Eliciting Crime-Relevant Information from Suspects:
Exploring Approaches of Strategic Evidence Disclosure when Interviewing Guilty Suspects

Bachelor's Thesis

Leon D. Buiter

University of Twente

Supervised by

Dr. Simon Oleszkiewicz

June 2019

Abstract

This study is about how to influence guilty suspects to reveal new crime-relevant information via interviewing. During investigative interviews, suspects might use strategies to appear innocent. To counteract such strategies, evidence that the interviewer holds on the suspect's activities, can be disclosed strategically throughout the interview. Past research mainly focused on detecting deception. However, to form conclusions about guilt or innocence, admissions from suspects are necessary. In this study, all participants (N = 50) performed a mock crime consisting of several activities that generated pieces of evidence regarding their activities. Hence, all suspects were guilty. Contrary to previous studies, the state of evidence was more complex as it did not reveal all legal activities that suspects engaged in prior to and after the crime (i.e., details about suspects' activities also needed to be clarified during the interview). Thereafter, suspects were interviewed with either of two techniques. One group was interviewed with the Shift-of-Strategy (SoS) technique, whereby evidence is disclosed after each crime-relevant question that is asked. This aims to make the suspect overestimate the knowledge of the interviewer. To cope with that, the suspect might change his/her strategy from withholding information to providing information. A new manipulation was added to the SoS technique at the end of the interview. Instead of asking one critical question about the crime, the suspect was asked three questions. This aimed to utilize the moment at which the suspect started to overestimate the interviewer's knowledge, so that the suspect would provide more information which the interviewer did not know before. The second group was interviewed using the late disclosure technique. Within late disclosure, all the pieces of evidence are disclosed at once, after all crime-relevant questions have been asked. The SoS condition resulted in significantly more admissions and elicited significantly more new crime-relevant information compared to the late disclosure condition. The manipulation that was added to the SoS technique (i.e., the three questions) was partially shown to be effective in eliciting more admissions. Furthermore, the manipulation generated valuable implications for the future of the SoS approach. This study provides strong support for the SoS technique as an effective approach to elicit new crime-relevant information.

Keywords: Strategic Use of Evidence, Shift-of-Strategy, new crime-relevant information, admission, late disclosure

Introduction

Jamal Ahmad Khashoggi was a Saudi Arabian journalist, working for the New York Times. He was a fierce critic of the Saudi Arabian crown prince Mohammed bin Salman (MBS). Khashoggi planned to marry the Turkish journalist Hatice Cengiz, whose father had consented to the marriage one month before he had asked for her hand. On the second of October 2018. Khashoggi went inside the Saudi Arabian embassy in Istanbul to retrieve documents for his marriage. Since that time, he was deemed missing and was never seen again. Khashoggi's disappearance was first reported in the news media. At that time, Saudi Arabian officials insisted that he had left the embassy through the back entrance. However, no security footage could verify that statement. Subsequently, the Turkish government leaked information that would raise doubt about Saudi Arabia's account. Video footage showed that on the day of Khashoggi's disappearance, more than a dozen Saudis travelled to Istanbul by plane. The same individuals left the embassy hours after Khashoggi's arrival. They drove black vans with tinted windows and left the country on the very same day. Following the leak, 18 men were arrested in Saudi Arabia. Most of them were personnel working closely to the crown prince. Following that, the statement made by Saudi officials was revised. The director of public prosecutions of Saudi Arabia confirmed that Khashoggi died in the embassy. He attributed the death to an escalated fistfight, which was portrayed as an "unlucky event". Later, the Turkish government leaked further evidence which again disproved the second account given by Saudi Arabian officials. It turned out that the Turkish government possessed audio recordings of the incident at the embassy. These were so clear that Khashoggi's voice could be identified and confirmed, along with eerie sounds of a bone saw. Responding to that disclosure, the story about the murder was changed once again. In an interview with Fox News (US), Saudi Arabia's Foreign Secretary stated that the killing was the result of a non-authorized "rogue operation" by governmental personnel.

After it was established that a Saudi death squad was responsible for Khashoggi's death, the Turkish President, Erdogan posed three further questions to Saudi officials: "Where is Khashoggi's body? Who is the 'local collaborator' to whom Saudi officials claimed to have handed over Khashoggi's remains? Who gave the order to kill this kind soul?" These questions addressed the most crucial aspects of the crime that needed clarification. However, the Saudis refused to answer any of them. Instead, they asked the investigating parties to provide them with a report about existing evidence. The investigating parties declined this request. This

implies a great uncertainty for Saudi Arabian officials about how to respond to questions related to Khashoggi's killing.

When formulating answers to the three questions posed by Erdogan, the Saudis seemed to carefully consider what evidence the investigation might produce. In particular, if they were guilty, they would have tried to avoid producing even more inconsistencies, which had already highly undermined their credibility. Hence, the three questions were asked at the right point in time: Saudis had to consider providing some self-incriminating information in response to these questions, in order to avoid contradicting possible evidence again. This could perhaps have led to admissions containing information that was not previously known by the investigators, which therefore, would be highly valuable for the investigation.

The development of the Khashoggi case, as outlined above, could be transferred to the interrogative context of suspect interviewing. It provides two main implications for current interviewing techniques. First, questions are asked related to an existing piece of evidence. After the suspect's response, the specific piece of evidence is disclosed. Repeating that pattern seems to increase the suspect's uncertainty about the interviewer's knowledge. The suspect notices that constant withholding or denial makes him/her appear even more suspicious. This is where the second implication comes into play. When that particular point in time is reached, suspects might formulate a new strategy and become more forthcoming in order to restore their credibility. When that happens, three critical questions may be asked that are most relevant to the crime. Importantly, the interviewer does not know the answers to those questions. Due to the suspect's uncertainty about the interviewer's knowledge, s/he might now carefully decide what information s/he should provide. As withholding or denying details which the interviewer knows about has proven to be rather unprofitable, the suspect might now accidentally decide to reveal information that the interviewer does not know.

To sum up, this approach might yield two highly valuable insights for an investigation. First, the suspect's attempts to deceive the interviewer might be utilized to influence the suspect's strategy. Secondly, and most importantly, this might lead suspects to reveal crime-relevant information that was unknown prior to the interview. That information can in turn support the investigation and help investigators to find more conclusive clues that hint at someone's involvement in the crime. Therefore, based on the implications derived from the Khashoggi case, the present study focuses on increasing the efficacy of current interviewing techniques.

Accusatorial Vs. Information Gathering Interviewing Techniques

Common Hollywood-interrogation methods include: Good cop, bad cop; interrogators pressuring the suspect until they break emotionally, arriving at the eagerly awaited confession. To a certain extent, these methods seem to resemble the reality of the past century. More precisely, accusatorial techniques were and are still used today in the U.S. and other countries (Dixon, 2010; Meissner, Redlich, Bhatt, & Brandon, 2010).

The typical accusatorial method (as defined by Meissner et al., 2014) is divided into two phases. The first phase consists of a non-accusatorial interview to form an impression about the suspect's guilt. This impression relies on non-verbal behavioural cues as well as analyses of linguistic and paralinguistic styles which are assumed to indicate deception (Meissner et al., 2014). However, research has demonstrated that relying on these types of cues is very risky as, for example, stress and emotions can result from multiple reasons other than being dishonest (Granhag & Hartwig, 2008). Nevertheless, if the investigator believes the suspect to be guilty, the second phase is initiated: The accusatorial interview. The goal of the accusatorial interview is to elicit a confession, as the investigator at this point, assumes that the suspect should be guilty (Meissner et al., 2014). A guilt-presumptive accusatorial interview establishes control and utilizes psychological manipulation tactics to secure a confession. These are designed to make suspects comply to the interviewer's assumption of guilt rather than being an attempt to find the truth (see Kassin & Gudjonsson, 2004 for a summary).

Kassin and McNall (1991) labelled the manipulative tactics used during accusatorial interviews as maximization and minimization. Maximization involves tactics designed to make suspects feel hopeless in their attempt to come across as innocent. They include making accusations, citing real or manufactured evidence, or overriding objections. The threat of harsher consequences is communicated as a response to suspects' denials. Minimization tactics, on the other hand, are designed to justify moral decisions of the suspect made during the crime. This is achieved by the interrogator offering sympathy and understanding. The crime gets 'normalized' or 'minimized', suggesting that others, even the interrogator themselves, would have acted in the same way as the suspect, had they been placed in the same position. Minimization tactics also involve providing suggestions or alternative explanations for why a crime was committed. For example, that the murder was an unfortunate outcome of necessary self-defence. It is communicated that a confession will result in more lenient consequences.

Alarmingly, this approach is associated with not only true, but also a number of false confessions (Horgan, Russano, Meissner, & Evans, 2012; Kassin et al., 2009). Due to the high stress and manipulation inflicted on suspects, some innocents confess to the crime as means to escape interrogation. The extent of responsibility and authority that the accusatorial approach

implies on investigators is highly problematic. The conviction of a suspect relies heavily on the investigator's unilateral judgement about the suspect's guilt, formed during the first phase (i.e. the non-accusatorial interview). Unfortunately, experienced professionals have been shown to be overconfident in their own lie detection skills (Kassin et al., 2007), while their success rate is similar to that of the average lay person: Close to an estimate by chance (54%, Bond & DePaulo, 2006).

In light of the problems outlined above, accusatorial interviewing strategies might generally not be justified. Innocent subjects can be falsely accused, while the real culprit remains free of any consequences. Psychological manipulation misleads suspects and shifts their goal to escaping the interrogation, no matter the cost. To tackle those problems, research has focused on so-called "information-gathering" approaches and their implications for criminal investigation. Several countries, including the United Kingdom, Norway, New Zealand, and Australia, have already changed their interrogation methods into information-gathering practices (Meissner et al., 2010). They all introduced the PEACE model to suspect interviewing, which was developed in the UK (for more details see Bull, 2018). In brief, practices like the PEACE model focus on rapport building and information gathering rather than seeking a confession. The PEACE model provides a set of guidelines on how to behave during an interview to protect innocent suspects from being falsely convicted. Strategies other than psychological manipulation and coercion need to be included to achieve results that can advance the investigation. Taking these guidelines into consideration, has shown to be at least as effective as accusatorial approaches to interviewing and especially less error-prone (see Meissner et al., 2010 for a review).

Strategic Use of Evidence

The strategic use of evidence (SUE) approach is in line with guidelines offered by the PEACE model. It consists of challenging the suspect with evidence that is held against him/her during an investigative interview. The procedure and timing for disclosing evidence during the interview has been subject of research within the past decades.

Commonly used disclosure techniques focus on disclosing evidence early at the start of the interview (Hartwig, Granhag, Strömwall, & Vrij, 2005). All the evidence the interviewer holds is presented to the suspect before asking them to make a statement. Consequently, the suspect can adjust or modify his/her story to fit the knowledge of the interviewer by not omitting or contradicting the existing evidence. Hence, the suspect can formulate sound lies, which seem

to be in line with what the investigators know. Thereby, the interviewer does not gain new insights into the case, which could provide a new lead for the investigation.

Due to the rather insufficient results of early disclosure, research has focused on other evidence disclosure strategies. 'Late disclosure' refers to disclosing evidence at a later stage of the interview (Hartwig et al., 2005). The suspect is asked numerous crime-related questions before the evidence is disclosed. Therefore, suspects cannot adjust or modify their story to fit the knowledge of the interviewer. Under such circumstances, suspects typically withhold potentially incriminating knowledge and make up stories to deceive the interviewer (Hartwig, Granhag, Strömwall, & Kronkvist, 2006). This frequently results in inconsistencies between the suspects' account and the existing evidence. Subsequently, the interviewer discloses the evidence he holds, drawing attention to the inconsistencies between the suspect's story and existing evidence.

Hartwig and colleagues (2005) compared both techniques (early vs. late disclosure) with regard to their potential of detecting deception. Late disclosure was shown to be significantly more accurate in detecting deception. The inconsistencies between the suspects' statement and the evidence can be quantified. The more inconsistencies arise, the less credible the suspect appears to be. A meta-analyses by Hartwig, Granhag, and Luke (2014) showed that guilty suspects have a tendency to make statements that contradict evidence. This tendency is amplified when they are uninformed about the evidence against them.

Suspects' objections to specific pieces of evidence are called 'statement-evidence inconsistencies' and have shown to be a diagnostic cue to deceit (Granhag, Strömwall, Willén, & Hartwig, 2013; Hartwig et al., 2014, 2006). That means, when a suspect's statement contradicts the evidence, s/he is likely to be lying. Statement-evidence inconsistencies can therefore be seen as counterpart to the non-verbal cues that are used to detect deception during accusatorial interviewing. Instead of relying on ambiguous bodily signals, the suspect's statements can be compared to established facts. In fact, guilty suspects have been shown to produce higher numbers of statement-evidence inconsistencies than innocent suspects (Hartwig et al., 2014).

Following statement-evidence inconsistencies, suspects typically change their story to fit the facts again. Thereby, they often contradict their previous account. Such modifications between statements are called 'within-statement inconsistencies' which serve as additional indicators of deception. Therefore, the SUE technique has been predominantly used to assess suspects' veracity. However, the commonly held belief that truth-telling suspects are always more consistent than lying suspects has not received much empirical support (for a review, see

Vredeveldt, van Koppen, & Granhag, 2014). Liars' statements are typically either equally consistent or less consistent with existing evidence than truth-telling suspects. Hence, the belief that inconsistency is predictive of lying has so far only received modest support. Therefore, using inconsistency as a tool to judge the suspect's credibility does not necessarily help the investigator to draw conclusions that support the investigation.

Furthermore, assessing the suspect's veracity, whether judged accurately or not, does not provide the interviewer with new knowledge about the crime that can be used to identify the perpetrator. Therefore, even though the late disclosure approach might hint at a lying suspect, the interviewer's ultimate goal is not yet likely to be achieved.

Influencing suspects to become more forthcoming with New Crime-Relevant Information

The interviewer aims to prosecute guilty suspects, whilst relieving innocent suspects from suspicion. To do so, the interviewer needs additional information to form confident conclusions about guilt or innocence, respectively. For that reason, eliciting incriminating admissions from suspects, together with new crime-relevant information, should be the main aim of suspect interviewing. However, guilty suspects usually do not want to be found guilty. Therefore, they strategically decide to avoid providing incriminating knowledge (Granhag, Clemens, & Strömwall, 2009; Strömwall & Willén, 2011). Hence, the interviewer needs a strategy to overcome this challenge to make suspects more forthcoming.

Strategies which suspects choose during the interview are called counter-interrogation (CI) strategies. CI strategies aim at convincing the interviewer of one's innocence (May, Granhag, & Tekin, 2017; Tekin et al., 2015). Compared to innocent suspects, guilty ones have been shown to use different counter-interrogation strategies: They mainly focus on withholding potentially incriminating knowledge (Hartwig et al., 2006). For that reason, the interviewer might accomplish his goal of eliciting admissions from the suspect by finding ways to change the strategies of suspects from withholding, to being more forthcoming, during the interview.

In an attempt to address this challenge, Granhag and Luke (2018) introduced the Shift-of-Strategy (SoS) approach. In contrast to the late disclosure of evidence approach, the main goal of the SoS approach is not to elicit cues to deception, but rather, to elicit admissions that would incriminate guilty suspects. That is, whereas the late disclosure approach aims to influence the suspect to continue to lie to the interviewer (i.e., continuously producing statement-evidence inconsistencies), the Shift-of-Strategy technique aims to influence a change in the suspect's CI-strategies, during the interview. Specifically, the SoS technique aims at shifting guilty suspects' strategies from withholding information, to providing information.

The mechanism of the SoS technique is based on two premises: (i) suspects form impressions about what evidence is held against them by the interviewer and (ii) suspects will make inferences regarding the interviewer's disclosure pattern. When the suspect believes there exists no evidence against him/her, s/he may stick to withholding strategies (e.g., "They cannot know I have been there, so I better not tell them about it"). However, if that perception changes, (e.g., "Oh, the interviewer knows more than I thought!") the suspect may be influenced to shift his/her strategy from having been withholding to becoming more forthcoming with information.

When the suspect becomes more forthcoming, the main goal of the SoS approach becomes attainable. In other words, the technique not only aims to gain admissions from the suspect conceding to existing evidence, but primarily aims to elicit admissions consisting of new crime-relevant information. That means, when the suspect overestimates the interviewer's knowledge, the suspect might decide to provide new information, as s/he believes that the interviewer might already know about it. Hence, asking critical questions at this particular point in time, might elicit admissions from the suspect that can substantially enhance the investigation. To achieve such a change in the suspect's strategy, the SoS approach puts forward an evidence disclosure pattern to be used by the interviewer. This can best be explained with a practical example.

The interviewer starts by asking a question related to a piece of evidence s/he holds, without disclosing what s/he knows (e.g., "Have you been around the lockers close to the entrance area of the building today?"). While asking for a clarification of the suspect's activities, the interviewer gives the impression that s/he knows nothing about the suspect's whereabouts. This might then influence the suspect to withhold critical details in the belief that no evidence of that specific situation exists ("they have no proof of me being there today"). Then the interviewer challenges the suspect with a known fact, disclosing that evidence regarding that specific situation exists (e.g., "A witness reported seeing you picking up an item from the lockers"). The suspect might then realize that s/he had a wrong impression of the interviewer's knowledge and that this caused problems in his/her attempt to appear innocent. When the interviewer turns to the next question, repeating the same pattern, the suspect might eventually read the interviewer's strategy (i.e., "The interviewer asks an open question, makes me avoid revealing important details, then catches me off guard with existing evidence"). Thus, the elicitation of inconsistencies is utilized to make the suspect realize that his/her current CI strategy has not served him/her well. To restore credibility, the suspect might conclude that s/he might profit from a shift of strategy (i.e., "Probably it is better to try telling them what they

already know"). That shift of strategy then creates an opportunity for the interviewer to ask questions about situations for which no evidence exists.

The SoS approach received some support for its efficacy in eliciting admissions from guilty suspects (Granhag & Luke, 2018; May et al., 2017; Tekin et al., 2015). The two premises of the approach seem to hold: The suspects in the studies became more forthcoming as they started overestimating the interviewer's knowledge. Hence, influencing the suspect's perception of the evidence held against him/her seems a promising way to influence them to provide more information voluntarily.

An idea to further refine the SoS technique resulted from findings of a preceding study. The interviewer asked an open question without disclosing what s/he knew. After the suspect's response, the interviewer confronted the suspect with a known fact. However, even when inconsistencies arose, the interviewer moved on to the next question without giving the suspect a chance to explain the inconsistency (Tekin et. al., 2015). While this approach was found to be effective in eliciting admissions from guilty suspects, a group of suspects revealed nothing throughout the interview. Upon further investigation, the researchers found that these suspects felt that their attempts to convince the interviewer of their innocence would be futile and therefore, they were not inclined to provide any further information.

To resolve this problem, May and colleagues (2017) formulated a promising method to influence the suspect's decision to become more forthcoming. Their approach to advance the SoS technique was for the interviewer to invite the suspect to provide explanations for arising statement-evidence inconsistencies: when the interviewer challenged the suspect with a known fact, detecting an inconsistency between the suspect's statement and existing evidence, the interviewer asked the suspect for an explanation (e.g., "Would you mind explaining why the witness saw you at the lockers when you told me earlier that you have not been there?").

Using this adapted approach (i.e., inviting suspects to explain inconsistencies), May and colleagues (2017) found that suspects feel more involved in the dialogue. This creates a cooperative atmosphere for the interview rather than a feeling of confrontation and interrogation. The suspect consequently retains the belief of being able to resolve the critical situation that was created by the statement-evidence inconsistency. Therefore, the suspect may decide to remain active within the conversation, providing more information to come clean of his/her suspicion.

Considerations About the Implementation of the SoS Approach in Previous Research

May and colleagues (2017) successfully showed the efficacy of the SoS approach in making suspects provide new information. However, two aspects of previous studies should be considered. First, after successfully making suspects shift their strategy, the interviewer asked them one question about the critical crime phase (e.g., "Now tell me everything you have done after leaving the library"). When suspects volunteered with a cue, follow up questions were posed. When no more information was revealed by the suspect, the interview ended. When the open-ended question was answered by the suspect, the previous disclosure pattern of the interviewer ends. Eventually, the suspect may perhaps notice after some time that the interviewer ran out of evidence and then shift back his/her withholding strategy. However, this did not raise a big issue in previous studies, as can be shown by turning to the second aspect of previous studies to be considered: the structure of the mock crimes.

Mock crimes employed in previous studies consisted of three phases and were rather simple (May et al., 2017; Tekin et al., 2015). Phase one and two served as preparation for the crime. No illegal activities were executed during these phases. The actual crime happened during the last phase. The interviewers possessed evidence for all activities of suspects during phase one and two. No knowledge was held about the activities in the third phase. This is a well-structured condition for using a strategy by which the interviewer can influence the suspect's perception of existing evidence (i.e., the interviewer can show that he knows every single activity of the suspect prior to the crime). Asking one open-ended question about the critical crime phase at the end of the interview might suffice to elicit crucial knowledge about the crime phase without the suspect noticing too early that the interviewer ran out of evidence. While these studies have shown the SoS technique to be efficient in eliciting admissions and new crime-relevant information (May et al., 2017; Tekin et al., 2015), it remains unknown how well the technique arrives at its intended goals when the interviewer did not come to know every detail of the suspect's legal activities prior to or after the crime. The suspect's perception of the interviewer's knowledge might be less influenced by evidence that lacks details about his/her whereabouts and activities. Therefore, the SoS technique might potentially yield less useful results when a crime produces a more complex state of evidence.

The Present Study

Based on the above considerations, this study aims to extend research on the SoS approach with two respects. First, we aim to maximize the interviewer's potential to exploit the moment when the suspect shifts his/her strategy (i.e., becomes more forthcoming), so that more new crime-relevant information can be elicited. To do this, we draw on the approach Erdogan

used when questioning the Saudis. This study will implement three questions instead of one, to ask the suspect about the critical crime activities. This means that the suspect is prompted to provide more information on three specific aspects before ending the interview. This might delay the moment when the suspect can notice that the interviewer's knowledge is depleted. The suspect has to then carefully weigh up what the interviewer might or might not know. This may consequently lead the suspect to provide more information than the interviewer actually holds. In previous studies, one question about the critical crime phase had been sufficient. This study might therefore enhance the SoS technique's applicability to situations, when one question is not enough to cover all important details about a crime which need to be clarified.

Secondly, this study aims at exploring the efficacy of the SoS approach, when the crime produces a less detailed body of evidence, which can be used by the interviewer during the interview. Knowledge about the suspect's activities and the crime at hand will be rather fragmented and need further clarification. The themes that have to be addressed during the interview will concern the following: (1) Clarification about situations of which only partial information is known by the investigator (e.g., it is known that someone picked up an envelope, while its content is unknown); (2) gaps in the course of events that are completely non-transparent so far (e.g., 'what happened at the time the suspect was between location A and B?'). As outlined above, in previous studies, the interviewer possessed knowledge about all suspect activities in all phases except for the critical crime phase. In the present study, each phase will leave important details unknown to the interviewer. Exploring these conditions might help to further specify the applicability of the SoS technique in the interrogative context.

To explore the effects of the outlined changes, this study employs two interviewing conditions. Suspects interviewed with to the SoS technique (experimental condition) will be compared with suspects interviewed with a late disclosure approach (control condition). All participants in this study will conduct the mock crime representing guilty suspects. As in previous studies, no innocent suspects have been included in this study. This relies on findings of prior studies: Innocent suspects were significantly more forthcoming regardless of the interviewing condition (as cited in Tekin et al., 2015). A total of 59 out of 60 innocent suspects disclosed all critical admissions during the interviews. Therefore, as stated, the present study focuses on the effectiveness of the employed interviewing techniques on guilty suspects only.

Hypotheses

Total admissions. The term 'total admissions' from here on, holds for all crime-relevant admissions that the suspect reveals during the interview. This comprises both (1) evidence

conformity (i.e., already known by the interviewer) as well as (2) evidence advancements (i.e., information that is new to the interviewer). This will allow us to measure and compare the overall effect of the interviewing techniques. Admissions that the suspect reveals before the manipulation (i.e., the three questions, SoS condition) or before the evidence disclosure (late disclosure condition) will be termed 'total admissions early'. Admissions revealed after that point during the interview, will be termed 'total admissions late'. We predict that the SoS condition will result in more total admissions than the late disclosure condition (Hypothesis 1), and we predict that the SoS condition will elicit more total admissions early compared to the late disclosure condition (Hypothesis 2). The first two hypotheses are based on the typical findings regarding the SUE framework, which this study aims to replicate. Further, as the late disclosure condition focuses on eliciting admissions mostly at the end, we expect no difference between the two conditions regarding total admissions late.

New crime-relevant information. The term 'new crime-relevant information' from here on, relates only to evidence advancements revealed by the suspect. This allows us to measure whether the specific goal of the interview (i.e., gathering new information that can promote the investigation) was achieved. As with the total admissions, new crime-relevant information will be divided into 'new crime-relevant information early' and 'new crime-relevant information late'. We predict that the SoS condition will in total elicit more new crime-relevant information than the late disclosure condition (Hypothesis 3). This is based on the findings that suspects typically become more forthcoming when subjected to the SoS technique. Due to the main difference in evidence disclosure strategies, we also predict that the SoS condition will result in more new crime-relevant information early, compared to the late disclosure condition (Hypothesis 4). Further, we predict that the SoS condition will result in more new crime-relevant information late than the late disclosure condition (Hypothesis 5) as the manipulation (three questions) aims to elicit new crime-relevant information.

Furthermore, the number of pieces of new crime-relevant information that specifically relate to the content of the three questions will be compared between conditions. This will allow us to further examine and specify the effect of the three questions. We predict that the SoS condition will elicit more new crime-relevant information late that is related to the content of the three questions compared to the late disclosure condition (Hypothesis 6).

Methods

Participants

Participants (N = 50) included 22 males and 28 females between the ages of 19 and 28 years (M = 22.4, SD = 1.73). All 50 participants indicated to be students. They were randomly allocated to either the Shift-of-Strategy (SoS) condition (n=24) or the Late Disclosure condition (n=26). The study was advertised via flyer distributed across the University of Twente campus, as well as the university's online platform for recruiting student participants (i.e., SONA system). The participants received 5€ and 1 SONA credit (if eligible) for their participation. All participants were students at the University of Twente. Requirements for participation were basic familiarity with the university's facilities and a mobile phone to receive instructions during the experiment. The participants had to read and sign an informed consent (see Appendix A) before participating in the experiment. The participants were fully debriefed after the experiment and had to again confirm their consent. One participant was excluded from analyses as their values extremely deviated from the rest. Analyses regarding this participant will be further discussed within the results section.

Procedure

Background. Participants received instructions to imagine themselves taking part in illegal activities at the University of Twente (see Appendix B). Their task was to collect evidence to convict a professor who conducted illegal and harmful animal testing at the University. Participants were asked to imagine that they have had contact with an animal rights organisation. Together they developed a plan to obtain data of the animal experiments. The plan was handed to them as a checklist form, functioning as instructions for the mock crime (see Appendix C). The participants had to bring the checklist when performing the illegal activity (i.e., to always know what to do next). All participants received the same instructions. Hence, all participants were guilty suspects.

The mock crime. After having read the background, the participants had the chance to ask clarifying questions. Then they started following the instructions to perform the planned activities. An outline of three phases of the illegal activity will be provided below.

Phase 1. First, the participants had to collect a USB stick that an accomplice (a researcher) had placed inside a locker. The locker was next to the study area on the ground floor of the building of the psychology department. They (a) received a text message of an accomplice (one of the researchers) informing them about the location and the code with which to open the locker. They then (b) went to the lockers, typed in the code, and (c) picked up an envelope in which the USB stick was placed. Importantly, the participants were allowed to contact their contact at any time during the illegal activity (e.g., if they got lost in the building).

Phase 2. In the second phase, participants had to obtain a file about the animal experiments from the computer of the professor. They (a) went to the professor's empty office on the second floor of the building. There they (b) gained access to the computer and (c) copied a file named 'Experiments' (located on the desktop) containing data of the experiments onto the USB device. After that, participants left the room.

Phase 3. The goal of the third phase was to send the stolen file to a journalist. The participants (a) went into another room where a laptop was placed. They (b) accessed the computer, (c) plugged in the USB stick and (d) sent the file via email to the journalist. After that they had to (e) hide the stick in the envelope in a folder, with the label 'Private', placed in the same room. An accomplice would pick up the envelope later. The participants were then instructed to look for documents on animal testing in another folder. They had to (f) make photos of the documents and (g) send the photos to their contact at the animal rights organization. When all the evidence had been sent the mission was complete. The participants then went to the final room in which they found a sheet of paper informing them about the upcoming interview (see Appendix F).

The evidence. The activities that the participant engaged in generated several pieces of evidence regarding the suspect's activities (see Table 1). Importantly, no piece of evidence was sufficient to establish guilt. Guilt would only be established when finding out that the suspect copied the confidential files from the computer of the professor. Furthermore, the criminal activities of phase 3 (i.e., sending the data to the journalist, taking photos of the documents from the folder and sending them to their contact) were not known at all by the police. Hence, these activities could only be revealed during the interview if the suspect voluntarily decided to talk about them (e.g., "I think they might know about this, so I better mention what I did there.").

Table 1

Activities of suspects and pieces of evidence held by the police per Phase

	Activities	Evidence
Phase 1	(a) Receive text message	Time and recipient (participant) of text message
	(b) Go to lockers	Witness: Saw suspect picking up envelope from lockers
	(c) Pick up envelope	

Phase 2	(a) Go to professor's office (b) Access computer (c) Copy files onto the USB stick	Witness: Saw suspect close to the office Fingerprints on appointment sheet that suspects had to remove from the computer
Phase 3	(a) Go into second room (b) Access computer (c) Plug in USB stick (d) Send file to journalist (e) Hide USB stick and envelope in folder 'private' (f) Take pictures of documents (g) Send pictures to accomplice	Webcam Photo

Evidence phase 1. The suspect's accomplice was allegedly under surveillance by the police for prior involvement in criminal acts related to animal rights. Therefore, the police intercepted the text message that was sent to the suspect at the beginning of phase 1. The time and receiver of the text message was encrypted by the investigating team. However, no content could be deciphered. Furthermore, a witness had seen the suspect picking up an envelope from the lockers, while its content (i.e., the USB device) remained unknown.

Evidence phase 2. Before entering the professor's office, an employee had seen the suspect close to the office on the second floor (but did not see the suspect entering the office). Second, the fingerprints of the suspect had been secured on an appointment sheet that the professor left on his laptop. The sheet covered the touchpad and keyboard of the laptop, so that participants had to remove it in order to use the laptop to copy the file onto the USB device.

Evidence phase 3. In the last phase one piece of evidence was collected. The webcam of the laptop that was used in the final room was set to always take a picture when the computer

was activated. Hence, there was photo evidence that the participant had been inside the room activating the PC.

Before the interview. Once participants entered the last room, they received further instructions which informed them about the upcoming interview (see Appendix F). The participants were instructed to try to convince the interviewer of their innocence. As an incentive to do so, they were told that the animal rights organisation would not be able to publish their findings and convict the cruel professor if the participants would be found guilty of their illegal activities. If they would be found guilty, they were told that all their hard work would have been for nothing. They were further instructed to waive their rights for a lawyer as well as their rights to remain silent, as agreeing to this might work against an innocent impression. Before the interviewer entered the room, participants were given 5 minutes to prepare.

The interview. The interview protocols can generally be divided into two stages. Important to note here is that the beginning of the first stage and the ending of the second stage did not differ across conditions. In the beginning of both interviewing conditions, the investigator informed the suspect of the reason why s/he was being interviewed: Someone had broken into the university's facilities and stolen confidential data; there is reasonable suspicion on him/her, and therefore s/he will be asked questions about his/her behaviour and observations at the university that day. The suspect was further given the opportunity to consult a lawyer and was informed about his/her right to remain silent. As instructed, all participants waived these rights.

In both conditions, the interviews continued with a broad question about involvement ("Do you confess or deny having engaged in any criminal activities?"). All participants denied. The interviewer then prompted the suspect to give a free narrative about his/her activities at the university that day.

After that, the specific activities of the suspect related to the pieces of evidence were addressed (i.e., activities the interviewer knew about; see Table 2). Importantly, the first piece of evidence (the text message) was omitted and used later on. The first question was: "Have you been around the study area on the ground floor of the Cubicus building (*psychology department*) today?" Whenever the suspect remained silent or answered with a yes, s/he was further asked to provide more details (e.g., "Would you mind explaining what you did there?"). Then, the other pieces of evidence were addressed in the same order as the steps were performed by the suspect (see Table 2).

Table 2

Order of questions in stage 2 of the interview

Question 1	*"Have you been around the study area on the ground floor of the Cubicus building today?"*
Question 2	*"Have you been around the office C225 after being at the study area?"*
Question 3	*"Have you recently entered the office C225?"*
Question 4	*"Have you entered any other room today?"*

Late-Disclosure Condition. In the late disclosure condition, the interviewer directly moved on to the next question after the suspect gave an answer to his previous question (see Appendix D). When the suspect only answered with "yes", the interviewer asked him/her to provide more details. This was repeated until the last situation was addressed (i.e., "Have you entered any other room today?"). The Suspect was then invited to provide more information (i.e., "Is there anything you would like to add at this point?"). Then the interviewer listed all the pieces of evidence that were held against the suspect: "We have collected some evidence that I would like you to address. Our tech team intercepted the text message you received today; shortly thereafter a witness saw you picking up an envelope from the lockers in the Cubicus building. Later on, another witness saw you near the office C225. We have also found your fingerprints inside the office, and a webcam has shown that you used the computer in room C230". Afterwards, the interviewer invited the suspect to explain all of those activities ("Would you mind explaining all these activities?"). Subsequently, the second stage of the interview began.

SoS Condition. The order of questions asked during the first stage is the same as with the late disclosure condition. Whenever the suspect answered with only "yes", the interviewer asked the suspect to provide more details. In the SoS condition, the interview protocol differed from the late disclosure condition with respect to evidence disclosure and the ending of the first stage (see Appendix E). The piece of evidence that was related to a question was immediately disclosed after the suspect's response to the question. When the suspect's account matched the evidence, the interviewer affirmed this to him/her (e.g., "What you say fits the evidence we hold, as a witness has seen you picking up an envelope from the lockers"). In case of a statement-evidence inconsistency, the interviewer discredited the suspect's response with the corresponding piece of evidence and gave him/her the opportunity to change or explain the inconsistency (e.g., "What you say does not fit the evidence we hold. A witness has seen you

picking up an envelope from one of the lockers. Would you like to respond to that statement?"). When the suspect gave an explanation or refused to do so, the interviewer moved on to the next question, repeating the same pattern.

After all the pieces of evidence were addressed (i.e., except for the text message), the aforementioned addition to the SoS strategy was initiated ("Okay, I have three additional questions I need you to address before we end this interview"). Three questions were posed at once. Each addressed one of the most crucial aspects of the criminal activity that was partly unknown by the police. The first question challenged the suspect with the text message that had been intercepted ("I need you to explain the text message you received just before going to the locker"). The second question was built on the assumption that the suspect had been inside the office of the professor where the apparent crime had happened ("You have to clarify what you did on the computer inside the office of the professor"). The third question addressed the last room the participant had been to ("and I need you to describe exactly what you did in room C230"). Subsequently, the second stage of the interview began.

The second stage of the interview was the same for both interviewing conditions. The suspect gave a response to either the three questions (SoS condition) or all the pieces of evidence (Late Disclosure condition). Then, the interviewer invited the suspect to give one last statement. Appealing to the suspect's doubt about the interviewer's knowledge, the interviewer reminded participants of possible consequences and inconsistencies within the prior dialogue: "I would like to point out that you're better off, the more information you provide voluntarily. You might have noticed that there were several inconsistencies between what you told us and the evidence we hold. I'll give you one last chance to cooperate by answering my questions". Following the suspect's response, s/he was once again asked whether s/he confessed or denied having engaged in any criminal activities. After that, the interview ended with the interviewer thanking the suspect for his/her time and wishing him/her a good day. Another researcher then joined the room and administered a questionnaire to the participant.

The interviewers. The interviews were held by the five researchers conducting the experiment. All five researchers held a similar number of interviews in both interviewing conditions (i.e., between 5 and 6 per condition, per researcher). The interviewers were aware of the suspect's guilt and of what outcome measures were to be analysed. To control the interview procedure, the researchers strictly followed standardized interview protocols word-by-word and were not allowed to deviate from the protocol. Sometimes participants posed counter-questions, in which case the interviewers were instructed to kindly ask the suspect to

answer his or her question (e.g., “We can address that later. For now, please answer my question.”).

Data Preparation

Coding of the interviews. All interviews were transcribed verbatim. Each transcript was then coded in terms of ‘total admissions’ revealed by the suspect (range: 0 to 19 units, see Table 3). ‘Total admissions’ entails both admissions in form of evidence conformity as well as admissions in form of evidence advancements. From the total admissions, a second measure was derived which isolated evidence advancements. Hence, ‘new crime relevant information’ refers to information that was not known by the interviewer prior to the interview (range: 0 to 11 units, see Table 3). It was further differentiated between possible points in time of when a participant disclosed information: Information was labelled ‘total admissions early’ (or ‘new crime-relevant information early’) in case it was mentioned when (1) the evidence-focused questions were posed (i.e., stage one of the interview). Otherwise it was labelled ‘total admissions late’ (or ‘new crime-relevant information late’) when it was mentioned (2) after disclosing all evidence in the Late disclosure approach and after the three questions in the Shift of Strategy approach (i.e., stage two of the interview). Importantly, each piece of information was only counted once. If the same information was revealed two or more times, it was counted only the first time it was mentioned.

Table 3

List of units related to pieces of evidence. Evidence advancements are indicated with ‘(new)’. The unit ‘connection to animal rights organisation (new)’ is not related to a particular piece of evidence and therefore not displayed in the table.

Intercepted Text Message	Witness: Saw suspect at lockers	Witness: Saw suspect around office C225	Fingerprints inside office	Webcam Photo
1. Admission to text message	1. Admission to lockers 2. Envelope	1. Admission to being around the office area	1. Admission to having entered the office	1. Admission to being in second room

2. Identify sender 3. Content of message (new)	3. USB stick (new)		2. Using the computer (new) 3. Copying data to the USB stick (new)	2. Used Computer 3. Sent email (new) 4. Identify recipient of email (new) 5. Content of email (new) 6. Took pictures of documents (new) 7. Sent pictures to accomplice (new) 8. Location of the hidden USB stick (new)

The transcripts were further coded in terms of Statement-Evidence inconsistencies (range: 0 to 5 units) and Within-Statement inconsistencies (range: starting at 0 units without a maximum). Only true pieces of information were coded as total admissions or new crime-relevant information. Hence, lies were not subject to analyses, except for statement-evidence inconsistencies and within-statement inconsistencies.

It is important to note here that statement-evidence inconsistencies might at first sight, be confused with the opposite of evidence compliance (see Table 3: units not indicated with '(new)'). However, a statement-evidence inconsistency can arise first, by not revealing already known facts (e.g., "I have not been around the professor's office"). After that the suspect can yet still decide to comply with evidence (e.g., "Oh, you are right, I actually went past the office."), for example, when the interviewer disclosed what he knows. Therefore, both measures show distinct decisions of the suspect. That is, statement-evidence inconsistencies represent the suspect's withholding strategy while an admission represents a decision to be forthcoming. The latter can result from the former so that this displays a development from being withholding to becoming more forthcoming. Therefore, both measures together can map the suspect's progress of deciding whether to be forthcoming or to remain withholding.

'Total admissions early' and 'new crime-relevant information early' were compared between conditions, to see whether the general effects of the SoS approach were replicated. The number of total admissions throughout the interviews was counted to compare the overall effectiveness of the two conditions. To measure the effect of the manipulation of the SoS approach (three questions) the number of 'total admissions late' as well as 'new crime-relevant information late' were compared between conditions with analyses of variance. Furthermore, the amount of new crime-relevant information that specifically related to the content of the three questions (manipulation) was compared to examine the effect of asking three questions at the end of the interview.

Interrater reliability. Two researchers transcribed and coded the interviews; each of them coded one half of the interviews. Then they exchanged the coded transcripts, discussed their disagreements and adjusted the coding procedure accordingly. Due to time constraints, interrater reliability calculations were not performed. However, in an attempt to examine differences between the coders, independent-samples *t* tests were conducted for the final codings of each dependent measure: *total admissions, t*(48) = -.52 , *p* = .61 , *d* = 0.15, 95% CI [-2.05, 1.21]; *total admissions early, t*(48) = -0.34, *p* = .74, *d* = 0.10, 95% CI [-1.46, 1.04]; *total admissions late, t*(48) = 0.46, *p* = .65, *d* = 0.13, 95% CI [-1.13, 0.71]; *new crime-relevant information, t*(48) = 0.59, *p* = .56, *d* = 0.17, 95% CI [-0.40, 0.74]; *new crime-relevant information early, t*(48) = -0.45, *p* = .65, *d* = 0.12, 95% CI [-0.35, 0.22]; *new crime-relevant information late, t*(48) = 1.05, *p* = .30, *d* = 0.29, 95% CI [-0.21, 0.67]; *statement-evidence inconsistencies, t*(48) = -0.13, *p* = .90, *d* = 0.04, 95% CI [-0.57, 0.50]; *within-statement inconsistencies, t*(48) = -0.77, *p* = .40, *d* = 0.22, 95% CI [-0.47, 0.21]. Hence, there was no significant effect of rater on any of the dependent measures.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Two suspects confessed to the crime. Therefore, their responses were subjected to further analyses. One of them deviated extremely from the rest of the sample. Having considered the transcript of the interview, it was decided to exclude this participant from analyses. Briefly explained, we assume that the suspect misinterpreted the interview to be over during the final part of the interview, and therefore reconstructed the crime when the interviewer asked for explanations. Importantly, all analyses on the main variables were run after excluding the data from this participant, and all significant results remained. In addition, after excluding both confessors, all significant results remained too. It was decided to keep the data of the second confessor because (a) his/her deviation was not as extreme as the first confessor, (b) the interviewer did not display any deviation from the standardized protocol, and (c) we found no other indications that the second confessor would have misinterpreted the task.

To detect possible interviewer effects, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effect of interviewer on each dependent measure. There was no significant effect of interviewer on any dependent measure: *statement-evidence inconsistencies, F*(4, 49) = 2.31, *p* = .18; *within-statement inconsistencies, F*(4, 49) = 1.10, *p* = .37; *total admissions, F*(4, 49) = 1.93, *p* = .12; *total admissions early, F*(4, 49) = 0.80, *p* = .53; *total admissions late, F*(4, 49) = 1.41, *p* = .25; *new crime-relevant information early, F*(4, 49) = 0.47, *p* = .76; *new crime-relevant information late, F*(4, 49) = 1.63, *p* = .18.

Furthermore, a two-way ANOVA was conducted to detect possible interaction effects of interviewer and interview condition. No significant interaction between interviewer and interview condition was found to have an effect on *statement-evidence inconsistencies (p* = .35), *within-statement inconsistencies (p* = .97), *total admissions (p* = .58), *total admissions early (p* = .38), *total admissions late (p* = .50), *new crime-relevant information early (p* = .73), *new crime-relevant information late (p* = .72). Hence, no significant interaction between interviewer and interview condition effect was found.

Information Revealed during the Interview

Total number of admissions. The total number of admissions made during the entire interviews was compared between conditions. An independent-samples *t* test showed that the

SoS condition (*M* = 4.54, *SD* = 3.10) resulted in significantly more total admissions than the late disclosure condition (*M* = 2.08, *SD* = 1.98) during the full interview, *t*(38.59) = -3.38, *p* < .01, *d* = 0.94 , 95% CI [-3.96, -0.97]. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (*F* = 4.30, *p* = .04), so the degrees of freedom were adjusted from 48 to 38.59. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

A second independent-samples *t* test indicated that the SoS condition (*M* = 3.42, *SD* = 2.17) resulted in significantly more total admissions early than the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.42, *SD* = 0.70), *t*(27.45) = -6.47, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.86, 95% CI [-3.94, -2.04]. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (*F* = 24.74, *p* < .001), therefore the degrees of freedom were adjusted from 48 to 27.45. Hence, hypothesis 2 was supported.

A third independent-samples *t* test showed that there was no significant difference in total admissions late between the SoS condition (*M* = 1.13 , *SD* =1.48) and the late disclosure condition (*M* = 1.65, *SD* = 1.70), *t*(48) = 1.17, *p* = .25 , *d* = 0.33, 95% CI [-0.38, 1.44]. Thus, the expectation that there will be no difference between the two conditions with respect to total admissions late was supported.

New crime-relevant information. The total amount of new crime-relevant information revealed during the first and second stage of the interviews was compared between conditions. An independent-samples *t* test showed that the SoS condition (*M* = 0.92 , *SD* = 1.18) resulted in significantly more new crime-relevant information than the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.27, *SD* = 0.67), during the full interview, *t*(48) = -2.42, *p* = .02, *d* = 0.68, 95% CI [-1.19, -0.11]. Hence, hypothesis 3 was supported.

A further independent-samples *t* test indicated that the SoS condition (*M* = 0.42, *SD* = 0.65) resulted in significantly more new crime-relevant information early than the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.00, *SD* = 0.00), *t*(23) = -3.12, *p* < .01, *d* = 0.87, 95% CI [-0.67, -0.16]. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (*F* = 76.21, *p* < .001), so the degrees of freedom were adjusted from 48 to 23. Thus, hypothesis 4 was supported. More specifically, the late disclosure technique elicited no new crime-relevant information early at all.

A third independent-samples *t* test showed that the SoS condition (*M* = 0.50 , *SD* = 0.89) and the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.27, *SD* = 0.67) resulted in no significant difference in eliciting new crime-relevant information late, *t*(48) = -1.05, *p* = .30, *d* = 0.29 , 95% CI [-0.67, 0.21]. Hence, hypothesis 5 was not supported.

New crime-relevant information related to the three questions. New crime-relevant information that was specifically related to the content of the three questions, elicited during the second stage of the interview, was compared between conditions. An independent-samples

t test indicated that the SoS condition (*M* = 0.21, *SD* = 0.42) resulted in significantly more new crime-relevant information regarding the content of the text message compared to the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.00, *SD* = 0.00), *t*(23) = -2.46, *p* = .02, 95% CI [-0.38, -0.03]. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (*F* = 48.39, *p* < .001), so the degrees of freedom were adjusted from 48 to 23. This provides partial support for Hypothesis 6. A further independent-samples *t* test showed that there was no significant difference in eliciting new crime-relevant information regarding the professor's office between the SoS condition (*M* = 0.13, *SD* = 0.45) and the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.08, *SD* = 0.27), *t*(48) = 0.33, *p* = .65, *d* = 0.17, 95% CI [-0.26, 0.16]. This finding provides no support for Hypothesis 6. Another independent-samples *t* test indicated that there was no significant difference in eliciting new crime-relevant information regarding the second room between the SoS condition (*M* = 0.17, *SD* = 0.38) and the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.12, *SD* = 0.33), *t*(48) = -0.51, *p* = .61, *d* = 0.14, 95% CI [-0.25, 0.15]. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported by this measure. A fourth independent-samples *t* test showed that in total there was no significant difference in eliciting new crime-relevant information regarding the content of the three critical questions between the SoS condition (*M* =0.50, *SD* = 0.89) and the late disclosure condition (*M* = 0.19, *SD* = 0.49), *t*(35.33) = -1.50, *p* = .14, *d* = 0.43, 95% CI [-0.72, 0.11]. Levene's test indicated unequal variances (*F* = 4.51, *p* = .04), so the degrees of freedom were adjusted from 48 to 35.33. This finding does not support Hypothesis 6. Hence, overall there was no substantial but only partial support for Hypothesis 6.

Exploratory Analyses

Correlations between statement-evidence inconsistencies and (i) the total admissions and (ii) the new crime-relevant information were tested to detect whether there is a relationship between 'forthcomingness' and statement-evidence inconsistencies. Statement-evidence inconsistencies were negatively correlated with the total of admissions, Pearson's *r* = -.64 , *p* < .001, and negatively correlated with the total of new crime-relevant information, Person's *r* = -.39 , *p* < .01. This indicates that the less statement-evidence inconsistencies come about, the more forthcoming the suspect is with evidence conformity as well as with providing evidence advancements.

Discussion

This study examined the effectiveness of an advanced version of the Shift-of-Strategy (SoS) technique on eliciting evidence conformity and new crime-relevant information from

guilty suspects. When interviewed with the SoS technique, suspects were requested to address each inconsistency between their statement and existing evidence immediately. When interviewed with the late disclosure technique, suspects were asked to address all inconsistencies late in the interview. Overall, we found that the SoS technique elicited more admissions that conform with existing evidence, as well as admissions that advance the existing evidence.

Admissions Elicited During the First Stage of the Interview

As expected, challenging suspects with inconsistencies immediately (SoS condition) made them reveal more admissions, compared to when presenting all evidence after the corresponding questions had been asked (late disclosure condition). This effect held throughout the full interview: The SoS approach elicited more admissions in total, compared to the Late Disclosure approach. Furthermore, the SoS approach outperformed the late disclosure approach with regards to eliciting new crime-relevant information. This effect also held throughout the full interview.

These results are in line with previous studies (May et al., 2017; Tekin et al., 2015) and might be explained by the general pattern of evidence disclosure. A suspect interviewed with the SoS technique was presented with evidence after each question. This suggests that by being asked to immediately address each piece of evidence, the suspect might have been influenced to revise his/her perception of the interviewer's knowledge. Hence, based on the new estimation of the interviewer's knowledge, the suspect might have felt the need to shift his/her strategy into a more forthcoming counter-interrogation strategy.

For the late disclosure interview, admissions containing information that were new to the interviewer, were absent before any evidence was disclosed. Presumably, as guilty suspects mainly employ withholding strategies (Granhag et al., 2009), they would mainly attempt to avoid incriminating themselves further. More specifically, they might not have expected the interviewer to hold any knowledge about their activities. Therefore, they might have decided that withholding strategies would serve them best.

Suspects interviewed with the SoS technique, on the other hand, revealed new information during the first stage that was previously unknown by the interviewer. This might mainly be explained by the fact that the interviewer invited the suspects to provide explanations for their inconsistencies. Suspects then mostly complied with the request (e.g., "Oh, now that you mention it, I actually remember using the computer in room C230"). Importantly, they sometimes provided additional information within their explanation that the interviewer did not

know before (e.g., “I used the computer to send an email”). Perhaps suspects added more information instead of just conceding to the evidence presented by interviewer, as a means to come across as less suspicious. Merely stating “now that you mention it, I have actually used the computer” without any further details, might give the impression of deliberately omitting facts.

Previous studies provide an explanation for why the suspect continues providing information to the interviewer. According to May and colleagues (2017), maintaining the suspect’s faith in their ability to convince the interviewer of their innocence is vital for maintaining their forthcomingness. In order to do so, one has to ‘keep the suspect in the game’ (Granhag & Luke, 2018; May et al., 2017): Giving the suspect the chance to explain their inconsistencies keeps them in a social dialogue, which seems to facilitate forthcomingness. It is reasonable to assume that this made the suspect perceive the interviewer more as a conversational partner than an adversarial interrogator. The interviewer builds up a rather normal social atmosphere instead of posing a threat to the suspect. This might lead the suspect to further contribute to that atmosphere by providing information, instead of resisting the conversation by keeping silent.

Admissions Elicited During the Second Stage of the Interview

As expected, no difference was found regarding the number of total admissions elicited during the second stage of the interview between both conditions. However, contrary to our expectations, the SoS technique did not elicit more new crime-relevant information after the three questions were posed. As can be seen above, many of the possible admissions were elicited during the first stage of the SoS interview. In contrast, most admissions and all new crime-relevant information that were elicited during the late disclosure interview happened during the second stage of the interview (i.e., after all the evidence was presented). This makes sense, as suspects interviewed with the late disclosure technique are only made aware of the interviewer’s knowledge at the end of the first stage. Hence, before that point in time, they might hold onto the perception that withholding strategies serve them best. Therefore, admissions are mainly centred in the second stage of the interview in the late disclosure condition.

Importantly, even though the SoS technique already exhausted more potential admissions and new crime-relevant information during the first stage, the late disclosure approach did not outperform the SoS approach on these measures during the second stage of the interview. This implies that suspects still might have been more forthcoming during the

second stage when interviewed with the SoS technique. This suggests that the SoS technique facilitates forthcomingness during the first stage, and this forthcomingness transfers to the second stage of the interview. Hence, the SoS approach might be used to first establish forthcomingness, which might then help to gather new crime-relevant information on unknown details of the crime. This supports the assertion that the SoS technique is in fact capable of achieving its intended goal: eliciting new crime-relevant information that might eventually promote the investigation. Further potential explanations for these findings can be specified when examining the effect of the three questions that were added to the SoS technique.

The Effect of the Three Questions

In an attempt to further enhance the SoS technique in its capability to elicit new crime-relevant information, we have advanced the approach. Before the disclosure pattern is interrupted, which might otherwise lead the suspect to notice the interviewer has run out of evidence, the suspect is prompted to provide information on three different themes, critical to the crime. The suspect has to carefully weigh up what the interviewer might or might not know. Instead of deciding whether or not to disclose information, the suspect might now be deciding which theme to disclose information about. The results of this study show that, apart from the suspect confessing to the crime, all suspects decided to at least withhold information that identified them as the culprit (i.e., copying data from the professor's computer to the USB device). While half of the suspects withheld any information about the three questions during the second stage (50%), the remaining suspects decided to disclose information about at least one of the two remaining questions (e.g., the content of the text message, or using the computer in the second room to send an email).

More specifically, the SoS approach made more suspects provide new crime-relevant information regarding the text message (i.e., the content of the text message) compared to the Late Disclosure approach. This partially supports the added effect of the three questions. However, a few things have to be considered regarding this finding. As Tekin and colleagues (2015) have suggested, suspects may be more sensitive to technical evidence. The interviewer in this study introduced the theme without revealing that he did not know about the content of the message (i.e., "I need you to explain the text message you received just before going to the lockers"). As technical evidence might be more conclusive, suspects might have automatically assumed that the interviewer was aware of the content and was, thus, asking for further clarifications beyond its content (e.g., "The interviewer wants me to explain why I got a text message that entails codes to the locker and computers"). However, no suspect within the late

disclosure condition revealed anything about the content of the text message. Hence, the fact that the text message was technical evidence, seemed to have no substantial effect. Therefore, two implications can be drawn from this finding. First, it further underlines that the suspect's forthcomingness, established during the first phase, seems to continue within the second phase. Secondly, the suspect makes the decision to reveal new information to at least one of the three questions asked.

The fact that the suspect decided to reveal new information to at least one of the three questions will be discussed in more detail. Apart from the question on the text message, the other two questions specifically address the criminal activities. Acknowledging that, it becomes clear why even the more forthcoming suspects decided not to reveal many more details regarding these questions. Even though they might have known that withholding information had not served them well, they probably concluded that providing true answers to those questions was practically a confession (e.g., "I have copied data on experiments from the professor's computer"). Therefore, they might have accepted the possible risk of producing further inconsistencies, as an inconsistency does not prove any specific activity yet. Interestingly then, the suspects who were more forthcoming, decided to reveal information about the text message (while this was not the case in the late disclosure condition). This might be explained by the fact that providing information about the text message would not be as incriminating compared to the other two questions. As the suspect might initially have decided to be more forthcoming, s/he might now be trying to stick to that strategy. To do so, the suspect might now decide what information s/he can provide regarding the three questions, without appearing too suspicious (i.e., too withholding) but also without incriminating him/herself too much (e.g., "I should reveal some information, so the interviewer thinks that I still cooperate and comply with his requests. However, I should not mention that I have stolen and forwarded confidential data."). Hence, asking three questions after influencing the suspect's perception of evidence held against him/her, might elicit additional new crime-relevant information.

These findings relate to the ongoing case of Khashoggi's murder. As a reminder, the three questions posed by Erdogan were: "Where is Khashoggi's body? Who is the 'local collaborator' to whom Saudi officials claimed to have handed over Khashoggi's remains? Who gave the order to kill this kind soul?". The Saudis have provided some information on what happened to Khashoggi's body (i.e., the body was handed over to a local collaborator). However, they gave no answer to the other two questions. Disclosing the local collaborator's identity might have had adverse consequences for the Saudis when that collaborator would have been questioned about the substance of the Saudis' claims. Revealing who ordered the killing

is obviously the most critical piece of information to be avoided by those involved in the crime. Hence, the Saudis decided to provide some new information regarding the first question, as that might be the least incriminating choice. Thereby, they appeared to maintain a balance between being forthcoming and not providing too much information that would identify them as guilty.

The Effect of a More Complex State of Evidence

Taking all findings into account, it can generally be assumed that the SoS approach remains more effective when compared to the late disclosure approach. Even if the crime situation produces a more complex state of evidence and leaves multiple questions about each of the suspect's activities, the SoS approach successfully elicits more admissions and new crime-relevant information. The mechanism that the technique adheres to (i.e., influencing suspects to shift their withholding strategy to a more forthcoming one by influencing their perception of the interviewer's knowledge) seems to continue producing the desired outcome: gathering new crime-relevant information. This further specifies the applicability of the approach in the interrogative context. The Shift-of-Strategy approach seems to be a considerable technique for promoting an investigation by interviewing suspects involved in a crime that initially produced a complex state of evidence (i.e., leaving uncertainties and gaps in the knowledge about the suspect's activities and whereabouts).

Limitations and Future Directions

The present study comes with some limitations. First, the interviewers were not blind to the experimental conditions (i.e., they knew about all the activities of the suspect). Hence, they were aware when the suspect lied. This might have influenced their non-verbal signals towards the suspect, which might have made the interviewers appear more sceptical towards the suspect's untruthful statements. However, some scepticism on the part of the interviewer towards the suspect might be considered fairly normal during an investigative interview. To avoid more overt, verbal signs of distrust, which could have had adverse effects on the cooperative atmosphere, the interviewers were instructed to follow the protocols word-by-word. Furthermore, in both conditions the interviewers were not blind to the experimental setting. Therefore, we assume that this had a rather insignificant impact when comparing both conditions. In fact, the cooperative atmosphere might be even stronger in real-life as the interviewer cannot as easily detect and react to the suspect's lies. This might have a positive influence on the suspect's forthcomingness, as it might strengthen his/her belief that s/he can convince the interviewer of his/her innocence. This might increase the efficacy of the interview.

Secondly, the current study only had limited possibilities to standardize the mock crime. Due to capacity issues of the university's research facilities, no fixed rooms could be guaranteed for the experiment. Rooms were booked via the university's service for booking rooms for group meetings. These rooms cannot be reserved more than 2 weeks in advance. For that reason, the rooms which participants had to go to after leaving the professors office, varied based on the rooms' availability. While some of the participants stayed in the same building during the whole experiment, others had to walk to another building on campus. Therefore, the interviews were also held in different rooms. Any external influences could not be controlled. However, the two researchers present during each experiment closely monitored the whereabouts and activities of the participants. Participants were not distracted when walking to other buildings, which took no more than about 4 minutes. We believe that this did not have any major impact on any of the outcome measures. Except for the rooms and the route participants had to walk, the other conditions of the experiment did not differ between participants. Still, no analyses were made that could show whether different rooms and routes really had no impact on any of the measures, which would entirely erase any doubt about the influence of these circumstances. Generally speaking, such circumstances should be avoided if possible.

Thirdly, the study is based on a sample that might not represent the usual suspects. In real-life, suspects might be even more inclined to develop and employ counter-interrogation strategies. In a field study, Alison and colleagues (2014) showed that real-life suspects think up and employ verbal counter-interrogation strategies. As the SoS technique is geared to counteract such strategies, it might be even more effective in real-life settings compared to laboratory settings.

Fourthly, this study did not include a group of innocent suspects. Thereby, it remains unknown what effect the advanced SoS technique might have on innocent suspects. In previous studies, innocent suspects have been shown to be forthcoming throughout the full interview (for a review, see Hartwig et al., 2014). The fact that innocent suspects chose this counter-interrogation strategy, has mainly been attributed to a concept from social psychology, namely, the 'belief in a just world' (Lerner, as cited in Granhag & Luke, 2018). Briefly speaking, people mainly believe that everyone receives what they deserve. Hence, innocent suspects might believe that even if they provide self-incriminating information, they will eventually be found innocent as that would be the only just outcome.

However, it might be interesting to examine whether posing three questions at the end of the interview has distinct effects on innocent suspects. The questions that were asked during this study implied that the suspect is still suspected by the interviewer. Even if suspects

previously denied having used the computer in the professor's office, the interviewer still said, "I need you to explain what you did on the computer of the professor". Perhaps, innocent suspects might feel pressured by questions that imply the distrust of the interviewer and assume that their counter-interrogation strategy is not serving them well. As a result, they might, contrary to guilty suspects, shift their strategy to a less forthcoming but more withholding one, as they might believe that the interviewer is drawing false conclusions. Hence, further research is necessary to establish the advanced SoS technique's influence on innocent suspects.

In future studies, the nature of the three questions that were chosen to advance the SoS technique might be reconsidered. Two of the three questions in this study asked the suspect to provide specific details about the criminal activities. If suspects had been more forthcoming with answering these questions, they would almost have given a confession. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that these two questions were less efficient in eliciting more new crime-relevant information. Hence, it might be worthwhile to consider choosing questions critical to the crime and the suspect's activities, which do not demand the suspect to almost provide a confession. Future studies implementing such questions would allow to further specify the value of the advancement to the SoS technique made in the present study.

Furthermore, the three questions might elicit more new crime-relevant information when they contain only one question that demands highly incriminating answers, while the remaining two questions demand less but still incriminating answers. As suggested by the findings of this study, the suspect seems to weigh up possible answers s/he might give to the three questions. In an attempt to appear cooperative (i.e., forthcoming), the suspect might decide to reveal information to those questions which seem least incriminating. Hence, having one question that almost demands a confession would serve as contrast to the other two questions. When this contrast is established, the suspect might believe that providing answers to the less demanding questions serves his/her goal to appear credible while not actually confessing to the crime. Thereby, the suspect would stick to his/her strategy to be forthcoming, which was established during the first stage of the interview as s/he noticed that withholding information previously caused problems in the attempt to come across as innocent.

Conclusions

This study showed that the Shift-of-Strategy approach effectively influences suspects to become more forthcoming. This forthcomingness remains when the interviewer starts asking questions to which s/he does not know the answer. Advancing the technique with asking three crime-relevant questions for which no evidence exists, has partly been shown to add to the

technique's intended effect. The suspect provides new crime-relevant information. While the intended efficacy of the three questions was to some extent supported by the findings, promising implications for future research can be drawn. Further adding to what is known about the SoS technique's applicability, its effects remain when the crime resulted in a rather complex state of evidence. In conclusion, the SoS approach is a favourable contestant among investigative interviewing practices for eliciting new crime-relevant information that might promote the investigation to eventually solve the crime.

References

Alison, L., Alison, E., Noone, G., Elntib, S., Waring, S., & Christiansen, P. (2014). Whatever you say, say nothing: Individual differences in counter interrogation tactics amongst a field sample of right wing, AQ inspired and paramilitary terrorists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *68*, 170–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.031

Bond, J. C. F., & DePaulo, B. M. (2006). Accuracy of Deception Judgments. *Contemporary Psychology: A Journal of Reviews*, *27*(4), 277–278. https://doi.org/10.1037/021073

Bull, R. (2018). PEACE-ful Interviewing/Interrogation. *Diversity in Harmony - Insights from Psychology*, (August), 189–210. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119362081.ch10

Dixon, D. (2010). Questioning suspects: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *26*(4), 426–440. https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986210377107

Granhag, P. A., Clemens, F., & Strömwall, L. A. (2009). The usual and the unusual suspects: Level of suspicion and counter-interrogation tactics. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *6*(2), 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.101

Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2008). A new theoretical perspective on deception detection: On the psychology of instrumental mind-reading. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, *14*(3), 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160701645181

Granhag, P. A., & Luke, T. J. (2018). *How to Interview to Elicit Concealed Information: Introducing the Shift-of-Strategy (SoS) Approach*. *Detecting Concealed Information and Deception: Recent Developments*. Elsevier Inc. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812729-2.00012-4

Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., Willén, R. M., & Hartwig, M. (2013). Eliciting cues to deception by tactical disclosure of evidence: The first test of the Evidence Framing Matrix. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *18*(2), 341–355. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8333.2012.02047.x

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., & Luke, T. (2014). *Strategic Use of Evidence During Investigative Interviews: The State of the Science*. *Credibility Assessment: Scientific Research and Applications*. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394433-7.00001-4

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Kronkvist, O. (2006). Strategic use of evidence during police interviews: when training to detect deception works. *Law and*

Human Behavior, *30*(5), 603–619. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9053-9

Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Vrij, A. (2005). Detecting deception via strategic disclosure of evidence. *Law and Human Behavior*, *29*(4), 469–484. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-005-5521-x

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 and Law*, *18*(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2011.561801

Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S. A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G. H., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. D. (2009). *Police-induced confessions: Risk factors and recommendations. Law and Human Behavior* (Vol. 34). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-009-9188-6

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*(2), 33–67. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1529-1006.2004.00016.x

Kassin, S. M., Leo, R. A., Meissner, C. A., Richman, K. D., Colwell, L. H., Leach, A. M., & Fon, D. La. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: A self-report survey of police practices and beliefs. *Law and Human Behavior*, *31*(4), 381–400. https://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*(3), 233–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01061711

May, L., Granhag, P. A., & Tekin, S. (2017). Interviewing suspects in denial: On how different evidence disclosure modes affect the elicitation of new critical information. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(JUL), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01154

Meissner, C. A., Redlich, A. D., Bhatt, S., & Brandon, S. (2010). Interview and Interrogation Methods and their Effects on Investigative Outcomes. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *8*(1), 4–52. Retrieved from https://campbellcollaboration.org/media/k2/attachments/0117_CJCG_Meissner_Protocol.pdf

Meissner, C. A., Redlich, A. D., Michael, S. W., Evans, J. R., Camilletti, C. R., Bhatt, S., &

Brandon, S. (2014). Accusatorial and information-gathering interrogation methods and their effects on true and false confessions: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *10*(4), 459–486. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9207-6

Strömwall, L. A., & Willén, R. M. (2011). Inside criminal minds: Offenders' strategies when lying. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *8*(3), 271–281. https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.148

Tekin, S., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L., Giolla, E. Mac, Vrij, A., & Hartwig, M. (2015). Interviewing Strategically to Elicit Admissions From Guilty Suspects. *Law and Human Behavior*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000131

Vredeveldt, A., van Koppen, P. J., & Granhag, P. A. (2014). The Inconsistent Suspect: A Systematic Review of Different Types of Consistency in Truth Tellers and Liars. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative Interviewing* (pp. 183–207). New York, NY: Springer New York. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9642-7_10

Appendix A

Informed Consent

Criminal Decision Making

Informed Consent

Purpose

This study is about criminal behaviour. An important feature of a criminal investigation is to understand the behaviour of suspects of crime. The current study will examine your perceptions and behaviours as a suspect who commits a mock crime.

More detailed information regarding the theoretical background, such as underlying concepts or frameworks, cannot be disclosed at the present moment to ensure that you behave as normal and natural as you would in reality. Any detailed information will be provided upon request after the experiment is done.

Procedure

As a participant in this study, you will be instructed to perform some criminal activities and afterwards you will be interviewed about it and fill in a questionnaire about your perceptions of your experiences. The interview will be audio recorded.

Once you have filled in the questionnaire the study is completed. Because it is important to protect the validity of psychological experiments (i.e., that you behave as normal and natural as possible during the operation), we cannot tell you everything about the study at this time. After the study is complete you will be fully debriefed and we will answer any questions that you may have about the study. If you decide to enrol in this study, your involvement will last for up to 60 minutes and you will receive 1 SONA credit for your participation. To ensure confidentiality, your responses will be anonymous (i.e., personal identifying information cannot be matched with your answers) and we only analyse group averages (i.e., individual performances will not be analysed). The recorded data is treated confidentially and only available to the research team. In case of publication, it is obligatory to store the material for up to 10 years.

Participant Rights

Your participation is voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without consequences. Also, the audio recordings will be destroyed immediately at your request. You will receive the full compensation also if you stop participating. For further information about this study, contact the principal investigator Simon Oleszkiewicz, Ph.D. at s.oleszkiewicz@utwente.nl

Consent and Authorization Provisions

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in **Criminal Decision Making**, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered.

Name

_____

I consent to participate in the study on criminal behaviour

Signature

_____

I consent to be audio recorded during the interview

Signature

_____

Appendix B

Background

Imagine that you are a person who was raised in a house full of love for pets, especially cats and dogs. Having been around animals all your life you have developed a very special bond to them. Simply put, you love cats and dogs.

You are currently studying at the UT and from your fellow students, you just heard some rumours that made your bones chill to the core: There is a professor at the University who does animal testing on dogs. You found out that this professor is doing his research on animals illegally, and that he violates the strict ethical procedures for animal handling.

However, it seems as if the university is turning a blind eye. Because of your love for animals, you decided that this was too much: There is no way such cruel treatment of animals can be justified, you had to do something to make it stop!

Since your gruesome discovery, you have made several attempts to put an end to this horror. You have emailed the professor directly, you have arranged demonstrations, talked with the heads of several faculties, the HR department, study advisors, you name it. However, this has only resulted in straight out denials – nobody acknowledges any unethical animal treatment. At this point in time, your hard work and efforts have not paid off at all, and you conclude that only one option remains: To collect evidence about the unethical behaviour and forward it to an investigative journalist that will publish a story about it in the news.

To collect the evidence you need help, so you contacted the organization *Rights for Animals*. However, this organization is currently under investigation for other crimes. Therefore, they cannot play any major role in gathering evidence, but they are willing to help you work out the necessary activities to secure the necessary evidence.

What you are going to do

You're planning to collect evidence that the UT is involved in illegal and cruel treatment of animals. The organization *Rights for Animals* supports you. Soon, they will get into contact with you and help you with your mission. The collected evidence will then be forwarded to an employee at *Rights for Animals.*

Briefly put, to complete your mission you have to (specific instructions will follow later):

(1) gain access to the office

(2) collect evidence in the office

(3) provide the evidence to your accomplice

You will next receive detailed instructions for what you have to do to collect and forward the evidence. Read the instructions carefully so you know it by heart. You will be allowed to take these instructions with you, so you do not need to memorize every word. Feel free to check this paper if you get insecure or can't remember what to do next.

Appendix C

Instructions

These instructions will be performed in consecutive order. Meaning that once you have ticked off a box, you move to the next box directly under it. Do not jump between boxes; you have to follow the order from top to bottom.

☐ received text message from your contact person from the animal rights organization (mission starts) → WhatsApp message

☐ collect envelope at the given location established by the text message

☐ go into the office where you find information regarding the animal experiments (room C225)

☐ start the computer and plug in the USB stick to collect the necessary evidence

☐ search the file ‘experiments’ and copy it on the USB stick (<u>located on Desktop</u>)

☐ take the USB stick and the envelope and leave the office

☐ go to room XXX (there you can find a secure computer)

☐ use the computer to log into your email- account

☐ send the files of the USB stick to KalleBlomNews@gmail.com (a journalist who belongs to *Rights for Animals* who wants to publish your story)

☐ next to the computer, search for the folder ‘contracts’ and take a picture of the Documents which you find inside. They serve as additional evidence.

☐ send it via WhatsApp to the number to the contact person who contacted you in the beginning

☐ put the USB stick back into the envelope and place it into the folder ‘private’ (your accomplice will collect it)

☐ return to room XXX

Appendix D

Late Disclosure Interview Protocol

"Hello, my Name is XXX. I am part of the team investigating a crime that was committed here at the University today. Someone broke into the University's facilities and stole confidential data. There is reasonable suspicion that you have committed this crime, and I will therefore ask you some questions about your behaviour and your observations around the University today. Because of the suspicion against you, you do have the right to have a lawyer present during this interview. Would you like to consult one?

I also want to mention that you have the right to remain silent and that you do not have to answer any of my questions.

#Response of Suspect

Do you confess or deny having engaged in any criminal activities?

#Response of Suspect

You can start by freely telling me how you arrived at the university today and what you did there.

#Response of Suspect

Thank you. I have a few more specific questions.

Have you been around/ You mentioned being at **the study area on the ground floor of the Cubicus building** today?

#Response of Suspect

if suspect remains silent or only answers with a 'yes' after the first question of each evidence theme, prompt once by saying: Please tell me about that

Have you been around/you mentioned you were around **the office of one of the professors** after being at the study area?

#Response of Suspect

Have you recently entered/ you mentioned that you entered the office of a professor?

#Response of Suspect

Have you entered/you mentioned that you entered **another room** after you left the office?

#Response of Suspect

Is there anything you would like to add at this point?

#Response of Suspect

Okay, thank you. We have collected some evidence that I would like you to address. Our tech team intercepted the text message you received today, shortly thereafter a witness saw you pick up an envelope from one of the lockers in the Cubicus building. Later on, another witness saw

you near the office of the professor. We have also found your fingerprints inside the office, and a webcam has shown that you used the computer in room XXX. Before we conclude this interview, would you mind explaining all these activities.

#Response of Suspect

Alternative Deceptive: I would like to point out that you're better off, the more information you provide voluntarily. I'll give you one last chance to cooperate by answering my questions.

#Response of Suspect

If suspect remains silent

So, do you have anything to add?

If suspect objects or complains, simply read out the evidence again

---

Okay, to conclude this interview I will ask the same question I started with: Do you confess or do you deny having engaged in any criminal activities?

Okay, thank you for your time. If we find something in need for further clarification, we will ask you to come back at a later time. Have a good day.

(Researcher joins the room to administer questionnaire)

Appendix E

Shift-of-Strategy Interview Protocol

"Hello, my Name is XXX. I am part of the team investigating a crime that was committed here at the University today. Someone broke into the University's facilities and stole confidential data. There is reasonable suspicion that you have committed this crime, and I will therefore ask you some questions about your behaviour and your observations around the University today. Because of the suspicion against you, you do have the right to have a lawyer present during this interview. Would you like to consult one?

I also want to mention that you have the right to remain silent and that you do not have to answer any of my questions.

#Response of Suspect

Do you confess or deny having engaged in any criminal activities?

#Response of Suspect

You can start by freely telling me how you arrived at the university today and what you did there.

#Response of Suspect

Thank you. I have a few more specific questions.

Evidence 2: Seen at study area in the Cubicus building

Have you been around/ You mentioned being at the **study area on the ground floor of the Cubicus building** today?

if suspect remains silent after the first question of each evidence theme, prompt once by saying: Please tell me about that

Discredit: What you say doesn't fit the evidence we have. A witness has seen you picking up an envelope from one of the lockers there. Would you like to respond to that statement?

#Response of Suspect

Go to the next question

Accept: What you say fits the evidence we hold, as a witness has seen you picking up an envelope from one of the lockers there.

Go to the next question

Evidence 3: Proximity to the office

Have you been around/you mentioned you were around **the office of one of the professors** after being at the study area?

Discredit: What you say does not fit the evidence, as an employee has seen you there today. Can you explain what you did there?

#Response of Suspect

Go to next question

Accept: Okay, very good. We have evidence that supports your answer. An employee saw you there today at that time.

***Go to next question ***

Evidence 4: Fingerprints on object

Have you recently entered/ you mentioned that you entered the office of a professor?

Discredit: What you say does not fit the evidence. We found “an object” inside the office with your fingerprints on it. Would you mind explaining how they got there?

#Response of Suspect

Go to next question

Accept: Thanks for clarifying this. We did find your fingerprints on “an object” inside the office.

***Go to next question ***

Evidence 5: Webcam footage of Computer

Have you entered/you mentioned that you entered **another room** after you left the office?

Discredit: What you say does not fit the evidence we hold. Our technical team accessed the webcam of a computer in room XXX and it shows clear footage of you. Would you mind explaining what you did on the computer?

#Response of Suspect

Go to next question

Accept: Thank you for working with me here. Our technical team accessed the webcam of the computer in room XXX and the footage clearly shows you at the computer.

***Go to next question ***

The three questions:

Okay, I have three additional questions I need you to address before we end this interview. I need you to explain the text message you received just before going to the lockers in the study area; you have to clarify what you did on the computer in the office; and I need you to describe exactly what you did in room XXX.

#Response of Suspect

Alternative Deceptive: I would like to point out that you're better off, the more information you provide voluntarily. I'll give you one last chance to cooperate by answering my questions.

If suspect remains silent

So, do you have anything to add?

Okay, before we end this interview, I will ask the same question I started with: Do you confess or deny having engaged in any criminal activities?

Ending:

Okay, thank you for your time. If we find something in need for further clarification, we will ask you to come back at a later time. Have a good day.

(Researcher joins the room to administer questionnaire)

Appendix F

Instructions for participant (before the police interview starts)

In 5 minutes, you will be interviewed by a police officer. You are instructed to interact with the police, so please try to imagine how you would answer possible questions in reality. The police already held several interviews with suspects, collected fingerprints from all involved (including you) and checked back alibis.

Please imagine that you have already concluded that it is important for you to give an innocent appearance and that this will best be done by speaking with the police. Hence, you concluded that using your right to remain silent will only make you seem more suspicious. In addition, during the interview you will be asked whether you want to have a lawyer present. Please imagine that you have already considered this option and decided it was best to not invite a lawyer, because in this way you look more innocent. Hence, you are instructed to answer this question with a 'No'.

Don't forget: You are an activist for animal rights. While getting your information about the cruel researcher, you were, however, committing a crime. In order to complete your mission, you should try to convince the interviewer of your innocence. Otherwise, *Rights for Animals* won't be able to publish your findings as their work will be linked to your criminal activity; all your work would be for nothing. Please imagine that this is very important for you: If you don't come across as innocent during the interview you will fail to save the animals.

Please note that it is the interviewer who will end the interview. The interviewer will then tell you what you need to do after the interview is over.