PERSONALITY TYPES AND CRIMINAL INTERROGATIONS: EXAMINING INTERROGATION STRATEGIES AND FALSE ADMISSIONS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

COMMUNICOLOGY

AUGUST 2014

By

Mark Warner

Thesis Committee:

William Sharkey, Chairperson

R. Kelly Aune

Amy Hubbard

Keywords: False confessions, interrogation, personality, interrogation strategies

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationship between interrogation strategies, personality types and the likelihood that a false confession might occur. The usage of minimization and maximization tactics in interrogations by investigators was explained; as was how investigators might choose one interrogation tactic over another based on a suspect's dominant personality type. Specifically, introversion and extraversion were considered most relevant. The study utilized 103 subjects reading a hypothetical interrogation scenario involving a make-up exam and rated the likelihood that they would confess to the accusation of sharing answers with a classmate. Results showed that minimization strategies led to a significant higher likelihood that participants would falsely admit to sharing answers than would maximization strategies. Implications and limitations of the results are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Chapter 1: Introduction	3
Eliciting Confessions	6
Types of Confessors	7
Coercion	8
Interrogation Strategies	10
The Kinesic Method and Confessions	12
Dominant Personality Types	16
Chapter 2: Method	21
Chapter 3: Results	26
Chapter 4: Discussion	29
Appendix A: EPQR-S	36
Appendix B: Interrogation Scenarios	38
References	42

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Within the American judicial system, whether a suspect confesses to a crime or not carries great importance in determining guilt or innocence at trial. For instance, former Supreme Court Justice William Brennan wrote: "Triers of fact accord confessions such heavy weight in their determinations that the introduction of a confession makes the other aspects of trial in court superfluous, and the real trial, for all practical purposes, occurs when the confession is obtained … No other class of evidence is so profoundly prejudicial" (*Colorado v. Connelly*, 1986).

Black's Law Dictionary defines a confession as "a statement admitting or acknowledging all facts necessary for conviction of a crime." Past studies have demonstrated that confession evidence can have a stronger impact on a potential juror's decision-making than any other type of probative evidence (Henkel, Coffman, & Dailey, 2008; Kassin & Neumann, 1997). Many criminal investigations are totally absent of any physical evidence and are entirely reliant on confessions to provide a solution (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2013). In fact, Zimbardo (1967) suggested that as many as 80% of all crimes are solved via a suspect making a confession. With this in mind, the need for investigators to gain admissions from suspects to effectively show guilt becomes apparent.

Investigators have developed numerous interrogation tactics designed to convince suspects to confess guilt. The interrogation stage of an investigation is an accusatorial process that involves accusing suspects of specific crimes in an attempt to gain confession evidence (Inbau et al., 2013). Interrogation training manuals and texts are regularly published in the United States with this purpose in mind (e.g., Aubry Jr. & Caputo, 1972; Flanagan, 1982; Inbau,

et al., 2013; Kidd, 1940; Link & Foster, 1989; Mulbar, 1955; Rabon & Chapman, 2009; Royal & Schutt, 1976; Walters, 2003; Zulawski & Wicklander, 2002), each recommending a different general strategy to elicit confessions from suspects; however, these manuals rarely incorporate empirical evidence to support their claims. Rather, anecdotal evidence from experienced law enforcement members is oftentimes relied upon to substantiate the claims made therein. Gudjonsson (2003) suggested that a divide exists between the experts authoring these interrogation handbooks and psychologists studying the efficacy of the recommended interrogation tactics from a distance, saying that a fundamental problem with interrogation manuals is "the lack of scientific research into the police interrogation process and the techniques utilized" (p. 9).

Certain interrogation methods may be too persuasive in their attempts to yield admissions. A number of researchers have found that sometimes interrogation tactics are so powerful at eliciting confessions that innocent suspects might falsely confess to crimes they had no actual role in (Horgan, Russano, Meissner, & Evans, 2012; Kassin & Keichel, 1996; Kassin & McNall, 1991; Russano, Meissner, Narchet, & Kassin, 2005). To address the problem of false confessions, some authors specifically include sections in their manuals explaining how investigators may avoid educing a false confession (e.g., Gordon & Fleisher, 2006; Inbau et al., 2013; Walters, 2003).

In one such manual, *Principles of Kinesic Interview and Interrogation*, Stan B. Walters (2003) recommended that investigators devise unique interrogative strategies for each case based on the psychological type of a suspect. That is, investigators attempt to identify the suspect as introverted or extraverted and build an interrogative plan from there. While kinesic investigators evaluate the suspect's personality, they simultaneously observe the suspect's verbal and

nonverbal behaviors along with any other cues that might indicate deceptive communication. The ability of investigators to properly detect deception is vital to the kinesic technique. If investigators sense a suspect is truly guilty, or is lying about case facts, they will attempt to gain compliance from the suspect in the form of a confession to the crime. This is accomplished by using a unique interrogation strategy tailored to the personality profile of the suspect.

Even though the kinesic technique is one of the two most commonly used interrogation methodologies for investigators (Colwell, Miller, Lyons Jr. & Miller, 2006), few scientific studies have focused on the technique's accuracy (Frantzen, 2010). And although past research has indicated that personality factors may play a large role in one's willingness to confess (Forrest, Wadkins, & Larson, 2006; Gudjonsson, 2003; Gudjonsson, Sigurdsson, Bragason, Einarsson, & Valdimarsdottir, 2004), rarely has a suspect's personality type been studied in terms of a specific interrogation strategy. The kinesic technique is among those that have not been studied in such a manner.

This project's purpose will be to investigate whether the strategies prescribed by Walters (2003) involving psychological typologies work in the manner suggested in his manual, and what role two prevalent interrogation strategies, minimization and maximization, play in the occurrence of false confessions. The following will look at false confessions and why they occur, the kinesic interview and its recommended approaches to interviewing and interrogating, and whether or not the recommendations made by Walters are truly effective at provoking true confessions or, rather, are more susceptible to producing false confessions.

Eliciting Confessions

Many confessions are gained through interrogation, but certainly not all. Before an official interrogation begins, investigators will typically interview suspects as part of an investigation's fact-finding process. Although the terms are often used interchangeably, and both may produce confessions, there are important distinctions between interviews and interrogations (Inbau et al., 2013). For instance, interviews are non-accusatorial, take place early in an investigation and serve as open forums for investigators to gather information regarding suspect alibis and access to a crime scene. Investigators will remain neutral and as objective as possible throughout the interviewing process. Often, the interview will reveal that a suspect had no involvement in the crime or that evidence (physical or behavioral) is not sufficient for a conviction. In that case, the suspect will not be questioned further beyond the interview. However, if a confession is not gained via the interview but investigators still believe in the suspect's guilt, then the investigators will begin interrogating their primary suspect. Important to note is that investigators try not to interrogate anyone without reasonable certainty that the suspect is guilty or knows valuable case facts (Inbau et al., 2013). Opposite to the interview, criminal interrogations can be highly confrontational processes. Suspects will be accused, and investigators will be aggressive and dominate the proceedings (Inbau et al., 2013) in an effort to learn the truth, which is being withheld, and/or to elicit an admission of guilt.

Kassin et al. (2007) said that the goal of an interrogation is to move a presumed guilty suspect from denial to admission. A meta-analysis by Gudjonsson (2003) suggested that between 42% and 76% of all interrogation subjects will eventually confess. There are three reasons these true confessions occur: A suspect's belief that investigators hold strong evidence, external pressure from interrogators, and/or internal pressures—like a need to clear one's conscience

(Gudjonsson et al., 2004). Interrogators use these motivations to collect confessions by breaking down the suspect's resistance toward inquiries from law enforcement (Gudjonsson, 2003). However, it is important to ensure that confessions are only collected from suspects who are truly guilty since those "who confess are treated differently at every subsequent stage of the criminal process than those who do not" (Kassin et al., 2007, p. 384). Indeed, at times, the confessions collected and taken to court are actually false.

Types of Confessors

According to the Innocence Project (innocenceproject.org), of the first 312 DNA exonerations that the organization had been involved with, approximately 25% involved a defendant falsely confessing to a crime. Gudjonsson et al. (2004) posited that criminal suspects who are innocent of a crime being investigated, may provide a confession for a number of reasons. For example, a voluntary false confession involves no provocation from investigators (Leo, 2008) but results from specific needs or psychological states of the confessor, such as mental issues (Gudjonsson et al., 2004). Voluntary confessions might also occur to protect a friend or accomplice from being convicted (Gudjonsson, 2003). Other false confessions result from the suspect actually believing, wrongly, that he or she committed the crime and subsequently admitting false guilt (Kassin & Wrightsman, 1985), these are called internalized false confessions. In the present study, the focus will be on a third type of false confession, the compliant false confession—which occurs when "the suspect publicly professes guilt in response to extreme methods of interrogation, despite knowing privately that he or she is truly innocent" (p. 77).

Traditionally, torture, or other unsavory methods of coercion, lead to the majority of identified compliant false confessions (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004). These methods are known

as third degree tactics and were used until the 1960s, but have since fallen out of favor (Leo, 2008) or been made illegal (See *Ashcraft v. Tennessee,* 1944; *Chambers v. Florida*, 1940; or *Malinski v. New York*, 1945 for Supreme Court cases prohibiting Third Degree tactics). Typically, investigators will try to gain confessions through non-coercive methods, and judges now exclude confessions that are elicited through violence or explicit threats (Kassin & McNall, 1991). Simply, coercion involves overbearing the suspect's free will (Inbau, et al., 2013). French and Raven (1959) explained that coercive power results from a subject's expectation that a punishment is forthcoming, unless she or he conforms to the influence attempt from a more powerful actor. Specifically, an act is considered coercive if the investigator creates a situation in which the suspect has no reasonable alternative but to act in a manner prescribed by the person making the proposal—in this case, the interrogator (Wertheimer, 1987).

Coercion

To determine whether or not coercion was used in an investigation, the Supreme Court considers whether the actions of investigators shock the conscience (Addicott, 2008). In other words, an investigator may not act in a way that "is so egregious, so outrageous, that it may fairly be said to shock the contemporary conscience" (*County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, 1998). Behaviors that may be considered shocking could include anything from overly manipulative language (e.g., language that implies an offer of leniency, or a suggestion of harsher punishment) to outright torture, and is considered coercive if the investigator uses threats or promises to convey real consequences as leverage (Inbau et al., 2013).

Scholars have argued that these definitions of coercion are too imprecise and leave room for case-by-case interpretations from judges and investigators (Wertheimer, 1987). Even without

the use of illegal coercion or violence that shocks the conscience, interrogations are confrontational and may involve trickery and deceit (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004). The tactics used now are carefully crafted to follow the laws in place. While explicit promises of leniency or threats of harm unless a confession is given are not legal (Inbau et al., 2013), Moffa and Platania (2007) found that police may utilize tactics that do not make explicit threats or promises to suspects, but have similar effects nonetheless. Looking in to the literature discussing compliance gaining can be instructive in understanding how these tactics work as they do.

The extant research in the realm of compliance-gaining suggests that police likely may not need to use these prohibited tactics to gain the upper hand in an interrogation setting. Rather, the suspect's perception of a difference in power between investigators and suspects might be sufficient to induce compliance (e.g., Bacharach & Lawler, 1981; Donohue & Taylor, 2007; Levine & Boster, 2001). Kelman (1961) defined compliance as the process of change associated with the presence of sanctions, and interrogations are rife with tactics aimed specifically at compliance-gaining. Bacharach and Lawler (1981) posited that a weaker party's inability to reciprocate with punishments or threats leaves a stronger party with an advantage in negotiations or arguments. In the context of interrogations, the suspect is certainly the weaker party and does not have the ability to levy threats or punishments. Likewise, Levine and Boster (2001) found that power had a meaningful impact on one's success in a hypothetical compliance-gaining scenario using negotiations over a used car transaction—those in the higher power condition fared better in negotiations than those in the lower power condition. Levine and Boster postulated that the increased success for the more powerful parties likely occurred because of the nature of social power. Naturally, a more powerful actor will likely have abundant social influence and resources. As such, powerful actors have more options for gaining compliance

than a person with low power would. That is, applying this concept to interrogations, a party with higher power (the investigator) is more likely to succeed in a negotiation than a low power subject (the suspect). Donohue and Taylor (2007) said that high-powered negotiators, like criminal investigators, are significantly advantaged by an imbalanced negotiation market in their favor. And, according to Find et al. (2003), an agent is more likely to succeed in gaining compliance when the agent is perceived by the target to be more powerful. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) identified numerous compliance-gaining strategies that may utilize the power of power in interpersonal negotiations. Examples of such strategies include promises ("If you comply, I will reward you"), moral appeals ("You are immoral if you do not comply"), positive esteem ("People will think better of you if you comply") and negative altercasting ("Only a person with bad qualities would not comply"), and these tactics are still present in compliance gaining campaigns today. Minimization and maximization are two popular interrogation tactics that incorporate such methods within the realm of criminal investigations.

Interrogation Strategies

Conceptually, minimization and maximization are broad titles introduced by Kassin and McNall (1991) for strategies used in police interrogations. They argued that many methods used by modern interrogators could be classified as falling under the umbrella of one type or the other, and that minimization and maximization tactics may contribute to an increase in false confessions. Plainly, minimization is a term for strategies that give the suspect a false sense of security and "generally involves a gentle, friendly approach in which the interrogator attempts to gain the suspect's trust and minimize the seriousness of the offense" (Horgan et al., 2012, p. 66). Friendliness is used to gain cooperation (Kelly, Miller, Redlich, & Kleinmann, 2013), which may

be accomplished by expressing sympathy, using flattery, offering excuses, or underplaying the seriousness of the charges (Klaver et al., 2008).

Minimization tactics may also include investigators providing moral justification for the crime (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004), offering face-saving excuses (Russano et al., 2005) and downplaying the potential consequences of confessing or stressing the benefit of cooperation (Horgan et al., 2012) to suspects. In a survey of police interrogators, Frantzen (2010) found that offering moral justification and psychological excuses, both minimization strategies, were among the most effective tactics used by interrogators. According to one of the interrogators surveyed: "You want to minimize the effect of [the suspects'] negative behavior by providing them with reasons such as self-defense" (p. 232). The surveys from Kassin et al. (2007) and Frantzen (2010) show that police often use minimization techniques and other researchers (Horgan et al., 2012; Klaver, Lee & Rose, 2008; Russano et al., 2005) have suggested that doing so may increase the likelihood of false confessions.

Russano et al. (2005) held that while minimization can effectively obtain true confessions from guilty parties, the technique also puts innocents at risk for false confessions. Likewise, Klaver et al. (2008) said that using minimization strategies may be a powerful factor affecting the likelihood of producing a false confession and that more attention should be given to the risks involved with using the minimization technique. Kassin and Gudjonsson (2004) found that minimization may provide a loophole for police to imply leniency without actually making a promise—which is illegal. For instance, Kassin and McNall (1991) found that the use of minimization tactics lowered sentencing expectations for mock jurors. There, minimization tactics included officers empathizing with suspects and downplaying the seriousness of the offense. The minimization tactics produced a similar effect as an explicit promise of leniency

would—a lower sentence. With this in mind, one begins to understand why compliant false confessions happen. The suspect is in a vulnerable position in comparison to the more powerful interrogator. By providing a false confession, the innocent suspect hopes to lower any potential punishments through compliant behavior, as no other options seem to be available.

Maximization tactics, oppositely, involve the use of harsh methods designed to intimidate suspects. This includes interrogators exaggerating the seriousness of charges (Klaver et al., 2008), making implicit threats (Moffa & Platania, 2007), presenting fabricated evidence, and refusing to accept denials or claims of innocence (Russano et al., 2005). Such fabrications may include staging an eyewitness identification (Kassin & McNall, 1991) or convincing a suspect that nonexistent fingerprints were actually found at the scene of the crime (Russano et al., 2005). Plainly, maximization is a "hard-sell technique in which the interrogator tries to scare and intimidate the suspect into confessing" (Kassin & McNall, 1991, p. 234). The investigator will attempt to make clear the difference in social power between the suspect and interrogator. Through threats of punishment, a more powerful actor is able to make clear the gap in power and move closer to gaining compliance (Bacharach & Lawler, 1981) in the form of a confession. With an understanding of the tactics used within an interrogation, it is next important to consider how an interrogator decides upon a particular strategy. The next section will examine how practitioners of the Kinesic Method elect to approach a suspect before reaching the interrogation stage.

The Kinesic Method and Confessions

Since it is not in the best interest of suspects to confess, police must work to convince them to do so anyway. Oftentimes, interrogations are not entirely concerned with collecting truth, but rather on collecting incriminating evidence to be used in court (Leo, 2008). The goal of

the kinesic interview is to read the subject's behavior, both verbal and nonverbal, and tailor a specific persuasive message designed solely for that particular encounter (Walters, 2003) in hopes of collecting sufficient incriminating evidence for a conviction. By reading the actions and establishing the dominant personality of the suspect, investigators using the Kinesic technique attempt to develop a sort of map into the interviewee's psyche.

To draw this map, the Kinesic investigator focuses on verbal and nonverbal behaviors coming from subjects. Important to consider is that before any interrogating begins, the suspect undergoes a Kinesic analysis phase—an interview in which the investigator attempts to ascertain the subject's natural verbal and nonverbal behaviors, and personality. Here, investigators will ask simple, nonthreatening questions in an attempt to develop rapport with the suspect. The investigator will take note of any verbal or nonverbal reactions that the suspect makes as these are valuable, for comparison's sake, in the later stages of the interrogation (see Walters, 2003).

During the analysis phase, interviewers attempt to administer an unstressed interview, which should provide baseline information regarding the suspect's normal, relaxed behavior in response to questioning (Walters, 2003). After completing the analysis phase, the investigator will have basic information to help later judge whether or not the suspect may be withholding or repressing any pertinent information because repressed emotion is often visible through some form of body motion (Darwin, 1872). Ekman and Friesen (1969) termed these motions "leakage cues." That is, involuntary nonverbal behaviors that may indicate repressed emotion or other potential signs for deception. While there are no universal, definitive deception signals, investigators will look for discriminating signs of stress that result from specific points of inquiry and suggest a heightened probability for deception (Walters, 2003). Investigators attempt to determine the veracity of a suspect's remarks by assessing the timing of these stress signs in

relation to interrogative questioning. As such, Matsumoto and Hwang (2011) suggested that law enforcement officers would benefit from studying how to better read such cues.

Some leakage cues are visible on the face, as that is a primary site for the display of affects (Ekman & Friesen, 1969), but the hands, feet, legs, and posture also provide possible clues to deceptive activity (Inbau et al., 2013). Ekman (1985) stated that these "microexpressions" are automatically activated by an intensely experienced emotion. Likewise, Pfister, Li, Zhao and Pietkainen (2011) said that micoexpressions can reveal suppressed affect. Here, these behaviors likely result from anxiety due to the stress that naturally comes with being interrogated or accused of a crime. But, with knowledge of the suspect's baseline behavior, investigators can judge how the resultant anxiety may be affecting the suspect and whether or not any discriminating signs of stress are present. Matusmoto and Hwang (2011) found that the ability to read these signs can be learned and retained—which is crucial for investigators.

Investigators also closely examine the verbal content of any suspect during the interview. Specifically, how the suspect displays any signs of anger or depression are of particular interest to kinesic investigators (Walters, 2003). If the suspect displays anger during the unstressed interview, this could indicate that the suspect feels vulnerable and is trying to regain control of the situation—which could indicate deceptive communication. A depressed suspect during the interview may also signal deception. Whereas angry behavior is aggression directed toward the investigator, depressed behavior by a suspect is aggression directed inward and might indicate guilt. Repeated denials, sudden memory lapses, stalling maneuvers, and bargaining are other verbal behaviors that the kinesic investigator looks for as possible signs of a deceptive suspect.

Once the interviewer has formed initial judgments regarding the mindset and behavior of the suspect, a strategy is formed concerning how best to interrogate and gain the truth and/or a

confession from the suspect. Additionally, during the interview stage, investigators are attempting to determine suspects' personality types. This determination will lead to the choice of strategies during an interrogation. The goal of an interrogation is to move every suspect to an acknowledgement stage. To do this, every action taken by the interrogator will be influenced by the particular responses observed during the analysis phase.

Kinesic investigators look at several aspects of behavior and form overall impressions of suspects' veracity as well as their personality. Of central concern to the Kinesic strategy's formation is suspects' dominant personality type. Specifically, whether the suspect is an introvert or extravert plays a primary role in the development of an interrogation strategy (Walters, 2003), although additional case facts such as, eyewitness identifications, unique information that only a guilty party would know, and/or physical evidence (Inbau et al., 2013) play a part in the overall strategy used as well. By determining whether a suspect is an introvert or extravert, investigators can tailor an appropriate strategy for any suspect (Walters, 2003). Walters also stressed that it is important "to recognize that suspects have different mental operating systems and that the attack [investigators] make … must be based on the person's unique personality type" (p. 255). Also important to note is that no empirical research exists that examines the efficacy of Walters' suggestions regarding interrogative strategies—that is, no existing data support or refute the effectiveness of his recommendations. Because interrogators' ability to determine the personality of a suspect plays such an important role in the selection of interrogation tactics, the next section will examine the traits that introverts and extraverts typically exhibit and what strategies interrogators use to convince suspects who display these traits to confess to a crime.

Dominant Personality Types

In writings dealing with his theory of psychological types, Carl Jung (1921/1971) originally proposed that human beings' personalities typically fit into one of two general attitude types: Introverted or extraverted (Wehr, 1969/1971). Everyone has the potential for both attitudes, but either introversion or extraversion typically becomes the dominant attitude of consciousness (Mattoon, 1981). The ego controls which attitude becomes dominant and expressing the attitude not controlled by the ego can be awkward. For instance, introverts enjoy being alone. So, an introvert attempting to socialize at a crowded party would be uncomfortable and unlikely to flourish emotionally.

Introverts are typically associated with having an emotionally based outlook (Walters, 2003), high communication apprehension and a desire to work alone (Russ, 2013), and find orientation in their inner lives (Quenk & Quenk, 1982)—meaning that introverts typically allow emotions to influence their decision-making and that their inner-most feelings hold great weight. They direct energy inward, are typically clumsy in social settings, and oftentimes feel overly conscientious, pessimistic, and self-critical (Mattoon, 1981). Likewise, Jylha, Melartin, Rytsala and Isometsa (2009) found that introversion scores are higher in depressed subjects than is seen in the general public. The introverted attitude is normally a "hesitant, reflective, retiring nature that keeps to itself, shrinks from objects, is always slightly on the defensive, and prefers to hide from mistrustful scrutiny" (Wehr, 1969/1971, p. 63). Perhaps most important to interrogators is that introverts only open up to those deemed dependable; those who will not betray trust (Walters, 2003).

Walters recommended that investigators form bonds with these individuals who emphasize their introverted attitude since "the introvert sees himself [or herself] as the victim

and attempts to have others perceive him [or her] in the same manner" (p. 263). Furthermore, Walters asserted that the first rule in dealing with an introvert is to avoid hostility or intimidation. While never explicitly stated, Walters' recommended strategy for an introverted suspect is clearly to use minimization tactics. Downplaying the seriousness of the allegations and expressing compassion, while gaining the suspect's trust, allows the interviewer to make the suspect feel like a victim. Furthermore, minimization strategies may help lower any anxiety experienced by introverts. In a setting as stressful as an interrogation, the more powerful actor (the interrogator) will have more available compliance-gaining strategies when dealing with an anxious subject, so minimization tactics would likely be preferable. Therefore, a first research hypothesis may be formed:

> H1: Introverts will be more likely to consider admitting guilt (truly and falsely) when minimization strategies are used compared to the use of maximization strategies.

Extraverts experience emotion in an opposite manner, they have low communication apprehension and actively seek human interaction (Russ, 2013). Extraverted individuals pursue stimulation from the outside world (Quenk & Quenk, 1982) and are outgoing, candid and accommodating, and can easily adapt to a given situation. In research involving idea generation in small groups, Jung, Lee and Karsten (2011) found that extraverts are well-suited to formulate unique and diverse ideas, compared to introverts. Further, extraverts may confidently enter unknown situations with ease (Wehr, 1969/1971). Extraverts are sociable and enthusiastic but may depend upon making a good impression with others and are afraid to be alone (Mattoon, 1981). Additionally, extraverts tend to be more behaviorally active and happier than introverts (Forsman, Manzano, Karabanov, Madison & Ullen, 2011). Typically, emotion is not involved in thinking or reasoning processes as the extraverted personality is based on non-emotional input.

Important to law enforcement interviews and interrogations is that extraverts are often highly competitive and may respond to stress or conflict with aggression (Walters, 2003). Also, the extravert "needs large doses of reality input all the time, or he [or she] becomes bored and distracted" (p. 268). The extraverted suspect is usually logical and often avoids expressing any overt emotion (Walters, 2003). Therefore, interviewers and interrogators must do the same. Presenting evidence in a convincing manner is crucial. While Walters recommended developing an entirely unique strategy for each extraverted subject, the emphasis on evidence is, in a way, similar to maximization. That is, investigators using the maximization strategy will often overstate the strength of their physical evidence against the suspect. Likewise, Kinesic investigators, when dealing with extraverted suspects, may exaggerate the power of physical evidence because tangible evidence will have more effect than emotional appeals. It makes sense that investigators attempt to maximize the perception of a power gap in the interrogation through threats or a hard sell technique, in the hope of gaining compliance in the form of confession evidence. That the extraverted suspect has low communication apprehension and is expressive and decisive (Russ, 2013) may even exacerbate the need for an investigator to maximize threat levels. However, no research has specifically examined which strategies will be most effective for extraverted suspects. Because it is unclear whether minimization or maximization strategies will increase the chances of a false confession, a research question will be used to discover which strategy will increase the likelihood of eliciting a confession from extraverted individuals:

> RQ1: Which strategy, minimization or maximization, will more likely lead an extraverted suspect to admit guilt?

However, regardless of strategies used, Gudjonsson et al. (2004) found that one's extraversion and one's susceptibility to falsely confess may be related. Using interviews with

Icelandic college students regarding confessions to police, as well as teachers and parents, they discovered that false confessors scored higher in extraversion than true deniers, true confessors, and false deniers. Of those false confessors, 60% did so to protect a friend or acquaintance from trouble. This could be due to the social nature of extraverts. Simply, perhaps, the more friends one has, the more likely one will be to falsely confess to protect one or more of them. Therefore:

H2: Extraverts will be more likely to provide false admissions than introverts.

Finally, this research will attempt to discover whether or not there is a difference in admission rates between the two interrogation strategies, without including personality type. In an experiment testing how self-esteem and other personality factors would influence the effectiveness of various interrogation techniques, Klaver et al. (2008) found that participants subjected to minimization techniques were four times more likely to sign a false confession than those subjected to maximization techniques. They suggested that by offering the accused with a "dignified way to save face" (p. 81), investigators using minimization tactics were able to utilize feigned sincerity and empathy to minimize the seriousness of signing a confession document. The power difference present in an interrogation also plays a role here. The less powerful suspect is likely eager to regain some of the social capital lost through an ordeal as trying as an interrogation. As such, the suspect might confess in an attempt to please the more powerful actor—the interrogator. With this in mind, a third research hypothesis can be forwarded:

H3: The minimization strategy will produce more false admissions of guilt than the maximization strategy.

And last, a research question will be used to examine whether, by removing personality type from consideration, interrogation strategies solely play a role in one's likelihood to truthfully admit guilt.

RQ2: Which strategy, minimization or maximization, results in a higher likelihood of true admissions?

CHAPTER TWO

Method

Participants

This study employed 103 undergraduate students recruited from a large Pacific university. Originally, 112 registered to participate, but due to various errors in completing the study's surveys, nine participants could not be used in the final analyses and were withdrawn from consideration. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 38 years, with an average age of 20 (M = 20.52 years, SD = 3.19). There were 52 females (50.5%) and 50 males (48.5%), with one participant choosing not to disclose any gender information. Participants were comprised of freshmen 33% (n = 34), sophomores 31% (n = 32), juniors 18% (n = 19) and seniors 18% (n = 18). Participants registered for the study through SONA, a web-based recruiting site that allows students to anonymously complete research in return for course credits. A brief study overview was posted on SONA, indicating the experiment time of 10 to 20 minutes and disclosing the number of credits the study would be worth. Data collection involved participants completing a questionnaire that focused on personality types and the likelihood of confession in response to a hypothetical interrogation scenario. All questionnaires were completed using SurveyMonkey, a website used to prepare online surveys.

Design and Procedure

This study examined the independent variables of guilt/innocence, interrogation strategy and personality type to determine the likelihood that participants would admit to giving another student an answer during a hypothetical make-up exam. Participants were randomly placed in one of four cells (innocent/minimization, innocent/maximization, guilty/minimization, and

guilty/maximization) and completed the short form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-S) to determine placement in either the extravert or introvert cell.

The EPQR-S is a modified version of Eysenck's (1956) original Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI). Developed by Eysenck, Eysenck and Barrett (1985), the EPQR-S measures extraversion in a more concise manner than the MPI. Using a cross-cultural analysis of American, English, Canadian and Australian undergraduates, Francis, Brown and Philichalk (1992) found that the EPQR-S correlates highly to Eysenck's original extraversion (.88) and neuroticism (.84) scales.

The original MPI posited that one's level of introversion or extraversion results from a number of personality traits including social boldness, impulsiveness, and sociability acting together. Sparrow and Ross (1964) found that sociability and impulsiveness are the traits most significantly related to introversion-extraversion, with convergent validity of .80 and .92, respectively. Francis, Lewis and Ziebertz (2006) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .85 for the EPQR-S extraversion scale. The original EPQR-S asked participants to answer questions regarding personality traits using yes or no responses. However, for this research participants answered using a six-point Likert-type scale with responses ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This change was made to create a range of answers for participants to rate their level of introversion-extraversion. Sample questions from the EPQR-S include: "Are you a talkative person?" and "Can you easily get some life into a rather dull party?" (See Appendix A for the full EPQR-S scale). A Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .76 was found for the scale used in this research.

Participants were then presented with a description of an interrogation based on the paradigm used in Russano et al.'s (2005) study and its corresponding hypothetical scenarios from

Horgan et al. (2012), which were modified from third person to first person and changed from using a hypothetical research project scenario to a make-up exam based situation. These alterations were made in an effort to increase both the realism and severity of the hypothetical confession situations. The surveys were pre-tested by six graduate students to check for errors or confusing test items before being administered to participants. The pre-tests took between 10 and 20 minutes to complete, and all pre-test participants indicated that the scales and test items were understood as was intended by the researcher.

Each scenario involved two students (the study participant and a hypothetical classmate) who were completing a make-up exam in an otherwise empty classroom. The guilty condition involved the other student asking the participant for help on a test question—with the participant providing the answer. The innocent condition involved the classmate approaching the participant and asking to borrow a pencil during the exam, but otherwise the exam session went according to plan, with each student focused on completing her/his exam. Both conditions then told the participant that before completing the exam, the course professor and the course TA entered the room with an air of concern and asked that the classmate come to the professor's office while the TA stayed in the classroom with the participant.

Next, participants read one of four interrogation scripts in which the professor returned to the classroom and interrogated the participant. In the two maximization conditions (guilty/innocent), the professor interrogated the participant using maximization techniques. The maximization techniques mirrored techniques used by criminal interrogators and included: The presentation of false testimony, exaggerated consequences for failing to confess and the refusal to accept a suspect's denials of guilt. In the two minimization conditions (guilty/innocent), the professor used minimization tactics during the interrogation. These tactics included: Stressing the

benefit of cooperation, using flattery, and providing moral justification for the offense (see Appendix B for the four scenarios). All conditions involved the professor telling participants that she/he may not leave until a confession is given, even though the participant had an important job interview scheduled during this time. This was done to increase the suspect's urgency to leave the interrogation situation, which is another commonly seen characteristic in real-life interrogations (Leo, 2008). Each participant then rated the likelihood that she/he would confess to giving her/his friend the answer to an exam question, if in the hypothetical interrogation situation, using a 6-point Likert-type scale (M = 3.14, SD = 2.00) ranging from 1 *(I would not admit to giving the answer)*, 2 *(extremely unlikely I would admit to giving the answer)*, 3 *(unlikely I would admit to giving the answer)*, 4 *(likely I would admit to giving the answer)*, 5 *(extremely likely I would admit to giving the answer)*, to 6 *(I would admit to giving the answer)*. Half of the participants completed the EPQR-S before reading the scenarios, while the other half read the scenarios and then completed the EPQR-S. An independent samples t-test showed it did not matter whether participants completed the EPQR-S before or after reading the scenarios, t [101] = -1.25, p = .99. No statistical differences were found between those who read the scenarios first (n = 56, M = 2.91, SD = 2.00) compared to those who read the scenarios later (n = 47, M = 3.40, SD = 1.99); hence, the two conditions were combined for all analyses.

Instruments

To determine whether participants would be classified as introverts or extraverts, a split was created using the midpoint of the introversion-extraversion scale, where any participant with an introversion-extraversion mean score above three would be classified as extraverted. This resulted in 97 extraverts (M = 4.39, SD = .64) and only six introverts (M = 2.68, SD = .21). Because the vast majority of respondents were classified as extraverts using this split, the

decision was made to reexamine the data to see if the creation of an alternate nominal classification of participants would yield a larger number of introverts. An overall mean was calculated for EPQR-S extraversion scale responses (*M* = 4.33, *SD* = *.74)* a mean split was conducted where anyone scoring above 4.33 on the introversion-extraversion scale would be classified as extraverted. This led to a classification of 46 introverts and 57 extraverts. However, this also caused 40 participants whose scores fell on the extraverted side of the EPQR-S' midpoint being classified as introverted—which likely does not provide an accurate test of introversion versus extraversion. As a result, it was decided to classify participants who answered a majority of EPQR-S extraversion scale items with "1," "2," or "3" were as introverts and those who reported "4," "5," or "6" on a majority of items were classified as extraverts (after items that were reverse-coded were corrected), this resulted in 88 extraverts (*M* = 4.51, *SD* = .54) and 15 introverts (*M* = 3.00, *SD* = .32)—an increase of nine introverts.

CHAPTER 3

Results

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis one (H1) predicted that introverts would be more likely to consider admitting guilt, truly or falsely, when minimization strategies are used, compared to the use of maximization strategies. Using the nominal level personality data from which only introverts were selected, an independent-sample t-test was run. Inspection of the homogeneity of variance for both groups as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variance was significant, $f = 5.37$, $p = .04$; therefore, a t-test assuming unequal variances was run. No difference between strategies used and the likelihood of admitting guilt was found, one-tailed t (13) = -.47, $p = .33$, Cohen's $d = -.36$; H1 was not supported. The professor's choice of minimization ($n = 9$, $M = 4.11$, $SD = .46$) or maximization strategies ($n = 6$, $M = 3.67$, $SD = .96$) had no impact on introverts' likelihood of truly or falsely admitting that they gave information to their fellow classmate during their make-up exam.

Research question one (RQ1) asked whether minimization or maximization strategies would more likely lead an extraverted suspect to admit guilt—regardless of whether the suspect was guilty or innocent. Using the nominal level personality data from which only extraverts were selected, an independent-sample t-test found no association between strategy and likelihood of admitting guilt, t (86) = .32, $p = .75$, Cohen's $d = .07$. That is, neither minimization ($n = 40$, $M = 2.93$, $SD = .32$) nor maximization ($n = 48$, $M = 3.06$, $SD = 2.06$) strategies were more likely to lead extraverts to admit that they gave information to their fellow classmate during their make-up exam.

Hypothesis two (H2) predicted that extraverts would be more likely to provide false admissions of guilt than introverts. An independent-sample t-test was run to test H2 (only those participants who were innocent but indicated a likelihood of falsely admitting to the charge were included in this analysis). The results did not show a difference in admission rates between extraverts and introverts, one-tailed t (2) = -1.00, p = .21, Cohen's d = -1.41. Extraverts (n = 2, M = 5, SD = 1.41) and introverts (n = 2, M = 4, SD = .00) did not differ in their likelihood to admit to the accusation. As such, H2 was not supported. Therefore, the results do not support the assertion that extraverted students will be more likely to falsely admit to giving a classmate information during an exam than introverted students.

Hypothesis three (H3) predicted that minimization tactics would lead to a higher likelihood of false admissions than would maximization tactics. Using only students who did not give information to a fellow student during their exam (i.e., innocent), an independent samples t-test was run to test H3. Inspection of the homogeneity of variance for both groups as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variance was significant, f = 9.70, p = .003; therefore, a t-test assuming unequal variances was run. The results showed a significant difference exists, one-tail t (36.553) = -1.98, p = .03, observed power = .50, Cohen's d = .55 (r = .27). Hence, H3 was supported. The use of minimization (n = 27, M = 1.85, SD =1.32) strategies did in fact produce a higher likelihood that innocent students would falsely admit to giving information to a classmate during an exam, compared to the use of maximization (n = 27, M = 1.30, SD = .61) strategies.

RQ2 asked whether minimization or maximization strategies led to a higher likelihood that one would give a true admission. Using only students who responded honestly to their guilt, an independent-sample t-test was run to examine the research question. Neither the use of minimization (n = 22, M = 4.73, SD = .27) nor maximization (n = 27, M = 4.96, SD = .23)

strategies, t (47) = .67, p = .51, Cohen's d = .194, increased the chance of a true admission of guilt.

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

Although most of the hypotheses forwarded in this study were not supported, and none of the research questions provide significant results, the findings herein are not without merit. H3 provided a significant outcome regarding the likelihood that minimization tactics may produce false admissions more often than maximization tactics. Furthermore, the resultant effect sizes for H2 and H3 suggest that significant results for them may not be far off. Indeed, the medium to large effect sizes, combined with such small sample sizes (e.g., H2's $n = 4$, H1's $n = 15$), offer the possibility that increasing the study's sample (i.e., power) could lead to more significant results.

The one vitally important discovery from this research is that three participants indicated they would likely falsely admit to sharing answers in the hypothetical exam scenario, and one participant responded by reporting a 6 on the 1-6 scale indicating "*I would admit to giving the answer*." In fact, it appears that minimization tactics actually increase the possibility that a person would falsely confess to the sharing of answers; in support of this claim the one-tailed t-test just was significant and there was a medium effect size for the strategy leading to an admission of guilt. Even though the admit mean (likelihood to admit) leans toward not likely to admit, the *SD* for maximization strategies (.61) is gathered around the low mean, whereas the *SD* for minimization strategies is quite large (1.32) and includes one person who claimed he would admit and three who at least considered it.

These data support Klaver et al.'s (2008) finding that minimization tactics lead to a higher rate of false confessions than do maximization tactics. This relationship between the

minimization strategy and the likelihood that a student would admit to sharing an answer is the central finding provided by this study. That three participants would consider falsely admitting and one would admit to a nonexistent transgression runs directly counter to the beliefs of both investigators and laypeople alike. That is, most individuals believe that no right-minded person would ever voluntarily incriminate oneself in the context of an interrogation, barring the use of torture; and people cannot be talked into confessing to a wrongdoing they did not commit. Leo (2008) termed this misguided belief the "myth of the psychological interrogation" (p. 235).

According to Leo, this myth influences the treatment of false confessors through every step of the judicial process. Indeed, research shows that jurors are wary to accept the possibility that confession evidence may be invalid or forced. For instance, Leo discussed the discoveries of Sauer and Wilkens (1999), who found that a vast majority of potential jurors in Washington D. C. contended that it was not possible for a suspect to falsely incriminate oneself. Likewise, most police investigators are trained to believe that false confessions are not possible (Leo, 2008). For instance, Inbau et al. (2013), in their highly influential interrogation manual, go to great lengths to explain how their prescribed methodology prevents innocent suspects from even reaching the interrogation stage of an investigation. However, that one participant from this study would falsely admit sharing information and three others would likely falsely admit to sharing information with a fellow student directly challenges these assertions. While real world criminal suspects would face an onslaught of trained professionals working to gain a confession, the likely false confessors in this research did so in a medium-stakes hypothetical situation in which no interrogator was sitting across from them, interacting with them, while being presented with multiple compliance gaining tactics. This finding, provides support for the contention that false

confessions are a valid threat to investigations that investigators need to at least consider as a possibility during interrogations.

Also important to consider here, and in real life interrogations, is why false confessors would make such admissions. One possible answer comes from the extant research into compliance gaining in the context of negotiations. Numerous studies (e.g., Bacharach & Lawler, 1981; Donohue & Taylor, 2007; Find et al., 2003; Levine & Boster, 2001) have advanced the notion that power greatly influences one's persuasive abilities. In the realm of criminal interrogations, power is heavily stacked in favor of the investigator rather than the suspect and the less powerful actor (the suspect) in a negotiation scenario, like an interrogation, is at a clear disadvantage (Levine & Boster, 2001). The higher-powered negotiator is able to create an imbalance in the negotiation market and can more easily gain compliance from that lower powered negotiator in short-term negotiations (Donohue & Taylor, 2007). As Levine and Boster (2001) pointed out, the more powerful person is more influential simply because of the nature of social power—less powerful individuals do not have the social capital to combat a significantly more powerful figure, like a criminal investigator in an interrogation room.

Another possible explanation for the existence of false confessions comes from the literature discussing social exchange theory. Originally introduced by Homans (1958), social exchange theory posits that all social interactions are guided by an exchange of goods. That is, Homans framed social behaviors in an economic light, where social interactions are viewed as negotiations between at least two parties. How these negotiations play out, then, affects the behaviors of the involved actors. Of particular interest to criminal interrogations and false confessions is the idea of social power and "fate control." Essentially, fate control is most relevant in an interpersonal negotiation where one actor (person A) has more social power than

the other actor (person B), and person A controls some portion of person B's fate (Franklin, 1982)—like in a criminal interrogation where an investigator is person A and the suspect is person B.

In an interrogation, the investigator has what Thibaut and Kelley (1959) called "behavior control." How the investigator decides to vary behavior necessarily affects the suspect and, as a result, the suspect needs to react accordingly. Emerson (1962) described how an imbalance in power can benefit the more powerful person. In the case of interrogations, this power allows the investigator to easily manipulate the alternatives available to the suspect. This can be accomplished by creating behavioral alternatives for interrogative subjects and forcing them to choose one; which is known as the comparison level of alternatives (Wood, 1997), where the suspect needs to weigh the acceptability of two or more possible outcomes. In the hypothetical situation used here, the possible outcomes were confessing and accepting the punishment that came along with doing so, but making it to a job interview on time, versus continually asserting one's innocence during the interrogation and likely missing the interview. The open-ended explanations participants provided for likely admitting or not admitting to giving answers to another student supports this idea. For instance, one participant who claimed that she would likely falsely admit said "Running late for an interview is more important than one letter grade; that probably won't matter anyway. Also reporting it to the dean could be much worse." Here, the student clearly weighed the two possible outcomes. Despite knowing that it would be costly academically to falsely admit to the alleged transgression, the subject would at least consider lying to escape the interrogation and make it to the job interview. By forcing the suspect to think in this way, the investigator increases the likelihood of gaining an admission.

With few alternatives made available, aside from confessing, that would allow the suspect to escape the interrogation scenario, the investigator had a clear advantage in accomplishing goals—like gaining confession evidence. By informing the person suspected of sharing exam answers that the interrogation would not end until the truth was told, the interrogator limited the behavioral options made available to the suspect. The power differential in the interrogation allowed the investigator to control nearly all aspects of the interaction. In this research, the suspect was faced with the overwhelming task of convincing the powerful professor that no cheating occurred. Making matters worse for the suspect was that another more powerful figure, the teaching assistant, provided an eyewitness account. All told, one can see the difficulty for the suspect to continually assert innocence and better understand why a suspect might decide to falsely confess when there is little chance to escape the interrogation otherwise.

Limitations and Future Research

A number of factors limited the generalizability and findings associated with this study. First, there were not enough introverted participants in the sample. This could be due to the fact that most participants came from communication-related classes, where enrolled students will skew toward extraversion more so than other academic areas (e.g., accounting, computer sciences, criminology; see Florida Tech Online's website for more on recommended areas of study for introverts). Future studies in this realm should recruit students from diverse areas of study, in an effort to balance the levels of introverts and extraverts. Also, the sample in general was too small for meaningful conclusions to be drawn in data analyses. Increasing the sample size could allow future researchers to more accurately test the hypotheses and answer the research questions, thus reducing Type II errors.

Another limitation is that this study occurred online using hypothetical interrogation scenarios. An alternative technique to test for false confessions would involve using actual behavioral data collected from participants in a laboratory setting. For instance, Kassin and McNall (1991) invited participants to a lab under the premise that they were completing a simple typing exercise. While participants typed, the researchers entered the room and accused the subjects of hitting a forbidden key that crashed the entire system—which never actually happened. The researchers then made false accusations in an attempt to induce false confessions. Since this study is meant to generalize findings to real world interrogation settings that are likely to be much more contentious than an exam-based scenario, like law enforcement or military interrogations, face-to-face behavioral data in a makeshift interrogation room would be much more informative than asking participants to make hypothetical judgments on a paper and pencil style survey. Research like this paper and pencil study could be improved by utilizing a similar methodology to that used by Kassin and McNall and interrogating participants face-to-face.

Another limitation may come from the use of only one type of hypothetical scenario. Perhaps students taking a hypothetical exam is not the best stimulus to simulate the high pressure settings that an actual interrogation brings forth. If future studies are to use hypothetical scenarios, consideration should be given to using multiple scenarios taking place in a number of different contexts. This could create more generalizable data, which may limit the influence that a substandard scenario may have on the study's overall findings and conclusions.

Although this project was extremely limited in scope, it does provide support for what organizations like the Innocence Project have been exposing through the use of DNA evidence—that false confessions do occur (see the Innocence Project's (2014) website for information on DNA exonerations). While this study produced only three potential false confessors and one

confessor, this is not an insignificant amount in the context of real world interrogations where serious punishments such as the death penalty could be a legitimate option. Considering that minimization tactics have been shown to induce false confessions, interrogators should consider eliminating these tactics, or at least lowering the reliance on confession evidence to gain a conviction at trial. Were less emphasis placed on gaining confession evidence, the use of manipulative minimization tactics would not be so vital to investigators' ability to accurately determine guilt. Furthermore, this research provides evidence in support of the "myth of the psychological interrogation" that no right-minded person would falsely confess to a crime–they do (see The Innocence Project, 2014). Future studies should continue to focus on how certain tactics put suspects at an unfair risk for false confessions and how to best prevent these from happening.

APPENDIX A

Short-form Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-S)

Directions: For each of the following statements, please indicate how much you agree. That is, consider how you generally feel, rather than in the context of any specific conversation or event on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree).

1. My mood often goes up and down.
2. I am a talkative person.
3. I sometimes feel 'just miserable' for no reason.
4. I am rather lively.
5. I am an irritable person.
6. I enjoy meeting new people.
7. My feelings are easily hurt.
8. I can usually let yourself go and enjoy yourself at a lively party.
9. I often feel 'fed-up.'
10. I usually take the initiative in meeting new friends.
11. I would call myself a nervous person.
12. I can easily get some life into a rather dull party.
13. I am a worrier.
14. I tend to keep in the background on social occasions.
15. I would call myself tense or 'highly strung.'
16. I like mixing with people.
17. I worry too long after an embarrassing experience.
18. I like plenty of bustle and excitement around me

19. I suffer from ‘nerves.’

20. I am mostly quiet when I am with other people.

21. I often feel lonely.

22. Other people think of me as being very lively.

23. I am often troubled about feelings of guilt.

24. I can get a party going.

APPENDIX B

Interrogation Scenarios

Guilty/maximization: You and a classmate are individually completing a make-up exam in an otherwise empty classroom that has windows facing the sidewalk outside. During the exam, your classmate asks you for help on one of the questions. You respond by quietly providing the answer. Shortly thereafter, your professor and the class's TA enter the room with concerned looks on their faces. The professor says there is an issue that you will each need to discuss with them separately. The professor asks that you wait in the classroom with the TA while your classmate accompanies the professor to a nearby office. After five minutes, the professor returns to the classroom. The professor tells you that a teaching assistant for another class walked by the test room on the way to lunch, clearly saw you and your classmate talking to each other during the exam and has accused you of sharing answers. Your professor tells you, "I really value honesty and I want you to be straight with me. We know what happened. If you do not tell the truth and admit to giving your classmate the answer to one of the test questions, I will have to fail you and report your misconduct to the Dean—which could lead to worse consequences, like academic probation or expulsion." Furthermore, the professor says, "Your classmate already admitted to speaking to you during the exam, and we think you shared answers. This is considered cheating and there's really nothing you can say that will change my mind." The professor will not let you leave until the situation is resolved, even though you've made it clear that you are running late for an important job interview. In such a situation, how likely would you be to admit to the professor that you gave your classmate the answer to the test question?

Guilty/minimization: You and a classmate are individually completing a make-up exam in an otherwise empty classroom that has windows facing the sidewalk outside. During the exam, your

classmate asks you for help on one of the questions. You respond by quietly providing her the answer. Shortly thereafter, your professor and the class's TA enter the room with concerned looks on their faces. The professor says there is an issue that you will each need to discuss with them separately. The professor asks that you wait in the classroom with the TA while your classmate accompanies the professor to a nearby office. After five minutes, the professor returns to the classroom. The professor tells you that a teaching assistant for another class walked by the test room on the way to lunch, clearly saw you and your classmate talking to each other during the exam and has accused you of sharing answers. Your professor tells you, "I really value honesty, so if you just admit that you shared answers during the exam I'll only deduct one letter-grade off your score. But if you won't admit it, I'll have to report this misconduct to the Dean." Furthermore, the professor says, "It's understandable that you might want to help your friend, and it's obvious that behavior like this is not normal for such an intelligent student like you." The professor will not let you leave until the situation is resolved, even though you've made it clear that you are running late for an important job interview. In such a situation, how likely would you be admit to the professor that you gave your classmate the answer to the test question?

Innocent/maximization: You and a classmate are individually completing make-up exams in an otherwise empty classroom that has windows facing the sidewalk outside. During the exam, your classmate approaches you to ask if you have a spare pencil to loan out. Other than this, you both complete your exams independently from one another without any other issues, disturbances or conversations. Shortly thereafter, your professor and the class' TA enter the room with concerned looks on their faces. The professor says there is an issue that you will each need to discuss with them separately. The professor asks that you wait in the classroom with the TA while your classmate accompanies the professor to a nearby office. After five minutes, the

professor returns to the classroom. The professor tells you that a teaching assistant for another class walked by the test room on the way to lunch, clearly saw you and your classmate talking to each other during the exam, and has accused you of sharing answers. Your professor tells you, "I really value honesty and I want you to be straight with me. We know what happened. If you do not tell the truth and admit to giving your classmate the answer to one of the test questions, I will have to fail you and report your misconduct to the Dean—which could lead to worse consequences, like academic probation or expulsion." Furthermore, the professor says, "Your classmate already admitted to speaking to you during the exam, and we think you shared answers. This is considered cheating and there's really nothing you can say that will change my mind." The professor will not let you leave until the situation is resolved, even though you've made it clear that you are running late for an important job interview. In such a situation, how likely would you be to admit to the professor that you gave your classmate the answer to the test question?

Innocent/minimization: You and a classmate are individually completing make-up exams in an otherwise empty classroom that has windows facing the sidewalk outside. During the exam, your classmate approaches you to ask if you have a spare pencil to loan out. Other than this, you both complete your exams independently from one another without any other issues, disturbances or conversations. Shortly thereafter, your professor and the class' TA enter the room with concerned looks on their faces. The professor says there is an issue that you will each need to discuss with them separately. The professor asks that you wait in the classroom with the TA while your classmate accompanies the professor to a nearby office. After five minutes, the professor returns to the classroom. The professor tells you that a teaching assistant for another class walked by the test room on the way to lunch, clearly saw you and your classmate talking to

each other during the exam, and has accused you of sharing answers. Your professor tells you, “I really value honesty, so if you just admit that you shared answers during the exam I’ll only deduct one letter-grade off your score. But if you won’t admit it, I’ll have to report this misconduct to the Dean.” Furthermore, the professor says, “It’s understandable that you might want to help your friend, and it’s obvious that behavior like this is not normal for such an intelligent student like you.” The professor will not let you leave until the situation is resolved, even though you’ve made it clear that you are running late for an important job interview. In such a situation, how likely would you be admit to the professor that you gave your classmate the answer to the test question?

Maximization strategies used: Exaggerating consequences, fabricated evidence of an accomplice’s confession, and refusal to accept denials of guilt.

Minimization strategies used: Stressing benefit of cooperation, using flattery, and providing moral justification for the offense.

REFERENCES

Addicott, J. F. (2008). *Terrorism law: The rule of law and the war on terror* (2nd ed.). Tucson, AZ: Lawyers & Judges.

Ashcraft v. Tennessee, 322 U.S. 143 (1944).

Aubry, A. S., Jr., & Caputo, R. R. (1972). *Criminal interrogation* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Bannerstone House.

Bacharach, S. B. & Lawler, E. J. (1981). *Power, tactics, and outcomes.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chambers v. Florida, 309 U.S. 227 (1940).

Colorado v. Connelly, 479 U.S. 157 (1986).

Colwell, L. H., Miller, H. A., Lyons Jr., P. M., & Miller, R. S. (2006). The training of law enforcement officers in detecting deception: A survey of current practices and suggestions for improving accuracy. *Police Quarterly, 9,* 275-290. doi: 10.1177/1098611104273293.

County of Sacramento v. Lewis, 523 U.S. 833 (1998).

Darwin, C. (1872). *The expression of emotions in man and animals.* New York, NY: D. Appleton. doi: 10.1037/10001-000.

Donohue, W. A. & Taylor, P. J. (2007). Role effects in negotiation: the one-down phenomenon. *Negotiation Journal, 23(3),* 307-331. doi: 10.1111/j.1571-9979.2007.00145.x

Ekman, P. (1985). *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics and marriage.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). Nonverbal leakage and clues to deception. *Psychiatry Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 32,* 88-105.

Emerson, R. M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27,* 31-41.

Eysenck, H. J. (1956). The questionnaire measurement of neuroticism and extraversion. *Rivista di Psicololgia, 50,* 113-140.

Eysenck, S. B. G., Eysenck, H. J., & Barrett, P. (1985). A revised version of the psychoticism scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6(1),* 21-29. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(85)90026-1.

Find, E. L., Cai, D. A., Kaplowitz, S. A., Chung, S., Van Dyke, M. A., & Taylor, J. N. (2003). The semantics of social influence: Threats vs. Persuasion. *Communication Monographs, 70(4),* 295-316.

Flanagan, E. J. (1982). Interviewing and interrogation techniques. In J. J. Grau (ed.), *Criminal and civil investigation handbook.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Florida Tech Unversity Alliance. (2014). *Eight career paths for introverts*. Retrieved from www.floridatechonline.com/resources/online-degree-programs-information/eight-career-paths-for-introverts

Forrest, K. D., Wadkins, T. A., & Larson, B. A. (2006). Suspect personality, police interrogations, and false confessions: Maybe it is not just the situation. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40,* 621-628. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2005.09.002.

Forsman, L. J., de Manzano, Ö., Karabanov, A., Madison, G., & Ullén, F. (2012). Differences in regional brain volume related to the extraversion–introversion dimension—a voxel based morphometry study. *Neuroscience research*, *72*(1), 59-67.

Francis, L. J., Brown, L. B., & Philipchalk, R. (1992). The development of an abbreviated form of the revised Eysenck personality questionnaire (EPQR-A): Its use among students in England, Canada, the U.S.A. and Australia. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13(4),* 443-449. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(92)90073-X.

Francis, L. J., Lewis, C. A., & Ziebertz, H. G. (2006). The short-form revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-S): A German edition. *Social Behavior and Personality, 34 (2),* 197-204. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2006.34.2.197.

Franklin II, C. W. (1982). *Theoretical Perspectives in Social Psychology.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Frantzen, D. (2010). Interrogation strategies, evidence, and the need for *Miranda*: A study of police ideologies. *Police Practice and Research, 11,* 227-239. doi: 10.1080/15614260902830005.

French, J. R. P. & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.). *Studies in Social power.* (pp. 150-167). Oxford, England: University of Michigan.

Gordon, N. J. & Fleisher, W. L. (2006). *Effective interviewing and interrogation techniques.* Boston, MA: Academic Press.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook* Chicester, England: Wiley.

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., Bragason, O. O., Einarsson, E., & Valdimarsdottir, E. B. (2004). Confessions and denials and the relationship with personality. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 9,* 121-133. doi: 10.1348/135532504322776898.

Henkel, L. A., Coffman, K. A. J., & Dailey, E. M. (2008). A survey of people's attitudes and beliefs about false confessions. *Behavioral Science Law, 26,* 555-584. doi: 10.1002/bsl.826.

Homans, G. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology, 63,* 597-606.

Horgan, A. J., Russano, M. B., Meissner, C. A., & Evans, J. R. (2012). Minimization and maximization techniques: Assessing the perceived consequences of confessing and confession diagnosticity. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 18,* 65-78. doi: 10.1080/1068316X.2011.561801.

Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., Buckley, J. P., & Jayne, B. C. (2013). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (5th ed.). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning. doi: 10.2307/1140860.

Innocence Project (2014). *Understand the Causes: False Confessions*. Retrieved from www.innocenceproject.org/understand/False-Confessions.php.

Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types* (R. F. C. Hull, trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1921).

Jung, J. H., Lee, Y., & Karsten, R. (2011). The moderating effect of extraversion–introversion differences on group idea generation performance. *Small Group Research*, doi: 1046496411422130.

Jylha, P., Melartin, T., Rytsala, H., & Isometsa, E. (2009). Neuroticism, introversion, and major depressive disorder—traits, states, or scars? *Depression & Anxiety, 26(4),* 325-334.

Kassin, S. M., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2004). The psychology of confessions: A review of the literature and issues. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 5,* 33-67. doi: 10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00016.x.

Kassin, S. M., & Kiechel, K. L. (1996). The social psychology of false confession Compliance, internalization, and confabulation. *Psychological Science, 7,* 125-128. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.1996.tb00344.x.

Kassin, S. M., Leo, R. A., Meissner, C. A., Richman, K. D., Colwell, L. H., Leach, A. M., & La Fon, D. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: A self-report of police practices and beliefs. *Law and Human Behavior, 31,* 381-400. doi: 10.1007/s10979-006-9073-5.

Kassin, S. M., & McNall, K. (1991). Police interrogations and confessions: Communicating promises and threats by pragmatic implication. *Law and Human Behavior, 15,* 233-251. doi: 10.1007/BF01061711.

Kassin, S. M., & Neumann, K. (1997). On the power of confession evidence: An experimental test of the fundamental difference hypothesis. *Law and Human Behavior, 21,* 469-484. doi: 10.1023/A:1024871622490.

Kassin, S. M., & Wrightsman, L. (1985). *The psychology of evidence and trial procedures.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kelly, C. E., Miller, J. C., Redlich, A. D., & Kleinmann, S. M. (2013). A taxonomy of interrogation methods. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 19,* 163-178. doi: 10.1037/a0030310.

Kelman, H. C. (1961). Processes of opinion change. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 25,* 57-78.

Kidd, W. R. (1940). *Police interrogation.* New York, NY: R. V. Basuino.

Klaver, J. R., Lee, Z., & Rose, V. G. (2008). Effects of personality, interrogation techniques and plausibility in an experimental false confession paradigm. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 13,* 71-88. doi: 10.1348/135532507X193051.

Leo, R. A. (2008). *Police interrogation and American justice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Levine T. R. & Boster F. J. (2001). The effects of power and message variables on compliance. *Communication Monographs, 68(1),* 28-48.

Link, F. C., & Foster, D. G. (1989). *The kinesic interview technique*. Riverdale, CA: Interrotec Associates.

Malinski v. New York, 324 U.S. 401 (1945).

Marwell, G. & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry, 30(4),* 350-364.

Matsumoto, D. & Hwang, H. S. (2011). Evidence for training the ability to read microexpressions of emotion. *Motivation and Emotion, 35(2),* 181-191.

Mattoon, M. A. (1981). *Jungian psychology in perspective.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Moffa, M. S., & Platania, J. (2007). Effects of expert testimony and interrogation tactics on perceptions of confessions. *Psychological Reports, 100,* 563-570. doi: 10.2466/pr0.2.563-570.

Mulbar, H. (1955). *Interrogation*. Springfield, IL: Bannerstone House.

Pfister, T., Li, X., Zhao, G., & Pietikainen, M. (2011). Recognising spontaneous facial micro-expressions. In *Computer Vision (ICCV), 2011 IEEE International Conference on* (pp. 1449-1456). IEEE.

Quenk, A. T., & Quenk, N. L. (1982). The use of psychological typology in analysis. In M. Stein (Ed.) *Jungian Analysis.* LaSalle, IL: Open Court.

Rabon, D., & Chapman, T. (2009). *Interviewing and interrogation* (2nd ed.). Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.

Royal, R. F., & Schutt, S. R. (1976). *The gentle art of interviewing and interrogation: A professional manual and guide.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Russ, T. L. (2013). The relationship between theory X/Y: Assumptions and communication apprehension. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 34*, 238-249.

Russano, M. B., Meissner, C. A., Narchet, F. M., & Kassin, S. M. (2005). Investigating true and false confessions within a novel experimental paradigm. *Psychological Science, 16,* 481-486. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01560.x.

Sauer, M., & Wilkens, J. (1999, May 16). The bombshell. *San Diego-Union Trib*.

Sparrow, N. H. & Ross, J. (1964). The dual nature of extraversion: A replication. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed.), *Readings in extraversion-introversion: Theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 145-150). London: Staples Press.

Thibaut, J. W. & Kelly, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups.* New York, NY: John Wiley.

Walters, S. B. (2003). *Principles of kinesic interview and interrogation* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. doi: 10.1201/9781420058413.

Wehr, G. (1971). *Portrait of Jung: An illustrated biography*. (W.A. Hargreaves, Trans.) New York, NY: Herder & Herder (Original work published 1969).

Wertheimer, A. (1987). *Coercion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Wood, J. T. (1997). *Communication Theories in Action.* Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Zimbardo, P. G. (1967). The psychology of police confessions. *Psychology Today, 1,* 17- 27.

Zulawski, D. E., & Wicklander, D. E. (2002). *Practical aspects of interviewing and interrogation* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press. doi: 10.1201/9781420058475.