Campbell Crime and Justice Group
Campbell Systematic Reviews on Critical Aspects of Policing

1. Cover Sheet

Title: Interview and Interrogation Methods and their Effects on Investigative Outcomes

Names of the Reviewers:
Christian A. Meissner, Ph.D. (University of Texas, El Paso)
Allison D. Redlich, Ph.D. (University at Albany, SUNY)
Sujeeta Bhatt, Ph.D. (U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency)
Susan Brandon, Ph.D. (U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency)

Contact information for Lead Reviewers:

Christian Meissner, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Departments of Psychology
  and Criminal Justice
University of Texas, El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968
Tel: 915-747-6056
cmeissner@utep.edu
http://iilab.utep.edu

Allison Redlich, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Criminal Justice
135 Western Avenue
University at Albany, SUNY
Albany, NY 12222
Tel: 518-442-4217
aredlich@albany.edu
http://www.albany.edu/scj/redlich.htm

2. Background for the Review

The request for a systematic review of the research on interviewing and interrogation methods is extremely timely and germane to current social events. Specifically, bright lights have been shone on both military and police investigation methods. The effectiveness of military interviewing, or human intelligence (HUMINT), has come under intense scrutiny because of the situations in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the heated debate over the use and efficacy of torture for educing intelligence (see Evans, Meissner, Brandon, Russano, & Kleinman, in press; Redlich, 2007). Just recently, information was released about the "enhanced interrogation" tactics used by the CIA with prisoners of war. At the same time, in the criminal justice arena, police interview and interrogation methods are being called into question because of the increased identification of false confessions and wrongful convictions.

False confessions are an international problem that has been documented in almost every continent (see Kassin, Drizin, Grisso, Gudjonsson, Leo, & Redlich, 2010). In response, several countries, including the United Kingdom, Norway, New Zealand, and Australia, have changed interrogation practices from those that are guilt-presumptive to information-gathering in nature. The United States, Canada, and many Asian nations continue to utilize a guilt presumptive, accusatorial framework (Costanzo & Redlich, 2009; Leo, 2008; Ma, 2007; Smith, Stinson, & Patry, in press). The purpose of this systematic review is to evaluate information-gathering and interrogative (guilt-presumptive or accusatory) methods for persons suspected of committing crimes.[1] One potential measure of effectiveness is diagnosticity. Interviewing methods can be considered "diagnostic" when they produce a higher ratio of true to false confessions and/or ability to detect accurate from inaccurate information. When assessing the effectiveness of questioning techniques on investigative outcomes, it is important to consider the accuracy of the outcome as well as the outcome itself. It is equally important to assess efficacy when suspects are both guilty and innocent (when known), as these two contexts may produce different levels of effectiveness.

The **information-gathering method** of interviewing is typified by Great Britain's model. In 1984, because of a spate of high-profile false confessions, Great Britain enacted the Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE) Act of 1984 (Bull & Soukara, 2010; Home Office, 2003), which prohibited the use of psychologically manipulative techniques and mandated the recording of custodial interrogations. In 1993, the Royal Commission on Criminal Justice further reformed British interrogation methods by introducing the PEACE[2] model. More specifically, the PEACE model focuses on developing rapport, explaining the allegation and the seriousness of the offense, emphasizing the importance of honesty and truth-gathering, and requesting the suspect's version of events. Suspects are permitted to explain the situation without interruption and questioners are encouraged to actively listen. This interview method has the goal of "fact finding" rather than that of obtaining a confession (with an emphasis on the use of open-ended questions), and investigators are expressly prohibited from deceiving suspects (Milne & Bull, 1999; Mortimer & Shepherd, 1999; Schollum, 2005).

---

[1] We believe that a review of interviewing styles on the effectiveness of eliciting accurate and complete information from victim/witnesses of crime combined with a review of suspects is inappropriate. The motivations of the individual being questioned and the resultant efficacy of interviewing styles are distinct for these groups. Further, we believe the more pressing policy issues relates to persons suspected of crimes.

[2] PEACE stands for **P**lanning and **P**reparation; **E**ngage and **E**xplain; **O**btain an **A**ccount; **C**losure; **E**valuation

In part, the PEACE model is based on components of the Cognitive Interview (CI; Fisher & Geiselman, 1992). The CI was derived from basic memory research and involves a series of strategies and techniques. One of the principal techniques is context reinstatement (attempts to reinstate emotions, perceptions, and sequences of the event to-be-remembered). Another technique is to vary the order in which events are recounted. Often, the research that has been conducted on interviewing styles concentrates on the individual techniques/strategies and the theories underlying them. For example, Vrij, Mann, Fisher, Leal, Milne, and Bull (2008) recently tested whether recalling an event in reverse order (which, in theory, should be more difficult for liars than truth-tellers) influenced others' abilities to accurately detect deception. Although the effectiveness of the CI has been researched extensively, the majority of the research (but importantly, not all) and subsequent reviews of the research (e.g., Kohnken, Milnes, Memon, & Bull, 1999) have focused on witnesses and victims' reports of events, not suspects.

The **accusatorial method** (as defined here) is typified by the U.S. model (Leo, 2008). It is generally contradictory to the information-gathering style in that it is confrontational and guilt-presumptive. In the U.S., police questioning of suspects consist of two phases. The first phase is the Interview phase (such as the "Behavioral Analysis Interview", or BAI, see Inbau, Reid, Buckley & Jayne, 2001), in which the investigator is trained to conduct a non-accusatorial interview to determine whether the person of interest is indeed "the suspect" and should therefore be formally interrogated. A major part of this determination of guilt is a reliance on non-verbal behavioral cues and analyses of linguistic styles that are believed to indicate deception, but which consistently have been found by scientific methods to be unreliable (see Bond &DePaulo, 2006 for a review). Thus, by definition, U.S. interrogations are guilt-presumptive processes – they are focused upon extracting a confession by suspects who are believed to be guilty of the crime (Inbau et al., 2001; Meissner & Kassin, 2002, 2004). This second phase – the formal interrogation – consists of a variety of psychologically oriented, compliance gaining tactics. As summarized by Kassin and Gudjonsson (2004), interrogations involve: (a) *custody and isolation*, in which the suspect is detained in a small room and left to experience the anxiety, insecurity, and uncertainty associated with police interrogation; (b) *confrontation*, in which the suspect is presumed guilty and told (sometimes falsely) about the evidence against him/her, is warned of the consequences associated with his/her guilt, and is prevented from denying his/her involvement in the crime; and finally (c) *minimization*, in which a now sympathetic interrogator attempts to gain the suspect's trust, offers the suspect face-saving excuses or justifications for the crime, and implies more lenient consequences should the suspect provide a confession. One important and particularly controversial difference between information-gathering and accusatorial methods is the permissible use of trickery and deceit (i.e., lying to suspects about evidence).

The scientific study of investigative interviewing has proliferated in the past two decades or so. Both the PACE and PEACE models and some of their individual components (e.g., strategic disclosure of evidence, use of open-ended questions) have been studied in the field and in the laboratory (Bull & Soukara, 2009; Meissner, Russano, & Narchet, 2010; see also Clarke & Milne, 2001 for an evaluation). Similarly, numerous experiments have been conducted on general (e.g., minimization and maximization; Russano, Meissner, Narchet, & Kassin, 2005) and more specific accusatorial methods (e.g., presenting false evidence; Redlich & Goodman, 2003). However, to our knowledge, a synthesized review such as the one proposed here has not been undertaken. That is, a review focusing on the effectiveness of

information-gathering and accusatorial methods of questioning suspects has yet to be done, but one that will surely be instructive to academics and policymakers alike.

In the U.S., police and military interrogation and intelligence gathering methods, which are accusatorial and guilt-presumptive in nature, are under fire. Some 20 years ago, Great Britain underwent similar controversies and in response, made sweeping policy changes that arguably preceded the scientific research. Via this systematic review of the experimental literature and its subsequent results, we are in a unique position to inform public policy before it may be altered. As detailed below, our main methodology of review will be meta-analysis and study space analysis, which are appropriate when aiming to translate research into policy recommendations.

3. Objectives of the Review

The objective of this review is to systematically and comprehensively review published and non-published, experimental and quasi-experimental studies on the effectiveness of interviewing and interrogation methods. We plan to focus on suspects as our population, interview style (information-gathering, accusatorial, control) as the intervention, and the diagnosticity of the methods as the primary measure of efficacy. Our guiding question is whether information-gathering or accusatorial methods are more diagnostic in the accuracy of the information that is produced when employed on guilty and innocent suspects. When relevant and available, completeness and consistency of information will also be examined as indicators of effectiveness. Finally, important knowledge has been gained from field, quasi-experimental studies. Thus, although accuracy of outcomes (e.g., confessions) cannot be discerned, we conduct a separate systematic review of field studies.

With interrogation and intelligence gathering methods under intense scrutiny, jurisdictions, states, and countries may have to revisit their questioning procedures and policies, if they have not done so already. As mentioned above, numerous nations in the recent past have changed their interrogation practices. Armed with a review such as the one proposed here, policy makers and law enforcement decision-makers will have the best information available. Interview methods that increase the amount of true information gained from actual perpetrators while at the same time do not increase false information from innocent individuals are important to identify via a systematic, comprehensive, and scientific approach.

4. Methodology

We will conduct two separate meta-analyses and a study space analysis. As we describe more fully below, a study space analysis is one that highlights the topics—and intersection of topics—that have and have not yet been (but need to be) studied.

4a. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion of studies:

The primary products of this systematic review will be two meta-analyses (MA) and subsequent forest plots that graph the magnitude and direction of calculated effect sizes. The first MA (i.e., MA 1) will only include experimental studies in which the "ground truth" (i.e., whether the person is innocent or guilty) is known. The second MA (i.e., MA 2) will include quasi-experimental, field studies in which the ground truth is unknown.

<u>MA 1</u>

To be eligible for the first meta-analysis, published and unpublished studies must meet these requirements:

- *Intervention*: The intervention of interest is interviewing style (information-gathering, accusatorial, and/or "control" methods). To be included, the study must include **experimental** manipulations that contrast the information-gathering and/or accusatorial methods with each other or with another (control or no method) interview style.
- *Outcomes:* Outcome variables include true and false confessions when the suspects are guilty and innocent, as well as potentially measures of completeness and accuracy. Eligible studies must report outcomes for "guilty" participants, "innocent" participants, either, or both (for example, several studies only include situations in which all participants are innocent). Further, at least one outcome measure (with sufficient quantitative data to calculate an effect size), such as a confession rate, completeness or accuracy of reported information, or accuracy in discriminating the credibility of the statement/denial, (see below list of Dependent Variables) must be present.
- *Population/Samples:* The population of interest is suspects (of any age, nationality, or status) who are accused of committing mock crimes/transgressions or withholding important information. Interviewing effectiveness of victims and witnesses will not be included as the motivations and information to-be-gained (and thus the potential effectiveness of methods) differ. Thus, to be eligible, studies must include "suspected perpetrators" or "suspected transgressors."

<u>MA 2</u>

To be eligible for the second meta-analysis, published and unpublished studies must meet these requirements:

- *Intervention*: Systematic studies that examined interview and interrogation techniques used in actual law enforcement/military settings (i.e., the "field") are included here. These can include studies of observed interviews/interrogations (live or on video) or archival analysis studies (e.g., police reports, transcribed interviews). The study must quantify at least one interview or interrogation technique. When possible, these techniques will be categorized (by reliable consensus) into information-gathering or accusatorial, though we acknowledge that this may not be possible.
- *Outcomes*: Eligible studies must report at least one outcome, such as confession (partial, full), or *Miranda* or rights waiver. Of importance, the authors must link interview/interrogation techniques with outcomes, and provide sufficient quantitative data to calculate effect sizes.
- *Population/Samples*: The population of interest is identical to MA 1. That is, to be eligible, studies must include suspects or those with knowledge.

A study that may be eligible for MA 1 and the SSA would be one conducted by Vrij and colleagues (2007; see below for more details). A study that would not be eligible would be one by Colwell, Hiscock-Anisman, Memon, Rachel, and Colwell (2007) because it focuses on witnesses rather than suspects.

In searching the below references and databases, we will determine relevance by reading titles and abstracts. For example, titles that clearly refer to victim/witness accounts will not be included. When

more information is needed, we will access and review full reports. Graduate students will be responsible for determinations of initial relevance, with Professors Meissner and Redlich making final decisions.

4b. Search strategy for identification of relevant studies: We will search for published and unpublished, experimental and quasi-experimental studies on information-gathering-accusatory interviewing. Although we will not set an *a priori* limit on the publication dates of searched studies, we anticipate that the majority of studies that would be potentially eligible (pass the first round of review) will have been published from 1980 to the present.

We have several comprehensive resources to initiate the search. Below are examples:

- Justice, B. P., Bhatt, S., Brandon, S. E., & Kleinman, S. M. (2009). *Army field manual 2-22.3 interrogation methods: A science-based review* [Lists approximately 250 references]
- Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. D. (2010). APLS-Approved White Paper, Police-induced confessions: Risk factors and recommendations. *Law and Human Behavior*. DOI 10.1007/s10979-009-9188-6. [Lists approximately 300 references]
- Schollum, M. (2005). *Investigative interviewing: The literature*. New Zealand Police Department. Retrieved January 15, 2006, http://www.police.govt.nz/resources/2005/investigative-interviewing/investigative-interviewing.pdf [Lists approximately 240 references]
- Williamson, T. (2006). *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research, and regulation*. Devon, England: Willan Publishing. [this book was the result of the 1st International Conference on Investigative Interviewing]
- Educing information. Interrogation: Science and Art. Intelligence Science Board, Phase 1 Report (December 2006). Washington, DC: National Defense Intelligence College.

We will also search the following databases:

1. Criminal Justice Periodical Index
2. Criminal Justice Abstracts
3. National Criminal Justice Reference Services (NCJRS) Abstracts
4. PsychInfo [which includes PsychARTICLES]
5. MEDLINE
6. Sociological Abstracts
7. Social Science Abstracts (SocialSciAbs)
8. Social Science Citation Index
9. Dissertation & Theses Abstracts
10. Google Scholar—Advanced
11. Australian Criminology Database (CINCH)
12. Centrex (Central Police Training and Development Authority)—UK National Police Library
13. Scopus
14. Web of Knowledge
15. Publisher databases, such as Springer and Wiley
16. California POST Library

We will use the following keywords to initiate the search. We expect more keywords to be generated as the search progresses. In addition, we will combine keywords to produce more targeted searches, such as "interview and suspect," and "confession and interrogation."

1. Interrogation(ory)
2. Information (gathering)
3. Inquisitorial(ive)
4. Interview(ing)
5. Suspects
6. Confession
7. Cognitive Interview
8. Conversation Management
9. Ethical interviewing
10. Disclosure
11. Strategic evidence
12. Accusatory(ion)
13. Deception detection
14. Statement Validity Analysis (SVA)
15. Criterion Based Content Analysis (CBCA)
16. Reality Monitoring (RM)
17. PEACE model of interviewing
18. PACE (Police Crime and Evidence Act)
19. Adversary(ial)
20. Miranda
21. Coercion (psychological coercion)
22. Entrapment

Finally, the reviewers have many well-established contacts with researchers studying interviewing and interrogation here in the U.S. and abroad. In Appendix A, we have started a list of possible researchers to contact. We will reach out to known and unknown contacts for unpublished or 'in press' studies to possibly include. We have obtained the programs of the 2nd and 3rd (June 2008) International Conferences on Investigative Interviewing. Included in these programs are more than 100 presentations that we can follow up on to determine if the studies have been written up.

4c. Description of methods used in primary research.

First, we describe an experimental laboratory study that may be eligible for inclusion in MA 1. Then, we describe an example of a quasi-experimental field study that may be appropriate for MA 2.

<u>The typical experimental research paradigm</u> on the interviewing of suspects involves first, a mock crime, and second, an interview session. Participants are usually randomly assigned to be guilty or innocent of the crime (or to tell the truth or lie), and then randomly assigned to one of two or more interview styles (or specific interview techniques). Experiments are usually recorded and outcomes are reliably coded.

We use a recent study by Vrij and colleagues (2007) to illustrate. The title of the study was, *Cues to deception and ability to detect lies as a function of police interview styles*, and published in a leading journal, *Law and Human Behavior*.

In Experiment 1, 120 college students participated; half of them participated in a staged event (playing the game Connect 4 with a confederate) in which money was taken from the wallet of another confederate. This was the "truth tellers" condition. In the other condition, the "liars" did not partake in this staged event, but instead were given scripted information about the event. The "liars" also were instructed to take the money out of the wallet, hide it on themselves, and pretend to have participated in the staged event.

Next, both liars and truth tellers were told they would be interviewed and to convince the interviewer that they did not take the money. There were three interview conditions; 60 truth tellers and 60 liars were randomly assigned across them. In the "information-gathering" condition, participants were instructed to tell everything they could about the Connect 4 game, providing as much detail as possible, and follow-up questions were open-ended (as opposed to leading). In the "accusation" condition, participants were asked 11 questions with an accusatory tone, such as "Are you sure you're telling me the truth?" and "Your reactions make me think you're hiding something from me." In the "behavior analysis interview" condition, participants were asked for free recall and then asked 15 BAI questions, such as "Do you think that someone else did purposefully take the money?"

The interviews were then coded and scored using Criterion Based Content Analysis (CBCA) and Reality Monitoring (RM). These scores were used as the dependent measures. In brief, they found that accusatory interviews resulted in no discernible differences between truth tellers and liars when either CBCA or RM scores were examined, whereas the other two interviewing styles did (though not across the board).

In Experiment 2, Vrij et al. (2007) showed the videotaped stimuli (the three interview conditions) to 68 British police officers. The officers were told that they would see clips of interviews of students who were lying or telling the truth. Officers made dichotomous judgments of accuracy, which were used to calculate hits and false positives. In brief, they found that accuracy was unaffected by interview style and that a truth bias was found in that truth telling was more accurately assessed than lying. Effect sizes were reported.

Additional studies have followed similar experimental methods, such as Hartwig et al. (2005) and Vrij et al. (2008 and 2009).

An example of a quasi-experimental study would be Study 2 by Bull and Soukara (2010). In this study, the authors coded 80 actual interviews of suspects, which were randomly selected from a sample of 200 interviews. The authors reliably coded the interviews for the presence/absence of 17 tactics, the extent to which suspects moved towards confession (1 = no change to 5 = move from denial to confession), and a dichotomous confession outcome. The 17 tactics were categorized into information-gathering (e.g., open questions, gentle prods) or interrogatory (e.g., maximization, intimidation, leading questions).

As stated by the authors, "this Study 2 did not find a simple relationship between degree of tactic usage and extent of shift to confessing" (p. 149). However, Study 2 did find that the two tactics of positive confrontation and leading questions (both interrogatory tactics) were more frequent in the interviews producing confessions. These results help to highlight the techniques that produce outcomes (although the accuracy of outcomes are unknown) with actual crime suspects.

4d. Criteria for determination of independent findings

If eligible studies have multiple outcomes, we will compute an effect size (odds ratio) for each outcome measure separately. If studies employ multiple conditions that represent a single construct (accusatorial or information-gathering methods), a weighted mean effect size will be calculated across these conditions, or a single condition will be selected for inclusion in the data. At this point (i.e., prior to our comprehensive search), our understanding of the literature is that most, if not all, studies have not repeatedly interviewed participants over time. Thus, we do not anticipate outcomes from multiple time points to be problematic. However, if we do encounter this, we will use the final outcome to compute effect sizes.

4e. Details of study coding categories

After conducting the searches as described above, a study eligibility code sheet will be developed. This sheet will include basic information about the study (such as author names, journal name and volume, and title) and a checklist for each eligibility criterion described above.

After the subset of eligible studies is finalized, they will be logged and assigned a unique study id number. Again basic information about the type of publication (conference paper, government report) and the study itself (date range of research, subject pool, country) will be documented. Of importance, we will also assess the methodological rigor of the studies. For example, we could use the Scientific Methods Scale designed by Lawrence Sherman, and utilized recently by Cynthia Lum and colleagues (see http://gemini.gmu.edu/cebcp/Matrix/SMSScoreKey.html). This scale categorizes studies into five categories of methodological rigor.

At a broad level, we will code independent, method/procedural, and dependent variables for each study. Here are some possibilities of each. Final variables to be coded will partially depend on the number of studies that examine and report on them.

Independent variables
- Interview style: information-gathering (e.g., PEACE), accusatorial, BAI, control (e.g., no instruction group)
- Guilt/Innocence, Truth-Telling/Lying
- Demographic characteristics of the suspect: age group, gender
- Type of crime
- Number of techniques used

Method/Procedural variables
- Random assignment
- Laboratory vs. field
- Country in which study took place
- Active participation vs. non-active participation (e.g., watch video) in event
- Students vs. offenders as suspects
- Students vs. law enforcement as interrogators/deception detectors

Dependent variables
- Confession

- Accuracy in detection deception: hits, false positives, truth or deception biases
- Diagnosticity: ratio of true to false confessions/information
- Memory-measure scores: CBCA, SVA, SUE, RM
- Coded verbal and non-verbal behaviors
- Completeness of information provided
- Consistency of information provided (with the 'ground truth')
- Degree of change from denial to confession
- Miranda or rights waiver

4f. Statistical procedures and conventions
We will generate two meta-analyses and a study space analysis.

For both meta-analyses, we will code our outcome variables and assess the distribution of effect sizes for each outcome using a random effects model, including a report of the mean weighted effect sizes, any outliers, and the 95% confidence interval. A weighted analysis (least squares regression) of moderator effects will also be pursued if a sufficient number of studies is present (with sufficient variance among a given set of predictors). A forest plot graphing the calculated effect sizes will be produced.

We will also aim to conduct a study space analysis, which is an analysis that provides a frequency and graphic representation (a matrix) of the current literature identifying the relationship between key independent, classification, methodological, procedural, dependent and measured variables. Of importance, these variables are intersected, and when the study space analysis is completed, the areas which have been ignored or are in need of study become apparent. Thus, whereas traditional literature reviews tend to focus on the findings of scientific studies, study space reviews can highlight what is needed to be studied, which can be quite important for policy-laden issues. An example of a generic study space matrix (from Malpass et al., 2008; Table 1) is below.

As specified by Malpass and colleagues (2008), there are five steps in constructing a study space matrix: 1) identify the studies (which is also part of the meta-analysis); 2) construct for each study a matrix which shows the independent, method, procedural, and dependent variables; 3) identify and incorporate into the matrix constant variables; 4) enter a '1' in the matrix cells corresponding to an intersection of study attributes for each study; and 5) merge the individual study matrices into one matrix. Malpass et al. (2008) conducted a study space analysis for eyewitness identification line-up procedures, and for the effects of alcohol on witness memory. The latter matrix is attached below as an example of a completed matrix.

4g. Treatment of qualitative research.

Qualitative studies will not be eligible for the study space and meta-analyses because they do not meet the experimental or quasi-experimental criteria. However, when such studies are located in our extensive search, we will make determinations about their possible relevance in identifying additional outcome measures, in developing future research questions, and in the interpretation of results. These determinations will be made by logging and coding the studies for content, authors' conclusions, etc. A discussion of any qualitative studies identified in our search will be included in the final report.

5. Timeframe

The below timeline of approximate dates will be adhered to as closely as possible:

Searches for published and unpublished studies:	September 18 – October 31, 2009
Pilot testing and coding of inclusion criteria	November 1 – December 31, 2009
Study space and meta-analyses	January 1 – January 31, 2010
Meeting of Reviewers in El Paso, TX	February 1 – February 3, 2010
Finalize presentation for NPIA/CEBCP Conference	February 1 – February 15, 2010
Preparation of final report	February 20 – April 30, 2010
Dissemination and Publication	May 1 – September 7, 2010

6. Plans for Updating the Review

The review will be updated every three to five years. The lead reviewers and their students will be responsible for updating. Pending effectiveness, the same search and data coding methods will be employed.

7. Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

8. Statement concerning Conflict of Interest

None of the reviewers have financial conflicts of interest.

Professor Meissner has evaluated the deception detection and interviewing/interrogation literatures, including conducting several meta-analyses in this and other areas (Meissner & Brigham, 2001a, 2001b; Meissner & Kassin, 2002; Meissner, Sporer, & Susa, 2008; Mitchell, Haw, Pfeifer, & Meissner, 2005). He has also co-organized a conference sponsored by the American Psychological Association on investigative interviewing. This conference developed into a co-edited volume entitled, *Interrogations and confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations*, which was published by the American Psychological Association (Lassiter & Meissner, 2010).

Professor Redlich has reviewed the literature on U.S. police and military interrogations, most notably as part of the American Psychology-Law Society's scientific review committee to write a "white paper" on police interrogations and false confessions (see Kassin et al., 2010). This review (as well as others; Redlich, 2007; Redlich & Meissner, 2009) provide the basis for her interest in proposing to conduct this systematic review.

Dr. Susan Brandon (Acting Director for the Behavioral Science Program, Defense CI & HUMINT Center, U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency) and Dr. Sujeeta Bhatt (Research Scientist, Defense CI & HUMINT Center, U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency) will also collaborate on the project as reviewers. Both were instrumental in a recent review of the U.S. Army's FM 2-22.3 (Justice, Bhatt, Brandon, &

Kleinman, 2009). Drs. Brandon and Bhatt have knowledge and access to reports of projects funded by the U.S. Government (as well as the United Kingdom) relevant to this proposed topic. They will also participate in the reviewers meeting to be held in February 2010 at the University of Texas at El Paso.

9. References

Bond, C. F., & DePaulo, B. M. (2006). Accuracy in deception judgments. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 214-234.

Bull, R., & Milne, B. (2004) Attempts to improve the police interviewing of suspects. In G. D. Lassiter (Ed.), *Interrogations, confessions, and entrapment* (pp. 181-196). New York, NY, US: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Bull, R. & Soukara, S. (2010). What really happens in police interviews. In G.D. Lassiter & C.A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Clarke, C. & Milne, R. (2001). *National evaluation of the PEACE investigative interviewing course*. Police Research Award Scheme. London: Home Office.

Colwell, K., Hiscock-Anisman, C., Memon, A., Rachel, A., & Colwell, L. (2007). Vividness and spontaneity of statement detail characteristics of witness credibility. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology*, *25*, 1-26.

Costanzo, M. & Redlich, A. (2010). Use of physical and psychological force in criminal and military interrogations. In J. Knuttsson & J. Kuhns (Eds.), *Policing around the world: Police use of force*. Praeger Security International.

Evans, J. R., Meissner, C. A., Brandon, S. E., Russano, M. B., & Kleinman, S. M. (2010). Criminal versus HUMINT interrogations: The importance of psychological science to improving interrogative practice. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law*.

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing: The cognitive interview*. Springfield, IL, England: Charles C Thomas, Publisher.

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., & Vrij, A. (2005). Police interrogation from a social psychology perspective. *Policing & Society*, *15*, 379-399.

Home Office (2003). *Police and criminal evidence act 1984*. *Codes of practice A-E revised edition*. HMSO: London, UK.

Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., Buckley, J. P., & Jayne, B. C. (2001). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (4th ed.). Gaithersberg, MD: Aspen.

Justice, B. P., Bhatt, S., Brandon, S. E., & Kleinman, S. M. (2009). *Army field manual 2-22.3 interrogation methods: A science-based review*. Unpublished manuscript.

Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S. A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G. H., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. D. (2010). Police-induced confessions: Risk factors and recommendations. *Law & Human Behavior*.

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.

Kohnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999). A meta-analysis on the effects of the cognitive interview. *Psychology, Crime & the Law, 5*, 3–27.

Lassiter, G. D., & Meissner, C. A. (2010). *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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

Ma, Y. (2007). A comparative view of the law of interrogation. *International Criminal Justice Review, 17*, 5-26.

Malpass, R. S., Tredoux, C. G., Schreiber Compo, N., McQuiston-Surret, D., MacLin, O. H., Zimmerman, L. A., & Topp, L. D. (2008). Study space analysis for policy development. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 22*, 789-801.

Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001a). A meta-analysis of the verbal overshadowing effect in face identification. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 15*, 603-616.

Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001b). Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in memory for faces: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law, 7*, 3-35.

Meissner, C. A., & Kassin, S. M. (2002). "He's guilty!": Investigator bias in judgments of truth and deception. *Law & Human Behavior, 26*, 469-480.

Meissner, C. A., & Kassin, S. M. (2004). "You're guilty, so just confess!": Cognitive and behavioral confirmation biases in the interrogation room. In D. Lassiter's (Ed.), *Interrogations, confessions, and entrapment* (pp. 85-106). Kluwer Academic / Plenum Press.

Meissner, C. A., Russano, M. B., & Narchet, F. M. (2010). The importance of a laboratory science for improving the diagnostic value of confession evidence. In G. D. Lassiter & C. Meissner's (Eds.) *Interrogations and confessions: Research, practice, and policy*. Washington, DC: APA.

Meissner, C. A., Sporer, S. L., & Susa, K. J. (2008). A theoretical and meta-analytic review of the relationship between verbal descriptions and identification accuracy in memory for faces. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology, 20*, 414-455.

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

Mitchell, T. L., Haw, R. M., Pfeifer, J. E., & Meissner, C. A. (2005). Racial bias in juror decision-making: A meta-analytic review of defendant treatment. *Law & Human Behavior*, *29*, 621-637.

Mortimer, A., & Shepherd, E. (1999). Frames of mind: Schemata guiding cognition and conduct in the interviewing of suspected offenders. In A. Memon & R. Bull (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of interviewing* (pp. 293-315). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Redlich, A. D. (2007). Military versus police interrogations: Similarities and differences. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *13*, 423-428.

Redlich, A. D., & Goodman, G. S. (2003). Taking responsibility for an act not committed: The influence of age and suggestibility. *Law & Human Behavior*, *27*, 141-156.

Redlich, A. D. & Meissner, C. A. (2009). Techniques and controversies on the interrogation of suspects: The artful practice versus the scientific study. In J. Skeem, K. Douglas, & S. Lilienfeld (Eds.), *Psychological science in the courtroom: Controversies and consensus* (pp. 124-148). New York: Guilford Publications, Inc.

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.

Schollum, M. (2005). *Investigative interviewing: The literature*. New Zealand Police Department. Retrieved January 15, 2006, http://www.police.govt.nz/resources/2005/investigative-interviewing/investigative-interviewing.pdf.

Smith, S. M.., Stinson, V., & Patry, M. W. (in press). Using the 'Mr. Big' technique to elicit confessions: Successful innovation or dangerous development in the Canadian legal system. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*.

Vrij, A., Leal, S., Granhag, P. A., Mann, S., Fisher, R. P., Hillman, J., & Sperry, K. (2009). Outsmarting the liars: The benefit of asking unanticipated questions. *Law and Human Behavior*, *33*, 159-166.

Vrij. A., Mann, S.A., Fisher, R.P., Leal, S., Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2008). Increasing cognitive load to facilitate lie detection: The benefit of recalling an event in reverse order. *Law & Human Behavior*, *32*, 253-265.

Vrij, A., Mann, S., Kristen, S., & Fisher, R. (2007). Cues to deception and ability to detect lies as a function of police interview styles. *Law & Human Behavior*, *31*, 499-518.

10. Tables and Figures

Table 1 from Malpass et al., 2008

Generic study space structure

		IV / CV				MV / PV				DV / MV			
		1	2	.	n	1	2	.	n	1	2	.	n
IV / CV	1												
	2												
	.												
	n												
MV / PV	1												
	2												
	.												
	n												
DV / MV	1												
	2												
	.												
	n												

Where:
IV / CV = Independent Variables / Classification Variables
MV / PV = Methodological variables / procedural variables
DV / MV = Department Variables / Measured Variables

Copyright

Table 3 from Malpass et al., 2008

Completed study space for alcohol and eyewitness testimony

| A. INDEPENDENT VARIABLES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
1. INTOXICATION LEVEL	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	3.1	3.2	3.3
1.1 Alcohol , unvaried	■													
1.2 moderate		■												
1.3 extreme intoxication			■											
1.4. Placebo	1			■										
1.5 Sober	2			2	■									
2.1 EYEWITNESS ID: TP (Lineup)	1			1	1	■								
2.2 TA (Lineup)	1			1	1		■							
2.3 Sequential								■						
2.4 Simultaneous	1			1	1				■					
2.5 TP (Showup)	1				1					■				
2.6 TA (Showup)	1				1						■			
3.1 WITNESS INT: Recall format												■		
3.2 Recall delay	1			1	1								■	
3.3 Misinformation				1	1									■
B. DEPENDENT VARIABLES														
4 EYEWITNESS IDs														
4.1 Correct IDs	2			1	2	1	1		1	1	1			
4.2 Filler IDs	2			1	2					1	1			
4.3 No IDs												1		
4.4 ID confidence	1			1	1									
5 WITNESS INTERVIEWING														
5.1 Recall accuracy	1			2	2									
5.2 Recall quantity	1			1	1									
5.3 Recall confidence				1	1									
5.4 Ratings of Credibility														

Appendix A: Initial List of Potential Individuals to Contact

Randy Borum	University of South Florida, FL USA
Joseph Buckley	John Reid and Associates, IL USA
Ray Bull	University of Leicester, United Kingdom
Julie Cherryman	University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom
Mark Costanzo	Claremont Graduate School, CA USA
David Dixon	University of New South Wales, Australia
Steven Drizin	Northwestern School of Law, IL USA
Ronald Fisher	Florida International University, FL USA
Michael Gelles	US Naval Criminal Investigative Services, USA
Gisli Gudjonsson	Kings College London, United Kingdom
Par Anders Granhag	Goteborg University, Sweden
Maria Hartwig	John Jay College of Criminal Justice, NY USA
Saul Kassin	John Jay College of Criminal Justice, NY USA
Gunther Kohnken	University of Kiel, Germany
Steven Kleinman	MacDill Air Force Base, FL USA
Michael Lamb	University of Cambridge, United Kingdom
Amy Leach	Simon Fraser University, Canada
Richard Leo	University of San Francisco School of Law, CA USA
Samantha Mann	University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom
Jaume Masip	University of Salamanca, Spain
Amina Memon	University of Aberdeen, United Kingdom
Rebecca Milne	University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom
Charles A,. Morgan	Yale University
Fadia Narchet	University of New Haven, CT USA
John Pearse	Detective Superintendent, Scotland Yard (former)
Melissa Russano	Roger Williams University, RI USA
Mary Schollum	New Zealand Police, New Zealand
Leif Stromwall	Goteborg University, Sweden
Aldert Vrij	University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom