Police Interrogation Training and Practices with Adult and Juvenile Suspects: A National Survey of Police Officers and Detectives

Todd C. Warner
B.A., University of Kansas, 2003
M.A., Ball State University, 2007

Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Virginia in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology
April 27th, 2015

Dissertation Committee:

N.Dickon Reppucci, Ph.D. Chair

Barbara Spellman, Ph.D.

Joseph Allen, Ph.D.

Noelle Hurd, Ph.D.

Abstract

Largely as a result of the innocence project, many highly publicized cases involving wrongful convictions and false confessions have captured the attention of the public casting an increased spotlight on the manner in which police interrogate suspects. And yet, very little research exists examining the training officers receive for interrogating suspects and the possible link among trainings to the techniques they use during questioning. This study explored police training experiences regarding the interrogation of adult and juvenile suspects and is the first study to directly compare the reported interrogation practices of police with adult suspects to juvenile suspects. Data were collected from 340 police officers attending a national training seminar at the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Participants completed surveys about their interrogation training experiences and practices with suspects. Results indicated that: (1) interrogators learn specific strategies for interrogation via a combination of on-the-job training from a more experienced officer and a formal training, most likely the Reid method, (2) there does appear to be a relationship among the content learned during trainings and actual practices inside the interrogation room, and (3) based on the self-reported interrogation practices of police, it appears that youth and adults are interrogated in very similar ways. Implications for public policy and directions for future research are discussed.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

First off, I would like to acknowledge all of the people that played such an important part in the completion of this journey that go unmentioned in the next couple pages. Unfortunately, I do not have the necessary pages to adequately thank all those who truly helped me along the way. I am indebted to so many people in Kansas, Indiana, Arizona, and Virginia for their support, inspiration, and friendships over the years. Your contributions do not go overlooked and are much appreciated. That said, the following people have been truly instrumental in the completion of this document, and more broadly, extraordinarily meaningful in my life.

I feel compelled to start my personal acknowledgements with my advisor, Dick Reppucci. His sincere interest in the well-being of his students, both personally and professionally, is remarkable and extends far beyond that of a typical advisor. I want to especially thank you for instilling in me a psychological sense of community that would have Seymour gleaming with pride. You have shown me that values do not have to be sacrificed in the pursuit of objective science. My goal is to pass on this legacy to future generations of social scientists seeking to improve public policy. I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to my dissertation committee members: Joe Allen, Bobbie Spellman, and Noelle Hurd. Thank you for your time, encouragement, ideas, and constructive feedback. Each one of you contributed valuable insights that clearly improved the quality of this study. Thank you!

I want to also thank all of graduate students that I was fortunate enough to work with over the last six years. To Cristina Reitz-Kruger, Alison Nagel, Tammi Walker, Lucy Guarnera, and Myles Durkee, thank you for sharing all your brilliant ideas,

encouragement, and personal support. The friendships and support of this collaborative environment provided experiences that will last a lifetime. I want to particularly thank Barbara Oudekerk and Hayley Cleary. I am extremely grateful for all the guidance and wisdom the two of you provided me over the years. You both exemplify the scholar that I strive to be.

I would also like to thank my first graduate advisor, Kerri Pickel. You awoke in me a sense of curiosity that, to this day, has me formulating new and interesting ideas that I am tremendously excited to pursue. You helped me realize that a career as a psychological researcher, specifically forensic psychology, is what I was meant to do. At Ball State you built a foundation of scientific skills in me that made this all possible. Thank you!

To all of my wonderful friends in Charlottesville that helped provide a perfect balance of personal and professional happiness, thank you! I would like to especially acknowledge Brett Meyer, Carlee Beth Hawkins, Danelle Juillerat, and Justin Juillerat. Our memories together playing softball, hiking, hanging out with the dogs, traveling, and uproarious shenanigans are some of the most cherished memories of my life. The four of you provided a family for me in Charlottesville to which I am forever indebted. To Andrea Iglesias, your love and unconditional support over the last year have been invaluable to achieving this goal. You brought a happiness to my life that was missing and in doing so, helped me rediscover how much I enjoy my work. I can't thank you enough for helping me achieve this final, and most challenging, milestone.

Finally, I owe an enormous thank you to my family. To my dearest sister, I want to thank you for being there for me throughout all the ups-and-downs of graduate school.

I couldn’t ask for a better sibling and best friend. To my parents, I want to thank you for your unwavering support through this seemingly, never-ending journey of education. I can never thank you enough for everything you have provided me over the course of my life. You have instilled in me a desire to work hard not simply for the sake of achievement or monetary gain, but for the betterment of others. To this end, I have chosen to dedicate my life and career goals for which I hope you are proud.

Police Interrogation Training and Practices with Adult and Juvenile Suspects: A National Survey of Police Officers and Detectives

Over the last 20 years, many highly publicized cases involving wrongful convictions and DNA exonerations such as the 'Central Park Five' (McMahon & Burns, 2012) have captured the attention of the public and media alike. In this case, five teenagers falsely confessed to the violent sexual assault of a woman jogging through Central Park and all were subsequently convicted in court. As in this case and many others, a false confession was obtained from the suspect(s) casting a spotlight on the manner in which police interrogate suspects. Since that time, researchers have examined many different factors related to the questioning of suspects such as the role of various interrogation techniques (Leo, 1996), camera angles used during the video-recording of interrogations (Lassiter et al., 2010), and police officers' ability to detect deception during interrogation (Vrij, 2010). However, very little research exists examining the training officers receive for interrogating suspects and its possible link to the techniques they use during questioning.

A review of the literature (Kassin et al., 2010; Owen-Kostelnik, Reppucci, & Meyer, 2006) cites the Reid-technique repeatedly as the most common form of interrogation training and yet, virtually no data exist to substantiate this claim. Critics of this technique (Feld, 2013; Kassin et al., 2010; Owen-Kostelnik et al., 2006; Redlich, 2003) have cited the over-representation of youth in false confession cases (Garrett, 2010; Gross et al., 2004; Kassin et al., 2010) as an indication that the use of some Reid techniques are problematic. As one possible solution, some argue that youth should be questioned differently from adults and that officers should receive training on adolescent

development to decrease the likelihood of using psychologically manipulative tactics with youth, and the federal government agrees. In fact, the Department of Justice has been actively disseminating information to officers on the developmental differences of adolescents for nearly a decade now but no evidence exists examining the prevalence of these types of trainings to officers and whether it has an impact on the techniques they use during interrogation with juvenile suspects. The primary aim of this study is to explore police training experiences regarding the interrogation of adult and juvenile suspects from a sample of high ranking police officers with considerable interrogation experience. In particular, this project aims to: (1) more thoroughly understand how officers are trained to interrogate juvenile and adult suspects; (2) examine the self-reported practices of police officers' during interrogation and; (3) reveal the degree to which these trainings are associated with the techniques they use during interrogation.

Background

Although there is some debate regarding the overall confession rate of suspects detained for questioning in the United States, a review of the confession literature estimates that it lies somewhere between 42% to 55% (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004). If obtained, confession evidence has a very powerful and persuasive impact on eventual verdicts essentially sealing a defendant's fate at trial. Therefore, police officers are highly motivated to obtain self-incriminating statements from suspects during the course of an investigation because the legal incentive is very high. The techniques police officers learn during interrogation training can provide them valuable tools for obtaining incriminating statements from guilty suspects. However, problems arise when false confessions are elicited from innocent suspects. Although it is impossible to accurately

determine how often innocent suspects are convicted, studies of DNA exoneration cases have found that false confessions are present in approximately 25%-30% of these cases (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Scheck, Neufeld, & Dwyer, 2000). While there are only a few hundred of these cases so far (Garrett, 2010), there are valid reasons to believe that many more false confession cases exist because no current studies can account for cases in which charges were dropped prior to trial, cases in which DNA evidence was not available (e.g. drive-by shooting), or convictions that receive no attention due to the lack of available resources for investigating innocence claims. One thing that is known, is that juveniles are disproportionately represented in proven false confession cases. In a national review of 340 exoneration cases over a 15-year period, nearly half (42%) of the juvenile exonerees falsely confessed and of those, 69% were 15 or younger (Gross, 2005). Research from laboratory studies (Redlich & Goodman, 2003) has also provided additional evidence suggesting that youthfulness is a dispositional risk factor for submitting false information to police.

Given that false confessions appear to be strongly associated with wrongful convictions, researchers have been examining the interrogation process in an attempt to better understand how this happens, and ultimately, decrease these occurrences moving forward (Kassin et al., 2010). While many researchers have been focusing on the types of questioning techniques officers use, far less attention has been given to the manner in which officers are trained to interrogate. This is especially true for the interrogation of juvenile suspects. Research that has examined the tactics used during interrogation (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Feld, 2013) has found that these techniques are highly sophisticated, psychologically manipulative strategies (e.g., presentation of false

evidence; use of deceit; and victim blaming) that are designed to induce the suspect into confessing and yet there is almost no evidence examining how officers' learn these techniques.

Police Interrogation Training

While there are many formal interrogation trainings for police officers to participate in, the Reid technique for interviewing suspects is thought to be the most common formal training for interrogators. The Reid technique of police interviewing and interrogation is highly contentious because it purports to teach investigators how to detect deception in criminal suspects, use subtle psychologically manipulative tactics to gain cooperation, and sometimes advocates interviewing strategies that are designed to maximize suspects' anxiety (Inbau et al., 2013). This approach consists primarily of two stages: the Behavior Analysis Interview (BAI) and the interrogation. The BAI is an information gathering stage in which the detective attempts to determine the suspect's innocence or guilt based on preliminary evidence about the case. During the BAI, a detective must decide whether a suspect is displaying behaviors and making statements that are indicative of guilt. To do this, detectives are trained to look for verbal and non-verbal behaviors that suggest the suspect is being truthful or deceptive. Unfortunately, research has shown that detectives are no better than chance at being able to distinguish "truth-tellers" from liars (Vrij, 2000) but are nonetheless more confident in their ability to do so. Additionally, Meissner and Kassin (2002) found that detectives are more likely to judge suspects as being deceitful rather than truthful. For adolescent suspects, these findings are especially troubling because it means that Reid trained detectives may be more likely to interpret typical teen behaviors (e.g., slouching, gaze aversion) as

deceptive, thereby increasing suspicion of guilt. If a suspect has been judged as deceptive or displaying guilty behaviors, then according to Reid practices, the BAI is over and the suspect is read the Miranda warnings so a formal interrogation can commence.

Because suspects who reach the interrogation phase are presumed to be guilty, the process is carefully designed to elicit confessions by increasing the desirability of leaving the situation. To achieve this, suspects are often isolated and placed in a small interrogation room with bare walls, a table and two or three chairs (Cleary, 2014). Given this context in conjunction with adolescents' psychosocial immaturity, the questioning techniques used by detectives may exploit, intentionally or inadvertently, the vulnerabilities of adolescent suspects.

Interrogation practices with juveniles

How police are trained to interrogate suspects, both adult and juvenile, begs the question of how police actually interrogate suspects in practice. While very little research has examined police interrogation training, a fairly sizeable amount of research has focused on describing the general approaches to interviewing and interrogation, presumably based on police training.

The techniques used by detectives, including those endorsed by Reid, to obtain confessions from youth have come under question (Kassin, 2007; 2010; Owen-Kostelnik et al., 2006) because research suggests some of these techniques may disproportionately influence adolescent suspects into confessing regardless of whether they committed the crime. In other words, researchers are suggesting that some of these techniques produce not only more 'true' confessions, but also produce more false confessions among teens

(Redlich, 2003). The only legal protections against custodial interrogation for youth are the Miranda rights (*Miranda v. Arizona, 1966*; *In re Gault, 1967*) which youth are unlikely to exercise as studies suggest 90% or more waive these rights. Research suggests that youth 15 and younger not only have a difficult time understanding the vocabulary of the Miranda warning, but they also struggle to understand the protective function of the warning from future legal consequences (Grisso, 1981; 2003). Studies have also shown that adolescents are more suggestible to authority figures suggesting that even if they understand the meaning of the Miranda warning, they are less likely to exercise it and instead agree to be interviewed. From a legal perspective, the Supreme Court has not provided clear guidelines or restrictions for questioning minors differently from adults (*Fare v. Michael C.*, 1979*; Yarborough v. Alvarado,* 2004) and consequently, some research has shown that detectives might use the same questioning techniques with children and adolescents as they do with adults (Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009; Meyer & Reppucci, 2007).

Two broad categories of interrogation techniques that authors have identified as potentially more problematic when used with youth are *maximization* and *minimization* (Kassin et al., 2010; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009). Maximization techniques are designed to overwhelm the suspect into thinking that confessing is in their best interest and there are no other viable alternatives. These techniques emphasize heightening the suspect's levels of anxiety, physical, or psychological discomfort. Examples include explicitly confronting the suspect with real or fabricated evidence, interrupting any denials, and the use of deceit. Minimization techniques, on the other hand, are designed to befriend the suspect and gain his trust so that the suspect will open up to the detective

and eventually confess. Examples of minimization techniques include deemphasizing the consequences of confessing, offering things to comfort the suspect (e.g., food, cigarettes), offering morally justifiable excuses as reasons for committing the crime, and blaming the victim. The use of minimization techniques has been shown to lead people to infer leniency for cooperation with police (Kassin et al., 2010). Research from reviews of police files (Feld, 2013) and data gathered from police officers (Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009; Meyer & Reppucci, 2007) has confirmed that detectives do sometimes use maximization and minimization techniques when questioning juveniles. When considering adolescents' impulsive decision-making, foreshortened time perspective, and bias toward valuing short-term gains over long-term consequences, they may be more likely to confess to police believing they will be able to go home or receive better subsequent treatment. In fact, some studies have found that one of the main reasons juveniles confess to police is the belief that they would be able to "go home" after confessing (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Grisso, 1981).

Researchers and advocates have criticized the Reid Technique because of the particular concern about using Reid-like strategies with adolescent suspects, who may be particularly vulnerable in interrogation situations. While the Reid Technique is widely criticized (Kassin et al., 2010; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2006; Redlich, 2005), it is unknown whether the techniques learned from the training are used with adolescent suspects or widely practiced at all. Yet, the Reid Technique is reported to be the most widely disseminated form of interrogation training for detectives (Inbau et al., 2013; Kassin, 2007; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009). According to their website, over 500,000 law enforcement officers from all 50 states have been trained in the Reid Technique and

they are the self-proclaimed, "world leader in teaching interview and interrogation techniques" (www.reid.com). Any review of the interrogation literature, even at the cursory level, describes the Reid-technique of interviewing as how interrogations are conducted. According to Google Scholar, the Reid manual (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2013) has been cited over 1,000 times in the literature, and yet only 2 studies have ever examined the prevalence of Reid training among police officers (Kassin et al., 2007; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009). Furthermore, there is quite a substantial discrepancy between the 2 studies regarding the prevalence of Reid-trained officers. Even after filtering out patrol officers within each sample (who are less likely to formally interrogate suspects) Kassin et al., (2007) found that only 11% of the sample had received Reid training whereas Kostelnik and Reppucci (2009) found that 57% of their sample had received the training.

The "training gap"

Discrepancies aside, given the number of citations and frequent references in the literature, one would expect that the vast majority of police officers responsible for interrogation would have received this training. However, this is not what was found. Although it is only one study, suppose the higher prevalence rate found by Kostelnik and Reppucci (2009) of 57% is true, this still leaves nearly half the sample of detectives that are non-Reid trained. How then, are the other officers trained to interrogate suspects? Prior research fails to clarify this gap regarding the training experiences of investigating officers. Presumably, every officer receives on-the-job training such as job shadowing a more experienced officer during interrogation but there are no data to support this idea. This form of training not only serves to familiarize officers with the day-to-day

operations and policies of the department, but it also might suggest a "training the trainer" model whereby the officer who actually attended the formal interrogation training, is then returning to the department and teaching the skills s/he learned to other officers within the department. Given the limited budgetary and personnel resources available across police departments, this training model serves to disseminate training to detectives more pragmatically. Or are there other formal trainings that officers attend that do not receive as much attention in the literature? There are no studies describing the prevalence and content of other formal, non-Reid trainings, so it is difficult to determine what specific content or strategies are associated with particular trainings such as Reid, and which techniques or strategies might be more 'generally' taught or learned from other officers. From a policy standpoint, more clearly understanding the content of particular trainings is essential if problematic strategies are identified and in need of altering.

Some research has shown that juveniles are vulnerable during police questioning to submit false or inaccurate information (Kassin, 2010; Owen-Kostelnik et al., 2006; Redlich & Goodman., 2003). Among juveniles who have falsely confessed, a primary reason was to escape police pressure (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Redlich et al., 2004). However, there is very little research examining police training and its possible relationship to tactics police actually use during interrogation. Kostelnik and Reppucci (2009) found that Reid-trained officers, compared to non-Reid trained officers, were equally likely to use deceit, minimize the seriousness of the crime, and present false evidence to juvenile and adult suspects alike. So, it is unclear what specific questioning techniques are used with juveniles, how those techniques are learned, and whether they

differ at all in comparison to the questioning techniques used with adults? One of the primary goals of the current research is to extend these findings by gaining a better understanding of how police are trained, formally and informally, to interrogate suspects and the impact this training has on the subsequent use of techniques during interrogation with juvenile and adult suspects.

Interestingly, some research shows that police acknowledge a lack of mature decision making for youth and adolescents in non-legal contexts, but do not believe that these impairments in decision making carry over to the interrogation context (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). In other words, police officers' perceptions of adolescent competency may hinge on the context in which they are viewed. In this particular study, police officers did not agree that deficits in decision making put youth at greater risk for implicating themselves during interrogation. However, a review of the literature on adolescent decision-making in legal contexts would suggest otherwise (Grisso, 1981; 2003; Owen-Kostelnik et al., 2006; Steinberg & Scott, 2003). Compared to adults, adolescents are cognitively and psychosocially less mature as they are more impulsive in their decision-making, more likely to engage in risky behaviors, more likely to value short-term gains over long-term consequences, and more susceptible to influence by peers and authority figures (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000; Fried & Reppucci, 2001; Grisso, 2003; Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996; Steinberg et al., 2009). Given the underdeveloped psychosocial capacities of youth (Steinberg & Scott., 2003) and the substantial discretion afforded to police officers (Inbau et al., 2013), adolescents present a unique set of issues when they are viewed as suspects by police officers. As a result, the

federal government has begun to address these concerns and provide recommendations for best practices regarding the interrogation of juveniles.

Developmentally appropriate approach to interrogation

Since 2006, the Department of Justice, in conjunction with the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) and the Center for Wrongful Conviction of Youth at Northwestern University, has actively disseminated a training curriculum specifically tailored to the special needs of adolescent suspects to over 2,100 officers representing 600 agencies across the country (www.theiacp.org). The training includes four courses, that specifically provide officers instruction on: a) understanding adolescent development, youth culture, and its impact on interrogation; b) how to interpret youth behavior during interrogation; c) techniques for building rapport with youth; d) constructing age-appropriate statements and questions; e) interviewing strategies and approaches designed for youth that are more open-ended, less confrontational, and focus on information gathering; and f) cautions and considerations for interrogating youth designed to decrease the likelihood of false or coerced confessions.

As part of this training, the IACP discusses brain development and adolescent traits that set them apart from fully developed adult brains drawing from social science and peer-reviewed articles (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Redlich, 2003; Reppucci, Meyer, & Kostelnik, 2010). This is quite a seismic shift for public policy regarding the interrogation of youth. While this aspect of police training has garnered increased attention from the Department of Justice for nearly 8 years, no studies have examined how many officers have received any training on adolescent brain development, or how adolescent decision-making differs from adults.

In sum, the psychologically manipulative and potentially coercive interrogation techniques that police have been found to use, in conjunction with the psychosocial immaturity that typifies adolescent suspects has many scholars and advocates concerned about the possibility of juveniles falsely implicating themselves inside the interrogation room. The current study is the first to examine the extent to which officers have received any training on the psychological differences between juveniles and adults. Understanding the content of trainings for how officers should deal with juveniles and adults during interrogation and how these trainings are associated with the specific techniques police officers report using during interrogation fills a much needed gap in the literature. This study is also one of the first to examine the training process officers receive for interrogation and the extent to which it is related to technique usage. Additionally, it is the first to directly compare police usage of techniques with adult versus juvenile suspects.

Current Study

This dissertation is designed to explore police training experiences and self-reported police practices regarding the interrogation of adult and adolescent suspects from a sample of officers with considerable interrogation experience. Findings may help identify gaps in police training and offer new insights for techniques designed for the unique legal and developmental challenges of interviewing adolescent suspects. The aims of this study are: 1) to describe law enforcement officers' interrogation training experiences using a diverse national sample of experienced interrogators; 2) to examine the prevalence of trainings for legal and psychosocial issues uniquely relevant to juvenile interrogation; 3) to examine police use of interrogation techniques commonly discussed

in the literature, including a comparison of techniques used with adult versus juvenile suspects; and 4) to examine the relationship between trainings and actual interrogation practices.

Research questions

(1) What are the training experiences for police officers and what are the specific tactics they learn during trainings for the interrogation of adult and juvenile suspects? The Reid Technique has repeatedly been cited as the most common form of interrogation training, yet only 2 studies have ever examined how many officers actually receive this training (Kassin et al., 2007; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009). More broadly, no studies have examined how many officers receive any kind of formal interrogation training, Reid or otherwise. This dissertation explores how many officers have received formal training for interrogating suspects using a national sample of officers and, perhaps more importantly, explores the content of trainings to better understand what kinds of techniques are associated with particular trainings. Presumably, officers use questioning techniques learned during the course of training but there is very little research examining the content of interrogation trainings and the relationship they may have in practice. For the purposes of this dissertation, formal training is defined as having attended, in-person, a class or workshop on the Reid technique or other formal training.

As a more specific part of this larger research question examining the training experiences of interrogators, exploratory research questions regarding the prevalence of trainings on any legal and psychosocial issues that are uniquely relevant to juvenile interrogation were investigated. This study examines the extent to which officers' have received training on adolescent brain development and/or adolescent decision-making.

Furthermore, to more clearly distinguish trainings targeting adolescent development from trainings on legal matters, this investigation also analyzed the prevalence of trainings on the unique legal parameters and policies associated with the interrogation of juveniles. Specifically, officers were asked about training experiences on (a) the laws or policies related to interrogating youth, (b) how to deliver the Miranda warning to juvenile suspects, and (c) laws or policies regarding the notification and/or involvement of parents.

(2) What are the self-reported practices used during interrogation with youth and adults? In what ways are they similar or different? There is reason to believe that techniques police use during the interrogation of adults are also employed with juveniles. A few studies examining video-taped confessions (Cleary, 2014), case files reviews (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Feld, 2013), and surveys of law enforcement (Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009; Meyer & Reppucci, 2010) have found the methods police use during the interrogation of juveniles to be similar to those used during interrogation of adult suspects. However, to date no study has ever examined a direct comparison of the techniques police use when questioning adult and adolescent suspects. This dissertation analyzes the self-reported practices used during interrogation from police officers to make direct comparisons of the practices used with adult suspects and those used with juvenile suspects to better understand the similarities and differences.

(3) To what extent are certain training characteristics associated with self-reported practices during interrogation with adult and juvenile suspects? While there is a relatively small, but growing, literature examining the practices of police inside the interrogation room (Cleary, 2014; Drizin & Leo, 2004; Feld, 2013), virtually no

research exists examining the nature of the relationship between interrogation trainings and police practices for questioning suspects. The general assumption is that officers use techniques they learned during training(s) but there is very little evidence investigating the extent to which training(s) are predictive of actual practices. It is essential for researchers to understand the content of these trainings and which techniques officers use during interrogation as a result of their training experiences, especially if some techniques are particularly problematic when used with juveniles. Moreover, it is important to gain a better grasp on the degree to which techniques are more frequently used as trainings might place a greater emphasis on some techniques over others, and finally, the context under which certain techniques are more or less likely to be used (e.g., with adult suspects or adolescent suspects).

Another rationale behind officers receiving juvenile specific training is that officers will be less likely to use techniques that are thought to exploit adolescent vulnerabilities inside the interrogation room (e.g., *using deceit, minimizing seriousness of crime, suggesting what happened*). Advocates of this approach believe that training officers on the science behind adolescent brain development and adolescent decision-making tendencies will encourage officers to more closely monitor the types of techniques they use during juvenile interrogation to prevent younger suspects from making false incriminating statements. Conversely, some postulate that trainings on adolescent development and decision-making may *encourage*, rather than discourage, the use of certain techniques that may be particularly manipulative with adolescent suspects. At this point, it is not known if police officers receive any trainings on adolescent psychological development and it's unclear whether receiving training on adolescent

development is related in any way to techniques used during questioning with juvenile suspects. The current research examines the extent to which officers receive any training regarding the unique issues associated with juveniles and whether these trainings are related to the use of interrogation techniques with juvenile suspects. The reported use of 16 different techniques among those who have received adolescent trainings and those who have not is examined. Consistent with the larger goals of this study, the objective was to examine whether patterns of technique usage differ among those who have received adolescent trainings and those who have not.

Method

Participants

The sample, drawn from a larger collaborative study of police training and practices, consists of 412 law enforcement officers who attended the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) National Academy (NA) training program. This training program provides college-level instruction and professional development for mid-to-high ranking law enforcement officers from a cross section of the United States and some international agencies. The training targets 'upwardly mobile' officers who currently, or have the potential to, serve in supervisory roles within their respective agencies (Schafer, 2010). To meet the criteria for enrollment, officers must have a current rank of Lieutenant or higher and a formal nomination from the head of their agency (e.g., commissioner, superintendent, chief of police, sheriff). The ten-week program offers college-level courses, accredited by the University of Virginia, and trainings on a wide array of subjects taught by academic personnel and special agents hired by the FBI.

Only officers with 11 or more juvenile interrogations were included in the analyses. This criterion was chosen to ensure the sample had adequate real-world experience interrogating juvenile suspects. Additionally, only officers working in the United States were included in the analyses because of the vastly different laws and approaches to interrogation in other countries.

As a result, 340 law enforcement officers met criteria for the study. Participants ranged in age from 29 – 61 (M = 44.84; SD = 5.18). Approximately 89% of participants were male, 8% were female, and 3% did not provide gender information. The ethnic breakdown was as follows: 77% Caucasian, 5% African American, 7% Hispanic, 4% other, and 7% did not report ethnic information. The vast majority of police officers (77%) reported having a bachelor's degree or higher.

The average amount of law enforcement experience was 21.23 (SD = 4.95) years. Approximately, 95% of the sample has conducted 51 or more interrogations of adult suspects and 75% has conducted 51 or more interrogations of adolescent suspects. The majority of participants work for a city or local police department (81%) with a smaller number working within a state agency (16%), and a few working for a federal agency (3%). The sample was fairly diverse regarding department size with approximately 32% working in a department with 200 or more officers; 19% working in a department with 100-200 officers; 22% working in a department with 50-100 officers; and 26% working in a department with fewer than 50 officers. Although policy restrictions prevented us from collecting specific geographic data on the sample such as zip codes, information from the national academy website reports training officers from all 50 states (http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/training/national-academy) and given the diverse

department size of the sample, it is reasonable to assume the sample is fairly representative of officers who interrogate suspects. Additional demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Participant Demographics

	n = 340	Percent[a]
Sex	*n* = 329	97%
Male	302	89%
Female	26	8%
Race/ethnicity	*n* = 315	93%
White	262	77%
Black	18	5%
Latino/a	24	7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	2%
Other	6	2%
Educational attainment	*n* = 317	93%
High school	9	3%
Some college	64	19%
College degree	116	34%
Some graduate work	33	10%
Graduate/professional degree	94	28%
Agency type	*n* = 340	100%
Federal	9	3%
State	53	16%
Local	273	80%
Other	5	1%
Agency size	*n* = 335	96%
< 20 officers	19	6%
20-49 officers	69	20%
50-99 officers	74	22%
100-199 officers	65	19%
200+ officers	108	32%
Jurisdiction size (# residents)	*n* = 324	95%
0 – 50,000	120	35%
50,001 – 100,000	63	19%
100,001 – 250,000	42	12%
250,001 – 500,000	25	7%
500,001 – 1 million	27	8%
> 1 million	47	14%

Note: [a] Percentages may not total 100 due data missing at random.

Procedure

To obtain access to the sample, the author contacted a collaborator from a past project who works for the FBI's behavioral research unit and is involved with the national academy training. Once the concept and measures were developed, all the materials were sent to the FBI for review and approval. Upon approval, officers attending the training were told that their participation was not a part of the national academy training program and told that their participation was completely voluntary. Officers who agreed to participate were then asked to complete a survey regarding their training experiences as police officers and for the questioning of suspects. Questionnaires were distributed and completed during the first day of the training and collected in a group setting. Officers were told the survey would take about 20-25 minutes to complete, and assured that their responses to the questionnaire would be confidential and no personally identifiable information would be collected. The data were collected from 2 different cohorts attending the national academy training. The first period of data collection took place in October 2013, and the second period took place in July 2014.

Survey Instrument

The police interrogation training survey (PITS) assesses law enforcement officers' reports of (a) total number of interrogations conducted, (b) formal and informal interrogation trainings completed, (c) trainings on adolescent development including brain development and decision-making, (d) laws or policies pertaining to the questioning of youth, (e) interrogation practices trained to use with youth and adults, and (f) interrogation practices actually used with youth and adult suspects (see Appendix).

Interrogation experience. For interrogation experience, participants were asked how many times, over their entire career, they had conducted an interview with an adult suspected of committing a crime, and how many times they had conducted an interview with a juvenile suspected of a crime (*0; 1-10; 11-50; 51-100; 100+*).

Interrogation Trainings. Officers were asked 10 questions regarding formal and informal trainings they received. Specific formal trainings covered in the questionnaire included: The Reid method; the Preparation, Engage, Account, Closure, and Evaluation (PEACE) method; Human Intelligence (HUMINT) method; and an open-ended question for any other formal trainings they received. Officers were also asked if they had received 'on-the-job' training about how to interrogate suspects (e.g. job shadowing a more experienced officer during interrogation). For all the interrogation training items endorsed, follow-up questions were asked covering the duration of the training (*Less than 4 hours – More than 5 days*); when the training took place (*within last 6 months – More than 10 years ago*); whether the training was required or voluntary; their level of satisfaction with the training (*1: Not at all satisfied – 5: Very satisfied*); and how useful the training was (*1: Not at all useful – 5: Very useful*).

Adolescent Trainings. Participants were asked two items regarding whether they received any training on adolescent brain development and how adolescent decision-making is different compared to adult decision-making. Officers were also asked three items regarding whether they received any training regarding legal policies and procedures related to the interrogation of juveniles (e.g. administering Miranda warnings, parental involvement). This was done to more clearly distinguish adolescent trainings that emphasize legal policies related to interviewing juveniles from trainings that focus

on adolescents' psychological and decision-making capacities. As before, if officers' endorsed an item they were instructed to answer a series of follow-up questions regarding the training that examined: how the officers' received the training (class/workshop or on the job); the duration of the training (*Less than 4 hours – More than 5 days*); when the training took place (*within last 6 months – More than 10 years ago*); whether the training was required or voluntary; their level of satisfaction with the training (*1: Not at all satisfied – 5: Very satisfied*); and how useful the training was when interviewing suspects (*1: Not at all useful – 5: Very useful*).

Interrogation Practices and Techniques. The survey also includes a list of 16 different interrogation techniques (Feld, 2013; Kassin et al., 2007; Kelly, 2013; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009; Leo, 1996). These specific techniques were chosen after an extensive review of the literature, police manuals, pilot testing with detectives from the Richmond Police Department, and consultation with academic scholars. For each technique listed, officers were asked four questions: (1) have you been trained to use this technique with adult suspects (*Yes-formal training; Yes-on the job; Yes-both; No*), (2) how often do you use this technique when you interview adults (*1: Never – 5: Always*), (3) have you been trained to use this technique with juvenile suspects (*Yes-formal training; Yes-on the job; Yes-both; No*), and (4) how often do you use this technique when you interview juveniles (*1: Never – 5: Always*).

Demographics. Participants were asked demographic questions (e.g., race, age, level of education) and questions about their professional background. Officers were asked to report the number of years worked in law enforcement; the type of agency they

work for; the size of the agency; and video-recording policies for adult and juvenile interviews.

Data Analysis

Preliminary Analyses. Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine the accuracy of data entry, any differences across the two cohorts' critical variables (training variables and interrogation practices), missing values, outliers, and violations of statistical assumptions. Analyses revealed no differences across cohorts for: Reid training, χ^2 (1, N = 334) = .36, p = .550; other formal (i.e. non-Reid) interrogation trainings, χ^2 (1, N = 317) = 2.32, p = .128; training on adolescent brain development, χ^2 (1, N = 336) = .79, p = .375; training on adolescent decision-making compared to adults, χ^2 (1, N = 336) = .24, p = .618; training on how peers' influence adolescent decision-making, χ^2 (1, N = 332) = .07, p = .778; the number of interrogations conducted for adult suspects, χ^2 (1, N = 340) = 3.13, p = .346; or the number of interrogations conducted with juvenile suspects, χ^2 (1, N = 340) = .779, p = .677.

Independent samples t-tests examining the frequency of specific techniques that officers use revealed differences across cohorts for observing body language as a cue for deceit with adults, t(333) = -2.57, p = .01, 95% CI [-.539, -.072]; building rapport with juveniles, t(333) = -3.69, p < .001, 95% CI [-.733, -.223]; and for emphasizing the seriousness of the crime with juveniles, t(331) = -2.55, p = .01, 95% CI [-.582, -.075]. No discernable pattern or reason could be extracted from the results regarding systematic differences in technique use across the cohorts and given that 34 different techniques were tested, the results were attributed to random error in the data. As a result, the full sample was used for analyses.

Data were not transformed as tests for the distribution of the dependent variables revealed only two variables with a slight pattern of skewness (building rapport with both

adults and juveniles) and that with relatively large sample sizes (e.g. > 200), skewness values are unlikely to make a substantive difference in the analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). While the author appreciates and understands the somewhat controversial use of statistical tests including those examining measures of central tendency using likert-scale data, it is still a common approach for the analyses of survey style data when assumptions regarding distributions are not violated (Lubke & Muthen, 2004). Given the results of the distribution analyses, there appeared to be no issues with the data beyond the given limitations of ordinal scale data.

Correlations were conducted to examine any possible relationships among the demographic variables and the dependent variables to determine any differences in technique usage related to the demographic characteristics of the sample. Tables 2 and 3 present correlation coefficients between the demographic characteristics of the sample and the dependent variables, almost all of which show no relationship or a small correlation. Thus, no demographic variables were included as covariates in analyses reported and no other group comparisons were conducted for demographic characteristics and the dependent variables.

Table 2. *Correlations Between Demographics and Dependent Variables*.

Dependent Variable	Gender	Age	Race	Education	Years Exp
Juveniles					
Building rapport	-.02	-.05	.01	-.12*	.05
Observing body language	-.01	.05	.01	-.12*	.11
Presenting false evidence	-.11	.03	-.05	.05	.04
Presenting real evidence	.01	.07	-.01	.02	.04
Using deceit	-.04	-.02	-.10	-.04	.00
Offering things	.08	.11	.03	-.07	.11
Observing speech patterns	-.05	.01	-.08	-.12*	.05
Blaming the victim	-.05	-.06	.06	-.08	.00
Leaving suspect alone	-.08	.03	-.07	-.11	.03
Emphasizing seriousness	-.04	-.01	-.21**	-.07	-.02
Minimizing seriousness	-.03	-.03	.12*	-.18**	.06
Using more than one interviewer	-.02	.01	-.09	-.02	.07
Asking same questions repeatedly	-.07	.05	-.09	-.13*	.03
Discouraging denials	-.01	-.02	.03	-.09	.04
Suggesting what happened	-.04	.01	-.04	-.15*	.04
Moving yourself/chair closer	-.02	.02	.00	-.24**	.05

Note. Gender (1 = male; 2 = female); Race (1 = minority; 2 = Caucasian). Technique use ranged from 1 = *never;* 5 = *always.* Higher scores = more frequent use. Asterisks indicate significance levels at: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Table 3. *Correlations Between Demographics and Dependent Variables*.

Dependent Variable	Gender	Age	Race	Education	Years Exp
Adults					
Building rapport	-.07	-.03	.03	-.09	.00
Observing body language	-.05	.00	.03	-.10	.06
Presenting false evidence	-.11	.02	-.04	.06	.03
Presenting real evidence	-.01	.01	-.03	.03	-.03
Using deceit	-.12*	-.05	-.10	-.07	-.04
Offering things	.03	.06	.07	-.09	.05
Observing speech patterns	-.11	-.04	-.08	-.11	.00
Blaming the victim	-.08	-.02	.03	-.06	.02
Leaving suspect alone	-.13*	.01	-.05	-.14*	-.01
Emphasizing seriousness	-.07	-.04	-.21**	-.08	-.07
Minimizing seriousness	-.08	.00	.16**	-.16**	.06
Using more than one interviewer	-.06	-.09	-.06	-.03	.01
Asking same questions repeatedly	-.07	-.02	-.08	-.09	-.03
Discouraging denials	-.02	-.04	.05	-.04	-.01
Suggesting what happened	-.01	-.02	-.05	-.10	.00
Moving yourself/chair closer	-.08	-.02	.03	-.15*	.00

Note. Gender (1 = male; 2 = female); Race (1 = minority; 2 = Caucasian). Technique use ranged from 1 = *never;* 5 = *always.* Higher scores = more frequent use. Asterisks indicate significance levels at: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Primary analyses.

Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, crosstabs, and means were run to examine the general training experiences of the sample. Binary logistic regressions and chi-square analyses were conducted to test the prediction of the dichotomous variables, most of which analyze the training (Yes/No) variables for each of the 16 different techniques. These analyses were also used to determine the differences for training regarding the usage of particular techniques with juveniles and adults.

To analyze the reported use of each of the interrogation techniques, paired-samples t-tests were conducted to determine any differences in frequency of use among adolescent and adult suspects. Furthermore, exploratory principal components analyses were conducted to examine whether the 16 different techniques clustered together in meaningful ways to better understand how officers might use techniques in conjunction with one another and whether particular training experiences might be associated with the manner in which they are used.

Results

RESEARCH QUESTION 1:

What are the training experiences for police officers and what are the specific tactics they learn during trainings for the interrogation of adult and juvenile suspects?

Table 4 reports the type (including informal), duration, recency, and officers' perceptions of usefulness and satisfaction of various training models for interrogation. The Reid technique was the most commonly reported formal training experience with slightly more than half (56%) of the officers' receiving formal Reid training. Formal

training in the P.E.A.C.E. and HUMINT interviewing approaches were much less common (8% and 6% respectively). Because the overall totals were too low, group comparisons for P.E.A.C.E. and HUMINT trained officers were not conducted. However, approximately half of the sample (49%) received formal training in some other interviewing method with over 40 other formal types of training for interrogation indicating a vast array of formal trainings for interrogation other than the Reid method. 'Other' formal trainings that had clear themes were categorized into different groups when possible (e.g., deception detection, "Truth or Lies - Microexpressions, "Stan Walters – The Lie Guy"). While responses varied widely, the most frequently reported training approaches involved deception detection (24 officers), statement analysis (11 officers), and youth-specific interviewing protocols for child abuse victims (49 officers).

Training experiences in the formal interrogation models ranged from less than a half day to more than five full days, with the majority of officers reporting multiple full days of training. For all of the interrogation models, most officers reported attending training 2-10 years ago or longer, which is not surprising given the age and experience of the sample. Officers found the Reid training more satisfying (M = 4.16; SD = .77) and useful (M = 4.06; SD = .83) than any other trainings, but as a whole, officers were satisfied with the formal training they received and reported that the training had been useful when interviewing suspects as these were the most common responses. Most officers reported receiving some kind of training via a book or manual (71.8%) or instructional video (42.6%). Relatively few officers (12.4%) completed an online training program. Additionally, in an effort to capture other means of acquiring interviewing skills, we also asked officers to report "on-the-job" training experience,

such as shadowing a more experienced interviewer. Nearly the entire sample reported receiving on-the-job training as 91% of the sample reported being trained in interrogation methods in this manner. Of the informally trained officers, approximately 68% reported training that occurred over multiple days and the majority of these officers reported the training lasted at least 5 days or longer suggesting that its quite common for many officers to 'job-shadow' a more experienced investigating officer.

Table 4.
Police Officers' Formal and Informal Interviewing and Interrogation Training Experience

	Reid		PEACE		HUMINT		Other formal		Informal	
Received training[a]	190	56%	28	8%	20	6%	166	49%	308	91%
Training duration										
Less than ½ day	2		5		6		6		26	
½ day to 1 day	18		7		4		22		46	
1-5 days	144		13		6		98		59	
More than 5 days	26		3		2		40		172	
Training recency										
Within past 2 years	15		6		7		16		32	
2-10 years ago	91		14		9		56		77	
More than 10 years	79		6		3		92		198	
Usefulness of training[b]										
Mean (SD)	4.06 (.83)		3.96 (.89)		3.47 (1.02)		3.91 (.90)		3.89 (.84)	
Satisfaction of training[c]										
Mean (SD)	4.16 (.77)		3.84 (.85)		3.74 (.87)		3.98 (.85)		3.74 (.88)	

Note. Columns are not mutually exclusive, as some officers received training in multiple approaches.
[a]Percentages in this row represent the proportion of the entire sample (N = 340) who received training in each method.
[b]1 = *not at all useful*; 5 = *very useful*. [c]1 = *not at all satisfied*; 5 = *very satisfied*.

Interrogation training for specific techniques. Officers were asked to report whether they were trained on 16 specific interrogation techniques. Officers reported separately whether they had been trained to use each technique specifically with adult suspects and specifically with juvenile suspects. Table 5 reports the officers who received any kind of training whatsoever (formal or informal) for each of the techniques. Of the 16 techniques that were assessed, across the entire sample, officers were trained on an average of 13.4 techniques for use with adults (*SD* = 3.76) and 11.3 techniques for use with juveniles (*SD* = 5.23). Approximately half the sample (49%) or more was trained on any given technique. Chi-squared analyses revealed that for all 16 techniques, officers were more likely to be trained on that technique for use with adults than for juveniles (χ^2s = 32.70 to 264.94). Table 6 provides further evidence for this by showing the number of officers who received formal or informal training for each technique. Officers were more likely to receive informal training for most of the techniques as they apply to juvenile suspects, whereas, officers were more likely to receive formal training for specific techniques with adult suspects. However, the overall patterns of training for individual techniques were comparable for adult versus juvenile suspects as the majority of officers reported receiving training for use with juvenile suspects. The most commonly occurring techniques on which officers were trained were *building rapport* (95.6% and 77.6% respectively), *observing body language as a cue for deceit* (93.2% and 77.1%), and *offering the suspect items for comfort* (90.0% and 76.8%). The least frequently trained techniques were *victim blaming* (61.5% and 49.7%) and *discouraging denials* (56.2% and 49.1%).

Table 5.
Officers' Training on Interrogation Techniques for Use with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

	Trained to use with adult suspects		Trained to use with juvenile suspects		
Interrogation Technique	*n*	%	*n*	%	χ^2
Building rapport	325	95.6	265	77.1	32.70***
Observing body language	316	93.2	265	77.1	82.43***
Offering things for comfort	304	90.0	262	76.8	109.96***
Presenting real evidence	288	85.3	249	73.5	156.28***
Using deceit	288	85.3	237	69.7	130.34***
Using more than one interviewer	285	84.1	253	74.1	164.68***
Minimizing seriousness of offense	283	83.5	242	71.2	163.81***
Moving physically closer to suspect	280	82.9	240	70.6	159.07***
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	272	80.6	239	70.3	191.53***
Asking same questions repeatedly	264	77.0	231	67.9	200.11***
Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room	261	76.6	211	62.1	164.33***
Presenting false evidence	249	73.2	192	56.5	151.48***
Observing speech patterns	242	71.8	202	59.4	184.91***
Suggesting what might have happened	229	67.9	200	58.8	227.42***
Blaming the victim	209	61.5	169	49.7	208.62***
Discouraging denials	189	56.2	167	49.1	247.22***

Note. Percentages represent proportions of the entire sample ($N = 340$) who have been trained on that technique. All chi-squared tests comparing adult and juvenile suspects are significant at $p < .001$***.

Table 6.
Officers' Formal and Informal Training for each Technique for Use with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

	Trained to use with adult suspects		Trained to use with juvenile suspects		
Interrogation Technique	Formal	Informal[a]	Formal	Informal[a]	χ^2
Building rapport	211	114	127	138	83.68***
Observing body language	268	49	195	70	126.31***
Offering things for comfort	163	143	133	129	203.35***
Presenting real evidence	153	137	114	136	182.45***
Using deceit	136	154	100	137	185.10***
Using more than one interviewer	154	132	117	136	152.36***
Minimizing seriousness of offense	152	132	110	132	168.91***
Moving physically closer to suspect	200	82	153	87	173.09***
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	127	147	99	140	186.87***
Asking same questions repeatedly	151	113	108	123	163.21***
Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room	124	138	89	122	148.33***
Presenting false evidence	124	125	83	109	119.39***
Observing speech patterns	167	77	117	85	149.60***
Suggesting what might have happened	118	113	84	116	150.74***
Blaming the victim	100	109	64	105	113.30***
Discouraging denials	110	81	84	83	127.09***

Note. [a]A training technique was coded 'informal' only if learned on-the-job from another officer. All chi-squared tests comparing adult and juvenile suspects are significant at $p < .001$***.

Training type and specific techniques. The next objective was to determine if there were certain techniques that were more likely to be associated with Reid trained compared to non-Reid trained officers. T-tests examining the total number of techniques that officers are trained to use shows that, on average, Reid officers' (M = 14.29; SD = 3.05) have received training on a greater number of total techniques for interviewing adult suspects compared non-Reid trained officers (M = 12.34; SD = 4.17). Likewise, the same pattern emerged when testing Reid trained officers' (M = 12.16; SD = 4.97) compared to non-Reid trained officers (M = 10.33; SD = 5.39) for the total number of techniques trained to use with juvenile suspects.

Table 7 presents a closer examination of the specific techniques more likely to be associated with Reid or non-Reid trained officers. Chi-squared tests revealed effects on 12 of the 16 techniques for Reid trained officers when questioning adult suspects (all $\chi^2 >$ 5.86) such that Reid trained officers were more likely to have received training on those techniques compared to non-Reid officers. The same pattern emerged for the questioning of juvenile suspects (all $\chi^2 > 3.89$) as effects were found on 12 of the 17 techniques for Reid officers compared to non-Reid officers. Overall, when examining which individual techniques garnered the largest effects, it appears that Reid trained officers were more likely to receive training on techniques that involve manipulative types of tactics (e.g., *minimizing seriousness of situation*, *moving*

Table 7.
Reid and Non-Reid Officers' Training for each Technique for Use with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

	Trained to use with adult suspects			Trained to use with juvenile suspects		
Interrogation Technique	Reid (n = 190)	Non-Reid (n = 144)	χ^2	Reid (n = 190)	Non-Reid (n = 144)	χ^2
Building rapport	188	134	8.21**	162	101	12.73***
Observing body language	187	127	15.21***	156	106	3.89*
Offering things for comfort	177	128	1.87	152	109	1.25
Presenting real evidence	170	117	5.86*	152	95	10.07**
Using deceit	174	113	9.99**	138	96	1.32
Using more than one interviewer	169	144	5.95*	154	97	9.36**
Minimizing seriousness of offense	175	107	19.74***	148	92	8.44**
Moving physically closer to suspect	173	106	19.99***	150	87	15.81***
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	154	118	0.11	133	104	0.16
Asking same questions repeatedly	156	106	3.84	133	96	0.49
Leaving alone in interrogation room	160	100	10.36**	129	81	5.06*
Presenting false evidence	147	99	2.80	117	72	4.19*
Observing speech patterns	149	94	7.61**	124	77	5.59*
Suggesting what might have happened	144	85	11.76**	122	76	4.94*
Using Facebook or social media	134	89	2.53	123	83	1.91
Blaming the victim	132	76	9.72**	108	60	7.55**
Discouraging denials	126	63	16.97***	109	56	11.83***

Note. Chi-squared results significant at, $p < .05$*, $p < .01$**, $p < .001$***.

physically closer to the suspect, *victim blaming*) compared to confrontational types of tactics (e.g., *asking same questions repeatedly*, *emphasizing seriousness of crime*, *presenting false evidence*). This pattern was consistent across trainings for the questioning of both adult and juvenile suspects.

Officers' training experiences for adolescent legal policies and psychosocial capacities. Table 8 reports the number of officers who received training on adolescent brain development or decision-making, the duration of training, how long ago the training was, and officers' perceptions of usefulness and satisfaction of the training when interviewing suspects. Approximately 22-25% reported receiving a formal training on adolescent brain development and/or adolescent decision making. Of that group, approximately 50% of the officers reported the training lasting one or more days and for the vast majority, 80% of this group, the trainings were 2 or more years ago. Furthermore, 44% of the officers who received training on adolescent brain development reported the training took place more than 10 years ago. As a whole, the group reported satisfaction with the trainings and found the information learned useful when interrogating suspects. These findings were relatively consistent with the descriptives reported for interrogation trainings.

Police officers' training experiences regarding the legal and procedural issues involved with interrogating juveniles is also reported below. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of officers (80% or more) have received training on laws for interviewing juveniles, how to administer Miranda rights to juveniles, and legal policies regarding parental involvement during interrogation. Officers' reported the greatest amount of satisfaction and usefulness for trainings on the administration of the Miranda warning and

how to evaluate the necessary competency level for a legal waiver. Given that the invocation of the Miranda warnings is working directly against the officers' goal of obtaining a confession, it is not surprising that officers' report a higher level of satisfaction and usefulness for these types of trainings.

Table 8.
Officer Training on Adolescent Psychosocial Capacities and Legal Policies for Questioning Juveniles.

	Brain Development[a]		Decision Making[a]		Laws or Policies for interviewing juveniles		How to Give Miranda to Juveniles		Laws Concerning Parental Involvement	
Received training[b]	73	22%	85	25%	301	90%	290	85%	280	82%
Training duration										
Less than ½ day	19		20		88		137		131	
½ day to 1 day	21		32		101		75		76	
1-5 days	18		19		78		55		44	
More than 5 days	15		14		33		21		29	
Training recency										
Within past 2 years	15		16		103		73		84	
2-10 years ago	26		45		112		90		103	
More 10 years ago	32		24		86		126		93	
Usefulness of training[c]										
Mean (SD)	3.62 (.76)		3.52 (.70)		3.59 (.78)		3.82 (.81)		3.67 (.77)	
Satisfaction with training[d]										
Mean (SD)	3.74 (.83)		3.53 (.67)		3.46 (.74)		3.76 (.86)		3.61 (.73)	

Note. Columns are not mutually exclusive, as some officers received training on multiple juvenile topics. [a]Only officers' receiving formal classroom or workshop training were included for adolescent psychosocial trainings. [b]Percentages in this row represent the proportion of the entire sample (N = 340) who received training in each method. [c]1 = *not at all useful*; 5 = *very useful*. [d]1 = *not at all satisfied*; 5 = *very satisfied*.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2:

What are the self-reported practices used during interrogation with youth and adults? In what ways are they similar or different?

Officers' Self-Reported Interrogation Technique Usage. To examine self-reported practices during interrogation, officers were asked separately to report on a 1 *(never)* – 5 *(always)* scale the frequency with which they have used each of the 16 techniques during interrogation with adult and adolescent suspects. As shown in Table 9, there was quite a bit of variation in reported use across the 17 techniques with both adults and juveniles. Building rapport (adults: $M = 4.12$, $SD = .93$; adolescents: $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.21$) and observing body language (adults: $M = 4.01$, $SD = 1.10$; adolescents: $M = 3.66$, $SD = 1.35$) were the most frequently used techniques and, in contrast, discouraging denials (adults: $M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.20$; adolescents: $M = 2.25$, $SD = 1.22$) and blaming the victim (adults: $M = 2.17$, $SD = .97$; adolescents: $M = 1.97$, $SD = .97$) were the least frequently used.

Paired sample t-tests were run to examine whether certain techniques were significantly used more often with adults compared to adolescents. Overall, each of the techniques were more frequently used with adult suspects compared to juvenile suspects (all $t's > 2.90$). However, the overall pattern of technique usage for adult and juvenile suspects was similar with the frequency of use on any given technique being slightly less compared to adults.

Table 9
Officers' Self-Reported Use of Interrogation Techniques with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

Interrogation Technique	Frequency of use with adult suspects *M (SD)*	Frequency of use with juvenile suspects *M (SD)*	*t* (*p*)
Building rapport	4.12 (.93)	3.67 (1.21)	8.58***
Observing body language	4.01 (1.10)	3.66 (1.35)	6.81***
Offering things for comfort	3.41 (1.09)	3.15 (1.27)	6.33***
Observing speech patterns	3.06 (1.41)	2.83 (1.46)	5.60***
Presenting real evidence	3.02 (1.00)	2.80 (1.13)	6.04***
Moving physically closer to suspect	3.00 (1.05)	2.76 (1.15)	6.37***
Minimizing seriousness of offense	2.98 (.97)	2.75 (1.07)	6.73***
Asking same questions repeatedly	2.93 (1.03)	2.75 (1.13)	5.32***
Using more than one interviewer	2.87 (1.01)	2.68 (1.13)	5.03***
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	2.86 (1.03)	2.74 (1.19)	2.90**
Using deceit	2.85 (.88)	2.54 (1.04)	7.66***
Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room	2.67 (1.01)	2.28 (1.09)	9.22***
Suggesting what might have happened	2.42 (1.02)	2.26 (1.07)	5.05***
Presenting false evidence	2.41 (1.07)	2.15 (1.08)	6.85***
Discouraging denials	2.37 (1.20)	2.25 (1.22)	4.05***
Blaming the victim	2.17 (.97)	1.97 (.97)	6.41***

Note. Items ranged from 1 = *never;* 5 = *always.* Higher scores = more frequent use. T-test results significant at, $p < .05$*, $p < .01$**, $p < .001$***.

Two separate exploratory principal components analyses (PCA) were conducted on the 16 techniques to better understand how these techniques are used during interrogation and whether patterns of techniques are frequently used in conjunction with one another or are conceptually related. Both principal components analyses were conducted with an oblique (direct oblimin) rotation to allow the factors to correlate with one another. Given the exploratory nature of the analysis, there was no a priori reason to believe that the components would not correlate with one another or be orthogonal. Four components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were identified for both the adult model and the adolescent model, accounting for 52% and 58% of the total variance respectively. Component cross-loadings for the models are presented in Table 10. For both models, 11 of the 16 items yielded a component loadings of .50 or greater suggesting that many of the items are used in conjunction with one another. Although the PCA's were conducted independently, the overall pattern of the component loadings were similar across the two models suggesting that officers use the techniques in similar ways when questioning adults and adolescents. Results of the PCA analyses and component cross-loadings for each item are presented in Table 10. An additional table is provided with the final four components and the items comprising each component for additional clarity (see Table 11).

The first component consisted of 'front-end' techniques or pre-interrogation types of items (e.g., *building rapport, observing body language as a cue for deceit, observing speech patterns*). This component accounted for 16% of the variance in the adult model and 17% of the variance in the adolescent model. Mean frequency of use for the pre-interrogation components

Table 10

Component Cross-Loadings of Interrogation Techniques used with Adult versus Juvenile Suspects

	Use with Adult Suspects				Use with Juvenile Suspects			
Interrogation Technique	Comp 1: Pre-inter-rogation	Comp 2: Manipul ation	Comp 3: Confront	Comp 4: Present Evidence	Comp 1: Pre-inter-rogation	Comp 2: Manipul ation	Comp 3: Confront	Comp 4: Present Evidenc e
Observing body language	**.68**	.17	-.05	.08	**.90**	-.02	-.07	.07
Observing speech patterns	**.40**	.06	.25	.19	**.55**	-.10	.17	.26
Building rapport	**.76**	.06	.02	.09	**.82**	.14	-.09	-.10
Offering things for comfort	**.68**	-.04	.15	.04	**.52**	.07	.30	-.10
Discouraging denials	-.10	**.64**	-.04	.32	.05	**.66**	-.02	.16
Suggesting what might have happened	-.11	**.65**	.17	.08	.01	**.60**	.19	.02
Moving physically closer to suspect	.25	**.61**	.06	-.13	.30	**.46**	.27	-.09
Blaming the victim	.06	**.68**	-.13	.05	.02	**.76**	-.14	.15
Minimizing seriousness of offense	.31	**.52**	-.14	.01	.13	**.63**	.13	-.02
Leave alone in interrogation room	.26	**.48**	.18	-.02	.13	**.38**	.36	-.10
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	-.01	-.14	**.78**	.19	.12	.26	**.68**	.29
Using more than one interviewer	.35	.08	**.47**	-.14	-.05	.11	**.68**	.02
Asking same questions repeatedly	-.11	.46	**.57**	-.02	-.07	.29	**.62**	.01
Using deceit	.08	.06	.13	**.68**	-.02	.12	.26	**.69**
Presenting false evidence	.03	.04	-.08	**.83**	.05	.16	-.09	**.84**
Presenting real evidence	.39	.02	.13	**.41**	.43	.17	.04	**.36**

Note. Minimum threshold set at .3 for four-factor solution. Bolded items comprise each respective component

Table 11
Four Components and Corresponding Items

Component 1: Pre-Interrogation	Component 2: Manipulation	Component 3: Confrontation	Component 4: Presentation of Evidence
Building rapport	Discouraging denials	Emphasizing seriousness of offense	Presenting real evidence
Observing body language	Suggesting what might have happened	Using more than one interviewer	Using deceit
Offering things for comfort	Moving physically closer to suspect	Asking same questions repeatedly	Presenting false evidence
Observing speech patterns	Blaming the victim		
	Minimizing seriousness of offense		
	Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room		

Note. Items ranged from 1 = *never;* 5 = *always.*

were 3.66 (*SD* = .85) with adult suspects and 3.32 (*SD* = 1.03) with adolescent suspects. A paired sample t-test revealed officers more frequently use pre-interrogation items on adults compared juveniles $t(336) = 9.89$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.257, .385].

The second component consisted of techniques that were manipulative types of items (e.g., *suggesting what happened, blaming victim, minimizing seriousness of situation*). The manipulative component accounted for 15% of the variance in the adult model and 15% of the total variance in the juvenile model. Mean frequency of use scores for the manipulation components were 2.60 (*SD* = .71) for the adult model and 2.37 (*SD* = .78) for the juvenile model. Follow-up t-test comparing the two means revealed that manipulation items were used more frequently with adult suspects compared to juvenile suspects $t(337) = 10.47$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.184, .269].

The third component was comprised of confrontational types of techniques (e.g., *emphasizing the seriousness of the crime, asking same question repeatedly*). The confrontational component accounted for 11% of the total variance in the adult model and 15% of the total variance in the juvenile model. Mean frequency of use scores for the confrontational components were 2.89 (*SD* = .74) with adult suspects and 2.72 (*SD* = .88) with juvenile suspects. A follow-up t-test comparing the two means revealed that confrontational items were used more frequently with adults compared to juvenile suspects $t(336) = 5.91$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.110, .220].

And finally, the fourth component consisted of techniques that dealt with the presentation of evidence (e.g., *presenting real evidence, presenting false evidence, using deceit*). The presentation of evidence components accounted for 10% of the total variance in the adult model 11% of the variance in the juvenile model. Mean frequency

scores for the presentation of evidence components were 2.75 (*SD* = .76) with adult and 2.49 (*SD* = .87) with juvenile suspects. Analysis of frequency of use revealed that officers more frequently used presentation of evidence items with adults than with juveniles $t(337) = 9.21$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.208, .321].

Overall, the frequency of use for items comprising each respective component was more often used with adult than with juvenile suspects. However, consistent with the results examining each of the individual techniques above, the overall trend of use for the categories of techniques reveals that officers report using these categories of techniques in a similar way with juveniles as they do with adults.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3:

To what extent are certain training characteristics associated with self-reported practices during interrogation with adult and juvenile suspects?

In order to examine the possible relationship between trainings and reported interrogation practices, correlations were conducted for each of the training technique variables and the corresponding variable measuring the frequency of use for that particular technique. The correlation coefficients for training and usage are presented in Table 12. Overall, there was a clear relationship among trainings regarding specific techniques and the frequency of usage for that particular technique. Across all 16 techniques, results of the correlation table indicate that if an officer was trained on a specific technique, the officer used that technique more frequently during interrogation. This pattern was found for interrogation of both adult and juvenile suspects.

Next, correlations were conducted for the training variables and each of the four components to examine whether training experiences were associated with the manner in which techniques were used during interrogation (see Table 13).

Table 12
Correlations Between Technique Training and Self-Reported Use of Corresponding Technique with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

	Frequency of use with adult suspects	Frequency of use with juvenile suspects
Interrogation Technique Trained (Y/N)	*r*	*r*
Building rapport		
Adult	.48**	.28**
Juvenile	.22**	.49**
Observing body language		
Adult	.58**	.43**
Juvenile	.36**	.62**
Offering things for comfort		
Adult	.39**	.29**
Juvenile	.35**	.57**
Observing speech patterns		
Adult	.80**	.68**
Juvenile	.61**	.73**
Presenting real evidence		
Adult	.66**	.55**
Juvenile	.53**	.70**
Moving physically closer to suspect		
Adult	.66**	.55**
Juvenile	.52**	.70**
Minimizing seriousness of offense		
Adult	.65**	.53**
Juvenile	.48**	.62**
Asking same questions repeatedly		
Adult	.64**	.52**
Juvenile	.53**	.66**

Using more than one interviewer		
Adult	.57**	.41**
Juvenile	.44**	.55**
Emphasizing seriousness of offense		
Adult	.64**	.50**
Juvenile	.53**	.64**
Using deceit		
Adult	.57**	.40**
Juvenile	.43**	.67**
Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room		
Adult	.68**	.48**
Juvenile	.55**	.69**
Suggesting what might have happened		
Adult	.75**	.66**
Juvenile	.64**	.72**
Presenting false evidence		
Adult	.61**	.46**
Juvenile	.54**	.65**
Discouraging denials		
Adult	.77**	.73**
Juvenile	.72**	.76**
Blaming the victim		
Adult	.79**	.66**
Juvenile	.66**	.76**

Note. Items ranged from 1 = *never;* 5 = *always.* Higher scores = more frequent use. Correlation coefficients significant at $p < .01$**.

Table 13

Correlations Between Trainings and Component Mean Scores with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

	Use with Adult Suspects				Use with Juvenile Suspects			
	Comp 1: Pre-inter-rogation	Comp 2: Manipul ation	Comp 3: Confron tation	Comp 4: Present Evidenc e	Comp 1: Pre-inter-rogation	Comp 2: Manipul ation	Comp 3: Confron tation	Comp 4: Present Evidenc e
Adolescent Trainings								
Brain Development[a]	**.16****	.10	.03	.04	**.18****	.11	.09	.07
Decision-Making[a]	**.16****	**.13***	.01	.08	**.13***	.08	.02	.08
Laws for Interview Juveniles	**.16****	.09	.03	**.11***	.11	.08	.03	.07
How to Give Miranda to Juvenile	.08	.07	.04	.06	.02	.06	.02	.01
Laws to Involve Parent	.08	.05	.04	.09	.10	.08	.03	.08
Interrogation Trainings								
Reid	**.21****	**.30****	.01	**.13***	**.17****	**.19****	.00	**.11***
Other formal	.08	.08	.01	.02	.04	.07	.01	.04

Note. [a]Only officers' receiving formal classroom or workshop training were included for adolescent psychosocial trainings. Asterisks indicate significant correlation coefficients: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Results of the correlation matrix indicate a positive correlation among officers who received trainings on adolescent psychological development and the first two components: pre-interrogation and manipulation. The direction of the relationship suggests that officers who have received trainings on adolescent brain development and decision-making more frequently use pre-interrogation and manipulation techniques during interrogation. In addition, positive correlations were uncovered for Reid trained officers and all of the components except for confrontation. These results indicate that Reid trained officers more frequently use techniques from the pre-interrogation, manipulation, and presentation of evidence components.

To further explore these relationships, a series of hierarchical linear regression models were conducted to determine which training factors predicted officers' self-reported use of the four interrogation components. Hierarchical models using the four component scores (similar to factor scores) for adult and juvenile suspects were run to compare the effects of the training predictors in both models after accounting for variance due to interrogation experience. Based on the results of the correlation matrix, legal training variables were left out of the models because no relationships among the legal trainings and components (all p's $>.05$) were discovered. The number of interrogations conducted for both adults and juveniles were entered into the models prior to any of the training variables (predictors) to account for variance due to officers having more interrogation experience. Four training variables were included in the models: (a) adolescent brain development, (b) adolescent decision-making, (c) Reid training, and (d) other formal training.

Component 1: Pre-interrogation. This component included items regarding techniques typically employed at the beginning of an interview or during the information gathering stages (see Table 10). As seen in Table 14, step 1 of the model examining interrogation experience was significant, $F(2, 310) = 4.54$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .02$, such that officers' with more experience interrogating suspects were more likely to use pre-interrogation techniques with adult suspects. For step 2 of the model, all of the predictors were entered simultaneously resulting in a significant increase in $R^2 = .07$, $F(6, 306) = 5.24$, $p < .001$. Specifically, Reid trained officers' were more likely to use pre-interrogation types of techniques with adults, compared to non-Reid trained officers, $b = .19$, $t(306) = 3.31$, $p < .001$, CI [.13, .51].

A similar pattern emerged when examining the results for pre-interrogation techniques used with juveniles. After accounting for the variance explained by officers' interrogation experience in step1, $F(2, 310) = 5.08$, $p = .007$, $R^2 = .03$, the full model with the addition of the training variables resulted in a significant increase in $R^2 = .04$, $F(6, 306) = 4.16$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .07$. Similar to the prior analysis with adults, Reid trained officers' were more likely to use pre-interrogation techniques with juveniles, $b = .13$, $t(306) = 2.38$, $p = .02$, CI [.05, .51] even after accounting for variance in interrogation experience with juveniles. Overall, for both adult and juvenile suspects, the Reid training was the only training variable associated with more frequent use of pre-interrogation techniques. All other training variables in the model produced no effects.

Component 2: Manipulation. These items were characterized by more subtle forms of persuasion (*e.g., suggesting what happened, victim blaming, minimizing seriousness of crime*) to obtain a confession (see Table 15). Step 1 of the model for adult

suspects shows that interrogation experience was a significant factor associated with the use of manipulation techniques, $F(2, 310) = 10.40$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$. Step 2 of the model incorporating the training variables was also significant, $F(6, 306) = 8.95$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .15$, and accounted for an increase in $R^2 = .09$. Upon closer examination, Reid training had a significant impact on the increase in effect size for model 2, $b = .27$, $t(306) = 5.06$, $p < .001$, CI [.24, .54] above and beyond the variance accounted for by experience interrogating adults, $b = .13$, $t(306) = 2.21$, $p = .02$, CI [.02, .33].

Similar results emerged from officers' use of manipulation items with juvenile suspects. Step 1 of the model revealed that officers with more interrogation experience, $F(2, 310) = 8.97$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$, and specifically with more juvenile experience, $b = .21$, $t(306) = 3.29$, $p < .001$, CI [.08, .31] were more likely to use manipulation techniques with juveniles. The addition of the training variables in step 2 was also significant, $F(6, 306) = 5.05$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$. Further examination revealed that Reid trained officers were more likely to use manipulation techniques, $b = .17$, $t(306) = 2.97$, $p = .003$, CI [.09, .44], even after controlling for interrogation experience with juveniles, $b = .21$, $t(306) = 3.29$, $p < .001$, CI [.08, .31]. Overall, Reid trained officers reported more frequent use of manipulation techniques compared to all other training variables tested in the model. No other training variables tested were associated with the use of manipulation techniques during interrogation.

Component 3: Confrontation. These items included techniques that were much more direct and accusatory (see Table 10). Examination of officers' self-reported use of confrontational items revealed no association among any of the variables tested in the models for adult or juvenile suspects (see Table 16). No significant relationships were

found for interrogation experience, adolescent trainings, or interrogation trainings, and the use of confrontational techniques during interrogation.

Component 4: Presentation of Evidence. Techniques in this component involved the use of presenting evidence to the suspect, real or false, and the use of deceit (see Table 10). Results of the hierarchical regressions revealed that only interrogation experience with juveniles, $b = .24$, $t(310) = 3.87$, $p < .001$, CI [.13, .39] was associated with the use of presentation techniques with juvenile suspects, $F(2, 310) = 9.31$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$. All other experience and training variables in both models (adult and juvenile) were not significant in step 2 of the regressions examining the use of presentation techniques (see Table 17).

Table 14
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Pre-Interrogation Items

Component 1: Pre-Interrogation	B	SE	*b*	*t*	*P*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult – Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 4.54$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .02$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.18	.10	.11	1.73	.08	-.02	.37
Interrogation experience – Juv	.09	.07	.08	1.37	.17	-.03	.22
Adult – Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 5.24$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.17	.10	.11	1.79	.08	-.02	.37
Interrogation experience – Juv	.03	.07	.03	.52	.61	-.10	.16
Brain development	.07	.13	.04	.52	.61	-.19	.33
Decision making	.23	.12	.13	1.88	.06	-.01	.47
Reid training	**.32****	.10	**.19****	3.31	**.001**	.13	.51
Other formal training	.15	.09	.09	1.64	.10	-.03	.34
Juvenile: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 5.08$, $p = .007$, $R^2 = .03$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.07	.12	.04	.55	.58	-.17	.31
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.20***	.08	**.16***	2.52	**.01**	.04	.36
Juvenile: Step 2 $F(6, 306) = 4.16$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .07$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.07	.12	.04	.57	.57	-.17	.31
Interrogation experience – Juv	.14	.08	.11	1.80	.07	-.01	.30
Brain development	.20	.16	.08	1.24	.22	-.12	.51
Decision making	.18	.15	.08	1.23	.22	-.11	.48
Reid training	**.28***	.12	**.13***	2.38	**.02**	.05	.51
Other formal training	.10	.11	.05	.84	.40	-.13	.32

Note: Asterisks indicate significant unstandardized and standardized coefficients at: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 15
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Manipulation Items

Component 2: Manipulation	B	SE	*b*	*t*	*p*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 10.40$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	**.17***	.08	**.13***	2.09	**.03**	.01	.34
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.14***	.05	**.16***	2.61	**.01**	.03	.25
Adult: Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 8.95$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .15$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	**.18***	.08	**.13***	2.21	**.03**	.02	.33
Interrogation experience – Juv	.09	.05	.10	1.69	.09	-.02	.19
Brain development	-.03	.11	-.02	-.26	.79	-.23	.18
Decision making	.13	.10	.09	1.37	.17	-.06	.33
Reid training	**.39*****	.08	**.27*****	5.06	**.001**	.24	.54
Other formal training	.14	.08	.10	1.79	.07	-.01	.28
Juvenile: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 8.97$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.08	.09	.05	.83	.41	-.10	.26
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.20****	.06	**.21****	3.29	**.001**	.08	.31
Juvenile: Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 5.05$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.07	.09	.05	.80	.43	-.11	.25
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.16****	.06	**.17****	2.67	**.008**	.04	.28
Brain development	.10	.12	.06	.85	.39	-.13	.34
Decision making	.01	.11	.01	.10	.92	-.21	.23
Reid training	**.26****	.09	**.17****	2.97	**.003**	.09	.44
Other formal training	.13	.09	.08	1.50	.14	-.04	.30

Note: Asterisks indicate significant unstandardized and standardized coefficients at: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Table 16
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Confrontational Items

Component 3: Confrontation	B	SE	*b*	*t*	*p*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 1.91$, $p = .15$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.16	.09	.12	1.84	.07	-.01	.34
Interrogation experience – Juv	-.02	.06	-.02	-.26	.79	-.13	.10
Adult: Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 0.65$, $p = .69$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.16	.09	.12	1.82	.07	-.01	.34
Interrogation experience – Juv	-.01	.06	-.01	-.20	.84	-.13	.11
Brain development	-.02	.12	-.01	-.18	.86	-.26	.21
Decision making	-.01	.11	-.01	-.10	.92	-.23	.21
Reid training	-.01	.09	-.01	-.10	.92	-.18	.16
Other formal training	-.01	.09	-.01	-.10	.92	-.18	.16
Juvenile: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 1.99$, $p = .14$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.11	.11	.07	1.02	.31	-.10	.32
Interrogation experience – Juv	.07	.07	.07	1.04	.30	-.06	.21
Juvenile: Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 0.84$, $p = .54$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.11	.11	.07	1.01	.31	-.10	.32
Interrogation experience – Juv	.07	.07	.06	.97	.33	-.07	.21
Brain development	.12	.14	.06	.85	.40	-.16	.39
Decision making	-.01	.13	-.01	-.10	.92	-.27	.25
Reid training	-.03	.10	-.02	-.29	.77	-.23	.17
Other formal training	-.03	.10	-.02	-.26	.80	-.22	.17

Note: Asterisks indicate significant unstandardized and standardized coefficients at: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Table 17
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for the Presentation of Evidence Items

Component 4: Presentation of Evidence	B	SE	*b*	*t*	*P*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 5.68$, $p = .004$, $R^2 = .03$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.12	.09	.09	1.35	.18	-.06	.30
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.12***	.06	**.13***	2.10	**.04**	.01	.24
Adult: Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 2.56$, $p = .02$, $R^2 = .05$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	.13	.09	.09	1.42	.16	-.05	.31
Interrogation experience – Juv	.11	.06	.11	1.76	.08	-.01	.22
Brain development	-.05	.12	-.03	-.44	.66	-.29	.18
Decision making	.04	.11	.03	.39	.69	-.18	.27
Reid training	.16	.09	.11	1.84	.07	-.01	.34
Other formal training	-.03	.09	-.02	-.31	.76	-.20	.14
Juvenile: Step 1: $F(2, 310) = 9.31$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	-.01	.10	-.01	-.12	.91	-.21	.19
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.26****	.07	**.24****	3.87	**.001**	.13	.39
Juvenile: Step 2: $F(6, 306) = 3.50$, $p = .002$, $R^2 = .06$							
Interrogation experience – Adult	-.01	.10	-.01	-.06	.95	-.21	.20
Interrogation experience – Juv	**.24****	.07	**.23****	3.54	**.001**	.11	.38
Brain development	.06	.14	.03	.43	.67	-.21	.33
Decision making	.01	.13	.01	.01	.99	-.25	.25
Reid training	.12	.10	.07	1.22	.22	-.07	.32
Other formal training	-.06	.10	-.04	-.63	.53	-.25	.13

Note: Asterisks indicate significant unstandardized and standardized coefficients at: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Discussion

The purpose of this investigation was threefold: (1) to more thoroughly understand the breath of training experiences of police officers who question suspects regarding crimes, especially as training relates to the questioning of adult versus juvenile suspects, (2) to document and directly compare the self-reported interrogation practices of police officers with adults suspects to that of juvenile suspects, and (3) to examine how training experiences are associated with the actual use of interrogation techniques and the manner in which they are used. Overall, results suggest that nearly all the interrogators have received some combination of formal and on-the-job training with the Reid training comprising the most common formal training experience. Although the content varied somewhat based on the formal training experience, similar training patterns and self-reported practices emerged for the questioning of adult and juvenile suspects. In addition, the strategies and manner in which techniques were used during interrogation varied as a function of the formal training experience, and not whether the suspect was an adult or juvenile. Understanding how police officers are trained and the tactics they use is an important step in the prevention of miscarriages of justice. The following summarizes the findings in more detail relative to the current state of interrogation literature, possible implications, study limitations, and a few concluding remarks.

Interrogation Training and the "Training Gap"

For years now, social scientists have been writing about the Reid method and basing their experimental designs on techniques promoted in the Reid manual (Inbau et al., 2013) with very little data to support or know how many officers actually receive this training. The current data suggest that approximately half (56%) of police officers who

are responsible for conducting criminal investigations are Reid trained which is more consistent with the Kostelnik and Reppucci (2009) rate of 57% of detectives and refutes the Kassin et al. (2007) rate of 11%. Moreover, the issue that has received even less attention is how the other half of investigating officers are trained to interrogate suspects. The conclusion from these findings is that Reid training is the predominant method but there is a vast array of other interrogation trainings police officers receive that researchers know very little about. Although the Reid method was the most common formal training for police officers and mattered in distinctive ways, nearly every officer in our sample had received on the job training from other officers and nearly half of the sample reported receiving other formal interrogation trainings. Our results suggest a wide variety of formal training experiences beyond merely attending a Reid workshop were reported by most officers. Unfortunately, the sample sizes for any particular training (28 or fewer) were too small to conduct any group comparisons regarding other formal interrogation trainings. This restricted the possible comparison groups mostly to Reid and non-Reid.

However, based on the officers' open-ended responses regarding the other formal trainings, it appeared that most had a particular theme (e.g., detection deception, statement analysis, polygraph courses). Some of these themes are covered in the Reid manual and Reid trained officers did report receiving training in these areas (e.g., *observing body language as a cue for deceit; observing speech patterns as a cue for deceit*). So there is reason to believe that some overlap exists across specific domains of interrogation tactics and why non-Reid trained officers implement some similar techniques. This may help explain why officers in previous studies (Kassin et al., 2007) have implemented 'Reid-like' tactics without having formally received the training

(Meyer & Reppucci, 2009). For officers trained in specific content areas, such as deception detection, they may rely more heavily on those types of techniques, and therefore, use them more often during interrogation or have less flexibility for use with other approaches when the current tactics are not meeting the desired goal. Future research should recruit more officers who have participated in formal trainings other than the Reid technique to better understand the content provided in these trainings and how these approaches vary in comparison to the Reid technique.

Training Content with Adult and Juvenile Suspects

While this might be more reflective of the unique sample than police in general, analyses examining the content of training experiences found officers were trained on a considerable number of techniques for use with adults and juveniles. On average, officers were trained to use 13 of the 16 different techniques with adults and 11 of the 16 with juveniles. As a whole, officers were more likely to have received formal training on specific techniques for use with an adult suspect rather than a juvenile suggesting that most of the trainings are geared toward use with adults. However, similar training patterns for the individual techniques emerged across the sample for the questioning of juveniles and adults. The majority of officers (70% or more) were most likely to have received training on rapport building techniques, deception detection, presenting evidence, and the use of deceit for both adult and juvenile suspects. Victim blaming and discouraging denials were the techniques officers reported receiving the least amount of training. Nonetheless, for every technique included in the study at least half of the sample reported they had received training on how to use that particular technique with a juvenile suspect revealing a wide range of different techniques available for use. Even

the controversial techniques of using deceit and presenting false evidence to juveniles had endorsement rates of 70% and 57% respectively. Officers were also more likely to report receiving training for juvenile suspects via informal methods rather than from a class or workshop suggesting they are learning these techniques on the job from other officers. One conclusion (Feld, 2013; Kassin, 2010; Meyer, 2007) is that interrogation trainings are generally intended for questioning adults and trainings specifically designed to account for the unique needs of juveniles are extremely rare if they exist at all. Findings from this study would further solidify that narrative as the overall trend in this sample suggests very few differences in trainings as a function of the suspect's legal status as an adult.

Interrogation Practices with Adults and Juveniles

A relationship between training content and practices was associated with the increased use of particular techniques during interrogation for both adults and juveniles. If an officer was trained to use a particular technique, he/she used that technique more often indicating a connection between the content that is learned during training and actual practices inside the interrogation room. While this finding might seem blatantly obvious, this study is the first to find such a connection among trainings for specific techniques and their actual use during interrogations filling in a much needed gap in the literature.

Although each technique was generally used less frequently with juveniles, the manner in which they were applied during interrogation was similar to that of interrogation with adults. Consistent with the training results reported, officers reported the use of rapport building techniques, deception detection, and the presentation of

evidence as the tactics they most frequently use to obtain a confession. This finding is not surprising considering that these tactics are likely to be used at the beginning of an interrogation. Therefore, even an interview lasting only 5 minutes may use some rapport building and early disclosures of real evidence against the suspect. As a result, many of the other interrogation techniques may not even be needed and thus, less frequently used. However, the high frequency with which officers report using body language and speech patterns as cues for deceit is somewhat alarming because a substantial research literature (Vrij et al., 2010) exists that clearly shows that police officers are no better than chance (50%) at accurately detecting deception. Yet, these data show that not only is this a frequently taught strategy, it is also used more than any other strategy with the exception of rapport building. These strategies can be particularly problematic for adolescents inside the interrogation room as typical teen behaviors such as slouching, poor posture, and avoiding eye contact can be interpreted as indicative of deceit (Inbau et al, 2013) increasing the likelihood that a detective will view them as guilty. Moreover, although Meyer and Reppucci (2007) found that officers recognize the fallibility in deception detection with youth, a growing body of literature is reporting the persistent use of techniques involving deception detection with both juveniles and adults. Given the current findings, these types of techniques may be heavily emphasized during trainings, and therefore, more likely to be used during questioning. Future research should investigate the confidence level that officers believe they can reliably detect deception and whether that level is related to training experiences.

Items that were reported as the least frequently used were victim blaming, discouraging denials, and the presentation of false evidence. While it is encouraging that

the presentation of false evidence was one of the least frequently used techniques, 66% of the officers reported using it with juveniles and 12% reported they often or always use this technique with juveniles. Many believe the use of this technique may place an undue burden of pressure upon the juvenile, and therefore capitalize on vulnerabilities related to impulsive decision-making and the inaccurate assessment of long-term consequences associated with short-term gains ("I must confess to get out of here"). Although there appears to be some refrain from using this technique in comparison to others, there are still many officers who report using this technique. And with its use for adults only slightly above that of juveniles, it does not appear there is any unique hesitation from using the technique with juveniles but rather a more general one.

Overall, there was very little difference in the self-reported practices of officers for interrogation practices among juveniles and adults. Generally, officers reported using the techniques slightly less frequently with adolescents compared to adults. However, this could be explained by research showing that juvenile interrogations are typically much shorter in duration (Cleary, 2014; Feld, 2013).

Interrogation Training and Practices

The manner in which certain techniques were used in conjunction with one another seemed to vary based on training experiences, especially the Reid training. Contrary to the criticism of several scholars (Kassin, et al., 2010; Owen-Kostelnik, Reppucci, & Meyer, 2006), it appears that Reid trained officers are not any more likely to use controversial techniques such as fabricating evidence or deceit than non-Reid trained officers. Rather, they are more likely to implement subtle tactics that rely on rapport

building, deception detection, and psychologically manipulative persuasion tactics such as suggesting what might have happened or minimizing the seriousness of the crime.

Across the entire sample, few differences emerged in training for confrontational types of techniques and tactics involving the presentation of evidence, either real or fake. This finding suggests that these types of techniques may be more 'generally' taught and more likely associated with informal training or job shadowing another officer. Some of the highest endorsement rates for informal trainings were in regard to these categories of techniques, especially for adult suspects. In contrast, the subtly manipulative techniques such as minimizing the seriousness of the crime and moving physically closer to the suspect (a rapport tactic) were much more likely to be learned from a formal training, most likely the Reid training as some of the largest differences resulted from analyses of these types of techniques. Logically, this makes sense as these techniques are (arguably) more sophisticated than simply confronting a suspect with evidence or asking the same question repeatedly (to encourage the desired answer, usually a confession). Furthermore, the current findings suggest that officers do use the techniques in a different manner as a function of training experience and not the age of the suspect. The final set of analyses show that Reid trained officers are more likely to use pre-interrogation and manipulative types of tactics compared to non-Reid trained officers. These results were found across models as well, suggesting that the use of these techniques does not differ across adults and juveniles.

Training on Adolescent Development and Policy Implications

Officers were asked about any trainings they had received on the topic of adolescent brain development and how adolescent decision-making is different from

adults. These items were included in the survey and analyzed for exploratory purposes because they were important for furthering our understanding of how officers question juveniles for two reasons: (a) as an initial step in understanding how many officers have received any training on adolescent psychosocial development and (b) to examine the possible association of interrogation practices used by officers questioning juveniles. Many advocates of policy change for the questioning of juveniles have proposed educational training for detectives on the psychosocial development of teens as a possible strategy for decreasing the likelihood that officers will use questioning techniques that could exploit the developmental vulnerabilities of adolescents' decision-making capacities. As a result, police would be less inclined to use certain techniques (e.g., deceit) that increase the likelihood of an adolescent falsely confessing. To date, we had no data or published studies on the prevalence rates for officers who have received these types of educational trainings, and this dissertation was an initial step toward that understanding.

Results of the analyses for the adolescent training items revealed that about a quarter (22-25%) of the sample reported receiving formal training on adolescent brain development and/or adolescent decision-making. Unfortunately, no relationship was found between adolescent trainings and the use (or refrained use) of particular techniques. One possible explanation could be the intent of the trainings was not on the cautioned use of particular techniques to prevent false confessions from occurring. Rather, the intent may have focused on how to more effectively acquire confessions from youth with little regard to the likelihood of obtaining false confessions. An examination of when the trainings took place reveals that many of the officers received this training 10

years ago when much of what we now know about adolescent brain development simply did not exist. This fact suggests the intent of the trainings was not likely to focus on the cautioned use of certain techniques with adolescents, but this is purely speculative. On the other hand, the intent of the current initiatives on adolescent trainings by IACP clearly underscore the need for different questioning strategies for juveniles as a way to help prevent false confessions from occurring. Unfortunately, the items in the current survey did not clearly ask officers about the intent of the trainings. Future research should more clearly define the goals of various trainings for officers, especially as they relate to interactions with juveniles. It should also monitor the practices of police officers before and after receiving these trainings to evaluate what impact it had, if any, on how police interrogate youth.

Overall, the results of the current study add to the small, but growing, literature examining the interrogation practices of police with juveniles (Cleary, 2014; Feld, 2013; Meyer & Reppucci; 2009) and draws the same major conclusion: it is difficult to distinguish any differences in the way that police interrogate youth versus adults. Researchers, policy advocates, and even the Supreme Court (*J.D.B v. North Carolina, 2011*) have asserted that youth should be questioned differently from adults but ultimately, the question is how? Based on extant research, it would be extremely difficult and speculative to determine with any kind of accuracy how often a particular technique produces a valid ('true') confession or conversely, a false one. Obviously, there are certain ethical restrictions to designing and conducting an experimental manipulation that randomly assigns youth to different questioning conditions by police. That said, there is

some evidence from the research that certain techniques may increase the likelihood of obtaining a false confession from youth (Redlich, 2003).

First, there is clear and convincing evidence that police officers cannot accurately detect deception greater than chance (Vrij, 2010). Therefore, the use of techniques and trainings that advocate the use of analyzing body language as a cue for deceit should cease. For example, the Reid training instructs officers that behaviors such as fidgeting, slouching, and lack of eye contact are indicative of lying and therefore, the juvenile is guilty of the crime in question (Inbau et al, 2013). The fact that these behaviors are typical mannerisms of teenagers regardless of whether they are telling the truth or lying is forgotten in the interrogation context (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). Decisions regarding whether to proceed with an interrogation of a juvenile should be based on other types of evidence such as witness statements, physical evidence, or other relevant contextual information (e.g. suspect member of feuding gangs).

Ironically, police *are* legally permitted to lie or fabricate evidence during interrogation. These types of techniques should be used with extreme caution or only in the rarest of instances with juveniles. Laboratory studies (Redlich, 2003; Russano, 2005) show that the use of these techniques with youth increases the likelihood of obtaining a false confession. Even the authors of the Reid manual (Inbau, 2013) have recently publicly acknowledged that the use of these tactics can be problematic but only discouraged their use with ‘young children’ (10 years old and younger) and made no explicit recommendation regarding adolescents.

Finally, the use of questioning techniques that suggest what might have happened should be used with extreme caution with teenagers. Research shows that teenagers are

more suggestible to comply with authority figures (Steinberg, 2003) and questioning techniques that involve leading or forced-alternate choices (e.g. ‘did you plan this out or was it a spur of the moment type of thing?’) may increase the likelihood of obtaining a false confession.

Viable alternative models for the interrogation of adolescents could parallel models describing the manner in which we question youth as witnesses (Lowell, et al., 2011). These models usually place a heavy emphasis on the use of open-ended questioning techniques and information gathering regarding the narrative given by the child (e.g., who, what, where). Disseminating these alternative approaches to interrogators could decrease the likelihood of obtaining false confessions from juveniles.

Limitations

As with any study, there are limitations that should be carefully evaluated when drawing conclusions from the results. The first concern is the use of self-report data in determining what happens when suspects are questioned by police because participants, particularly youth, may underreport socially undesirable behaviors. Police officers in this study had no tangible incentive to disclose tactics used during interrogation that could be perceived as particularly coercive such as physically intimidating the suspect, threatening the suspect with consequences of non-compliance, or overtly deceiving the suspect with fabricated evidence. Given the general skepticism of police regarding academic researchers, this is certainly a valid concern and it’s possible that this data does not capture the extent to which police use such practices. However, after an examination of the frequencies (see Table 9) of interrogation techniques, there appears to be no evidence of underreporting and a fairly normal distribution across the various interrogation

techniques. In addition, endorsement of some of the more harsh tactics such as the use of deceit and presenting false evidence make it seem unlikely that participants are responding in socially desirable ways. Police are instructed and legally permitted to use all of the techniques included in this study, and generally speaking, are permitted to use any techniques that are not physically harmful, or making explicit promises of leniency for cooperation. Therefore, it seems unlikely that police would view such tactics as socially undesirable. Nonetheless, scientific studies that use alternative approaches such as self-reported data from juveniles that have been interrogated or observational studies (e.g., videotaped interrogations) are needed to more accurately assess the techniques used during interrogation and the veracity with which they are used.

Another limitation was the lack of contextual information gathered that might impact officers' decisions regarding the use of particular interrogation techniques. While some interesting and meaningful results were uncovered, the effect sizes for each model were relatively small and many contextual variables could help explain more about the nature of interrogations. It is possible that officers use interrogation tactics in different ways depending on the nature of the crime being investigated. For instance, do interrogation techniques and strategies change as a function of the severity of the crime? Do officers use different questioning techniques when they are investigating a violent crime (murder, sexual assault) versus a non-violent crime (drug trafficking)? Does the use of interrogation techniques change when officers are aware that the interrogation is being videotaped? Future research is needed examining all the possible contextual variables that might impact the manner in which an officer conducts an interrogation.

Finally, the relatively small sample may limit the generalizability of the findings and the conclusions that can be drawn. However, given the vast interrogation experiences of the officers and the ecological validity of the sample, it seems reasonable to assume these officers are fairly representative of the officers responsible for investigating crimes and the interrogation of suspects. Nevertheless, it is important to be careful regarding the extent to which our results can generalize to other investigating officers and what actually happens during police questioning without corroborating evidence such as videotaped interrogations or direct observations.

Conclusion

This investigation has examined the training backgrounds of experienced interrogators and the potential relationship to practices used during interrogation. This study was also the first to directly compare the interrogation techniques used with adults to those used with juveniles from a sample of investigating officers. The overall findings suggest: (1) interrogators learn specific strategies for interrogation via a combination of on-the-job training from a more experienced officer and a formal training, most likely the Reid method; (2) there does appear to be a relationship between the content learned during trainings and actual practices used inside the interrogation room; and (3) based on the self-reported interrogation practices of police, it appears that youth and adults are interrogated in very similar ways.

For officers the goal of an interrogation is to obtain a confession from the suspect. To reach this goal, officers are likely to use the techniques they believe will be most useful in persuading the suspect to confess to the crime. If, as the results here suggest, training experiences can impact the use (or refrained use) of certain techniques to meet

that goal, there is potential for researchers to incorporate the science behind adolescent development into training protocols for interrogation. DNA exoneration cases strongly illustrate that false confessions are one of the highest risk factors associated with wrongful convictions and juveniles are disproportionately represented in these cases. Current approaches to interrogation with youth may increase the likelihood of future instances occurring. As more cases of wrongful convictions are discovered, law enforcement officers have a vested interest to prevent such cases from happening to protect their professional reputation, as well as the reputation of the department, the financial costs to the city (average settlement in false confession cases with juveniles is $8.2 million dollars - www.innocenceproject.org) and as a matter of public safety (i.e., the perpetrator remains in the community). It is the author's hope that the findings here can provide an incremental step toward incorporating separate questioning procedures for juveniles that is developmentally appropriate and yet empathetic to the unique challenges of police officers accurately determining the perpetrators of crimes. Although the dissemination of such trainings and practices would prove difficult, examples for the integration of social science and policy in other areas such as the questioning of child victims and the altering of eyewitness procedures has the author optimistic these goals can be achieved.

References

Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L. (2000). Immaturity of judgment in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *18*, 741-760.

Cleary, H. M. D. (2014). Police interviewing and interrogation of juvenile suspects: A descriptive examination of actual cases. *Law and Human Behavior, 38,* 271-282.

Drizin, S. A., & Leo, R. A. (2004). The problem of false confessions in the post-DNA world. *North Carolina Law Review*, *82*, 891–1007.

Drizin, S., Nawoichyk, J., Nirider, L., & Tepfer, J. (2012). Reducing risks: An executive's guide to effective juvenile interview and interrogation. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Guide.

Fagan, J., & Piquero, A. R. (2007). Rational choice and developmental influences on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, *4*, 715–748.

Fagan, J., & Tyler, T. (2005). Legal socialization of children and adolescents. *Social Justice Research*, *18*, 217 – 241.

Fare v. Michael C., 442 U.S. 707 (1979).

Feld, B. C. (2006). Police interrogation of juveniles: An empirical study of policy and practice. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *97*, 219–316.

Feld, B. C. (2013). Real interrogation: What actually happens when cops question kids. *Law and Society Review*, *47*, 1–36.

Fried, C. S., & Reppucci, N. D. (2001). Criminal decision-making: The development of adolescent judgment, criminal responsibility, and culpability. *Law and Human*

Behavior, 25, 45–61.

Garrett, B. L. (2010). The substance of false confessions. *Stanford Law Review, 62,* 1051-119.

Grisso, T. (1981). Juveniles' waiver of rights: Legal and psychological competence. New York: Plenum.

Grisso, T. (2003). Evaluating competencies: Forensic assessments and instruments (2nd edition). New York: Plenum.

Gross, S. R., Jacoby, K., Matheson, D. J., Montgomery, N., & Patil, S. (2005). Exonerations in the United States 1989 through 2003. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 95,* 523-560.

Heuer, L., Penrod, S. D., & Kattan, A. (2007). The role of resource and relational concerns among decision makers and decision recipients. *Law and Human Behavior*, *31*, 573 – 610.

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

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

In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).

J.D.B. v. North Carolina, 131 U.S. 2394 (2011).

Kassin, S. M. (2007). Internalized false confessions. In M. P. Toglia, J. D. Read, D. F. Ross, & R. C. L. Lindsay (Eds.), *The handbook of eyewitness psychology, Vol. 1*: Memory for events (pp.175–192). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

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 and Human Behavior*, *34*, 3–38.

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.

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

Kelly, C. E., Miller, J. C., Redlich, A. D., & Kleinman, S. M. (2013). A taxonomy of interrogation methods. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 1–14.

Kostelnik, J. O., & Reppucci, N. D. (2009). Reid training and sensitivity to developmental maturity in interrogation: Results from a national survey of police. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *27*, 361 – 379.

Lassiter, G. D., Ware, L. J., Lindberg, M. J., & Ratcliff, J. J. (2010). Videotaping custodial interrogations: Toward a scientifically based policy (pp. 143-160). In G.D. Lassiter & C.A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations.* Washington, DC: APA.

Leo, R., (1996). Inside the interrogation room. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 86,* 266-303.

Lowell, D. I., Carter, A. S. Godoy, L., Paulicin, B., & Briggs-Gowan, M. J. (2011). A randomized control trial of Child First: A comprehensive home based intervention translating research into early childhood practice. *Child Development, 82*, 193-208.

Lubke, G. H., & Muthen, B. O. (2004). Applying multigroup confirmatory factor models

for continuous outcomes to Likert scale data complicates meaningful group comparisons. *Structural Equation Modeling, 11*, 514-534.

McMahon, D., (Producer) & Burns, K. (Director), 2012. *The Central Park Five* [Documentary]. United States: Florentine Films.

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

Meyer, J. R., & Reppucci, N. D. (2007). Police practices and perceptions regarding juvenile interrogation and interrogative suggestibility. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *25*, 757-780.

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966).

Owen-Kostelnik, J., Reppucci, N.D., & Meyer, J. (2006) Testimony and interrogation of minors: Assumptions of immaturity and immorality. *American Psychologist*, *61*, 286-304.

Piquero, A. R., Fagan, J., Mulvey, E. P., Steinberg, L., & Odgers, C. (2005). Developmental trajectories of legal socialization among serious adolescent offenders. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *96*, 267 – 298.

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

Redlich, A. D., Silverman, M. A., Chen, J., & Steiner, H. (2004). The police interrogation of children and adolescents. In G. D. Lassiter (Ed.), *Interrogations, confessions, and entrapment* (pp. 107 – 125) New York: Kluwer Academic.

Redlich, A. D., Silverman, M. A., & Steiner, H. (2003). Factors affecting preadjudicative and adjudicative competence in juveniles and young adults. *Behavioral Sciences*

and the Law, 21, 1-17.

Reppucci, N. D., Meyer, J., & Kostelnik, J. (2010). Custodial interrogation of juveniles: Results of a national survey of police (pp. 67-80). In G.D. Lassiter & C.A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations.* Washington, DC: APA.

Schafer, J. A. (2010). The ineffective police leader: Acts of commission and omission. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38,* 737-746.

Scheck, B., Neufeld, P., & Dwyer, J. (2000). *Actual innocence*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Scott, E. S., Reppucci, N. D., & Woolard, J. L. (1995). Evaluating adolescent decision making in legal contexts. *Law and Human Behavior, 19,* 221-244.

Shulman, E. P., Cauffman, E., Piquero, A. R., & Fagan, J. (2011). Moral disengagement among series juvenile offenders: A longitudinal study of the relations between morally disengaged attitudes and offending. *Developmental Psychology, 47,* 1619-1632.

Steinberg, L. (2005). Cognitive and affective development in adolescence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 9(2),* 69-74.

Steinberg, L. (2007). Risk taking in adolescence new perspectives from brain and behavioral science. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16(2),* 55-59.

Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence. *Law and Human Behavior, 20(3),* 249-272.

Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., Woolard, J., Graham, S. & Banich, M. (2009). Are adolescents less mature than adults? Minors' access to abortion, the juvenile death penalty, and

the alleged APA "flip-flop." *American Psychologist, 58(12),* 1009-1018.

Steinberg, L., & Scott, E. (2003). Less guilty by reason of adolescence. *American Psychologist, 58(12),* 1009-1018.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics, 6th ed.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tepfer, J., Nirider, L., & Tricarico, L. (2010). Arresting development: Convictions of innocent youth. *Rutgers Law Review, 62,* 12-03.

Viljoen, J. L., Klaver, J., & Roesch, R. (2005). Legal decisions of preadolescent and adolescent defendants: Predictors of confessions, pleas, communication with attorneys, and appeals. *Law and Human Behavior, 29(3),* 253–277.

Vrij, A. (2000). Detecting lies and deceit: The psychology of lying and the implications for professional practice. Wiley.

Vrij, A., Fisher, R. P., Mann, S., & Leal, S. (2010). Lie detection: Pitfalls and opportunities (pp. 97-110). In G.D. Lassiter & C.A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research practice, and policy recommendations*. Washington, DC: APA.

Woolard, J. L., Harvell, S., & Graham, S. (2008). Anticipatory injustice among adolescents: Age and racial/ethnic differences in perceived unfairness of the justice system. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 26*, 207–226.

Yarborough v. Alvarado, 541 U.S. 652 (2004).

Appendix

Police Training on Interviewing Suspects

In the following survey, we will use the term "interview" to mean any session of questioning with a person suspected of a crime. This could include a formal interrogation at the police station, or more informal questioning elsewhere.

For the purposes of this survey, please consider a "juvenile" to be any person under the age of 18.

1. Over your entire career, how many times have you participated in an interview of an **ADULT** suspected of a crime?

0 1-10 11-50 51-100 More than 100

2. Over your entire career, how many times have you participated in an interview of a **JUVENILE** suspected of a crime?

0 1-10 11-50 51-100 More than 100

3. Over your entire career, how many times have you participated in an interview conducted **ON SCHOOL PROPERTY** of a juvenile suspected of a crime?

0 1-10 11-50 51-100 More than 100

4. Prior to arriving here at the National Academy, in which of the following have you participated, **<u>in order to learn how to conduct interviews with criminal suspects</u>?** *Please check all that apply in Columns 1 and 2. If you have **NOT** received any training pertaining to a particular method listed in Column 1, you do **NOT** need to answer the additional questions in Columns 3-7 pertaining to that training method.*

Only answer these additional questions if you checked "YES" in Column 2 →

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Source of training:	**Have you received training?**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your <u>most recent</u> training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
a) **<u>Formal</u>** training in the Reid Technique of interviewing (John E. Reid & Associates)	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful
b) **<u>Formal</u>** training in the P.E.A.C.E. Model of interviewing (**P**reparation and Planning, **E**ngage and Explain, **A**ccount, **C**losure, **E**valuation)	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Source of training:	**Have you received training?**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your <u>most recent</u> training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
c) **<u>Formal</u>** training in the HUMINT Model of interviewing (**Hum**an **Int**elligence)	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful
d) **<u>Formal</u>** training in the ChildFirst forensic interview method	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful
e) **<u>Formal</u>** training in some other type of interviewing method *(please describe):* _____ _____ _____ _____	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Source of training:	**Have you received training?**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your <u>most recent</u> training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
f) On-the-job training about how to interview suspects (like shadowing a more experienced officer during an interview or interrogation)	□ Yes □ No	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
g) Book, manual, or other printed resource about how to interview suspects	□ Yes □ No	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
h) Instructional video about how to interview suspects	□ Yes □ No	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Source of training:	**Have you received training?**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your <u>most recent</u> training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
i) Online training program about how to interview suspects	□ Yes □ No	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
j) Other *(if applicable, please describe):* _____ _____ _____ _____	□ Yes □ No	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful

5. Within any police job you have held, have you ever received any training or information on the following topics? *Please check all that apply in Columns 1 and 2. If you have **NOT** received any training pertaining to a particular topic listed in Column 1, you do **NOT** need to answer the additional questions in Columns 3-8 pertaining to that topic.*

Only answer these additional questions if you checked "YES" in Column 2

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Topic:	**Have you received training?**	**What type of training did you receive? Please check all that apply.**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your most recent training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
a) Adolescent brain development	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Class or workshop ☐ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer ☐ Written information or manual	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful
b) Adolescent decision making compared to adult decision making	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Class or workshop ☐ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer ☐ Written information or manual	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Topic:	**Have you received training?**	**What type of training did you receive? Please check all that apply.**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your most recent training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
c) How peers influence adolescents' behavior	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
d) Special needs of juvenile suspects	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Topic:	**Have you received training?**	**What type of training did you receive? Please check all that apply.**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your most recent training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
e) Laws or policies related to interviewing juvenile suspects	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
f) How to give Miranda rights to a juvenile suspect	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Topic:	**Have you received training?**	**What type of training did you receive? Please check all that apply.**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your most recent training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
g) How to evaluate whether a juvenile suspect is competent to waive his/her Miranda rights	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
h) Laws or policies related to interviewing a juvenile suspect on school property	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Topic:	**Have you received training?**	**What type of training did you receive? Please check all that apply.**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your most recent training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
i) Youth gangs	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful
j) Laws or policies concerning a juvenile suspect's parent/guardian involvement in interviews	□ Yes □ No	□ Class or workshop □ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer □ Written information or manual	□ Less than 4 hours □ 4 hours to 1 day □ 1 to 5 days □ More than 5 days	□ Within the past 6 months □ Within the past 2 years □ Within the past 10 years □ More than 10 years ago	□ Required □ Voluntary	□ 1 – Not at all satisfied □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat satisfied □ 4 □ 5 – Very satisfied	□ 1 – Not at all useful □ 2 □ 3 – Somewhat useful □ 4 □ 5 – Very useful

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Topic:	**Have you received training?**	**What type of training did you receive? Please check all that apply.**	**All together, about how many hours was this training?**	**How long ago was your most recent training?**	**Was this training a job requirement, or was it voluntary?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how SATISFIED were you with this training?**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how USEFUL has this training been when interviewing suspects?**
k) Other topics about adolescents and the law *(please describe)*: _____ _____ _____	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Class or workshop ☐ On-the-job experience or guidance from another officer ☐ Written information or manual	☐ Less than 4 hours ☐ 4 hours to 1 day ☐ 1 to 5 days ☐ More than 5 days	☐ Within the past 6 months ☐ Within the past 2 years ☐ Within the past 10 years ☐ More than 10 years ago	☐ Required ☐ Voluntary	☐ 1 – Not at all satisfied ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat satisfied ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very satisfied	☐ 1 – Not at all useful ☐ 2 ☐ 3 – Somewhat useful ☐ 4 ☐ 5 – Very useful

6. The following table (items a-t) lists techniques that police officers sometimes use when interviewing suspects. **Columns 2-3 pertain to ADULT** suspects, while Columns **4-5 pertain to JUVENILE** suspects. For each technique in Column 1, please note whether you have been trained to use that technique when interviewing a suspect. The training could be a formal training, like a workshop, or more informal training, like guidance from another police officer or reading a manual. Please complete every block in the table.

1	2	3	4	5
Technique for interviewing criminal suspects:	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with ADULTS?** ***Please check all that apply*.**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview ADULTS?**	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with JUVENILES?** ***Please check all that apply***	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview JUVENILES?**
a) Building rapport with the suspect (for example, by chatting with him/her before questioning)	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
b) Advising the suspect of his/her Miranda rights	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
c) Observing body language to determine if the suspect is being truthful or deceitful	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always

1	2	3	4	5
Technique for interviewing criminal suspects:	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with ADULTS?** ***Please check all that apply*.**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview ADULTS?**	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with JUVENILES?** ***Please check all that apply***	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview JUVENILES?**
d) Presenting false evidence to the suspect	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
e) Presenting real evidence to the suspect	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
f) Using deceit with the suspect (for example, saying that an accomplice had turned the suspect in)	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
g) Offering things to make the suspect more comfortable, like food, drink, cigarettes, a blanket, or a bathroom break	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
h) Observing the suspects' speech pattern to determine if he/she is being truthful or deceitful	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always

1	2	3	4	5
Technique for interviewing criminal suspects:	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with ADULTS?** ***Please check all that apply*.**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview ADULTS?**	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with JUVENILES?** ***Please check all that apply***	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview JUVENILES?**
i) Using information from the suspect's Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, etc.	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always
j) Blaming the victim	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always
k) Leaving the suspect alone in the interrogation room	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always
l) Emphasizing the seriousness of the crime	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always
m) Minimizing the seriousness of the crime	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always	□ Yes – formal training □ Yes – on the job training □ No	□ 1 – Never □ 2 – Seldom □ 3 – Sometimes □ 4 – Often □ 5 – Always

1	2	3	4	5
Technique for interviewing criminal suspects:	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with ADULTS?** ***Please check all that apply*.**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview ADULTS?**	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with JUVENILES?** ***Please check all that apply***	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview JUVENILES?**
n) Using more than one interviewer with a suspect	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
o) Asking the suspect the same questions repeatedly	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
p) Discouraging the suspect from making denials	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
q) Suggesting to the suspect what might have happened	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always
r) Moving yourself or your chair physically closer to the suspect	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always	☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always

1	2	3	4	5
Technique for interviewing criminal suspects:	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with ADULTS?** ***Please check all that apply*.**	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview ADULTS?**	**Have you been <u>TRAINED</u> to use this technique with JUVENILES?** ***Please check all that apply***	**On a scale of 1 to 5, how often do you <u>USE</u> this technique when you interview JUVENILES?**
s) Involving a parent in order to encourage the juvenile suspect to cooperate			☐ Yes – formal training ☐ Yes – on the job training ☐ No	☐ 1 – Never ☐ 2 – Seldom ☐ 3 – Sometimes ☐ 4 – Often ☐ 5 – Always

7. What are the biggest problems or frustrations you have run into while interviewing **JUVENILE** suspects?

8. If you could receive additional training about interviewing **JUVENILE** suspects, what topics would you be most interested to learn about?

9. How many years have you worked in law enforcement? _____ years

10. What is your current rank? _____

11. What is your current title? _____

12. Have you ever held the title of **DETECTIVE** (or equivalent)? Yes No *(please circle one)*

13. Which type of department or agency are you currently employed by?

- ☐ U.S. Federal agency
- ☐ U.S. State agency
- ☐ U.S. Local police department
- ☐ Agency outside the United States
- ☐ Other *(please describe)* _____

14. What is the population of the area your agency serves? Population: _____

15. How many law enforcement officers are employed at the department or agency you currently work for? *(If your department or agency has multiple branches, please only consider the particular branch that you work for.)*

Fewer than 20 officers 20-50 officers 50-100 officers 100-200 officers More than 200 officers

16. Does your police agency videotape ADULT interviews or interrogations?

Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

17. Does your police agency videotape JUVENILE interviews or interrogations?

Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

18. Are your performance evaluations in any way dependent on the number of admissions/confessions you obtain while interviewing suspects?

Yes No Don't Know

19. In your current job, about what percent of your work time is spent interviewing suspects? About _____ % of my work time

Please skip #20 if you answered "0%" for #19.

20. In your current job, **out of all the time you spend interviewing suspects**, about what percent is spent interviewing ADULT suspects and what percent is spent interviewing JUVENILE suspects? *(Please circle one percentage for ADULT suspects and one percentage for JUVENILE suspects)*

Time spent interviewing ADULT suspects:	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	85%	90%	95%	100 %

(Please make sure these two percentages sum to 100%.)

Time spent interviewing JUVENILE suspects:	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	85%	90%	95%	100 %

21. In your current job, do you have an appointment specifically related to juveniles (for example, youth gang specialist or school resource officer)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

22. Have you **EVER** held any of the following jobs that specifically involve working with adolescents? *(Check all that apply.)*

- ☐ Schoolteacher
- ☐ Paid sports coach
- ☐ Social worker working with juveniles
- ☐ Probation officer working with juveniles
- ☐ Corrections officer at a juvenile facility
- ☐ Other *(please describe)* _____
- ☐ I have never held any of these jobs

23. Outside of work, have you **EVER** participated in any of the following programs that specifically involve working with adolescents?

- ☐ After school program
- ☐ Mentoring program
- ☐ Volunteer sports coaching
- ☐ Prevention programs for teen crime
- ☐ Other *(please describe)* _____
- ☐ I have never participated in any of these programs

24. Approximately how many hours per week do you have contact with adolescents **AT WORK**? _____ hours per week

25. Approximately how many hours per week do you have contact with adolescents **OUTSIDE OF WORK** (including parenting of adolescents)?

I have contact with adolescents about _____ hours per week **OUTSIDE OF WORK**.

26. What is your age? _____ years

27. What is your gender? Male Female

28. What is your race or ethnicity?

- White/Caucasian
- Black/African-American
- Hispanic/Latino(a)
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Biracial
- Other *(please describe)* _____

29. What is your highest level of education?

- High school degree or equivalent
- Some college
- College degree
- Some post-college graduate work
- Graduate degree
- Professional degree (for example, lawyer)
- Other *(please describe)* _____

30. On a scale of 1 to 6, where 1 means *no sympathy* and 6 means *a lot of sympathy*, how much sympathy would you say you have overall for juvenile offenders?

1	2	3	4	5	6
No sympathy					A lot of sympathy