the one hand, police need powerful investigative techniques in order to identify and prosecute the guilty. Yet these techniques should not be so powerful that innocent suspects are wrongfully convicted for crimes they did not commit. The effort to balance the power of the police against the interests of the innocent is clearly evident in the context of police interrogations.

Police interrogations are one-sided conversations between suspects and the police in which the police accuse a suspect of committing a crime and employ a series of sophisticated psychological tactics—involving persuasion, manipulation, compliance, and deception—to elicit a confession. Interrogations are a powerful and necessary tool in law enforcement’s crime fighting arsenal, yet recent research demonstrates that they sometimes elicit false confessions from innocent suspects. According to the Innocence Project (a non-profit legal aid organization that provides DNA testing for individuals contesting their convictions) of the 312 post-conviction DNA exonerations to date, approximately 25% of these cases have involved false confessions (see www.innocenceproject.org).

There is currently little research on how the public perceives police interrogation tactics. Nor is there much research on the public’s knowledge of the legality of different
interrogation tactics. The current study cataloged participants’ perceptions of common police interrogation tactics and tested the hypothesis that participants would be more forgiving of harsh and deceptive police interrogation tactics if they believed the suspect was guilty compared to when they believed the suspect was innocent.

**Police Interrogations: The Reid Technique**

The contemporary model for conducting police interrogations is the *Reid Technique* (see Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne 2001). The Reid technique consists of a three-part framework for identifying guilty suspects and eliciting a confession. The first phase is the *factual analysis*, during which detectives collect and analyze case evidence and background information relevant to the investigation. This information serves as the factual foundation of the interrogation. In the second phase police conduct a *behavioral analysis interview* in which they question the suspect in a direct but non-accusatory manner regarding his or her knowledge and involvement of the crime (e.g., “Mr. Smith, where were you on the night of your wife’s murder? Do you have any knowledge of how your wife died? Did you kill your wife?”). During the behavioral analysis interview the detectives scrutinize the suspect’s answers and nonverbal behavior looking for signs of deception. It is during this phase that the police may ask the suspect to take a polygraph test or participate in some other physiological test for deception (e.g., voice stress analysis). Depending on the strength of the existing evidence, and the outcome of this interview, the police may conduct an *accusatory interrogation*, which is the third and final phase of the Reid technique.

The goal of the accusatory interrogation is to elicit a confession from a suspect whom the police believe is guilty and whom the police believe is lying. To this end this
phase of the interrogation employs a series of sophisticated psychological tactics
designed to overcome a suspect’s resistance to confessing, which is motivated by the
suspect’s effort to avoid the consequences of telling the truth. The accusatory
interrogation itself is comprised of 9 steps. It should be noted that the following outline of
the Reid technique is a general framework for police to follow when conducting
interrogations. However, not all interrogations follow this sequence and interrogators are
free to execute steps out of sequence or reorder them as the situation demands.

The Accusatory Interrogation

The first step is the *direct positive confrontation*. In this step the police attempt to
sidestep the question of the suspect’s guilt by informing the suspect of the overwhelming
evidence against him (which may or may not be true) (e.g., “We have a mountain of
evidence against you, so we’re not here to talk about whether you did it; we want to hear
your side of the story and find out why you did it.”) Thus, this step is meant to shift the
focus away from the suspect’s culpability to the motive for the crime. Obviously, if the
suspect reveals his motive, he has also made an admission of committing the crime.

The second step of the accusatory interrogation involves *theme development*. The
goal of this step is to identify and reinforce “stories” or excuses for the crime that may
already reside in the suspect’s mind. For example, if the accused is suspected of
murdering his wife and denies any involvement in her death, the police may suggest that
his wife was mentally unstable and acting erratically and that the suspect perhaps killed
her in an act of self-defense. Thus, such interrogation themes are meant to provide the
suspect with face-saving excuses.
The third step involves refuting suspect denials. According to Reid et al. (2001), it is at this phase of the interrogation that suspects will typically attempt to voice denials to the interrogator’s accusations. Interrogators are instructed to cut-off and interrupt suspect denials whenever they are made. The logic of this step, according to Reid et al. (2001), is that the more the suspect is allowed to voice denials the more psychologically difficult it will be for the suspect to confess. The forth step consists of overcoming the suspect’s objections. In this context objections are reasons or justifications the suspect uses to argue his innocence (e.g., I love my wife. I couldn’t have killed her). Interrogators are trained to let the suspect voice their objections and then use them to develop interrogation themes. According to Reid et al. (2001), at this point in the interrogation suspects will psychologically withdraw, perhaps to ponder their fate. The next step therefore is to bring the suspect’s attention back to the interrogation. At this point suspects may show psychological signs of defeat and surrender. The next step is to handle the suspect’s passive mood by narrowing theme alternatives and focusing their questioning accordingly.

It is at this point in the interrogation that many suspects will verge on confession. The next step is to present the suspect with an alternative question. This question contrasts a negative and a positive (or less negative) explanation for why the suspect committed the crime. For example, if the suspect is accused of killing his wife, the interrogator may ask him, “Did you intend to kill you wife then? Or was it an accident?” Obviously, if the defendant should choose the latter alternative he has admitted to the crime. Like many of the Reid stages and its tactics, this step is designed to lessen the defendant’s culpability. Assuming the suspect has made an admission, the next step is to
gain an oral confession in which the suspect not only admits that he committed the crime, but provides a motive and explanation for how the crime was committed. The final step in the Reid technique is to secure a written confession in which the defendant provides this information in writing and signs his name, thus converting the oral confession into concrete evidence that may be admitted in court. If a suspect refuses to provide a written confession his admission and oral confession may still be admitted in court, though the evidence in this form is considered less persuasive than a confession in written form (in the suspect's own handwriting) accompanied by his signature.

**Police Interrogation Tactics**

Within the Reid interrogation framework, the police may employ a number of psychological tactics in order to elicit a confession. Most of these tactics fall into the categories of maximization and minimization (Kassin & McNall, 1991). Maximization tactics involve threats or statements that overstate the consequences of the suspect's past behavior or his or her failure to comply with the demands of the interrogator. Essentially, maximization involves "scare" tactics designed to elicit a confession by exaggerating the perceived consequences of not confessing. Minimization tactics, in contrast, are those that imply or offer leniency, provide the suspect with face-saving excuses, or generally reduce the suspect's perceived culpability. What follows is a list of common interrogation tactics that were used in the current study (in the order in which they appeared in the stimuli).

1. **Implied Leniency.** With this tactic, the police imply that if the suspect cooperates with the investigation and confesses to the crime then he/she will be treated more leniently (less harshly) in return. This tactic may or may not be illegal, depending
on the context and how it is used. It is considered psychologically coercive and therefore illegal to explicitly offer leniency, so the police will commonly make implicit offers of leniency.

(2) Good Cop/Bad Cop. This technique involves one detective playing the role of the “good cop” and a different detective playing the role of the “bad cop.” It is designed to make the suspect more receptive to what the “good cop” is offering. This technique is also designed to convince the suspect that the “good cop” can be trusted and is trying to help the suspect and makes what the good cop is offering more attractive.

(3) Overstating Consequences. These are “scare tactics.” The police exaggerate the consequences of not confessing, which conveys to the suspect that he/she will be treated more harshly if he/she doesn’t confess. In the current study, the interrogator suggests that the suspect will be raped in prison.

(4) False Self-Disclosure. With this tactic, the detective suggests he has almost committed a similar crime in the past. This is a way of minimizing the seriousness of the crime and is designed to make it easier for the suspect to confess.

(5) Explicit offer of leniency. The detective utilizes this technique by explicitly and openly tells the suspect that if he confesses he will receive a lighter sentence. This tactic is considered to be psychologically coercive and therefore it is illegal to use this tactic during an interrogation.

(6) Minimizing Moral Consequences. This tactic enables the detective to provide a moral justification for committing the crime. He is downplaying the seriousness of the crime and thus is attempting to reduce the perceived culpability of the defendant.
(7) Blaming the Victim. Using this technique, the detective suggests that the victim is partly responsible for what happened. The detective is trying to make it seem like the suspect is less responsible for the crime.

(8) Questioning After a Request for Lawyer. With this tactic, the detective continues to speak to the suspect and ask him questions after he/has requested a lawyer. Technically, this tactic is illegal because the law states that after the suspect states that he know longer is willing to answer questions and requests a lawyer the police are supposed to honor this request and cease questioning the defendant.

(9) Presenting the Suspect with False Evidence. This technique involves the police lying to the suspect and telling him that they have strong evidence that he is guilty, when in fact the police have no such evidence. For example, they may state that they have located the suspect’s DNA at the crime scene when in fact no such evidence exists. Despite the widespread belief by the public that this tactic is illegal it is not.

(10) Suggesting Memory Failure. With this tactic, the police suggest that the suspect may not remember what happened during the crime. It provides the suspect with a face-saving excuse and the opportunity to claim that the crime was an accident and that the circumstances were beyond the suspect’s control.

**True Versus False Confessions.**

As noted previously, a significant minority (approximately 25%) of wrongful convictions have involved false confessions. There now exists scientific evidence that some police interrogation tactics can elicit false confessions from innocent suspects. Kassin and Keitchel (1996) conducted a study in which participants were falsely accused of hitting a forbidden key on a keyboard during a reaction time task and crashing a
computer, thus losing all of the computer’s data. The results of this study demonstrated that when a subject’s memory is vulnerable (manipulated by varying the speed of the reaction time task) and the subject was presented with false evidence (manipulated by having the experimenter claim that the participant hit the key), subjects are more likely to provide false confession and internalize their guilt (i.e., believe that they actually committed the crime). Russano, Meissner, Narchet, and Kassin (2005) conducted a similar study in which some participants were wrongfully accused of cheating on a laboratory problem solving task. Subjects were most likely to provide false confessions to cheating when the experimenter offered the subject an offer of leniency for confessing (if the subject confessed the experimenter would not call the professor) and when the experimenter used a minimization tactic (suggested to the subject they were being helpful rather than dishonest when providing a confederate the answers to the problem solving task). Collectively, these studies demonstrate that the tactics, when used in combination, —memory failure, false evidence, explicit leniency, and minimization—have the potential to elicit false confessions from innocent suspects. Unfortunately, research suggests that true versus false confessions are indistinguishable among observers who review confession evidence, even among trained investigators (Kassin, Meissner, & Norwick, 2005).

The Current Study

Research has studied the factors associated with false confessions, yet little is known about jurors’ sensitivity or knowledge of these factors. More specifically, there is little research on how everyday people perceive the coerciveness of different interrogation tactics. The goal of the current study was to catalog participants’
perceptions of different police interrogation tactics. We made no specific predictions regarding which specific interrogation tactics participants would consider to be the most coercive. However, we did predict that participants would judge the interrogation tactics to be more coercive, less effective, and less ethical when they believed the suspect was innocent compared to when they thought he was guilty. If these predictions were supported, it would suggest a bias regarding perceptions of police interrogation tactics, such that participants would discount the coerciveness of police interrogations when they believed the suspect was guilty.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were recruited through Montclair State University’s SONA system and were directed to the survey site at psychsurveys.org, a free online survey site. When participants accessed the study they were first directed to an informed consent page (a copy of the consent document can be found in Appendix A). If they agreed to participate they were then directed to a page where they were asked to answer demographic questions. Next, participants were randomly directed to a page containing one of the six interrogation scenarios. After reading the interrogation scenario participants were directed to 10 different pages containing the dependent measures. Finally, participants were directed to a manipulation check page that asked them to answer two basic questions about the scenario they had read (“What was the suspect accused of?” and “Did the suspect confess or not confess to the crime?”).

A total of 597 participants accessed the survey. However, only 156 participants actually completed the survey. Therefore 441 participants were dropped from the study.
Of the 156 participants who completed the survey, two participants failed to accurately answer manipulation check questions and were dropped from the study. The final sample consisted of 154 participants (68% female, 32% male; $M = 20.4$ years old, $SD = 3.1$). All participants (100%) indicated they were 18 years old or older and 93% indicated that to the best of their knowledge they were eligible for jury duty.

Design, Stimuli, and Manipulations

Design. The study consisted of a 3(interrogation scenario: murder vs. hit and run vs. rape) x 2 (confession: confessed vs. did not confess) between subjects factorial design.

Interrogation Scenarios. In each condition participants read one of three fictional police interrogations between a detective and a suspect. The scenarios consisted of either a murder, a hit-and-run, or a sexual assault (attempted rape). In each scenario, the detective used ten distinct interrogation tactics to try and elicit a confession from the suspect. At the end of each scenario, the suspect either confessed or did not confess. Thus, each participant could have been randomly assigned to read one of six interrogation scenarios. The scenarios are described in more detail below but a copy of each scenario can be found in Appendix B.

Murder. In the murder scenario, the alleged crime involved a domestic dispute between a man and a woman in which the man was accused of murdering his girlfriend by pushing her down the stairs. According to police the motive for this crime was the woman's discovery that the accused had been unfaithful to the relationship. In the confession condition, the suspect admitted that he had accidentally killed his girlfriend by pushing her down the stairs during a heated argument. In the non-confession condition,
the suspect was adamant about not murdering his girlfriend and left the police station without confessing.

**Hit-and-run.** In the hit-and-run scenario, the suspect was accused of hitting a woman with his car and fleeing the scene while intoxicated. In the confession condition, the suspect admitted to having a few drinks and hitting the woman because she had run out in front of his car and he admitted fleeing the scene because he did not want to get in trouble. In the non-confession condition, the suspect denied hitting the woman and left the police station without a confession.

**Rape.** In the rape scenario, the suspect was accused of attempting to rape his female neighbor. The detectives suggested he had attempted to rape her because she had repeatedly rebuffed his romantic overtures. In the confession condition, the suspect admitted that he was angry at her for rejecting him so he had attacked her. In the non-confession condition, the suspect denied attacking her and left the police station without confessing.

**Procedure**

Participants read one of three interrogation transcripts that contained 10 distinct interrogation tactics. Three different interrogation scenarios were used (murder, hit-and-run, and sexual assault) to increase the external validity of the study. Thus, if no differences were observed among the different scenarios, it would rule out the possibility that the study’s results were due to idiosyncratic features of the stimuli (e.g. the perceived likability of the suspect), thus increasing the generalizability of the results. Also manipulated was the ending of the interrogation—for half of participants the interrogation ended in a confession; in the other half the interrogation did not end in a
confession. Presumably, when the suspect confessed participants would consider the suspect to be guilty and would consider the suspect to be innocent when he did not confess and maintained his innocence in the face of harsh questioning. After reading the interrogation transcript participants were asked to rate the coerciveness, effectiveness, and ethicality of each interrogation tactic.

**Dependent Measures and Questionnaire**

After reading the scenario, participants answered several questions about each of the 10 tactics used in the interrogation. These tactics were: (1) implied leniency, (2) good cop/bad cop, (3) overstating consequences, (4) false self-disclosure, (5) an explicit offer of leniency, (6) minimizing moral consequences, (7) blaming the victim, (8) questioning the suspect after he requested a lawyer, (9) presenting the suspect with false evidence, and (10) suggesting memory failure.

For each tactic, the tactic was clearly labeled and defined. In addition, the context in which the tactic was used in the scenario was reproduced for the participant so that it could be referenced when making judgments about the tactic. To illustrate, consider the “implied leniency” tactic from the “Murder” scenario:

**Implied Leniency:** With this technique, the police imply that if the suspect cooperates with the investigation and confesses to the crime, then he will be treated more leniently (less harsh) in return.

**Example from Transcript:**

**Det. Marlow:** This is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you
cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I’m saying here? Can you read between the lines?

For each of the 10 interrogation tactics, participants were asked to indicate on a 10 point scale (1) “How effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?” (2) “How coercive is this technique?” (3) “How ethical is it for police to use this technique during the interrogation?” The questionnaire took approximately 25 minutes to complete. The interrogation scenarios and corresponding dependent measures can be found in the Appendix C.

Results

Preliminary Analyses: Differences Among Interrogation Scenarios.

A number of preliminary analyses were conducted to determine if there were significant differences on the three primary dependent variables as a function of interrogation scenario. For the first analysis, separate ANOVA’s were conducted on measures of effectiveness, coerciveness, and ethicality for each of the 10 interrogation tactics with interrogation scenario as a between subjects factor (30 separate ANOVA’s). No differences were found for any of the analyses (ps ranged from .08 to .99), indicating that participants’ judgments of each tactics’ effectiveness, coerciveness, and ethicality did not differ depending on what interrogation scenario they were given.

For the second analysis, the mean effectiveness rating, the mean coerciveness rating, and the mean ethicality rating across all 10 interrogation tactics were calculated and entered into three separate one-way ANOVA’s with interrogation scenario as the between subjects factor. As can be seen in Table 1, no differences were found on the mean effectiveness rating $F(2, 150) = .95, p = .39$, on the mean coerciveness rating $F(2,
151) = .51, \( p = .60 \), and the mean ethicality rating across interrogation scenarios \( F(2, 151) = .25, p = .78 \). Again, these results demonstrated that participants’ perceptions of the 10 interrogation tactics did not differ as a function of the interrogation scenario they received.

To summarize, no differences were found on the dependent variables as a function of interrogation scenario. Therefore interrogation scenario was eliminated as an independent variable for all subsequent analyses. That is, all subsequent analyses examined differences on the dependent variables between confession conditions only.

**Differences in Judgments of Tactic Effectiveness Between Confession Conditions.**

One of the hypotheses of this study was that participants would judge the different interrogation tactics to be more effective when the suspect confessed compared to when he did not. Individual t-tests were conducted on effectiveness ratings between confession and no confession conditions for each interrogation tactic. This hypothesis was only partially supported.

As can be seen in Table 2, each of the 10 interrogation tactics was judged to be more effective when the suspect confessed compared to when he did not. However, after correcting for familywise error \((.05/10 = p < .005)\), only the tactics of denying the suspect a lawyer \( t(149) = 3.06, p = .003 \), and presenting the suspect with false evidence, \( t(151) = 3.78, p = .001 \), were judged significantly more effective when the suspect confessed compared to when he did not. Still, an examination of the means reveals that overall participants found each of the interrogation tactics to be more effective when the suspect confessed.
Differences in Judgments of Tactic Coerciveness Between Confession Conditions.

The primary hypothesis of this study was that participants would judge the interrogation tactics to be more coercive when the suspect did not confess. Individual t-tests were conducted on coerciveness ratings between confession and no confession conditions for each interrogation tactic. As can be seen in Table 2, contrary to my hypothesis, after correcting for familywise error, no differences were found between confession conditions on any of the ratings of coerciveness. Most interesting, however, is that participants generally believed the interrogation tactics were more coercive when the suspect confessed.

Differences in Judgments of Tactic Ethicality Between Confession Conditions.

A third hypothesis of this study was that participants would judge the interrogation tactics to be less ethical when the suspect did not confess compared to when he did. Individual t-tests were conducted on ethicality ratings between confession and no confession conditions for each interrogation tactic. As can be seen in Table 2, no differences were found in ethicality ratings between confession conditions. Moreover, no clear pattern emerged from the data that would suggest whether participants generally found the tactics to be more or less ethical as a function of whether or not the suspect confessed.

Effectiveness, Coerciveness, and Ethicality For All Interrogation Tactics Combined Across Confession and No Confession Conditions.

Three separate mean composites were computed for ratings of effectiveness, coerciveness, and ethicality. In other words, the effectiveness rating for each of the 10 tactics was averaged together to construct a composite score, and similar composites
were conducted for ratings of coerciveness and ethicality. Three individual t-tests were computed to determine if these ratings differed as a function of confession condition. As can be seen in Table 3, after controlling for familywise error (.05/3 = p < .02), there were no differences in ratings of effectiveness or ethicality, but participants did believe that the tactics were more effective when the suspect confessed compared to when he did not $t(152) = 3.37, p = .001$. Still, overall, participants judged the interrogation tactics to be more coercive when the suspect confessed and more ethical when he did not.

**Discussion**

The goal of this study was to catalog participants’ perceptions of various police interrogation tactics. Participants read one of three interrogation transcripts that ended in a confession by the suspect or with the suspect maintaining his innocence. Three different interrogation scenarios were used to increase the external validity of the study. It was predicted that participants would judge the interrogation tactics to be less coercive, more effective, and more ethical when the suspect confessed compared to when he did not confess.

No differences were found among the three interrogation scenarios, demonstrating the pattern of results are generalizable across a range of criminal contexts and are not an artifact of the unique features of any given scenario (i.e., the nature of the crime, the perceived likability of the interrogator or the suspect). However, the prediction that participants would consider the interrogation to be less coercive, more effective, and more ethical when the suspect confessed were only partially supported.

Regarding tactic effectiveness, only two of the 10 tactics (denying the suspect an attorney and the presentation of false evidence) were judged to be significantly more
effective when the suspect confessed. However, supporting the study’s hypothesis, the mean effectiveness rating of all 10 interrogation tactics combined were found to be significantly greater when the suspect confessed compared to when he did not. Regarding tactic ethicality, no differences among the 10 tactics were found as a function of confession condition, nor were there differences between confession conditions on the mean rating of ethicality with all tactics combined. Thus, contrary to the study’s hypothesis, participants did not view the tactics to be more ethical when they believed the suspect was guilty.

The primary hypothesis was that participants would consider the interrogation to be more coercive when they thought the suspect confessed. To the contrary, the study’s hypothesis found no differences between confession conditions on any of the ratings of tactic coerciveness, nor was a difference found on the mean coerciveness rating when all tactics were combined. Most interesting, however, was the trend that participants generally believed the interrogation tactics were more coercive when the suspect confessed. It is possible that participants believed that more coercive interrogation tactics were necessary to elicit a confession from a suspect. In other words, guilty people are not likely to confess and therefore more coercion is necessary to elicit a confession. Said differently, because the individual confessed, more coercion must have been present during the interrogation.

But there is a competing explanation for these results. When this study was designed it was assumed that participants would equate a confession with guilt and a non-confession with innocence. In hindsight this may not have been the case—perhaps some participants in the confession condition believed the suspect was innocent and some
participants in the no-confession condition believed the suspect was guilty. If true, perceptions of guilt are confounded with confession condition, which in turn likely obfuscated the study results. This problem could have been remedied by simply asking participants at the end of the interrogation scenario whether they thought he was guilty or innocent, and this measure would then in effect constitute a new factor in the study. Unfortunately, this was not done and thus represents a major limitation to the study. This study should be replicated after controlling for this confound.

This study had a number of other limitations as well. The interrogation scenarios used in this study were closely modeled on real interrogations. However, they were fabricated and perhaps they did not completely capture the essence of a real interrogation. Also, the participants used in this study were largely undergraduate college students. Though most were eligible for jury service, they nonetheless do not constitute a representative sample of jury eligible citizens.

These problems notwithstanding, perhaps the greatest success of this project was creating and validating three unique interrogation scenarios that can be used for future research. Using multiple stimuli in an experiment is not a common practice, yet more and more journal and publication outlets are demanding that contemporary experiments take measures to increase the external validity of their results.

Constructing three interrogation scenarios reflecting crimes as diverse as murder, vehicular homicide, and sexual assault was no easy feat. A considerable amount of time when into designing the stimuli for the study. Though not part of the study’s hypothesis, finding no differences in the study measures among the different scenarios is a significant finding.
To summarize, the study’s primary hypothesis that participants would judge the police interrogation tactics to be more coercive when the suspect did not confess was not supported. This study nevertheless made a substantial contribution toward future research on perceptions of police interrogations. To determine if a suspect’s confession interacts with perceptions of the suspect’s guilt provides a fruitful avenue for future research.
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Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Judgments of Effectiveness, Coerciveness, and Ethicality for All Interrogation Tactics Combined Among Crime Scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Effectiveness M (SD)</th>
<th>Coerciveness M (SD)</th>
<th>Ethicality M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>6.29 (1.63)</td>
<td>6.05 (1.67)</td>
<td>4.45 (1.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit and Run</td>
<td>6.09 (1.90)</td>
<td>5.94 (1.94)</td>
<td>4.57 (1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>6.43 (1.74)</td>
<td>6.37 (1.45)</td>
<td>4.35 (1.64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Judgments of Effectiveness, Coerciveness, and Ethicality for All Interrogation Tactics Between Confession and No Confession Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Coerciveness</th>
<th>Ethicality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implied Leniency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.54 (2.53)</td>
<td>6.59 (2.67)</td>
<td>4.77 (2.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>5.53 (2.09)</td>
<td>6.20 (2.11)</td>
<td>4.57 (2.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Cop/Bad Cop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.29 (2.49)</td>
<td>7.27 (2.43)</td>
<td>4.33 (2.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>5.57 (2.18)</td>
<td>6.55 (2.18)</td>
<td>4.64 (2.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstating Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.57 (2.40)</td>
<td>7.67 (2.22)*</td>
<td>3.72 (2.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>6.12 (2.39)</td>
<td>6.67 (2.28)</td>
<td>4.26 (2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Self-Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.69 (2.33)</td>
<td>5.88 (2.83)</td>
<td>4.46 (2.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>5.98 (2.48)</td>
<td>5.19 (2.34)</td>
<td>5.03 (2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer of Leniency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>7.55 (2.02)</td>
<td>5.70 (2.95)</td>
<td>4.87 (2.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>6.60 (2.01)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.86)</td>
<td>5.47 (2.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing Morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.67 (2.21)</td>
<td>5.55 (2.73)</td>
<td>5.11 (2.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>6.12 (2.14)</td>
<td>5.17 (2.34)</td>
<td>5.67 (2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming the Victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.88 (2.22)</td>
<td>5.52 (2.75)</td>
<td>4.50 (2.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>6.09 (2.18)</td>
<td>5.40 (2.46)</td>
<td>4.69 (2.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>False Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denying Lawyer</td>
<td>6.01 (2.68)*</td>
<td>6.28 (2.68)</td>
<td>6.28 (2.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Evidence</td>
<td>8.09 (2.31)</td>
<td>6.72 (2.31)</td>
<td>5.90 (2.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory Failure</td>
<td>6.61 (2.10)*</td>
<td>5.83 (2.18)</td>
<td>5.90 (2.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * denotes statistically significant comparison at $p=.001$, without correcting for family wise error.
Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Judgments of Effectiveness, Coerciveness, and Ethicality for all Interrogation Tactics Combined Across confession and No Confession Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Coerciveness</th>
<th>Ethicality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>6.77 (1.64)*</td>
<td>6.45 (1.60)</td>
<td>4.28 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Confession</td>
<td>5.85 (1.73)</td>
<td>5.86 (1.72)</td>
<td>4.60 (1.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Denotes statistically significant comparison at $p=.001$ between Confession and No Confession Conditions.
Appendix A
Informed Consent Document

Hello! You are invited to participate in a study on how people evaluate interviews by police. We hope to learn how police interviews are evaluated by everyday people. You were selected as a possible participant because you chose this study for course credit through MSU’s SONA system, or you were invited by the Principle Investigator to participate in the study, or you contacted the Principle Investigator and expressed an interest in participating.

If you decide to participate, indicate below if you want to take part in the study. If you choose not to participate, you will be taken to another webpage. If you choose “yes,” follow the instructions to start the study. In this study, you will be asked to click on a link where you will read a short transcript of an interview between a police officer and a suspect. Then you will be asked to answer some questions about what you read. The questions will ask what you think about what was said and how people behaved in the transcript. The entire session will take about 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

No benefits accrue to you for answering the survey, but your responses will be used to help inform policy guidelines about how evidence is collected and presented in court. There are minimal risks associated with this study and they are not expected to be any greater than anything you encounter in everyday life. You may become bored or tired when completing the survey. If you do you are free to stop at any time. Data will be collected using the Internet; no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third party (i.e. your employer). Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. We strongly advise that you
do not use an employer issued device (laptop, smartphone etc.) to respond to this survey. If you are participating in this study for course credit at Montclair State University, you will be asked to enter your name at the start of the survey. This information will be used to assign you course credit. If you are not participating for course credit, you will not be asked to enter your name. If you are currently a student of Dr. Dickinson’s, you are ineligible for this study.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relationships with Montclair State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to stop at any time; you may also skip questions if you don’t want to answer them or may refuse to return the survey.

Please feel free to ask questions regarding this study. You may contact me, Sallie Vivo, at vivos1@mail.montclair.edu (or my faculty advisor, Dr. Jason Dickinson of the Department of Psychology at Montclair State University, at dickinsonj@mail.montclair.edu)

Any questions about your rights may be directed to Dr. Katrina Bulkley, Chair of the Institutional Review Board at Montclair State University at reviewboard@mail.montclair.edu or 973-655-5189.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sallie Vivo

Department of Psychology
Montclair State University
vivos1@mail.montclair.edu
By clicking the link below, I confirm that I have read this form and decided that I will participate in the project described above. Its general purposes, the particulars of involvement, and possible risks and inconveniences have been explained to my satisfaction. I understand that I can discontinue participation at any time. My consent also indicates that I am 18 years of age. [Please feel free to print a copy of this consent.]

☐ I agree to participate (link to survey)  ☐ I decline (link to close webpage)

The study has been approved by the Montclair State University Institutional Review Board as study #001426 on 11/28/13.
Appendix B

Interrogation Scenarios

Murder Scenario Confession and Non-Confession Conditions

**Det. Marlow:** I’m sorry to keep you waiting. I’m Detective Marlow. You are Nicholas Burke?

**Burke:** Yes. I’ve been waiting here for a half hour.

**Det. Marlow:** I know. I’m sorry about that.

**Burke:** Am I under arrest?

**Det. Marlow:** No. I just want to talk to you to get some things cleared up about the death of Lisa Bingham.

**Burke:** Can I leave?

**Det. Marlow:** No not yet. I have a few questions. Please state address, age, and occupation.

**Burke:** 1120 Wilshire Ave, Apt B12, Chicago Illinois 60018. I’m 33. I’m a heating and cooling contractor.

**Det. Marlow:** So what is that? What exactly do you do?

**Burke:** I install furnaces, boilers, air conditioning systems, stuff like that.

**Det. Marlow:** Okay. So even though you’re not under arrest I need to inform you of your rights, okay. This is just a formality.

**Burke:** Okay.

**Det. Marlow:** You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to an attorney. If you cannot afford one, one will be appointed to you. Do you understand these rights?
Burke: Yes.

Det. Marlow: Okay, sign here indicating you understand your rights. Thank you. So like I said, we just have a few questions about Lisa Bingham. I understand that she was your girl friend of two years and that you lived together. Is that correct?

Burke: Yes.

Det. Marlow: Tell me about your relationship. Where did you meet? How long had you been living together?

Burke: We had a great relationship. We’d been together for two years and were living together. We had talked about getting married. She was the love of my life.

Det. Marlow: How did you meet?

Burke: We met through a mutual friend, kind of a blind date sort of thing.

Det. Marlow: And you guys hit it off?

Burke: Right away, we hit it off right away. We saw each other a lot and three months later I moved in with her.

Det. Marlow: Okay. And did you guys have any problems? You know, did you guys fight or have something going on in your lives?

Burke: No, we didn’t fight, not more than any other couple. We had our ups and downs but things were pretty good, things were great. Am I a suspect here? I don’t like where this is going.

Det. Marlow: No you’re not a suspect. You’re a person of interest. In these type of investigations there are a lot of persons of interest. That simply means I’m interested in what you have to say. After all you were living with Lisa and you were her boyfriend. So
of course we want to speak with you. So, your interview here today is routine. We want to talk to you so we can rule you out as a suspect.

**Burke:** Okay.

**Det. Marlow:** Okay. Now, you said that things were great between you and Lisa.

**Burke:** Yes.

**Det. Marlow:** The reason I ask is because when we examined Lisa’s cell phone there were some text messages between her and her friend, ah, Ms. Jennifer Collins. Do you know Jennifer?

**Burke:** Yes she was a friend of Lisa’s.

**Det. Marlow:** Okay. I know that. Well in the text messages to Jennifer, Lisa conveyed that she thought you were cheating on her, I’m sorry, she said that she thought you were seeing or at least talking to another woman, someone named Sam. Do you know anyone by that name? Sam?

**Burke:** Sam is my friend’s wife, Bob Fitzpatrick. Her name is Samantha Fitzpatrick. And we are friends. I’m friends with Bob and Sam. That’s all.

**Det. Marlow:** So why would Lisa think you were involved with Sam?

**Burke:** Lisa had a jealous personality. That’s all. I was doing some work at Bob’s house, a big HVAC install, and Lisa didn’t like it.

**Det. Marlow:** Why didn’t she like it? What was the problem?

**Burke:** Lisa and Sam didn’t really get a long. Sam is a little flirty and I was doing the work at their place while Bob was at work. Lisa didn’t like it and she blew it way out of proportion.
Det. Marlow: Okay, so I gotta ask, you understand. There was no affair or sexual, or romantic relationship between you and Sam?

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: You’re sure? Now would be the time to tell me.

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: Okay. And did you have anything to do with the death of Lisa?

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: Do you know if anyone else had anything to do with the death of Lisa?

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: Do you know of any reason why someone would want to harm Lisa?

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: So, you know nothing about it. Okay, are we going to find anything that implicates you? Is there anything on that cell phone of hers that’s going to point the finger at you? Now is the time, now is the time to tell me.

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: Is there anything in Sam’s cell phone, Mrs. Fitzpatrick, is there anything in her cell phone that’s going to point a finger at you?

Burke: No.

Det. Marlow: Okay, we’re going to take a break. I can see that you’re upset.

Burke: Where is the bathroom? Can I use the bathroom?

Det. Marlow: Of course. Detective Dunay will show you were it is.

(break)
Det. Marlow: Okay Nicholas. Can I call you Nick?

Burke: Yeah.

Det. Marlow: Is there anything you'd like to say?

Burke: Like what? I already told you everything. I had nothing to do with Lisa's death. I told you everything, I had nothing to do with it.

Det. Marlow: Well the reason I ask is because we just got Sam's cell phone records. We submitted a subpoena for them. Do you know what the subpoena is?

Burke: Yeah. I know what that is.

Det. Marlow: Well it's not good for you. Let me read this text exchange between you and Sam.

Samantha Fitzpatrick: Hi! When you getting here?

Nicholas Burke: Bob's not home?

Samantha Fitzpatrick: Nope.

Nicholas Burke: Be there soon.

Det. Marlow: Now how do you explain that? What do you have to say about that?

Burke: It's nothing. I was doing some work at their house. Everyone knows I was working at their house.

Det. Marlow: Why did you ask if Bob was home?

Burke: I don't know. I was just curious if he was going to be around, so you know...I could talk with him and whatnot. He's my friend.

Det. Marlow: If he's your friend why didn't you text him? Why did you text her?

Burke: She's the one who is handling the job. She doesn't work. She deals with the renovations and the contractors. She's a housewife.
**Det. Marlow:** You sure about that? Will Bob back you up on that?

**Burke:** Listen, I didn’t have anything to do with her death. Nothing, okay and I don’t like you treating me like I did.

**Det. Marlow:** Relax Nick. I’m going to give you a few minutes to get your head together. I want you to think about our conversation here. I want you to think about if there’s anything you’re not telling me and how that’s going to look for you if we find out. I’ll be back in a few.

**Break:**

**Det. Sgt. Exley:** Nicholas Robert Burke.

**Burke:** Yes. Who are you?

**Det. Sgt Exley:** I’m Detective Sergeant James Exley. I’m Marlow’s boss. And I’m not buying any of this shit you’re selling.

**Burke:** Excuse me? Where, where, is Det. Marlow?

**Det. Sgt Exley:** Don’t worry about it. You’re talking to me.

**Burke:** I want…

**Det. Sgt Exley:** Shut your mouth. Don’t interrupt me. Listen, you’re good for this murder, okay? You know it, I know it. I’ll lay it out for you. You were plowing Samantha Fitzpatrick. Lisa found out about it. She was going to kick you out of the house, cut you off. She was going to tell Bob. So you killed her. You had motive, you had opportunity, you had means.

**Burke:** Listen…

**Det. Sgt Exley:** No you listen. I’m not here to baby you. I’m not here to play “let’s make a deal.” I’m here to tell you the way it is. And here’s how it is. We are going to bury you
under a mountain of charges, starting with first-degree murder. Hell, we might even make
some stuff up. We are going to bury you so deep with charges that you’ll be begging us
for a deal, you’ll be begging to tell your side of the story. We are going to drag you
through the mud. You will wish you were dead. You’re going to spend the rest of your
life in prison unless you start playing ball, understand? And you know what Nick, when
you go to prison you’re going to get it in the ass everyday for the rest of your life. You’re
going to the booty house Nick and you’re never getting out. Do you know what a perp
walk is? It’s when we take you to the courthouse and well call all the local TV stations
ahead of time and they’re waiting for you at the door. And your face will be all over the
evening news while you’re shuffling along cuffed up in that little orange jumpsuit. I’m
going to make sure that suit is two sizes too small just for the fun of it.

Burke: I want....

Det. Sgt Exley: Shut up. I’ve laid it all out for you and that’s the honest to God truth.
You think about that.

Break:

Det. Marlow: Sorry to keep you waiting.

Burke: What the hell is going on?

Det. Marlow: Sergeant Exley? He’s my boss. Don’t worry too much about him. He gets
a little fired up. He’s convinced you’re a piece of garbage. I told him you’re a good man
and that we need to give you a chance to tell your side of the story. I’m with you on this.

Burke: I didn’t...

Det. Marlow: As I was saying, I know you’re a good guy. I can tell. I see a lot of bad
people who do bad things. And they do those bad things because they’re evil people and
they make evil choices. But here, you’re a good guy who was put in a bad position. And you messed up, okay. You messed up. No one is perfect.

Burke: I’m done talking. I want my lawyer.

Det. Marlow: Okay Nick, you can have your lawyer, but let me finish. You’re a good person who was in a bad spot and you made a mistake. To be honest with you, a lot of people would have done the same thing in your situation. We’ve interviewed Lisa’s friends and we know that she had a difficult personality. To be frank, okay, we know she was a bitch. Sometimes women will push you over the edge and you just snap. It’s happened to everyone. It’s happened to me. There have been many times I’ve wanted to put my wife in her place like you did with Lisa. I’ve had to walk myself back from the edge more times than I can count.

Burke: I would like to see a lawyer.

Det. Marlow: Okay, I said you’ll get your lawyer. But let me tell you, once lawyers get involved then I no longer have the power to help you. It’s over. And here today, right now, you have a chance to tell your side of the story. You have a chance to set the record straight. This is your moment to help us understand. Let me ask you a question. Do you drink? Have you ever blacked out? I think that maybe you were drunk and you don’t remember this happening. Is that what happened? That would mean that you weren’t really responsible for killing her you know, you were lacking intent.

Burke: I didn’t kill Lisa. I, I really need to use the bathroom.

Det. Marlow: No you can’t use the bathroom. Not until we’re done here. Okay, now I want you to listen to me, okay. Just listen. This is, this is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball
here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I’m saying here? Can you read between the lines?

**Burke:** Let me start from the beginning. I am not a bad person. I did not kill Lisa and I don’t know...

**Det. Marlow:** Nick, if you come clean now. I can guarantee the judge will go easy on you, give you a reduced sentence. This is a good deal man, think about it. Don’t throw your life away here. And here’s something else to think about. When I was out of the room I talked to the forensic guys and they had some interesting things to show me. They found your DNA on Lisa’s body and they found your hair at the crime seen, at the bottom of the stairs. She had your hair in her hand. Now, that is conclusive, hard scientific evidence of your guilt. I’m going to step out for a few minutes and I want you to think about that. I’m giving you one last shot here.

*Break*

**Det. Marlow:** Well Nick, this is it. What’s it going to be?

**Burke:** I...I (sobbing), I killed Lisa.

**Det. Marlow:** Say that again? I couldn’t understand you.

**Burke:** I killed Lisa.

**Det. Marlow:** What happened?

**Burke:** It’s like you said. I was seeing Sam and, and Lisa found out about it. She was going to kick me out and take everything. She was going to tell Bob. And (inaudible)

**Det. Marlow:** What did you say? I couldn’t hear you.
Burke: We argued, we fought, I didn’t mean for it to happen. We are yelling and she pushed me and I pushed her. She fell down the stairs. I went to help her but she was gone. I never meant for this to happen. I never meant for this to happen. I never meant to hurt her. I’m so sorry.

Det. Marlow: Okay Nick. I’m going to step out for a few minutes and talk to Sergeant Exely. I’ll be right back. You did the right thing by telling us now. Okay, I’ll be back.

**Alternative Ending**

Det. Marlow: Well Nick, this is it. What’s it going to be?

Burke: This is the last time I’m saying this. I did not kill Lisa. I did not kill her. If I’m not under arrest I want to leave and I want to see a lawyer.

Det. Marlow: Okay Nick, have it your way. You’re free to go but don’t leave town understand? We’ll be seeing you soon. You know your way out?

Burke: Yes.

**Hit-and-run Scenario Confession and Non-Confession Conditions**

Det. Rossi: I’m sorry to keep you waiting. I’m Detective Bill Rossi. You are John R. Fowler?

Fowler: Yes. I’ve been waiting here for half an hour.

Det. Rossi: I know. I’m sorry about that.

Fowler: Am I under arrest?

Det. Rossi: No, I just want to get things cleared up about the incident involving...the hit and run incident involving Claire McKay.

Fowler: Can I leave?
Det. Rossi: No not yet. I have a few questions first. Please state address, age, and occupation.

Fowler: 19 Cherry Lane, Apartment 2B, Chicago, Illinois 60018. I’m 25 years old. I am a heating and cooling contractor.

Det. Rossi: So what is that? What exactly do you do?

Fowler: I install furnaces, boilers, air conditioning systems, stuff like that.

Det. Rossi: Okay. So even though you’re not under arrest I need to inform you of your rights, okay. This is just a formality.

Fowler: Okay.

Det. Rossi: Okay. You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to an attorney. If you cannot afford one, one will be appointed to you. Do you understand these rights?

Fowler: Yeah.

Det. Rossi: Okay, sign here indicating you understand your rights. Thank you. So like I said, I have just a few questions about the hit and run of Claire McKay. You heard about it, right?

Fowler: Yes. I live right by where the accident and it was on the local news.

Det. Rossi: Okay, so you know the injury, the accident occurred three nights ago, on Monday, November 19. Tell me what you were doing the night of the accident, between 10 and 10:30 pm.

Fowler: I was at Cha-chi’s.

Det. Rossi: Cha-chi’s? Okay. What were you doing there? Who were you there with?

Fowler: I was there with my buddy Jeremy.
Det. Rossi: What's Jeremy's last name?

Fowler: Bohler.

Det. Rossi: Can you spell that?

Fowler: Ah, B-O-H-L-E-R.

Det. Rossi: Okay, and what were guys going there? I mean, where you eating and drinking? What was the occasion?

Fowler: We were watching the Monday night game.

Det. Rossi: The Bears at San Francisco... that was a great game.

Fowler: It was.

Det. Rossi: Okay, what time did you leave the bar?

Fowler: We stayed until the end of the game, so probably it was, like 11:30 or so.

Det. Rossi: Or so...? But you stayed until the end of the game...?

Fowler: Yes.

Det. Rossi: How much did you have to drink that night? What time did you get to the bar?

Fowler: We got there for kick-off. It was about 9:00pm.

Det. Rossi: How much did you drink while you were there, between 9:00pm and 11:30?

Fowler: Well Jeremy had more than I did, I had...

Det. Rossi: How much did you have?

Fowler: I had three beers the whole night. I have to be careful. I have a DUI charge from way back. You probably know that.

Det. Rossi: I do know that actually.

Fowler: That was 10 years ago. I cleaned myself up since then.
Det. Rossi: You’re right, that was a long time ago. I’ll give you that.

Fowler: Am I a suspect here? I really don’t like where this is going.

Det. Rossi: No, you’re not a suspect. You’re a person of interest. There are many persons of interest in these types of investigations. That just means I’m interested in what you have to say. After all, you live right by the scene. Maybe you saw something. Your interview here is routine, okay. We just want to rule you out as a suspect and see if you have any information that can help us. Ms. McKay, as you know, was seriously injured.

Fowler: Okay.

Det. Rossi: Okay, so you said you didn’t see anything the night of the accident?

Fowler: No.

Det. Rossi: You knew nothing about until you saw it on the news.

Fowler: No.

Det. Rossi: And you were at the bar between 10:00 and 10:30?

Fowler: Yes.

Det. Rossi: Okay, I have one more question I have to ask. It’s routine. Did you hit Ms. McKay with your car that night, the night of Monday November 19th?

Fowler: No I did not. I had nothing to do with that accident.

Det. Rossi: Okay, so are we going to find anything that implicates you? Is there anything, anything at all you’re not telling me? Now is the time to tell me.

Fowler: No.

Det. Rossi: Okay, we’re going to take a break now. I can see that you’re upset.

Fowler: Where’s the bathroom? Can I use the bathroom?
Det. Rossi: Of course. Detective Walker will show you where it is.

Break

Det. Rossi: Okay, John. Is there anything you’d like to say?

Fowler: Like what? I already told you everything. I had nothing to do with the hit and run of Claire McKay. I told you everything. I didn’t see anything and I had nothing to do with it.

Det. Rossi: The reason I ask is because we just Det. Moore just got back from Cha-Chi’s and we pulled your bar tab, your bar receipt. Your total was $115.67. That’s a lot of beer.

Fowler: Well first off, I paid for my buddy too and he had more to drink than me. Second, the tab includes food.

Det. Rossi: Well still, that’s not looking good for you right. That’s a cheap bar menu down there and a cheap drink special for Monday Night Football. That’s a lot of beer my friend. Now, how do you explain that? What do you have to say about that?

Fowler: I already explained it. It included food and Jeremy’s drinks. He drank more than I did. It’s not hard to run up a $100 tab on a football game.

Det. Rossi: I’m sure it’s not.

Fowler: That’s not what I mean.

Fowler: Listen, I had nothing to do with the hit and run of Claire McKay. Nothing at all. And I don’t like you treating me like I did.

Det. Rossi: Well, listen, you have to understand why I’m questioning you. There is the bar tab, we already talked about that. But also, the bar tab is time stamped, and you paid the tab at 10:06pm. Now usually people pay their tab when they’re getting ready to leave. Also, and the reason we originally called you in…we got a description of the car from a
witness, and it was an early model black Ford SUV. Now what we did was, we pulled all
the DMV records of people living in the area, and there you are, a dark early model Ford
SUV, and you have a previous DUI conviction.

**Fowler:** That was 10 years ago, okay. Ten years ago. Second, I paid the bar tab early
before we left, because we were done drinking and I didn’t want to wait until the end of
the game when everyone else pays. It’s annoying. You have to stand there and wait. That
proves I was sober when I left. We stopped drinking around halftime. Not everyone gets
hammered at Monday Night Football games. This is a misunderstanding. Do you know
how many Ford SVU’s are in Chicago. It must be in the thousands.

**Det. Rossi:** Relax, John. I’m going to give you a few minutes to yourself. I want you to
think about our conversation here. I want you to think about if there’s anything you’re not
telling me and how bad it’s going to look if we find out. I’ll be back in a few.

**Break**

**Det. Sgt. Moore:** John Ronald Fowler.

**Fowler:** Yeah. You are?

**Det. Sgt. Moore:** I’m Detective-Sergeant Justin Moore. I’m Rossi’s boss. And I don’t
buy any of the shit you’re selling.

**Fowler:** Where did Detective Rossi go?

**Det. Sgt. Moore:** It doesn’t matter. You’re speaking to me now.

**Fowler:** I want...

**Det. Sgt. Moore:** Just shut your mouth and don’t interrupt me. Listen, you’re good for
this hit-and-run, okay? You know it and I know it. Let me lay it out for you. You were
driving home from Cha-Chi’s, you’d been drinking and hit Ms. McKay while she was
crossing the street because you didn’t see her. Instead of manning up, you took the cowardly way out and just drove away.

**Fowler:** Listen…

**Det. Sgt. Moore:** No, you listen. I’m not here to baby you. I’m here to tell you the way it is. And here’s how it is. We are going to bury you under a mountain of charges. Hell, we might even make some stuff up for the fun of it. We are going to bury you so deep with charges that you’ll be begging us for a deal, you’ll be begging to tell your side of the story. We are going to drag you through the mud. You will wish you were dead. You’re going to spend the rest of your life in prison unless you start talking, do you understand? And you know what? Ms. McKay is near death. They don’t think she’s going to make it. And if she dies, which she probably will, this whole thing will turn into a murder case.

**Fowler:** I…

**Det. Sgt. Moore** When you go to prison you’re going to get it in the ass everyday for the rest of your life. You’re going to the booty house and you’re never getting out. You know what the booty house is. Do you know what a perp walk is? It’s when we take you to the courthouse and call the local TV stations ahead of time and they’re waiting for you at the door. And your face will be all over the evening news while you’re shuffling along cuffed up in that little orange jumpsuit. I’ll make sure it’s two sizes too small just for the fun of it.

**Fowler:** I want…

**Det. Sgt. Moore:** Shut up. I’ve laid it all out for you and that’s the honest to God truth. Think about it.

**Break**
Det. Rossi: Sorry to keep you waiting.

Fowler: What the hell is going on?

Det. Rossi: Oh, Sergeant Moore? He’s my boss. Sorry about that. He gets overzealous at times. He’s convinced you’re a piece of trash. Ah, his words were “human garbage” actually. I told him that you’re a good guy and that we need to let you tell your side of the story. I’m with you on this.

Fowler: But I didn’t...

Det. Rossi: As I was saying, I know you’re a good guy. I can tell. I see a lot of bad people who do bad things. And they do those bad things because they’re evil people who make evil choices. But here, you’re a good guy who was put in an unfortunate situation. You messed up, okay? You messed up. No one is perfect.

Fowler: I’m through talking. I want my attorney.

Det. Rossi: Okay, you can have your lawyer, but let me finish. You’re a good person who was put in an unfortunate situation. To be honest with you, a lot of people would have done the same thing in your situation. We looked into Ms. McKay’s situation that night. She was at a bar too, O’Neil’s, and by all accounts she was drunk, drunker than you probably. We think she didn’t even look when she crossed the street. There have been many times I’ve almost hit people crossing the street because they weren’t paying attention. And I gotta tell you, there have been more than a few occasions I got behind the wheel when I shouldn’t have. Everyone has done it at sometime or another. You just got unlucky, you hit a drunk girl who wasn’t paying attention. You could even say she was at fault there. We just want to know what happened.

Fowler: Can I see my lawyer?
Det. Rossi: You'll get your lawyer. Let me just tell you that once lawyers are involved, I don't have the power to help you. Right here and right now you have a chance to tell your side of the story. You have a chance to set the record straight. This is your moment to help us understand. Let me ask you a question. Do you drink a lot? Have you ever blacked out? I think maybe you were drunk and don't remember this happening. Is that what happened? That would mean you didn't even see Claire and weren't able to hit the breaks in time. You really didn't know what was going on so you wouldn't have stopped to help her. It means you were lacking intent and didn't mean to leave the scene.

Fowler: I didn't hit anyone with my car. I really need to use the bathroom.

Det. Rossi: No, you can't use the bathroom. Not until we're done here. Okay, now I want you to listen to me, okay. Just listen. This is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I'm saying here? Can you read between the lines?

Fowler: Let me start from the beginning. I'm not a bad person and I didn't hit Ms. McKay with my car. I don't know...

Det. Rossi: John, if you come clean now, I can guarantee the judge will go easy on you, give you a reduced sentence. This is a good deal, man. Think about it. Don't throw your life away here. Here's something else to think about. We interviewed the bartender at Cha-Chi's and she has agreed to testify that you were shit-faced and that she had to cut you off that night.

Fowler: But that's not true! That's not true! I'm telling you that's not true.
Det. Rossi: Do you know how many times I’ve heard that? I’m going to leave you alone for a few minutes and give you one last chance to tell me what really happened. This is your last chance.

Break

Det. Rossi: John, this is it. What’s it going to be?

Fowler: I...I (sobbing), I hit her.

Det. Rossi: Say that again? I couldn’t understand you.

Fowler: I hit her. I hit Ms. McKay with my car.

Det. Rossi: Okay. What happened?

Fowler: It’s like you said. I was drinking at the bar with my friend and I was on the way home. I swear I wasn’t drunk. But she just ran out in front of me and I hit her. Just like you said.

Det. Rossi: Okay. Why did you flee the scene?

Fowler: I don’t know. Um, I didn’t want to get in trouble. I’m so sorry. I never meant to hurt her.

Det. Rossi: Okay John. I’m going to step out for a few minutes and talk to Sargent Moore and get you something to write on. I’ll be right back. You did the right thing by telling us now. Okay, I’ll be back.

Alternative Ending

Det. Rossi: John, this is it. What’s it going to be?

Fowler: This is the last time I’m saying this. I did not hit Ms. McKay with my car and leave the scene. I didn’t do it. If I’m not under arrest I’d like to leave and see a lawyer.

Det. Rossi: Fine, okay John, have it your way. You’re free to go, but don’t leave town, understand? We’ll be seeing you soon. You can count on it. Do you know your way out?
Fowler: Yeah.

Rape Scenario Confession and Non-Confession Conditions

Det. Dubois: I’m Detective Dubois. You’re John R. Hartley?

Hartley: Yeah. I’ve been waiting here for half an hour.

Det. Dubois: I know. I’m sorry about that.

Hartley: Am I under arrest?

Det. Dubois: No. I just want to talk to you to get some things cleared up about the incident involving, the ah, attempted rape of Ms. Daniela Carbon. She uh, she is in bad shape and can’t talk to us right now, which is why we really appreciate you coming down here.

Hartley: Can I leave?

Det. Dubois: No not yet. I have just a few questions for you first. Please state your address, age, and occupation.


Det. Dubois: What is that exactly? What do you do?

Hartley: I install heating and cooling systems, air conditioning systems, boilers, stuff like that.

Det. Dubois: Okay. So even though you’re not under arrest I need to inform you of your rights, okay? This is just a formality.

Hartley: Okay.
Det. Dubois: You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to an attorney. If you cannot afford one, one will be appointed to you. Do you understand these rights?

Hartley: Yes.

Det. Dubois: Okay, sign here indicating you understand your rights. Thank you. So like I said, we just have a few questions about Daniela Carbon. I understand that she has been your neighbor for two years?

Hartley: Yes.

Det. Dubois: We are interviewing all of her neighbors since the attack happened in the apartment building’s parking lot. Tell me how you know Ms. Carbon. How well do you know her?

Hartley: I know her from the building. I don’t know her very well.

Det. Dubois: Well, have you ever talked to her?

Hartley: Sure, you know, chitchat while we’re getting the mail or waiting for the elevator. I’ve seen her a couple of times in the laundry room. It’s a big building. I bump into a lot of the neighbors you know, people in the building.

Det. Dubois: How often did you bump into her?

Hartley: Oh maybe once a week or so, sometimes more, sometimes less.

Det. Dubois: Did you see anything the night of the attack? Ah, that would be two days ago, Monday November 9? Maybe, you know, any suspicious characters, unfamiliar people hanging around the building, anything like that?

Hartley: No I didn’t see anything. Didn’t see anything suspicious or anything like that.

Det. Dubois: Okay, where you romantically involved with Ms. Carbon?
Hartley: No. Like I said I just knew her from the building. That’s it.

Det. Dubois: Okay, well did you have any romantic attraction to Mr. Carbon?

Hartley: What?

Det. Dubois: Were you attracted to Ms. Carbon?

Hartley: What do you mean?

Det. Dubois: Did you find her attractive? I don’t know anyone other way to put it.

Hartley: No. There is no romantic attraction. Sure, she is a good-looking girl. That’s obvious to everyone, you know, everyone who’s seen her. But no, no romantic attraction.

Det. Dubois: Okay.

Hartley: Am I a suspect? I don’t like where this is going.

Det. Dubois: No, you’re not a suspect. You’re a person of interest. In these type of investigations there are a lot of persons of interest. That simply means I’m interested in what you have to say. After all you’re Daniela’s neighbor and the attack happened in the parking lot of the building. So, your interview here today is routine.

Hartley: Okay.

Det. Dubois: So you said you didn’t know Ms. Carbon well and that you ah, there was no romantic attraction.

Hartley: That’s right.

Det. Dubois: Okay, the reason I ask is because we interviewed her roommate, Ms. Nina Grombough, that’s Ms. Carbon’s roommate. Do you know her?

Hartley: I knew they were roommates. But I don’t know her. I know who she is.

Det. Dubois: Okay, so we talked to her and we asked her the same questions, you know, did you see anything suspicious or can you think of anyone that may want to hurt Ms.
Carbon, or you know, we asked her if there was anyone in the building that had their eye on her.

Hartley: Are you suggesting I had my eye on her?

Det. Dubois: Well the roommate, Nina, she said that Ms. Carbon told her that you had asked her out, you know, on a date... that you had asked her out twice. Ms. Carbon. Is that true?

Hartley: Well yes but that was a long time ago, like last year.

Det. Dubois: But you said there was no romantic attraction with Ms. Carbon.

Hartley: There's not, not anymore. I've had a girlfriend for the last 6 months.

Det. Dubois: All right. I have another question for you. I have to ask it, you understand it's routine. Did you attack Mr. Carbon?

Hartley: No. Absolutely not. I had nothing to do with it.

Det. Dubois: Do you know who did?

Hartley: No.

Det. Dubois: Do you know why someone would want to harm Daniela?

Hartley: No.

Det. Dubois: Where were you during the time of the attack? Ah, Monday night at approximately 8:00pm?

Hartley: I was at home, in my apartment, watching TV.

Det. Dubois: What were you watching?

Hartley: I was watching the football game. The Monday night game.

Det. Dubois: Okay, so you know nothing about it. Are we going to find anything that implicates you? Now is the time to tell me.
Hartley: No.

Det. Dubois: Okay, we’re going to take a break. I can see you’re upset.

Hartley: Where is the bathroom? Can I use the bathroom?

Det. Dubois: Of course. Detective Brown will show you where it is.

Break

Det. Dubois: Okay, John. Is there anything you’d like to say?

Hartley: No. I’ve already told you everything. I had nothing to do with Daniela’s attack.

Det. Dubois: Well the reason I ask is because we interviewed another one of your neighbors, uh, Mr. Daniel Brazinsky. Do you know him?

Hartley: I know who he is.

Det. Dubois: He told us that he saw you leave your apartment around 8:00 pm. He said that when he got out of the elevator you were waiting and you took it downstairs...the elevator.

Hartley: That’s true. I went to get the mail.

Det. Dubois: Get the mail? At 8:00 at night?

Hartley: I forgot to get it when I came home from work. I went down to get it. That happens all the time.

Det. Dubois: That’s odd, and Mr. Brazinsky said he didn’t see you come back.

Hartley: Well he probably wasn’t looking for me. Why would he? He was probably in his apartment.

Det. Dubois: Still it’s odd, and it’s odd that when I asked you where you were at 8pm you said you were in your apartment watching TV.
Hartley: I was. I just ran downstairs during a commercial to get the mail.

Det. Dubois: And, Brazinsky said you were wearing a black hoodie.

Hartley: I probably was. So what? Do you know how many people wear hoodies. I wear one all the time.

Det. Dubois: Ms. Carbon, before she was sedated, she gave a statement. She said her attacker was wearing a dark colored hoodie.

Hartley: That is a coincidence. I’m telling you, everyone wears a hoodie these days. Wearing a hoodie does not make you a criminal. I had nothing to do with her attack. I was home, I went down to get the mail and I came back up to my apartment. That’s it. There must be 200, maybe 300 people living in this building. I had nothing to do with the rape and I don’t like you treating me like I did.

Det. Dubois: Relax John. I’m going to give you a few minutes to get your head together. I want you to think about our conversation here. I want you to think about if there’s anything you’re not telling me and how that’s going to look for you if we find out. I’ll be back in a few.

Break


Hartley: Yeah. Who are you?

Det. Sgt. Anderson: I’m Detective-Sergeant Allen Anderson. I’m Dubois’ boss. And I’m not buying any of the bullshit that you’re selling.

Hartley: Excuse me? Where is Detective Dubois?

Det. Sgt. Anderson: Don’t worry about it. You’re talking to me.

Hartley: I want...
Det. Sgt. Anderson: Shut your mouth. Don’t interrupt me. Listen, you’re good for this attack, this assault okay? I’ll lay it out for you. You liked Daniela and she didn’t like you back. This is a classic case. I’ve seen it a hundred times. She didn’t like your advances and that pissed you off, so you tried to rape her. She struggled and you beat her. This whole case is that simple. I’m telling you I’ve seen it a million times. It’s called an anger-rape. You had motive, you had opportunity, you had means. And we have looked into your background. We know you have an assault charge. We call that a history of violence.

Hartley: That was over five years ago. Listen...

Det. Sgt. Anderson: No, you listen. I’m not here to baby you. I’m not here to play “let’s make a deal.” I’m here to tell you the way it is. And here’s how it is. We are going to bury you under a mountain of charges. Hell, we might even make some stuff up. We are going to bury you so deep with charges that you’ll be begging us for a deal, you’ll be begging to tell your side of the story. We are going to drag you through the mud. You will wish you were dead. You’re going to spend a long time in prison unless you start playing ball, understand? And you know what, when you go to prison you’re going to get it in the ass everyday. You’ll know how Daniela felt. You’re going to the booty house, John. Do you know what a perp walk is? It’s when we take you to the courthouse and call all the local TV stations ahead of time and they’re waiting for you at the door. And your face will be all over the evening news while you’re shuffling along cuffed up in that little orange jumpsuit. I’m going to make sure that suit is two sizes too small just for the fun of it.

Hartley: I want...
Det. Sgt. Anderson: Shut up. I’ve laid it all out for you and that’s the honest to God truth. You think about that.

Break

Det. Dubois: Sorry to keep you waiting.

Hartley: What the hell is going on?

Det. Dubois: Oh, Sergeant Anderson? He’s my boss. Don’t worry about him too much. He gets a little fired up. He’s convinced that you’re a piece of garbage. His words were “human garbage” actually. Relax, I told him you’re a good guy and that we need to give you a chance to tell your side of the story. I’m with you on this.

Hartley: But I didn’t…

Det. Dubois: As I was saying, I know you’re a good guy. I can tell. I see a lot of bad people who do bad things. And they do those bad things because they’re evil people and they make evil choices. But here, you’re a good guy who messed up, okay. You messed up. No one is perfect. Not a huge deal.

Hartley: I want my lawyer.

Det. Dubois: Okay, John, you can have your lawyer, but let me finish. You’re a good person who was in a bad spot and you made a mistake. To be honest with you, I know a lot of guys would have done the same thing in your situation. We’ve interviewed a number of people who know Daniela and we know she was quite promiscuous and has a reputation as being a flirt. Some women, you know, like to push buttons. We know Daniela was one of those women. And let me tell you, I see women downtown, you know, and they way they dress…some of them are asking for it…okay, and between you and me. I’ve thought about it. I think all men have.
Hartley: I would like to see a lawyer.

Det. Dubois: Okay, I said you'll get your lawyer. But let me tell you, once lawyers get involved then I no longer have the power to help you. It's over. And here today, right now, you have a chance to tell your side of the story. You have a chance to set the record straight. This is your moment to help us understand. Let me ask you a question. Do you drink? Have you ever blacked out? I think that maybe you were drunk and you don’t remember this happening. I think you couldn’t control your urges. That means you really weren’t responsible for trying to rape her; you were lacking intent.

Hartley: I didn’t try to rape Daniela. I really need to use the bathroom. Can I get something to drink?

Det. Dubois: No, you can’t use the bathroom until we’re done here. Okay, now I want you to listen to me, okay. Just listen. This is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I’m saying here? Can you read between the lines?

Hartley: Let me start from the beginning. I’m not a bad person and I didn’t try to rape Daniela. I don’t know...

Det. Dubois: John, if you come clean now, I can guarantee the judge will go easy on you, give you a reduced sentence. This is a good deal, man, think about it. Don’t throw your life away here. And here’s something else to think about. When I was out of the room one of our guys came back with security footage from the building. You probably didn’t know this but they had cameras put in the week before the attack, in the parking lot,
because of break-ins. They didn’t tell anyone. So we got the attack on tape and they guy looks a lot like you. We’re going to show that to the jury. Now, that is conclusive, hard scientific evidence of your guilt. I’m going to step out for a few minutes and I want you to think about that. I’m giving you one last shot here.

Break

Det. Dubois: John, this is it. What’s it going to be?

Hartley: I (sobbing), I did it.


Hartley: I did it…I attacked her.

Det. Dubois: What happened?

Hartley: It, it’s like you said, I asked her out a few times. She said no. She was a bitch about it. So, I, yeah, I did it. I attacked her.

Det. Dubois: Okay John, you did the right thing by coming clean. I’ll be write back. I’m going to get you something to write on.

Alternative Ending

Det. Dubois: John, this is it. What’s it going to be?

Hartley: This is the last time I’m saying this. I did not attack Daniela. I didn’t do it. If I’m not under arrest I’d like to leave and see a lawyer.

Det. Dubois: Fine, okay John, have it your way. You’re free to go, but don’t leave town, understand? We’ll be seeing you soon, okay? You can count on it. Do you know your way out?

Hartley: Yeah.
Appendix C

Dependent Measures

Murder Dependent Measures

1. **Implied Leniency**: With this technique, the police imply that if the suspect cooperates with the investigation and confesses to the crime then he will be treated more leniently (less harsh) in return.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Marlow**: This is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I’m saying here? Can you read between the lines?

**1-A** In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-B** In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-C** In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1-D** Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal 2. Illegal

**1-E** How confident are you in that your answer above (1-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Good Cop/Bad Cop**: With this technique, one detective plays the role of the “good cop” and a different detective plays the role of the “bad cop.” This technique is designed
to convince the suspect that the “good cop” can be trusted and is trying to help the suspect and makes what the good cop is offering more attractive.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Sgt Exley:** I’m here to tell you the way it is. And here’s how it is. We are going to bury you under a mountain of charges, starting with first-degree murder. Hell, we might even make some stuff up. We are going to bury you so deep with charges that you’ll be begging us for a deal, you’ll be begging to tell your side of the story.

**Det. Marlow:** Sergeant Exley? He’s my boss. Don’t worry too much about him. He gets a little fired up. He’s convinced you’re a piece of garbage. I told him you’re a good man and that we need to give you a chance to tell your side of the story. I’m with you on this.

**2-A** In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective

**2-B** In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive

**2-C** In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical

**2-D** Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal  2. Illegal

**2-E** How confident are you in that your answer above (2-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident

3. **Overstating Consequences:** These are “scare tactics.” With this technique, the police exaggerate the consequences of not confessing, which conveys to the suspect that she will be treated more harshly if he/she doesn’t confess.
Example from Transcript:

**Det. Sgt. Exly:** You’re going to spend the rest of your life in prison unless you start playing ball, understand? And you know what Nick, when you go to prison you’re going to get it in the ass everyday for the rest of your life. You’re going to the booty house Nick and you’re never getting out. Do you know what a perp walk is? It’s when we take you to the courthouse and well call all the local TV stations ahead of time and they’re waiting for you at the door. And your face will be all over the evening news while you’re shuffling along cuffed up in that little orange jumpsuit. I’m going to make sure that suit is two sizes too small just for the fun of it.

(3-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective

(3-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive

(3-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical

(3-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal  2. Illegal

(3-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (3-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident

4. **False Self-Disclosure:** With this technique, the detective suggests he has almost committed a similar crime in the past. This is a way of minimizing the seriousness of the crime and is designed to make it easier for the suspect to confess.
Example from Transcript:

**Det. Marlow:** It's happened to everyone. It's happened to me. There have been many times I've wanted to put my wife in her place like you did with Lisa. I've had to walk myself back from the edge more times than I can count. *(This statement isn't true).*

**(4-A)** In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(4-B)** In general, how **coercive** is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(4-C)** In general, how **ethical** is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(4-D)** Based on your knowledge, is it **legal** for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal
2. Illegal

**(4-E)** How confident are you in that your answer above (4-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Explicit offer of leniency:** With this technique, the detective explicitly and openly tells the suspect that if he confesses he will receive a lighter sentence.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Marlow:** Nick, if you come clean now. I can guarantee the judge will go easy on you, give you a reduced sentence. This is a good deal, man, think about it.

**(5-A)** In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(5-B)** In general, how **coercive** is this technique?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-C</td>
<td>In general, how <strong>ethical</strong> is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?</td>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-D</td>
<td>Based on your knowledge, is it <strong>legal</strong> for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)</td>
<td>1. Legal</td>
<td>2. Illegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-E</td>
<td>How <strong>confident</strong> are you in that your answer above (5-D) is correct?</td>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td>completely confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Minimizing Moral Consequences**: The detective provides a moral justification for committing the crime. He is downplaying the seriousness of the crime.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Marlow**: You’re a good person who was in a bad spot and you made a mistake. To be honest with you, a lot of people would have done the same thing in your situation.

(6-A) In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-B</td>
<td>In general, how <strong>coercive</strong> is this technique?</td>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-C</td>
<td>In general, how <strong>ethical</strong> is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?</td>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal  2. Illegal

(6-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (6-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident completely confident

7. **Blaming the Victim:** The detective suggests that the victim is partly responsible for what happened. The detective is trying to make it seem like the suspect is less responsible for the crime.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Marlow:** We’ve interviewed Lisa’s friends and we know that she had a difficult personality. To be frank, okay, we know she was a bitch. Sometimes women will push you over the edge and you just snap.

(7-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective completely effective

(7-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive completely coercive

(7-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical completely ethical

(7-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal  2. Illegal

(7-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (7-D) is correct?
8. Questioning After a Request for Lawyer: With this technique, the detective continues to speak to the suspect and ask him/her questions after he/she has requested a lawyer.

Burke: I would like to see a lawyer.

Det. Marlow: Okay, I said you’ll get your lawyer. But let me tell you, once lawyers get involved then I no longer have the power to help you. It’s over. And here today, right now, you have a chance to tell your side of the story. You have a chance to set the record straight. This is your moment to help us understand.

(8-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely ineffective completely effective

(8-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely non-coercive completely coercive

(8-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely unethical completely ethical

(8-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal 2. Illegal

(8-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (8-D) is correct?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9. Presenting the Suspect with False Evidence: With this technique, the police lie to the suspect and tell him that they have strong evidence that he is guilty, when in fact the police have no such evidence.

Example from Transcript:

Det. Marlow: When I was out of the room I talked to the forensic guys and they had some interesting things to show me. They found your DNA on Lisa’s body and they found your hair at the crime scene, at the bottom of the stairs. She had your hair in her hand. Now, that is conclusive, hard scientific evidence of your guilt. (This is false; there is no such evidence)

(9-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely ineffective completely effective

(9-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely non-coercive completely coercive

(9-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely unethical completely ethical

(9-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)
(9-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (9-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident  completely confident

10. Suggesting Memory Failure: With this technique, the police suggest that the suspect may not remember what happened during the crime. It provides the suspect with a face-saving excuse and the opportunity to claim that the crime was an accident and that the circumstances were beyond the suspect’s control.

Example from Transcript:

Det. Marlow: Let me ask you a question. Do you drink? Have you ever blacked out? I think that maybe you were drunk and you don’t remember this happening. Is that what happened? That would mean that you weren’t really responsible for killing her you know, you were lacking intent.

(10-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective  completely effective

(10-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive  completely coercive

(10-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical  completely ethical

(10-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)
2. Legal 2. Illegal

(10-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (10-D) is correct?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all confident completely confident

Hit-and-run Dependent Measures

1. Implied Leniency: With this technique, the police imply that if the suspect cooperates with the investigation and confesses to the crime then he/she will be treated more leniently (less harsh) in return.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Rossi:** This is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I’m saying here? Can you read between the lines?

(1-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely ineffective completely effective

(1-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely non-coercive completely coercive

(1-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely unethical completely ethical

(1-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

2. Legal 2. Illegal

(1-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (1-D) is correct?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all confident completely confident
2. **Good Cop/Bad Cop**: With this technique, one detective plays the role of the “good cop” and a different detective plays the role of the “bad cop.” This technique is designed to make the suspect more receptive to what the “good cop” is offering. This technique is designed to convince the suspect that the “good cop” can be trusted and is trying to help the suspect and makes what the good cop is offering more attractive.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Sgt. Moore**: I’m here to tell you the way it is. And here’s how it is. We are going to bury you under a mountain of charges. Hell, we might even make some stuff up. We are going to bury you so deep with charges that you’ll be begging us for a deal, you’ll be begging to tell your side of the story.

**Det. Rossi**: Oh, Sergeant Moore? He’s my boss. Sorry about that. He gets overzealous at times. He’s convinced you’re a piece of garbage. Ah, his words were “human garbage” actually. I told him you’re a good man and that we need to give you a chance to tell your side of the story. I’m with you on this.

2-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely ineffective completely effective

(2-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely non-coercive completely coercive

(2-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely unethical completely ethical

(2-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

2. Legal 2. Illegal

(2-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (2-D) is correct?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all confident completely confident
3. **Overstating Consequences**: These are “scare tactics.” With this technique, the police exaggerate the consequences of not confessing, which conveys to the suspect that he/she will be treated more harshly if he/she doesn’t confess.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Sgt. Moore**: When you go to prison you’re going to get it in the ass everyday for the rest of your life. You’re going to the booty house and you’re never getting out. Do you know what a perp walk is? It’s when we take you to the courthouse and well call all the local TV stations ahead of time and they’re waiting for you at the door. And your face will be all over the evening news while you’re shuffling along cuffed up in that little orange jumpsuit. I’m going to make sure that suit is two sizes too small just for the fun of it.

(3-A) In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3-B) In general, how **coercive** is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3-C) In general, how **ethical** is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

2. Legal 2. Illegal

(3-E) How **confident** are you in that your answer above (3-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **False Self-Disclosure**: With this technique, the detective suggests he has almost committed a similar crime in the past. This is a way of minimizing the seriousness of the crime and is designed to make it easier for the suspect to confess.
Example from Transcript:

**Det. Rossi:** There have been many times I’ve almost hit people crossing the street because they weren’t paying attention. And I’ve gotta tell you, there have been more than a few occasions I got behind the wheel and shouldn’t have *(This statement isn’t true).*

(4-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td>completely effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal 2. Illegal

(4-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (4-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td>completely confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Explicit offer of leniency:** With this technique, the detective explicitly and openly tells the suspect that if he confesses he will receive a lighter sentence.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Rossi:** John, if you come clean now. I can guarantee the judge will go easy on you, give you a reduced sentence. This is a good deal, man.

(5-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td>completely effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?
1  2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely  non-  coercive

(5-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely   unethically ethical

(5-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

2. Legal  2. Illegal

(5-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (5-D) is correct?

1  2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Not at all   completely confident
confident

6. Minimizing Moral Consequences: The detective provides a moral justification for committing the crime. He is downplaying the seriousness of the crime.

Example from Transcript:

Det. Rossi: You’re a good person who was in a bad spot and you made a mistake. To be honest with you, a lot of people would have done the same thing in your situation.

(6-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Completely ineffective  completely effective

(6-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Completely non-coercive completely coercive

(6-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Completely unethical completely ethical
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(6-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)
   2. Legal     2. Illegal

(6-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (6-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Blaming the Victim: The detective suggests that the victim is partly responsible for what happened. The detective is trying to make it seem like the suspect is less responsible for the crime.

Example from Transcript:

   Det. Rossi: We looked into Ms. McKay’s situation that night. She was at a bar too, O’Neil’s, and by all accounts she was drunk, drunker than you probably. We think she didn’t even look when she crossed the street.

(7-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(7-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

   2. Legal     2. Illegal

(7-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (7-D) is correct?
8. Questioning After a Request for Lawyer: With this technique, the detective continues to speak to the suspect and ask him/her questions after he/she has requested a lawyer.

Fowler: Can I get my lawyer?
Det. Rossi: You’ll get your lawyer. Let me just tell you, once lawyers get involved, then I don’t have the power to help you. Right here and right now you have a chance to tell your side of the story. You have a chance to set the record straight. This is your moment to help us understand.

(8-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident  completely confident

(8-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive  completely coercive

(8-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical  completely ethical

(8-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

2. Legal 2. Illegal

(8-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (8-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
9. **Presenting the Suspect with False Evidence**: With this technique, the police lie to the suspect and tell him that they have strong evidence that he is guilty, when in fact the police have no such evidence.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Rossi**: Here's something else to think about. We interviewed the bartender at Cha-Chi's and she has agreed to testify that you were shit-faced and that she had to cut you off that night. *(This is false; there is no such evidence)*

(9-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective
completely effective

(9-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive
completely coercive

(9-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical
completely ethical

(9-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

3. Legal 2. Illegal

(9-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (9-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
10. **Suggesting Memory Failure:** With this technique, the police suggest that the suspect may not remember what happened during the crime. It provides the suspect with a face-saving excuse and the opportunity to claim that the crime was an accident and that the circumstances were beyond the suspect’s control.

**Example from Transcript:**

**Det. Rossi:** Let me ask you a question. Do you drink a lot? Have you ever blacked out? I think maybe you were drunk and you don’t remember this happening. Is that what happened? That would mean that you didn’t even see Claire and weren’t able to hit the breaks in time. You really didn’t know what was going on so you wouldn’t have stopped to help her. It means you were lacking intent and didn’t mean to leave the scene.

(10-A) In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely ineffective  completely effective

(10-B) In general, how **coercive** is this technique?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely non-coercive  completely coercive

(10-C) In general, how **ethical** is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
completely unethical  completely ethical

(10-D) Based on your knowledge, is it **legal** for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal  2. Illegal
Rape Dependent Measures

1. **Implied Leniency**: With this technique, the police imply that if the suspect cooperates with the investigation and confesses to the crime then he will be treated more leniently (less harsh) in return.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Dubois**: This is your time to set the record straight, be a man, and own up to your mistake. And I can tell you this, if you play ball here, if you tell us what really happened, things will go a lot better for you. I will tell the judge you cooperated and that will look good for you when things are all said and done. Do you understand what I’m saying here? Can you read between the lines?

(1-A) In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1-B) In general, how **coercive** is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1-C) In general, how **ethical** is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1-D) Based on your knowledge, is it **legal** for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

|   | 3. Legal | 2. Illegal |

(1-E) How **confident** are you in that your answer above (1-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Good Cop/Bad Cop**: With this technique, one detective plays the role of the “good cop” and a different detective plays the role of the “bad cop.” This technique is designed to convince the suspect that the “good cop” can be trusted and is trying to help the suspect and makes what the good cop is offering more attractive.

**Example from Transcript:**

**Det. Sgt Anderson:** I’m here to tell you the way it is. And here’s how it is. We are going to bury you under a mountain of charges. Hell, we might even make some stuff up. We are going to bury you so deep with charges that you’ll be begging us for a deal, you’ll be begging to tell your side of the story.

**Det. Dubois:** Oh, Sergeant Anderson? He’s my boss. Don’t worry too much about him. He gets a little fired up. He’s convinced you’re a piece of garbage. His words were “human garbage” actually. Relax, I told him you’re a good man and that we need to give you a chance to tell your side of the story. I’m with you on this.

(2-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

3. Legal 2. Illegal

(2-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (2-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Overstating Consequences**: These are “scare tactics.” With this technique, the police exaggerate the consequences of not confessing, which conveys to the suspect that she will be treated more harshly if he/she doesn’t confess.
Example from Transcript:

Det. Sgt. Anderson: You’re going to spend a long time in prison unless you start playing ball, understand? And you know what, when you go to prison you’re going to get it in the ass everyday. You’ll know how Daniela felt. You’re going to the booty house, John. Do you know what a perp walk is? It’s when we take you to the courthouse and well call all the local TV stations ahead of time and they’re waiting for you at the door. And your face will be all over the evening news while you’re shuffling along cuffed up in that little orange jumpsuit. I’m going to make sure that suit is two sizes too small just for the fun of it.

(3-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective   completely effective

(3-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive   completely coercive

(3-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical   completely ethical

(3-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

3. Legal  2. Illegal

(3-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (3-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident   completely confident
4. **False Self-Disclosure:** With this technique, the detective suggests he has almost committed a similar crime in the past. This is a way of minimizing the seriousness of the crime and is designed to make it easier for the suspect to confess.

**Example from Transcript:**

**Det. Dubois:** And let me tell you, I see women downtown, you know, and they way they dress...some of them are asking for it...okay, and between you and me. I've thought about it. I think all men have. *(This statement isn't true)*

**(4-A)** In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(4-B)** In general, how **coercive** is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(4-C)** In general, how **ethical** is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(4-D)** Based on your knowledge, is it **legal** for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

3. Legal 2. Illegal

**(4-E)** How confident are you in that your answer above (4-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Explicit offer of leniency:** With this technique, the detective explicitly and openly tells the suspect that if he confesses he will receive a lighter sentence.

**Example from Transcript:**

**Det. Dubois:** John, if you come clean now. I can guarantee the judge will go easy on you, give you a reduced sentence. This is a good deal, man, think about it.

**(5-A)** In general, how **effective** is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

1. Legal
2. Illegal

(5-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (5-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td>completely confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Minimizing Moral Consequences: The detective provides a moral justification for committing the crime. He is downplaying the seriousness of the crime.

Example from Transcript:

**Det. Dubois:** You're a good person who was in a bad spot and you made a mistake. To be honest with you, I know a lot of guys would have done the same thing in your situation.

(6-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td>completely effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
completely unethical

(6-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

3. Legal  2. Illegal

(6-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (6-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident

7. **Blaming the Victim**: The detective suggests that the victim is partly responsible for what happened. The detective is trying to make it seem like the suspect is less responsible for the crime.

**Example from Transcript:**

**Det. Dubois**: We’ve interviewed a number of people who know Daniela and we know she was quite promiscuous and has a reputation as being a flirt. Some women, you know, like to push buttons. We know Daniela was one of those women.

(7-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective

(7-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive

(7-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical

(7-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)
3. Legal 2. Illegal

(7-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (7-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Questioning After a Request for Lawyer: With this technique, the detective continues to speak to the suspect and ask him/her questions after he/she has requested a lawyer.

**Hartley:** I would like to see a lawyer.

**Det. Dubois:** Okay, I said you’ll get your lawyer. But let me tell you, once lawyers get involved then I no longer have the power to help you. It’s over. And here today, right now, you have a chance to tell your side of the story. You have a chance to set the record straight. This is your moment to help us understand.

(8-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely non-coercive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely coercive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completely unethical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely ethical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

3. Legal 2. Illegal
(8-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (8-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident  completely confident

9. Presenting the Suspect with False Evidence: With this technique, the police lie to the suspect and tell him that they have strong evidence that he is guilty, when in fact the police have no such evidence.

Example from Transcript:

Det. Dubois: And here’s something else to think about. When I was out of the room one of our guys came back with security footage from the building. You probably didn’t know this but they had cameras put in the week before the attack, in the parking lot, because of break-ins. They didn’t tell anyone. So we got the attack on tape and they guy looks a lot like you. We’re going to show that to the jury. Now, that is conclusive, hard scientific evidence of your guilt. (This is false; there is no such evidence)

(9-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective  completely effective

(9-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive  completely coercive

(9-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical  completely ethical

(9-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)
(9-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (9-D) is correct?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
Not at all confident  completely confident

10. Suggesting Memory Failure: With this technique, the police suggest that the suspect may not remember what happened during the crime. It provides the suspect with a face-saving excuse and the opportunity to claim that the crime was an accident and that the circumstances were beyond the suspect’s control.

Example from Transcript:

Det. Dubois: Do you drink? Have you ever blacked out? I think that maybe you were drunk and you don’t remember this happening. I think you couldn’t control your urges. That means you really weren’t responsible for trying to rape her; you were lacking intent.

(10-A) In general, how effective is this technique in getting a suspect to confess?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely ineffective  completely effective

(10-B) In general, how coercive is this technique?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely non-coercive  completely coercive

(10-C) In general, how ethical is it for police to use this technique during an interrogation?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
completely unethical  completely ethical

(10-D) Based on your knowledge, is it legal for police to use this technique during an interrogation? (circle one)

5. Legal  2. Illegal
(10-E) How confident are you in that your answer above (9-D) is correct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all confident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completely confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>