Law and Human Behavior
2016, Vol. 40, No. 3, 270–284

0147-7307/16/$12.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000175

Police Training in Interviewing and Interrogation Methods: A Comparison of Techniques Used With Adult and Juvenile Suspects

Hayley M. D. Cleary
Virginia Commonwealth University

Todd C. Warner
John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Despite empirical progress in documenting and classifying various interrogation techniques, very little is known about how police are trained in interrogation methods, how frequently they use various techniques, and whether they employ techniques differentially with adult versus juvenile suspects. This study reports the nature and extent of formal (e.g., Reid Technique, PEACE, HUMINT) and informal interrogation training as well as self-reported technique usage in a diverse national sample ($N = 340$) of experienced American police officers. Officers were trained in a variety of different techniques ranging from comparatively benign pre-interrogation strategies (e.g., building rapport, observing body language or speech patterns) to more psychologically coercive techniques (e.g., blaming the victim, discouraging denials). Over half the sample reported being trained to use psychologically coercive techniques with both adults and juveniles. The majority (91%) receive informal, "on the job" interrogation training. Technique usage patterns indicate a spectrum of psychological intensity where information-gathering approaches were used most frequently and high-pressure tactics less frequently. Reid-trained officers (56%) were significantly more likely than officers without Reid training to use pre-interrogation and manipulation techniques. Across all analyses and techniques, usage patterns were identical for adult and juvenile suspects, suggesting that police interrogate youth in the same manner as adults. Overall, results suggest that training in specific interrogation methods is strongly associated with usage. Findings underscore the need for more law enforcement interrogation training in general, especially with juvenile suspects, and highlight the value of training as an avenue for reducing interrogation-induced miscarriages of justice.

Keywords: interrogation, training, techniques, juveniles, police

As many interrogation scholars have recently noted (e.g., Kassin et al., 2010; Kelly, Miller, Redlich, & Kleinman, 2013), the social science literature on police interviewing and interrogation has grown exponentially in recent decades. Psycholegal research has illuminated numerous key elements of the interrogation process, from Miranda rights comprehension to detection of deception to correlates of false confessions. Researchers have adopted a wide array of innovative approaches to studying interrogation, including clever laboratory paradigms (Redlich & Goodman, 2003; Russano, Meissner, Narchet, & Kassin, 2005), in-depth interviews with suspects/detainees (Goodman-Delahunty, Martschuk, & Dhami, 2014), and coding of actual interrogations (Cleary, 2014; Feld, 2013; King & Snook, 2009). The resulting literature has been called an "embarrassment of riches of sorts" (Kelly et al., 2013, p. 165) in which our scientific understanding of interviewing and interrogation continues to become simultaneously enriched and refined. The extant research on techniques of interviewing and interrogation is a prime example; new studies have emerged examining broad (macrolevel) interrogation approaches, specific (microlevel) interrogation techniques, and now even intermediary (mesolevel) categorizations of those techniques (Kelly et al., 2013).

However, as we discuss below, three important elements are largely missing from this discourse on interrogation methods. The first is a working knowledge about where interrogation techniques come from in the first place—that is, how police acquire the information, skills, and experience necessary to conduct interviews and interrogations with criminal suspects. It is possible that the manner in which police are trained in various interrogation methods influences both their perception and use of those methods. The second (related) element is the law enforcement perspective on interrogation in general—that is, the attitudes, beliefs, and self-reported practices of interrogators themselves. Data on use of techniques from the actual users could greatly inform laboratory studies aimed at, for example, determining the diagnostic value of confessions elicited by those techniques (e.g., Horgan, Russano, Meissner, & Evans, 2012; Russano et al., 2005). The third element is a direct comparison of technique usage with adult versus juvenile suspects. Too often, juvenile interrogations are excluded from empirical inquiry due to barriers to data access or complicated legal and procedural differences (see, e.g., Cleary, 2014, and Feld, 2013, for descriptions of elaborate steps taken to obtain juvenile

This article was published Online First December 14, 2015.

Hayley M. D. Cleary, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University; Todd C. Warner, Department of Psychology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

We gratefully acknowledge Supervisory Special Agent Delisa Johnson and Dr. John Jarvis for their assistance with this project.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hayley M. D. Cleary, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University, 923 W. Franklin Street, P.O. Box 842028, Richmond, VA 23284. E-mail: hmcleary@vcu.edu

interrogation recordings). However, it is precisely those barriers and complications that warrant special consideration of juvenile interrogations and additional investigation of the potentially different approaches police use when suspects are minors. The present study addresses these three elements by examining law enforcement training in various interrogation approaches as well as officers' self-reported use of those approaches in a sample of experienced American investigators.

Police Training in Interviewing and Interrogation

A notable "training gap" exists in the literature such that social science understands very little about how the law enforcement community prepares investigators—legally and tactically—to elicit information from criminal suspects. Systematic reviews or empirical analyses of interrogation training in the United States are not available, and international data are limited. What is known about modern police interrogation techniques is largely derived from the training manuals of commercially marketed interrogation training programs. The Reid Technique of interviewing and interrogation (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2013) is purported to be the most common interrogation training approach (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). Gudjonsson and Pearse (2011) state that "the Reid technique is the most popular and frequently used police interview technique in the United States" (p. 33). The Reid Technique has been widely referenced in the social science literature (Dixon, 2010; King & Snook, 2009; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009) and even in popular culture (e.g., Starr, 2013). John E. Reid and Associates, the corporation that publishes and conducts training in the Reid Technique and its copyrighted Nine Steps of Interrogation, claims that half a million individuals worldwide have been Reid-trained (http://www.reid.com/training_programs/interview_overview.html). The Reid Technique instructs officers to engage in Behavior Symptom Analysis during an initial information-gathering interview called the Behavior Analysis Interview (BAI). Trainees are taught to evaluate interviewees' nonverbal and verbal behavior to discern indicators of guilt. If the investigator is "reasonably certain of the suspect's guilt" (Inbau et al., 2013, p. 5), the interaction then becomes an accusatory interview in which officers employ various persuasive tactics such as overcoming objections, developing themes, and handling denials in order to secure a confession.

Despite its celebrity status, the actual prevalence of Reid training among contemporary law enforcement officers is not well understood. Only two studies to our knowledge have examined the prevalence of Reid training, and they reported widely different estimates. Kassin and colleagues (2007) reported that 11% of their sample of 631 American and Canadian law enforcement officers who had received training had specifically been Reid-trained. In Kostelnik and Reppucci's (2009) sample of over 1,800 officers, 29% of the total sample—and 57% of detectives—received Reid training. Such a sizable discrepancy merits additional investigation, particularly given the concerns researchers have raised about Reid's psychologically coercive strategies; for example, the latter study reported that Reid-trained officers were more likely than non-Reid trained officers to use deceit and false evidence with adolescent suspects.

Although widely known and cited, the Reid Technique is not the only formal training program available to law enforcement, especially outside the United States. In 1992, law enforcement officials in England and Wales drafted the PEACE model (Planning and Preparation, Engage and Explain, Account, Closure, Evaluation) of questioning suspects. Often positioned as an antidote to Reid, the PEACE model trains officers to employ a nonaccusatory, investigative-interviewing approach in which new information is compared against the suspects' previous statements and available evidence (Milne & Bull, 1999). The PEACE model is considered a successful alternative to accusatory interviewing and has since expanded to additional nations and organizations (Bull, 2014).

Other formal methods of interviewing and interrogation, perhaps newer or lesser known, are also emerging in both research and practice. Some programs that are targeted toward child victims or witnesses employ forensic interviewing strategies, such as the ChildFirst method (National Children's Advocacy Center, 2015). These programs generally advocate an information gathering approach and resemble the PEACE model in that one primary goal is to maintain a nonaccusatory atmosphere. In a very different vein, Human Intelligence (HUMINT) interrogation is a method used primarily in military and intelligence contexts. HUMINT interrogation bears similarities to criminal interrogations but is not necessarily limited to producing confessions or obtaining information about past events (Hartwig, Meissner, & Semel, 2014). Like Reid-style interrogations, HUMINT interrogations also involve extracting information from a source, but HUMINT interrogations are more likely to involve sources who are foreign nationals and/or high value suspects involved with threats to national security (Evans, Meissner, Brandon, Russano, & Kleinman, 2010). Evans and colleagues (2010) also argued that HUMINT differs from criminal interrogations in its basic goal: HUMINT interrogations intend to acquire information to support national security interests, whereas criminal interrogations intend to acquire information to support the conviction of guilty suspects in the courtroom (see Evans et al., 2010, for an extensive review of similarities and differences). Finally, other criminal interrogation trainings have emerged that focus on specific processes or skillsets. For example, statement analysis techniques such as Criteria-Based Content Analysis (Berliner & Conte, 1993) and Scientific Content Analysis (www.lsiscan.com) purport to evaluate the veracity of written and verbal statements and have been used with victims, witnesses, and suspects (see, generally, Vrij, 2008). Similarly, several commercial trainings in kinesic interviewing (see, e.g., Walters, 1996; www.dglennfoster.com) claim to teach participants to identify deception and elicit truth from deceptive subjects.

Police Use of Interrogation Techniques

How police are *trained* to interrogate suspects raises the question of how police *actually* interrogate suspects in practice. Although very little research has examined police interrogation training, more scholarship has explored the techniques police use during interviewing and interrogation. Kassin and colleagues' defining work in this area (Kassin & Kiechel, 1996; Kassin & McNall, 1991) introduced the concepts of minimization and maximization in police interrogation. Both have been described as "packages" of techniques, the former involving offers of sympathy, excuses, or face-saving justifications, whereas the latter involves intimidation, confrontation, and presentation or exaggeration of incriminating evidence. Researchers have expanded the study of interrogation techniques by identifying dozens of individ-

ual interrogation strategies in numerous different contexts. For example, Leo (1996) identified 25 disparate techniques used in his direct observation of interrogations in two California police departments. Pearse and Gudjonsson (1997) compared the use of nine different interrogation techniques among officers in two London-area police agencies. Soukara, Bull, Vrij, Turner, and Cherryman (2009) analyzed 80 audio-recorded interrogations from the United Kingdom to examine the frequency of 17 interrogation tactics.

Only three studies have systematically surveyed actual criminal interrogators about the practices they implement in the interrogation room: Kassin et al.'s (2007) questionnaire with U.S. and Canadian police officers and two (related) studies pertaining to juvenile interrogations (Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009, Meyer & Reppucci, 2007, discussed in the next section; see Redlich, Kelly, & Miller, 2014, for a survey of federal investigators and Feld, 2013, for perspectives from police interviewees). Kassin et al. (2007) were the first to assess police officers' self-reported attitudes and behaviors for a variety of interrogation-related constructs, including true and false confessions, detection of deception, and frequency of use for 16 various interrogation techniques, later factor analyzed into four factors. They reported that suspect isolation, rapport building, and identifying contradictions in the suspect's story were among the most frequently used strategies, whereas physical intimidation, threats for noncooperation, and expressions of impatience/anger were rarely used. The study also included a single dichotomous variable pertaining to interrogation training and preliminarily explored the impact of training on technique usage. Eighty-two percent of the overall sample indicated that they had received some sort of training (11% of those indicated the Reid Technique). The dichotomous training/no training variable (type unknown) predicted officers' self-reported use of two of the technique factors: *Isolation, rapport and minimization,* and *Presentation of evidence.*

Juvenile Interrogation Training and Practice

Other surveys of American interrogators emerged from the recognition that youth are psychosocially different from adults and sought to determine whether police possessed knowledge about child development and applied that knowledge in juvenile interrogations (Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009; Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). The concern often raised by scholars and youth advocates is that interrogators are using the same psychologically coercive interrogation techniques with juveniles as they use with adult suspects. One researcher who attended a 4-day Reid training reported that of the 32 instructional hours of training, "only 10 minutes of instruction were dedicated to youth and this was to advocate the use of the same strategies with youth as with adults" (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007, p. 761). This prospect is troubling in light of youths' well documented vulnerabilities in the interrogation room, including poor Miranda comprehension (Viljoen, Zapf, & Roesch, 2007), interrogative suggestibility (McLachlan, Roesch, & Douglas, 2011), and propensity toward false confession (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Redlich & Goodman, 2003) or confession in general (Grisso et al., 2003; Viljoen, Klaver, & Roesch, 2005).

Meyer and Reppucci's (2007) study was the first to assess police use of various interrogation techniques with juvenile suspects, utilizing a sample from the Baltimore County Police Department. Their primary findings were that psychologically coercive, Reid-like techniques were used frequently and that rates of technique usage did not differ for child versus youth versus adult suspects. A larger follow-up study (Reppucci, Meyer, & Kostelnik, 2010) found similar patterns of interrogation technique usage. For virtually all techniques assessed (e.g., observe body language, observe speech patterns, use of deceit, discouraging denials), interrogators endorsed using the same tactics with child and adolescent suspects as adult suspects. Notably, 33% of the first sample endorsed a need for additional training in juvenile interrogations, corroborating the concerns of some researchers (e.g., Meyer & Reppucci, 2007) and even senior police officials (e.g., International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2012) that law enforcement interrogation trainings are not adequately preparing officers for the unique challenges of interviewing youth.

Feld (2013) examined interrogation technique usage with children in his study of 16- to 18-year-old juvenile felony cases in Minnesota. He reported that police used maximization tactics approximately four times more frequently than minimization tactics and that multiple tactics in a single interrogation often occurred, especially with maximization techniques (i.e., 2–7 maximization techniques in were used in 45.9% of cases). Feld (2013) also reported that Reid-like BAI questions were used in approximately 29% of cases. It is essential that more research is conducted using both observational and self-report measures to better understand the actual practices police use when questioning youth.

The Present Study

As both Kassin et al. (2007) and Meyer and Reppucci (2007) noted, the law enforcement perspective is virtually absent from this steadily growing literature on police interrogation. The surveys described above are the only systematic data we have on American police officers' self-reported use of interrogation techniques. The studies provided important data on the perspectives of key players in this process: the interrogators themselves. However, we still have much to learn about the attitudes and behaviors of the law enforcement officials who actually conduct interrogations. In particular, the literature on interrogation technique usage would benefit from data on the training police receive in interviewing and interrogation; such data would provide much-needed context for studies examining discrete technique usage.

The present study addresses significant gaps in the literature pertaining to police officers' interrogation training as well as their self-reported use of interrogation techniques. To our knowledge, it is the first to report extensively on the training police receive, both formal and informal, in suspect interviewing and interrogation methods. Additionally, it adds to the extremely scant literature directly comparing police usage of techniques with adult versus juvenile suspects. The study aims are threefold: (a) to describe law enforcement officers' interrogation training experiences using a diverse national sample of experienced interrogators; (b) to examine police use of interrogation techniques commonly discussed in the literature, including a comparison of techniques used with adult versus juvenile suspects; and (c) to examine the relationship between interrogation training and actual interrogation practices. The study addresses these three aims using a targeted sample of highly experienced police investigators.

Method

Participants

Participants were students of the FBI National Academy (NA) in Quantico, Virginia, an intensive federally sponsored training program that serves primarily American state and local law enforcement officers but also international police professionals. The National Academy is a 10-week leadership program that trains four cohorts per year, each including approximately 220 officers from all 50 states and many other nations, and typically including only one officer from any given department. NA attendees are law enforcement officers from both local and state agencies (e.g., city police departments, county sheriff's offices, state police), are selected via a nomination process, and attend the NA only once in their careers (https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/training/national-academy). Because the program is geared toward supervisory or midcareer law enforcement professionals, it provided a unique sampling opportunity for the present study due to its diverse, national representation of officers who have considerable investigative experience. Data for this study were collected from two NA cohorts (n = 205 and n = 207 for a total N = 412). Official enrollments for the two cohorts were 220 and 210, respectively, yielding response rates of 93.2% and 98.6%. Although these response rates appear high, they are actually quite typical of the NA population (see, e.g., Phillips, 2015; Schafer, 2010). Because interrogation practices and legal norms vary widely outside the United States (see, generally, Bull, 2014), non-U.S. officers (n = 14) were excluded from the present analyses. As a means of ensuring a basic level of interrogation experience, we also restricted the sample to officers who had conducted at least 10 interrogations with both adult and juvenile suspects, which excluded 53 participants. Finally, 5 cases were excluded due to excessive missing data, yielding a final N = 340 officers.

Participants (N = 340) were predominantly male (91.8%) and Caucasian (83.2%; see Table 1). The average age was 44.8 years (SD = 5.2; median = 45; range = 29–61 years). Three quarters of the sample had earned a college degree or higher. Participants reported considerable career experience in law enforcement; the average number of years on the job was 21.2 years (SD = 4.9; median = 21; range = 2–40 years). Most officers (80.3%) served in local law enforcement agencies, and the remainder worked for a federal, state, or other law enforcement entity. Those agencies vary considerably in size, with both very small (fewer than 20 officers; 5.7%) and larger (more than 200 officers; 32.2%) police departments represented. Accordingly, the agencies also varied tremendously in the size of the jurisdiction they served, with resident populations ranging from 2,000 to 19 million (median = 80,000). The sample reported extensive interrogation experience. Eighty-three percent had conducted more than 100 interrogations with adult suspects over the course of their careers; nearly half (45.3%) had conducted more than 100 juvenile interrogations. More than two thirds (69.4%) held the title of detective (or equivalent) at some point in their careers. More than two thirds (69.7%) of officers reported that their agency often or always video records adult interrogations and 4.1% never video record adult interrogations, and over half (57.7%) of officers reported that their agency often or always video records juvenile interrogations and 10.3% never video record juvenile interrogations.

Table 1
Participant Characteristics

Characteristic	n	Percent
Sex	329	
Male	302	91.8
Female	26	7.9
Race/ethnicity	315	
White	262	83.2
Black	18	5.7
Latino/a	24	7.6
Other	11	3.6
Educational attainment	313	
High school	9	2.9
Some college	64	20.4
College degree	116	37.1
Some graduate work	33	10.5
Graduate/professional degree	91	29.1
Agency type	340	
Federal	9	2.6
State	53	15.6
Local	273	80.3
Other	5	1.5
Agency size	335	
<20 officers	19	5.7
20–49 officers	69	20.6
50–99 officers	74	22.1
100–199 officers	65	19.4
200 + officers	108	32.2
Jurisdiction size (no. of residents)	324	
0–50,000	120	37
50,001–100,000	63	19.4
100,001–250,000	42	13.0
250,001–500,000	25	7.7
500,001–1 million	27	8.3
More than 1 million	47	14.5

Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine any differences across the two cohorts on the primary study variables. This was done to ensure that the two cohorts were similar regarding their interrogation training experiences, practices, and demographics. Analyses revealed no differences across cohorts for: Reid training, $\chi^2(1, N = 334) = .36$, $p = .550$; other formal (i.e., non-Reid) interrogation trainings, $\chi^2(1, N = 317) = 2.32$, $p = .128$; the number of interrogations conducted for adult suspects, $\chi^2(1, N = 340) = 3.13$, $p = .346$; or the number of interrogations conducted with juvenile suspects, $\chi^2(1, N = 340) = .779$, $p = .677$. Independent samples t tests examining the frequency of use for each technique also revealed no differences across cohorts.

Materials and Procedure

A 67-item survey instrument was developed for the present study to assess officers' training in and experience with various interrogation approaches (survey available from first author upon request). The first section of the questionnaire asked participants to report formal training in several dominant interviewing and interrogation models (e.g., Reid Technique, PEACE model, HUMINT, ChildFirst). An open-ended item asked respondents to write in any formal training in a model or technique not listed. Written responses were recoded into the following categories: deception detection (including kinesic interviewing), statement analysis,

child-focused, in-house training, and other/undetermined. Categorizations were determined by the first author based upon publicly available information (e.g., company websites) and verified by the second author. After indicating whether they had received any formal training in the specified model, respondents then indicated the training duration (*less than [1/2] day; [1/2] −1 day; 1–5 days, more than 5 days*), recency (ranging from *within the past 6 months* to *over 10 years ago*), satisfaction with the training (from 1 = *not at all satisfied* to 5 = *very satisfied*), and perceived usefulness of the training (from 1 = *not at all useful* to 5 = *very useful*). Respondents also reported duration, recency, satisfaction, and usefulness of other training modalities outside of formal or commercialized models, including on-the-job training (e.g., shadowing an experienced officer during an interrogation), books/manuals, instructional videos, and online training.

The next section of the questionnaire pertained to 16 specific interrogation techniques and asked officers to report whether they had been trained on each technique (*formally*, *on-the-job*, or *not trained*) and how frequently they used each technique during interrogations (*1 = never* to *5 = always*). Techniques were selected to include a range of minimization, maximization, and BAI tactics. Examples included *blaming the victim*, *asking the suspect the same questions repeatedly*, and *observing the suspects' speech pattern to determine if he or she is being truthful or deceitful*. Respondents reported both technique training and usage separately for adult and juvenile suspects. A chronological age range for juveniles was not specified on the actual survey instrument, as the age of juvenile court jurisdiction varies across states.

The final section assessed professional and demographic information including respondents' rank and title, number of years in law enforcement, their agency type (*federal*, *state*, *local*, *international*, *other*), how frequently their agency video records adult and juvenile interrogations (*never*, *seldom*, *sometimes*, *often*, *always*), standard demographic characteristics (age, race/ethnicity, gender, educational attainment), and level of sympathy for juvenile offenders (1 = *no sympathy* to 6 = *a lot of sympathy*). Level of sympathy for juvenile offenders has been shown to be related to judgments of guilt and culpability (Redlich, Quas, & Ghetti, 2008) during questioning by police. Therefore, this variable was included in the study to account for possible relationship that sympathy for juvenile offenders may have with police practices during interrogation.

The questionnaire was presented to the entire cohort in a large lecture hall on the first day of the Academy. Voluntariness of participation was emphasized, and students who did not wish to participate were dismissed. Questionnaires were completed anonymously and took approximately 20–30 min to complete. Participants were given an information sheet containing a summary of the study and the researcher's contact information. All materials and procedures were approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the university and the FBI.

Results

Officers' Interrogation Training Experiences

To address our first study aim, respondents were asked to indicate the type, format, duration, and recency of various formal training models of interviewing and interrogation. The Reid technique was the most commonly reported formal training experience; 55.9% of respondents were Reid-trained. Other known types of formal training that were specifically assessed, PEACE and HUMINT, were less common (8.2% and 5.9% respectively; see Table 2). Moreover, half of the sample (48.8%) reported receiving formal training in some other interviewing method (i.e., not Reid, PEACE, or HUMINT) via an open ended item. Although responses varied widely, the most frequently mentioned training approaches were deception detection (24 respondents), statement analysis (11 respondents), and youth-specific interviewing and interrogation techniques, including ChildFirst and other protocols for child abuse victims (49 respondents). To clarify, the groups reported in Table 2 are not mutually exclusive, as some officers received more than one type of formal training. Only 26% of the

Table 2
Police Officers' Formal and Informal Interviewing and Interrogation Training Experience

	Reid		PEACE		HUMINT		Other formal		Informal	
Experience	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Received training[a]	190	55.9	28	8.2	20	5.9	166	48.8	308	90.6
Training duration										
Less than ½ day	2	1.1	5	17.9	6	31.6	6	3.6	26	7.6
½ day to 1 day	18	9.5	7	25.0	4	21.1	22	13.3	46	13.5
1–5 days	144	75.8	13	46.4	6	31.6	98	59.0	59	17.4
More than 5 days	26	13.7	3	10.7	2	10.5	40	24.1	172	50.6
Training recency										
Within past 2 years	15	8.1	6	23.1	7	36.8	16	9.7	32	9.5
2–10 years ago	91	49.2	14	53.8	9	47.4	56	34.1	77	22.6
More than 10 years ago	79	42.7	6	23.1	3	15.8	92	56.1	198	58.2
Usefulness of training[b]										
M (*SD*)	4.06 (0.83)		3.96 (0.89)		3.47 (1.02)		3.91 (0.90)		*M* = 3.89 (0.84)	
Satisfaction with training[c]										
M (*SD*)	4.16 (0.77)		3.84 (0.85)		3.74 (0.87)		3.98 (0.85)		*M* = 3.74 (0.88)	

Note. The *n*s = 317–334. Columns are not mutually exclusive, as some officers received training in multiple approaches. PEACE = Planning and Preparation, Engage and Explain, Account, Closure, Evaluation; HUMINT = Human Intelligence.
[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*.

sample reported receiving Reid training exclusively with no 'other' formal training. Alternatively, of the non-Reid trained officers, only 24% of the sample reported receiving 'other' formal training exclusively. Unfortunately, these two groups did not yield enough officers for direct comparisons. Therefore, many of the subsequent analyses compare Reid-trained officers to non-Reid trained officers.

Logistic regression was conducted to assess whether agency size was related to officers receiving Reid training. Agency size was not predictive of receiving Reid training, $\chi^2(4, N = 329) = 3.4$, $p = .49$, indicating that officers from larger departments were no more likely than officers from smaller departments to receive training in the Reid Technique. Training experiences in the formal interrogation models ranged from less than a half day to more than five full days, with most Reid-trained 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 was expected given the age and experience of the NA sample. As a whole, respondents were satisfied with the formal training they received and reported that the training had been useful in the course of their careers; on a scale from 1 (*not at all satisfied*) to 5 (*very satisfied*), mean satisfaction ratings across the training modalities ranged from 3.74 (HUMINT and Informal training) to 4.16 (Reid training).

Beyond the well-known formal training models, additional training modalities were assessed. 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, to capture other means of acquiring interviewing skills, we asked officers to report "on-the-job" training experience, such as shadowing a more experienced interviewer. Almost 91% of our sample reported being trained in interrogation methods in this manner. Over half of the sample reported informal training of at least 5 days that occurred more than 10 years ago.

Next we asked officers to report whether they were trained on 16 specific interrogation techniques (see Table 3). These techniques were selected to represent a range of interrogation strategies and included information gathering (pre-interrogation) types of techniques (e.g., *observing suspects' speech or body language*, *building rapport* with the suspect), manipulative or coercive techniques (e.g., *blaming the victim*, *minimizing the seriousness of the offense*), and confrontational techniques (e.g., *asking questions repeatedly*, *using multiple interviewers*). Officers reported separately whether they had been trained to use each technique specifically with adult suspects and specifically with juvenile suspects. These figures represent officers who received any kind of training (formal or informal). 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 ($SD = 5.17$). Approximately half the sample or more was trained on any given technique. McNemar 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 = 20.3 to 54.4). However, overall the patterns of training for individual techniques were comparable for adult versus juvenile suspects. The most commonly occurring techniques on which officers were trained were *building rapport* (95.6% and 77.9% respectively), *observing body language* (92.9% and 77.9%), and *offering things for comfort* (89.4% and 77.1%). The least frequently trained techniques were manipulation techniques such as *victim blaming* (61.5% and 49.7%) and *discouraging denials* (55.6% and 49.1%).

Officers' Self-Reported Interrogation Technique Usage

To address our second study aim, we then asked officers to report how frequently they used these techniques with actual adult and juvenile suspects on a scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*),

Table 3
Officers' Training in Interrogation Techniques for Use With Adult and Juvenile Suspects

Interrogation technique (n = 294–338)	Trained to use with adult suspects		Trained to use with juvenile suspects		χ^2	φ	φ 95% CI
	n	%	*n*	%			
Building rapport	325	95.6	265	77.9	54.4	.41	[.31, .50]
Observing body language	316	92.9	265	77.9	49.0	.38	[.28, .47]
Offering things for comfort	304	89.4	262	77.1	38.2	.33	[.23, .43]
Presenting real evidence	288	84.7	249	73.2	37.0	.33	[.23, .43]
Using deceit	288	84.7	237	69.7	49.0	.38	[.28, .47]
Using more than one interviewer	285	83.8	253	74.4	26.7	.28	[.18, .38]
Minimizing seriousness of offense	283	83.2	242	71.2	39.0	.34	[.24, .43]
Moving physically closer to suspect	280	82.4	240	70.6	38.0	.34	[.23, .43]
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	272	80.0	239	70.3	31.0	.30	[.20, .39]
Asking same questions repeatedly	264	77.6	231	67.9	31.0	.30	[.20, .39]
Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room	261	76.8	211	62.1	48.2	.37	[.28, .47]
Presenting false evidence	249	73.2	192	56.5	53.2	.39	[.30, .49]
Observing speech patterns	242	71.2	202	59.4	36.2	.33	[.22, .42]
Suggesting what might have happened	229	67.4	200	58.8	27.0	.28	[.18, .40]
Blaming the victim	209	61.5	169	49.7	38.0	.34	[.23, .43]
Discouraging denials	189	55.6	167	49.1	20.3	.24	[.14, .34]

Note. Percentages represent proportions of the entire sample ($N = 340$) who have been trained on that technique. All chi-squared tests significant at $p <$ .000.

consistent with previous studies (Kassin et al., 2007; Redlich et al., 2014). There was substantial variation in self-reported use across the 16 techniques assessed (see Table 4). On the whole, all of the techniques are used significantly more frequently with adults than with juveniles ($ps < .01$). However, the overall pattern of technique usage is similar for adult versus juvenile suspects. *Building rapport* emerged as the most frequently used technique with both age groups ($M = 4.12$ for adults and $M = 3.67$ for juveniles), followed by similar pre-interrogation techniques such as *observing body language* ($M = 4.01$ and $M = 3.66$, respectively) and *offering things for comfort* ($M = 3.41$ and $M = 3.15$, respectively). *Blaming the victim* was the least frequently used technique with both adults ($M = 2.17$) and juveniles ($M = 1.97$).

We next used principal components analysis (PCA) to explore whether patterns of technique usage emerged. Two separate exploratory PCA models were conducted with an oblique (direct oblimin) rotation to allow component correlation, since techniques were presumed nonindependent. Four components with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were identified for both the adult model and the juvenile model, accounting for 52% and 58% of the total variance respectively. Component cross-loadings for the models are presented in Table 5. For both models, 11 of the 16 items yielded component loadings of .50 or greater, indicating that many of the items are used in conjunction with one another.

The first component consisted of pre-interrogation, 'front-end' techniques (e.g., *building rapport*, *observing body language*, *observing speech patterns*) and accounted for 32% of the variance in the adult model and 38% of the variance in the juvenile model. Mean frequency of use for the pre-interrogation components was 3.66 ($SD = .85$) with adult suspects and 3.32 ($SD = 1.03$) with juveniles. A paired sample t test indicated that officers more frequently use pre-interrogation items on adults compared juveniles, $t(336) = 9.89$, $p < .001$, 95% confidence interval (CI) [.257, .385], $d = 1.07$, d 95% CI [.85, 1.31], where CIs represent lower and upper bounds for differences between tested means. The second component consisted of manipulation techniques (e.g., *suggesting what happened*, *blaming the victim*, *minimizing offense seriousness*) and accounted for 8% of the variance in the adult model and 7% of the variance in the juvenile model. Manipulation techniques were also used significantly more frequently with adults ($M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.71$) than with juveniles ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 0.78$), $t(337) = 10.47$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.184, .269], $d = 1.14$, d 95% CI [.91, 1.37]). The third component consisted of confrontation techniques (e.g., *emphasizing offense seriousness*, *asking same question repeatedly*) and accounted for 6% of the total variance in the adult model and 7% of the variance in the juvenile model. Confrontational techniques were used more frequently with adults ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 0.74$) compared with juvenile suspects ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 0.88$), $t(336) = 5.91$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.110, .220], $d = .64$, d 95% CI [.43, .86]). The fourth component consisted of techniques related to presentation of evidence (e.g., *presenting real evidence*, *presenting false evidence*) and accounted for 6% of the variance in the adult model and 6% of the variance in the juvenile model. Presentation of evidence techniques were used more frequently with adult suspects ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.76$) than with juvenile suspects ($M = 2.49$, $SD = 0.87$), $t(337) = 9.21$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [.208, .321], $d = 1.0$, d 95% CI [.77, 1.23]).

To summarize, PCA models indicated four distinct components of interrogation techniques, conceptualized here as pre-interrogation, manipulation, confrontation, and presentation of evidence. Officers report using all of these techniques—even the types of techniques considered to be more aggressive or manipulative, though those appear less frequently. Additionally, although all technique components were used more frequently with adults than with juveniles, the overall pattern of component loadings was similar across the two models (see Table 5), suggesting that officers use this array of techniques similarly when questioning adults versus juvenile suspects.

Table 4
Officers' Self-Reported Use of Interrogation Techniques With Adult and Juvenile Suspects

Interrogation technique (n's = 331–338)	Frequency of use with adult suspects, M (SD)	Frequency of use with juvenile suspects, M (SD)	$t(p)$	d	d 95% CI
Building rapport	4.12 (0.93)	3.67 (1.21)	8.58	.93	[.71, 1.16]
Observing body language	4.01 (1.10)	3.66 (1.35)	6.81	.74	[.52, .97]
Offering things for comfort	3.41 (1.09)	3.15 (1.27)	6.33	.69	[.47, .91]
Observing speech patterns	3.06 (1.41)	2.83 (1.46)	5.60	.61	[.39, .83]
Presenting real evidence	3.02 (1.00)	2.80 (1.13)	6.04	.66	[.44, .88]
Moving physically closer to suspect	3.00 (1.05)	2.76 (1.15)	6.37	.69	[.48, .92]
Minimizing seriousness of offense	2.98 (0.97)	2.75 (1.07)	6.73	.73	[.51, .96]
Asking same questions repeatedly	2.93 (1.03)	2.75 (1.13)	5.32	.58	[.36, .80]
Using more than one interviewer	2.87 (1.01)	2.68 (1.13)	5.03	.54	[.33, .77]
Emphasizing seriousness of offense	2.86 (1.03)	2.74 (1.19)	2.90	.31	[.10, .53]
Using deceit	2.85 (0.88)	2.54 (1.04)	7.66	.84	[.61, 1.06]
Leaving suspect alone in interrogation room	2.67 (1.01)	2.28 (1.09)	9.22	1.0	[.78, 1.23]
Suggesting what might have happened	2.42 (1.02)	2.26 (1.07)	5.05	.55	[.33, .77]
Presenting false evidence	2.41 (1.07)	2.15 (1.08)	6.85	.75	[.53, .97]
Discouraging denials	2.37 (1.20)	2.25 (1.22)	4.05	.44	[.23, .66]
Blaming the victim	2.17 (0.97)	1.97 (0.97)	6.41	.70	[.48, .92]

Note. Items measured on a scale of 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). All t tests significant at $p < .000$ with the exception of emphasizing the seriousness of the crime, $p < .01$. CI = confidence interval.

Table 5
Component Cross-Loadings of Interrogation Techniques Used With Adult Versus Juvenile Suspects

Interrogation technique	Use with adult suspects				Use with juvenile suspects			
	Comp 1: Pre-interrogation	Comp 2: Manipulation	Comp 3: Confrontation	Comp 4: Presentation of evidence	Comp 1: Pre-interrogation	Comp 2: Manipulation	Comp 3: Confrontation	Comp 4: Presentation of evidence
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 .30 for four-factor solution. Items comprising each respective factor in boldface. Comp = Component.

The Relationship Between Interrogation Technique Training and Usage

To address our third study aim, we conducted linear regressions to investigate whether interrogation training, as well as several other individual- and agency-level variables, predicted officers' use of the four interrogation technique components. Predictor variables were selected based on use in previous research (e.g., Kassin et al., 2007) or purported theoretical significance (Redlich et al., 2008). Initial (full) models included participant (a) gender, (b) number of years in law enforcement, (c) general sympathy for juvenile offenders, (d) interrogation experience with adult suspects, (e) interrogation experience with juvenile suspects, (f) formal Reid training (yes or no), and (g) video-recording practice for the given suspect age group (i.e., for the juvenile models, whether the officer's agency video records juvenile interrogations). Formal Reid training was selected in particular due to its curricular emphasis on psychologically manipulative interrogation. The first three variables were not significant predictors of technique usage in any of the models so were dropped in the final models in the interest of parsimony.

The ultimate goal of the regression analyses was to isolate the impact of interrogation training on officers' use of the four technique components, over and above the hypothesized impact of "everyday" experience interrogating suspects as well as being video recorded conducting those interrogations. Toward that goal, and to account for the significant relationship between juvenile interrogation experience and Reid training, $\chi^2(2, N = 334) = 9.7$, $p = .008$, $\varphi = .17$, we adopted a stepwise approach in which interrogation experience (both adult and juvenile) and video-recording practice for the given suspect age group were entered into Step 1 of each hierarchical linear regression and Reid training was entered into Step 2. Separate models were run for components relevant to adult interrogations and juvenile interrogations.

Component 1: Pre-interrogation. This component included items regarding techniques typically employed at the beginning of an interview or during the information gathering stages. As seen in Table 6, Step 1 of the model examining interrogation experience was significant, $F(3, 323) = 4.22$, $p = .006$, $R^2 = .04$, 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 change in $R^2 = .07$, $F(4, 322) = 5.98$, $p < .001$. Specifically, Reid trained officers were more likely to use pre-interrogation techniques with adults, compared with non-Reid trained officers, $\beta = .18$, $t(322) = 3.30$, $p < .001$, CI [.13, .50], $d = 0.37$, d 95% CI [.14, .59].

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 and video-recording policy in Step 1, $F(3, 316) = 3.84$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .03$, the full model with the addition of the Reid training variable resulted in a modest but significant increase in effect size, $F(4, 315) = 4.48$, $p = .002$, $R^2 = .05$. Similar to the previous model with adult suspects, Reid trained officers were more likely to use pre-interrogation techniques with juveniles, $\beta = .14$, $t(315) = 2.49$, $p = .01$, CI [.06, .52], $d = .28$, d 95% CI [.06, .50]. Overall, for both adult and juvenile suspects, Reid training was associated with more frequent use of pre-interrogation techniques.

Component 2: Manipulation. These items were characterized by more subtle forms of persuasion (e.g., *suggesting what happened, victim blaming, minimizing offense seriousness*) to obtain a confession (see Table 7). Step 1 of the model for adult suspects shows that interrogation experience and video-recording policy were associated with the use of manipulation techniques, $F(3, 323) = 10.24$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$. Step 2 of the model incorporating the Reid training variable was also significant, $F(4, 322) = 14.21$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .15$, and accounted for a significant change in R-squared from .09 to .15. Reid training had a significant impact on the increase in effect size for Step 2, $\beta = .26$, $t(322) = 4.89$, $p < .001$, CI [.22, .51], $d = .55$, d 95% CI [.32, .77]

Table 6
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Pre-Interrogation Component

Component 1: Pre-interrogation	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult—Step 1: $F(3, 323) = 4.22$, $p = .006$, $R^2 = .04$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.16	.10	.10	1.61	.11	−.04	.36
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.09	.07	.08	1.35	.18	−.04	.22
Video-recording practice	.18	.10	.10	1.76	.08	−.02	.39
Adult—Step 2: $F(4, 322) = 5.98$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .07$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.17	.10	.11	1.74	.08	−.02	.36
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.05	.06	.05	.84	.40	−.07	.18
Video-recording practice	.15	.10	.08	1.41	.16	−.06	.35
Reid training	.31***	.10	.18***	3.30	.001***	.13	.50
Juvenile—Step 1: $F(3, 316) = 3.84$, $p = .01$, $R^2 = .03$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.06	.12	.03	.45	.65	−.18	.29
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.20**	.08	.16**	2.56	.01**	.05	.36
Video-recording practice	.12	.12	.06	1.07	.29	−.11	.35
Juvenile—Step 2: $F(4, 315) = 4.48$, $p = .002$, $R^2 = .05$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.06	.12	.03	.52	.60	−.17	.30
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.17*	.08	.14*	2.15	.03*	.01	.31
Video-recording practice	.10	.12	.05	.88	.38	−.13	.33
Reid training	.29*	.12	.14*	2.49	.01*	.06	.52

Note. CI = confidence interval.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

above and beyond the variance accounted for by experience interrogating adults, β = .12, $t(322) = 2.11$, $p = .04$, CI [.01, .32], $d = .24$, d 95% CI [.02, .45] and video-recording policy, β = .13, $t(322) = 2.45$, $p = .02$, CI [.04, .36], $d = .27$, d 95% CI [.05, .49].

Similar results emerged from officers' use of manipulation items with juvenile suspects. Step 1 of the model revealed that officers with more juvenile interrogation experience and whose agencies video record juvenile interviews, $F(3, 316) = 8.09$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .07$, were more likely to use manipulation techniques with juveniles. The addition of the Reid training variable in Step 2 was also significant, $F(4, 315) = 8.12$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$ in the overall model. Reid trained officers were more likely to use manipulation techniques, β = .15, $t(315) = 2.78$, $p = .006$, CI [.07, .41], $d = .31$, d 95% CI [.09, .54] than non-Reid trained officers.

Component 3: Confrontation. These items included techniques that are much more direct and accusatory (e.g., *emphasizing offense seriousness*, *using multiple interviewers*). 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 8).

Component 4: Presentation of evidence. Techniques in this component involved the presentation of information to the suspect, such as actual or false evidence, as well as the use of deceit. Hierarchical regressions revealed that only interrogation experience with juveniles, β = .23, $t(315) = 3.66$, $p < .001$, CI [.11,

Table 7
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Manipulation Component

Component 2: Manipulation	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult—Step 1: $F(3, 323) = 10.24$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.15	.08	.12	1.90	.06	−.01	.31
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.14*	.05	.16*	2.60	.01	.03	.24
Video-recording practice	.24**	.08	.16**	2.91	.004	.08	.41
Adult—Step 2: $F(4, 322) = 14.21$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .15$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.16*	.08	.12*	2.11	.04	.01	.32
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.10	.05	.11	1.89	.06	.00	.20
Video-recording practice	.20*	.08	.13*	2.45	.02	.04	.36
Reid training	.37***	.08	.26***	4.89	.000	.22	.51
Juvenile—Step 1: $F(3, 316) = 8.09$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .07$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.06	.09	.04	.62	.54	−.12	.23
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.20**	.06	.21**	3.38	.001	.08	.31
Video-recording practice	.21*	.09	.13*	2.38	.02	.04	.38
Juvenile—Step 2: $F(4, 315) = 8.12$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .09$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.06	.09	.04	.70	.49	−.11	.24
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.17**	.06	.18**	2.93	.004	.06	.29
Video-recording practice	.19*	.09	.12*	2.18	.03	.02	.36
Reid training	.24**	.09	.15**	2.78	.006	.07	.41

Note. CI = confidence interval.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 8
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Confrontation Component

Component 3: Confrontation	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult—Step 1: $F(3, 323) = 1.37$, $p = .25$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.16	.09	.12	1.84	.07	−.01	.33
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	−.02	.06	−.02	−.28	.78	−.13	.10
Video-recording practice	.03	.09	.02	.34	.73	−.15	.21
Adult—Step 2: $F(4, 322) = 1.03$, $p = .39$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.16	.09	.12	1.83	.07	−.01	.33
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	−.01	.06	−.02	−.25	.80	−.13	.10
Video-recording practice	.03	.09	.02	.36	.72	−.15	.21
Reid training	−.01	.09	−.01	−.16	.87	−.18	.15
Juvenile—Step 1: $F(3, 316) = 1.36$, $p = .26$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.11	.11	.07	1.04	.30	−.10	.32
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.07	.07	.07	1.04	.30	−.06	.21
Video-recording practice	−.02	.10	−.01	−.16	.88	−.21	.18
Juvenile—Step 2 $F(4, 315) = 1.03$, $p = .39$, $R^2 = .01$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.11	.11	.07	1.04	.30	−.10	.32
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.07	.07	.07	1.06	.29	−.06	.21
Video-recording practice	−.01	.10	−.01	−.14	.89	−.21	.19
Reid training	−.02	.10	−.01	−.20	.84	−.22	.18

Note. CI = confidence interval.

.38], $d = .41$, d 95% CI [.18, .63] was associated with the use of presentation techniques with juvenile suspects, $F(4, 315) = 5.30$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$. 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 9).

Discussion

The present study is the first in-depth examination of law enforcement training in both adult and juvenile interrogations among a large sample of experienced investigators. It contributes data on interrogation techniques derived from interrogators themselves. It extends previous research (Kassin et al., 2007; Kostelnik & Reppucci, 2009; Meyer & Reppucci, 2007) in several ways—first, by expanding research on interrogation training beyond a training/no training dichotomous variable to explore the nature and scope of training; second, by assessing training pertaining to juvenile interviewing and interrogation; and third, by directly comparing interrogators' use of various techniques with adult versus juvenile suspects.

Officers' Interrogation Training Experiences

The sample's demographic characteristics were generally representative of state and local law enforcement officers nationwide; our sample was approximately 92% male and 83% Caucasian, compared with figures from a 2013 nationally representative sam-

Table 9
Regression Models Predicting Interrogation Technique Usage for Presentation of Evidence Component

Component 4: Presentation of evidence	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*	Lower CI	Upper CI
Adult—Step 1: $F(3, 323) = 4.98$, $p = .002$, $R^2 = .04$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.11	.09	.08	1.23	.22	−.07	.28
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.12*	.06	.13*	2.10	.04	.01	.23
Video-recording practice	.16	.09	.09	1.72	.09	−.02	.34
Adult—Step 2: $F(4, 322) = 4.66$, $p = .001$, $R^2 = .05$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	.11	.09	.08	1.28	.20	−.06	.29
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.10	.06	.11	1.80	.07	−.01	.22
Video-recording practice	.14	.09	.08	1.52	.13	−.04	.32
Reid training	.15	.09	.10	1.79	.08	−.02	.32
Juvenile—Step 1: $F(3, 316) = 6.47$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	−.02	.10	−.01	−.18	.86	−.22	.18
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.26***	.07	.24	3.92	.001	.13	.39
Video-recording practice	.06	.10	.04	.65	.52	−.13	.26
Juvenile: Step 2 $F(4, 315) = 5.30$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .06$							
Interrogation experience—Adult	−.02	.10	−.01	−.14	.89	−.22	.19
Interrogation experience—Juvenile	.24***	.07	.23***	3.66	.001	.11	.38
Video-recording practice	.05	.10	.03	.54	.59	−.14	.25
Reid training	.13	.10	.07	1.32	.19	−.06	.32

Note. CI = confidence interval.
* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

ple indicating that agencies nationwide are 88% male and 73% Caucasian (Reaves, 2015). Our first study aim was to describe the range of training experiences reported by this sample of experienced investigators. For years, social scientists have been writing about the Reid Technique (e.g., Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; King & Snook, 2009) and designing experimental studies around the techniques promoted in the Reid manual (e.g., Horgan et al., 2012) with very little data to draw upon regarding how many officers actually receive this training or how widely it is practiced. Approximately half (56%) of our sample of criminal investigators were Reid-trained. This figure closely resembles Kostelnik and Reppucci's (2009) report that 57% of detectives in their sample were Reid trained, much more so than the 11% reported by Kassin et al. (2007). Kassin et al. (2007) posited that their figure may be an underestimate due to officers not recalling the specifics of their training; additionally, approximately 9% of their sample was from Canada, where training practices may differ.

Although the Reid method was the most common formal training for police officers in the present study, nearly half the sample reported receiving other formal interrogation training. Unfortunately, the sample sizes for the other formal models we assessed (<28) were too small to conduct any group comparisons. The trainings represented a mixture of approaches, suggesting that training experiences among police are far from uniform. Some training models such as kinesic interviewing, which focuses on detecting deception, are likely similar to some aspects of the Reid technique. For example, a textbook on kinesic interviewing instructs investigators how to evaluate verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Walters, 1996), a recurring theme in the Reid manual. Child-focused trainings, by contrast, may have emerged out of forensic protocols for interviewing child witnesses and may thus differ in their level of developmental sensitivity. Future research may 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.

This study found that police receive informal training at very high rates; almost 91% of officers reported receiving "on-the-job" training in criminal interrogation from other officers. Although not terribly surprising given the considerable monetary and personnel costs of formal interrogation workshops, this does highlight that informal training may be the predominant mechanism through which officers' information and experience in conducting interrogations is transmitted. Such a mechanism represents both a challenge and opportunity for improving police training. On the one hand, it suggests that formal training in potentially problematic interrogation techniques (Reid or otherwise) may spread virally through agencies; indeed, officers in our study as well as previous studies (Kassin et al., 2007; Meyer & Reppucci, 2007) have indicated using tactics similar to those found in the Reid manual (Inbau et al., 2013) without having expressly received the official Reid training. On the other hand, it suggests that formal training in more humane and/or developmentally appropriate techniques has the potential to reach a wide audience and have a marked impact on everyday interrogations in the United States.

With regard to training in specific interrogation techniques, officers were more likely to have received formal training on specific techniques for use with adult suspects rather than juveniles and that similar training patterns emerged across the sample for the questioning of juveniles and adults, suggesting that most trainings are probably geared toward adult interrogations. This is consistent with Meyer and Reppucci's (2007) report that the Reid Technique focuses comparatively little attention on juvenile suspects. Although the most recent (5th edition) Reid manual is marginally more sensitive to adolescent developmental issues (e.g., suggesting caution when interpreting youth behavior) than the previous edition on which most academic literature is based (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2001), it nonetheless maintains that confrontational interrogations involving "active persuasion" and even deception are permissible with adolescents, which the manual defines as ages 10–15 (Inbau et al., 2013). Not only is this definition of adolescence wholly inconsistent with developmental science (e.g., Steinberg, 2014, adopts the age rage 10–25), but it raises concerns given research indicating that youth are disproportionately susceptible to police coercion (Redlich & Goodman, 2003).

Officers' Self-Reported Interrogation Technique Usage

With regard to the specific techniques police employ during criminal interrogations, overall police used less coercive tactics more frequently than the tactics generally considered more aggressive or coercive. When examining the individual techniques in order of frequency, the results form something of a gradient where the relatively benign, information-gathering types of strategies are used most frequently, and frequency of use declines as the techniques become more psychologically coercive. Indeed, the four items comprising the pre-interrogation component (*building rapport*, *observing body language*, *offering things for comfort*, and *observing speech patterns*) were the four techniques officers report using the most often with both adult and juvenile suspects. This is relatively consistent with Kassin et al.'s (2007) finding that high-pressure tactics were used comparatively infrequently as well as Feld's (2013) account that most juveniles in his study readily cooperated. However, our study is consistent with previous research suggesting that even the more aggressive techniques are still sometimes used; for example, the means for *presenting false evidence*, *using deceit*, and *moving physically closer to the suspect* ranged from 2.42–3.00 (where 3 = *sometimes*). Moreover, these aggressive techniques are used with similar frequency with juvenile suspects as with adults.

The pattern may be interpreted in several ways. It is possible that officers begin interrogations with minimal interrogative or psychological "force," reserving the more coercive strategies for especially recalcitrant suspects or unproductive interrogations. If suspects surrender the necessary information earlier in the interview, perhaps those interviews are shorter in duration and never progress to a more intense stage. This is essentially what the Reid Technique prescribes when it coaches interviewers to transition from an interview to an accusatorial interrogation (Inbau et al., 2013). It is also possible that individual and institutional attitudes among law enforcement are beginning to shift. Competitors to the Reid Technique are frequently surfacing, and the investigative-interviewing approach that dominates the UK and Australian models may be diffusing to the United States. For example, Dixon (2010) argues that interrogators in U.S. terrorism cases are beginning to gravitate toward more rapport based, information gathering approaches as an alternative to confrontational interrogations.

These data indicate that the gradient of coercion police employ with adult suspects is nearly identical with juvenile suspects. In fact, the overall pattern of usage for the 16 individual techniques assessed in this study corroborates concerns (e.g., Meyer & Reppucci, 2007) that police essentially interrogate juveniles the same way they interrogate adults. Although the usage patterns were the same for adult and juvenile suspects, the techniques were used slightly less often overall with juveniles. It is possible that juvenile interrogations in general are more brief than adult interrogations and thus the full body of coercive techniques is not needed; Feld (2013) found that 77% of his sample of juvenile interrogations concluded in 15 min or less (but see Cleary, 2014 for a study reporting longer mean durations). It is also possible that interrogations do not progress to the more coercive techniques because juvenile suspects are more likely to make legal decisions that reflect compliance with authority (Grisso et al., 2003). For example, Feld (2013) reported that maximization techniques were not used at all in approximately one third of cases. A third interpretation is that the lower usage rates for juvenile interrogations could simply reflect an availability heuristic, given that adult interrogations are more common than juvenile interrogations. Finally, the slight differences could be an artifact of the 16 specific techniques selected for this study; researchers have identified a vast array of interrogation tactics (see Kelly et al., 2013) and perhaps officers use different techniques more frequently with juveniles.

The Relationship Between Interrogation Technique Training and Usage

One primary research question in the present study was the relationship between interrogation training and practice. Reid training emerged as a significant predictor of the pre-interrogation component and the manipulation component. Regarding the former, it appears that Reid-trained officers are indeed practicing the Behavior Analysis Interview and other preparatory interview strategies that the training teaches (Inbau et al., 2013). This is consistent with Feld's (2013) report that more than one fourth of interrogations involved BAI questions. It may be that Reid-trained officers are skilled at developing an effective strategy for the interaction, particularly given that this is an explicit focus of Reid instruction.

Regarding the manipulation component, Reid-trained officers in our sample more frequently use manipulation tactics (e.g., *discouraging denials*, *suggesting what might have happened*, *minimizing offense seriousness*) than non-Reid trained officers. This difference in use of psychologically sophisticated techniques is not surprising, given that they are precisely the sort that Inbau et al. (2013) advocates. For example, with regard to physical proximity, Inbau et al. (2013) state that "it is a recognized fact that the closer a person is to someone physically, the closer he becomes to that person psychologically" and instruct interviewers to gradually move his or her chair closer to the suspect (p. 283). Minimizing the offense seriousness, another item in the manipulation component, is explicitly advocated as a "theme" interrogators can adopt to encourage confession (p. 211). Discouraging denials is such an integral component of the Reid Technique that one of the Nine Steps of Interrogation is dedicated to it in full. Our finding that Reid-trained officers are more likely to use manipulation techniques is relatively consistent with Kostelnik and Reppucci's (2009) report that Reid-trained officers were more likely to endorse the use of three specific psychologically coercive techniques (presenting false evidence, using deceit, and minimizing offense seriousness) for many of the suspect age groups they investigated.

In our view, the manipulation component represents a set of psychologically sophisticated tools in the toolbox of Reid-trained interrogators. Reid-trained officers appear to "specialize" in these manipulative strategies and use them more frequently than non-Reid trained officers. It is interesting to note that the effect of video-recording practice was significant for this component only; that is, officers whose agencies often or always video record interrogations (both adult and juvenile) were also more likely to use manipulative strategies. In some respects this is consistent with Kassin, Kukucka, Lawson, and DeCarlo's (2014) video recorded mock crime study. In that study, informing police participants that their interrogations would be recorded had no effect on most of the interrogation tactics observed, including confrontation, use of the bluff, lies about evidence, and various miscellaneous tactics. Being camera-informed only significantly predicted the use of minimization/leniency tactics (maximization was marginally significant), but in the opposite direction—interrogators who knew they were being recorded were *less* likely to use these techniques (Kassin et al., 2014). Differences between the two studies may be at least partially a function of how techniques were operationally defined. Kassin et al. (2014) used the factors derived from the previous law enforcement survey (Kassin et al., 2007), whereas the components included in the present study's regression analyses were devised from the same sample's self-reported technique usage. Additionally, interrogation length may be a factor. Interrogations in the mock crime study were limited to 20 min, whereas officers in the present study reported on their actual (full) interrogation experiences. In partial support, that study found that maximization techniques (but not minimization) were used more frequently in the later stages of interrogation (Kassin et al., 2014).

Although our finding that manipulation strategies were more common among officers who are usually video recorded may at first seem puzzling, all of the techniques assessed in this study are legally permissible, including the manipulation techniques. Officers who use these strategies on camera have no reason to fear legal repercussions; in fact, it is possible that individual law enforcement colleagues or agencies view the training and implementation of these manipulation items as exemplary. It is also important to note that the techniques are not necessarily used maliciously, and that in all likelihood, they do assist interrogators in securing confessions from scores of guilty suspects. The concern with these techniques, especially the manipulation items, is the potentially calamitous consequences of using them in conjunction with vulnerable suspects, especially juveniles and persons with mental illness (Kassin et al., 2010).

Our data indicate that police officers in the present sample interrogate juvenile suspects essentially the same way they interrogate adult suspects. They use the same patterns of manipulative, confrontational, or psychologically coercive techniques with comparatively the same frequencies. Scholars have long known that adolescence is a risk factor for false confessions (Kassin et al., 2010; Leo, 2009), but whether police employ the same psychologically coercive strategies known to induce false confessions with juvenile suspects remains unclear. Our findings indicate that police utilize them no more or less frequently with juveniles than

with adults in comparison to less coercive strategies. This is consistent with Meyer and Reppucci's (2007) report that officers in their sample used the same techniques with juvenile and adult suspects. Feld (2013) also reported a range of both maximization and minimization techniques but observed that maximization was used more frequently; for example, nearly 70% of cases involved one or more maximization technique. Although much more research is needed on police interrogation of juveniles, the existing studies are beginning to converge on the notion that interrogation strategies are similar irrespective of suspect age.

Implications for Interrogation Policy and Practice

The overall similarity between police training in individual interrogation techniques (see Table 3) and utilization of those techniques (see Table 4) indicates that training is strongly associated with practice. On the one hand, this finding is discouraging for scholars and advocates who worry that Reid or Reid-like techniques are being taught to American law enforcement officers (and even business professionals and school administrators; see http://www.reid.com) with increasing regularity—that the model of psychologically coercive interrogation is perpetuating. On a more positive note, this holds tremendous promise for the continual improvement of American police interviewing and interrogation, particularly with respect to juveniles. It suggests, at least preliminarily, that police officers' apparent unwillingness to account for youthful status in the interrogation room (see also Meyer & Reppucci, 2007) may be a function of inadequate training. We concur with the recommendation in Kassin et al.'s (2010) White Paper that law enforcement officers receive specialized training in interrogation of youthful and other vulnerable suspects given that the present study suggests that such training has the potential to influence police practices in everyday interrogations.

Britain's PEACE model is a noteworthy example of how law enforcement-led reform in training and practice can be successfully implemented on a large scale. A similar, if less far-reaching, training initiative specifically regarding juvenile suspects is actually underway in the United States. Since 2006, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) 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 curriculum includes four courses that provide empirically informed training on topics such as rapport building with youth, constructing age-appropriate questions, and adopting open-ended, less confrontational interviewing styles. Although the training program is relatively new, future program evaluations or other studies of curriculum dissemination could examine whether this juvenile-specific training impacts officers' conduct of juvenile interrogations.

Limitations and Conclusions

Several limitations to the present work should be noted. First, although the present sample was valuable in its geographic diversity and investigator experience, it was nonetheless nonrandom, and officers who advanced to leadership positions within their agencies or who volunteered to attend the National Academy's extensive training may differ from other investigators. Second, social desirability in self-report data may be a concern. Police officers in this study had no incentive to disclose interrogation methods that could be perceived as coercive, and it is possible that the present data do not capture the extent to which police use such practices. However, the frequencies of various technique usage (see Table 4) indicate a fairly normal distribution across the various interrogation techniques. In addition, moderate endorsement of the more intensive tactics (e.g., use of deceit, presenting false evidence) attenuates some of the concerns about social desirability. Nonetheless, scientific studies that use alternative approaches such as self-reported data from juveniles who have been interrogated or observational studies (e.g., live or video recorded interrogations) are needed to more accurately assess the techniques used during interrogation.

Another limitation was the lack of contextual information that might impact officers' decisions regarding the use of particular interrogation techniques. 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, perhaps interrogation strategies change as a function of the severity of the crime; officers may adopt different strategies in a violent crime investigation (e.g., murder, sexual assault) versus a nonviolent crime (e.g., breaking and entering). Perhaps strategies differ when the officer is aware of the suspect's prior criminal history or aware the interrogation is being audio or video recorded. Additional research is needed to examine the many possible contextual variables that may influence the conduct of interrogations.

Finally, the survey instrument did not assess several constructs that would have further elucidated results. For example, the survey did not include investigative interviewing types of techniques that are more common outside the United States. It is possible, therefore, that U.S. police also utilize techniques that are less adversarial and less coercive than the techniques assessed here. Redlich and colleagues (2014) included 67 different techniques nested within the six mesolevel domains proposed by Kelly et al. (2013), as well as 10 deception detection techniques, in their survey of federal and military interrogators. Future studies with state and local law enforcement, who conduct the majority of "everyday" interrogations, might employ this broader range of techniques. Fidelity to training was also not assessed. Although participants reported relatively high levels of satisfaction and perceived usefulness for multiple training models, we do not know how much they actually learned from their training, particularly since many respondents' training was not recent. It is possible that memory problems or cognitive distortions could impact the accuracy of participant responses.

To conclude, interrogation training is an important piece of the empirical interrogation puzzle because the training officers receive presumably underlies the approaches and techniques they choose to implement in the interrogation room. Research heretofore has explored the techniques themselves instead of their origin or has focused on the role of coercive interrogation techniques in generating false confessions (Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004; Leo & Drizin, 2010; Ofshe & Leo, 1997). Moreover, virtually no research has explored the use of known interrogation techniques with juvenile suspects, a legally and developmentally unique class of suspects (see Feld, 2013 for an exception). However, learning

more about how officers are trained to interrogate criminal suspects offers an opportunity to identify and implement avenues for reform. Descriptive data on the nature and scope of law enforcement training in such techniques—as well as the relationship between training and implementation—can hopefully inform the discussion on false confessions and lead to recommendations for improvement, more targeted training, and ultimately a reduction in false confession rates.

References

Berliner, L., & Conte, J. R. (1993). Sexual abuse evaluations: Conceptual and empirical obstacles. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 17,* 111–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(93)90012-T

Bull, R. (Ed.), (2014). *Investigative interviewing*. New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9642-7

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000070

Dixon, D. (2010). Questioning suspects: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 26,* 426–440. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1043986210377107

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

Evans, J. R., Meissner, C. A., Brandon, S. E., Russano, M. B., & Kleinman, S. M. (2010). Criminal versus HUMINT interrogations: The importance of psychological science to improving interrogative practice. *Journal of Psychiatry & Law, 38,* 215–249. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009318531003800110

Feld, B. C. (2013). *Kids, cops, and confessions: Inside the interrogation room*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Goodman-Delahunty, J., Martschuk, N., & Dhami, M. K. (2014). Interviewing high value detainees: Securing cooperation and disclosures. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28,* 883–897. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acp.3087

Grisso, T., Steinberg, L., Woolard, J., Cauffman, E., Scott, E., Graham, S., . . . Schwartz, R. (2003). Juveniles' competence to stand trial: A comparison of adolescents' and adults' capacities as trial defendants. *Law and Human Behavior, 27,* 333–363. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1024065015717

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Pearse, J. (2011). Suspect interviews and false confessions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20,* 33–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721410396824

Hartwig, M., Meissner, C. A., & Semel, M. D. (2014). Human Intelligence interviewing and interrogation: Assessing the challenges of developing an ethical, evidence-based approach. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing* (pp. 209–228). New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9642-7_11

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

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

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

International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2012). *Reducing risks: An executive's guide to effective juvenile interview and interrogation*. Washington, DC: Author.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00016.x

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

Kassin, S. M., Kukucka, J., Lawson, V. Z., & DeCarlo, J. (2014). Does video recording alter the behavior of police during interrogation? A mock crime-and-investigation study. *Law and Human Behavior, 38,* 73–83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000047

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

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

Kelly, C. E., Miller, J. C., Redlich, A. D., & Kleinman, S. M. (2013). A taxonomy of interrogation methods. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 19,* 165–178. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0030310

King, L., & Snook, B. (2009). Peering inside a Canadian interrogation room: An examination of the Reid model of interrogation, influence tactics, and coercive strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36,* 674–694. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0093854809335142

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 & the Law, 27,* 361–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bsl.871

Leo, R. A. (1996). Inside the interrogation room. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 86,* 266–303. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1144028

Leo, R. A. (2009). False confessions: Causes, consequences, and implications. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 37,* 332–343.

Leo, R. A., & Drizin, S. A. (2010). The three errors: Pathways to false confession and wrongful conviction. In G. D. Lassiter & C. A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations* (pp. 9–30). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12085-001

McLachlan, K., Roesch, R., & Douglas, K. S. (2011). Examining the role of interrogative suggestibility in Miranda rights comprehension in adolescents. *Law and Human Behavior, 35,* 165–177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9198-4

Meyer, J. R., & Reppucci, N. D. (2007). Police practices and perceptions regarding juvenile interrogation and interrogative suggestibility. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 25,* 757–780. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bsl.774

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

National Children's Advocacy Center. (2015). Forensic Interviewing of Children Training. Retrieved from http://www.nationalcac.org/events/bfi-training.html

Ofshe, R. J., & Leo, R. A. (1997). The decision to confess falsely: Rational choice and irrational action. *Denver University Law Review, 74,* 979–1122.

Pearse, J., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (1997). Police interviewing techniques at two south London police stations. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 3,* 63–74. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10683169608409795

Phillips, S. W. (2015). The attitudes and goals of police supervisors: Results from a national sample. *Police Practice & Research, 16,* 364–377. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2014.888349

Reaves, B. A. (2015). *Local police departments, 2013: Personnel, policies, and practices*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022543012851

Redlich, A. D., Kelly, C. E., & Miller, J. C. (2014). The who, what, and why of human intelligence gathering: Self-reported measures of interrogation methods. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 28,* 817–828. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/acp.3040

Redlich, A. D., Quas, J. A., & Ghetti, S. (2008). Perceptions of children during a police interrogation: Guilt, confessions, and interview fairness. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 14,* 201–223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10683160701652542

Reppucci, N. D., Meyer, J., & Kostelnik, J. (2010). Custodial interrogation of juveniles: Results of a national survey of police. In G. D. Lassiter & C. A. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions: Current research, practice, and policy recommendations* (pp. 67–80). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12085-004

Russano, M. B., Meissner, C. A., Narchet, F. M., & Kassin, S. M. (2005). Investigating true and false confessions within a novel experimental paradigm. *Psychological Science, 16,* 481–486.

Schafer, J. A. (2010). Effective leaders and leadership in policing: Traits, assessment, development, and expansion. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 33,* 644–663. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13639511011085060

Soukara, S., Bull, R., Vrij, A., Turner, M., & Cherryman, J. (2009). What really happens in police interviews of suspects? Tactics and confessions. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 15,* 493–506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10683160802201827

Starr, D. (2013, December 9). The interview: Do police interrogation techniques produce false confessions? *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2013/12/09/the-interview-7

Steinberg, L. (2014). *Age of opportunity: Lessons from the new science of adolescence*. Boston, MA: Eamon Dolan/Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

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,* 253–277. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10979-005-3613-2

Viljoen, J. L., Zapf, P. A., & Roesch, R. (2007). Adjudicative competence and comprehension of Miranda rights in adolescent defendants: A comparison of legal standards. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 25,* 1–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/bsl.714

Vrij, A. (2008). *Detecting lies and deceit: Pitfalls and opportunities* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

Walters, S. B. (1996). *Principles of kinesic interview and interrogation* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Received June 26, 2015
Revision received November 4, 2015
Accepted November 13, 2015 ■