

Week 1: APA Writing Exercise

Instructions: For each of the statements below, indicate in which section of the paper they should appear (**Introduction, Literature Review, Hypothesis, Method, Results, Discussion, and References**).

1. The mean age of participants was 19.4 years.
2. Because previous research suggests that minimization pragmatically implies an offer of leniency (Kassin & McNall), we predicted that the two techniques would have the same effect in the interrogation room, namely, to increase the likelihood of both true and false confessions.
3. Approximately 5 min later, the experimenter, blind to the participant's guilt or innocence, reentered the testing room for interrogation.
4. Our results indicated that minimization, a common and legal interrogation technique, provided an effective means of obtaining true confessions; however, this technique also put innocent participants at risk for false confessions.
5. Many legal scholars and researchers consider confession evidence to be the most potent form of evidence that exists, and research indicates that a confession is a very damning piece of evidence (Kassin & Neumann, 1997).
6. A significant main effect was found for guilt versus innocence, $x(1, N = 296) = 88.84$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.31$, such that guilty persons were 3.53 times more likely to confess (71.6%) than innocent persons (20.3%).
7. Researchers have categorized the interrogation methods promoted by interrogation manuals into two general types, namely, maximization and minimization (Kassin & McNall, 1991).
8. The novel experimental paradigm introduced in the present study appears to have successfully transposed into the laboratory several real-world interrogation elements, including use of an intentional "crime" that could involve rather serious consequences (i.e., when cheating is considered in the context of a university setting).
9. In the minimization condition, the interrogator was instructed to lessen the seriousness of the offense by making statements that expressed sympathy and concern, offered face saving excuses (e.g., "I'm sure you didn't realize what a big deal it was"), and suggested to participants that it was in their interest to cooperate by

signing the statement. In the no minimization condition, no such statements were made.

10. Three hundred thirty undergraduates (70% female) from a large Southeastern university received credit in a psychology course in exchange for their participation
11. A female confederate posing as another participant arrived at the lab at the same time as the actual participant, and the pair was greeted by one of six male experimenters.
12. Moreover, we encourage police investigators to carefully consider the use of interrogation techniques that imply or directly promise leniency, as they appear to reduce the diagnostic value of an elicited confession.
13. 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.
14. Statistical tests of these ratings indicated that they were not significantly influenced by the participant's guilt/innocence, $t_s(81) < 1.71, p_s > .09$; the use of minimization, $t_s(SI) \setminus .21, p_s > .20$; the offer of a deal, $p_s(81) < 1.36, p_s > .18$; or the participant's decision to confess, $t_s(81) < 1.49, p_s > .14$.
15. The experimenter then explained the true purpose of the experiment and the manipulations. He further explained that there was no angry professor and no pending negative consequence.
16. It is important, however, to have an appreciation for the limitations of the paradigm. Because suspects in the real world are accused of criminal, acts that are more severe both in nature and in consequence than the act featured in this paradigm, one could imagine that the confession rates overall would be lower in the real world than in the laboratory.
17. Although the absolute confession rates may differ and further research may be warranted, we believe that the underlying interrogative and psychological processes that occur in the laboratory similarly occur in the real world.
18. A 2 (guilt vs. innocence) x 2 (minimization vs. no minimization) x 2 (deal vs. no deal) analysis of variance was conducted on participants' ratings of pressure to confess.
19. It is interesting to note that although the use of the minimization and deal techniques clearly influenced the behavior of both guilty and innocent participants, they may have been unaware of this influence.