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Abstract

Bait questions—hypothetical questions about evidence, often used by detectives during interrogations—can activate the misinformation effect and alter jurors’ perceptions of the evidence of a case. Here, we were interested in investigating whether mock jurors’ implicit biases could amplify the magnitude of the misinformation effect. We accomplished this by manipulating the age and race of the suspect being interrogated. As an extension of Luke et al. (2017), we had participants read a police report describing evidence found at a crime scene, then read a transcript of a police interrogation where the detective used bait questions to introduce new evidence not presented in the report. Critically, the suspect was a juvenile rather than an adult, and we experimentally manipulated whether the juvenile was Black or White. In a second study, we also manipulated the way the suspect answered questions during the interrogation. Their responses either explained or rejected the evidence provided through the bait questions. Our results showed that bait questions did activate the misinformation effect and caused jurors to commit memory errors about the evidence; however, the race and age of the suspects did not seem to influence the magnitude of the effect.
Bait questions as source of misinformation in police interviews: does the race or age of the suspect increase jurors' memory errors?

Jurors have a great deal of power in the criminal justice system in United States. They declare which individuals are “guilty” and which are “innocent”. Jurors are, however, regular members of the community, and when in court, they act just like every other individual facing a forced-choice decision under uncertainty: their biases can take over more systematic decision making (Bornstein & Greene, 2011). The way jurors perceive the evidence, and therefore the suspect, is based on several factors: some are internal, such as implicit biases jurors might have, others are external. Implicit biases are driven by specific attitudes and/or stereotypes, positive or negative, that individuals might hold about concepts or social groups, without necessarily being aware of those biases. Critically, they become highly influential as people make personal judgments or inferences about those social groups or concepts, based on particular associations with certain traits (Kang et al., 2012). Do implicit biases, specifically concerning race and age, affect how jurors perceive the evidence presented in a trial? Can they influence how deceptive they think an interrogation is?

The answers to those questions become critical when put in the context of the systematic use of deceptive interrogation techniques during criminal investigations in the US justice system. Can those deceptive tactics trigger memory errors and influence jurors’ perception of the case, and can memory errors increase when implicit biases drive jurors’ decision-making processes? The purpose of this thesis is to investigate how the interaction of those internal and external factors can ultimately alter jurors’ judgments. Can certain individuals standing in front of a jury...
being more negatively affected than others because of this interaction, and therefore suffer harsher sentences?

While research identifies many issues with the use of deceptive tactics during interrogations (e.g., Perillo & Kassin, 2011; Underwager, 1992), we focus on bait questions and how they can be a vehicle for the misinformation effect. Additionally, we are interested in analyzing whether some of these internal factors that can steer the elaboration of information and decision-making process (e.g. race bias, juvenile stereotypes) can amplify the magnitude of the misinformation effect and create troubling systematic discrimination for minorities.

Interrogations and Bait Questions

Police interrogations are crucial in criminal investigations and the way detectives handle them can have consequences for the suspect and the way a jury deliberates. The Reid Technique (Inbau, Reid, Buckley, & Jayne, 2001) is widely used by law enforcement across the United States (Kassin et al., 2010). The approach, developed by Inbau, focuses on increasing pressure on suspects who are believed to be guilty, to extract a confession (Perillo & Kassin, 2011). Detectives trained with the Reid Technique are taught to use deceptive tactics, such as presenting incriminating evidence that might not exist (e.g. fingerprints, eyewitness, DNA) and use these bluff tactics to get suspects to confess. At the core of the Reid Technique approach is a belief that guilty suspects will feel threatened by the overwhelming evidence presented to them, and therefore compelled to confess, while innocent individuals will not feel the pressure of the threat, merely because of their innocence (Inbau et al., 2001). However, previous research shows how innocence can often be a dangerous risk factor, instead of a protective one (Kassin, 2005). In a study by Kassin and Norwick (2004), in fact, innocent suspects tended to waive their Miranda
Rights and they believed that the accusatory evidence presented to them during the interrogations would eventually exonerate them—instead of incriminate them.

Even though previous research on the use of deception in police interrogations shows how these techniques can be extremely harmful and lead to suspects confessing to crimes they did not commit (Perillo & Kassin, 2011; Horselenberg, Markelbach & Josephs, 2003), detectives are still allowed to lie during interrogations. (Frazier v. Cupp, 1966). In an attempt to increase transparency and protect suspects against the use of these coercive techniques, many researchers and professionals have argued for the videotaping of interrogations (Drizin & Reich, 2004). The idea is that the recording will protect against coercive tactics that lead to false confessions (Kassin et al., 2010), provide a more accurate picture of the events and make detectives more accountable for what they do and say during an interrogation. However, many police professionals are opposed to this practice and argue that videotaping interrogations could affect the dynamics between the detectives and the suspects, as well as alter jurors’ perceptions of the suspect during the trial (Kassin et al., 2004). Nonetheless, videotaping is now a mandated practice in many jurisdictions (Sullivan, 2012).

Although recording interrogations is clearly beneficial, there may be unintended side-effects. For example, as video recording of police interrogations becomes more common (Department of Justice, 2014), jurors are more likely to view the tapes of those interrogations as part of the evidence introduced during the trial. Although some coercive strategies will be clear, others are more subtle and might not be noticed by jurors (Leo & Liu, 2009). It is therefore possible that some of the techniques that deceive suspects might also deceive jurors. Indeed, as we discuss below, we know that interrogations containing false and misleading information in
the form of a hypothetical “bait question” can contaminate jurors’ memory and introduce inaccurate information into a trial (Luke, Crozier & Strange, 2017).

**Bait questions as source of Misinformation**

Bait questions—hypothetical questions about evidence that might not exist—are commonly used by detectives trained with the Reid Techniques (Kassin et al., 2007). For example, “*Would there be any reason we would find your fingerprints on the gun?*” when no fingerprints were actually found on the gun. Indeed, the police might not even have recovered a gun. The Reid Technique teaches that guilty suspects will provide *non-culpable* explanations for hypothetical pieces of evidence, while innocent suspects will deny the evidence. Thus the tactic can supposedly help detect deception. However, bait questions also appear to be a form of *misinformation* where detectives provide misleading information and suspects offer hypothetical explanations (Perillo & Kassin, 2011). Jurors who view those responses could, therefore, believe that additional evidence against a suspect exists, which would make people more likely to believe a suspect or defendant is guilty (Ruva & Guenther, 2015).

Indeed, bait questions can be a catalyst for the misinformation effect (ME), introducing misleading information into a trial (Luke et al., 2017). The ME occurs when people witness an event, are later provided with erroneous information, for example, in the form of a narrative describing what they supposedly saw earlier, and are then tested on that same event (Loftus et al., 1978). As a result, people’s recollection of the event contains elements that directly come from the misleading post-event information (they recall elements from the narrative), instead of coming from the event they have actually witnessed (Calvillo, 2014). The misinformation effect has been applied to several contexts, in and out of the criminal justice system. In the original study by Loftus (1975) participants witnessed a car accident (*event phase*), and were then
provided misleading information about the accident (post-event information) and finally had to perform a memory test and answer questions about the accident (test phase). Loftus (1975) found that the misinformation distorted people’s memories of what they actually saw.

The paradigm has been translated and applied to different crime scenes involving eyewitnesses and their recollection of events (Lindsay, 1990; Loftus, 1991), and the results have consistently showed that providing misleading information decreases the accuracy of the participant’s memory. Moreover, other experiments have tested the paradigm outside of the context of the criminal justice system, and have registered the same patterns of memory distortions. In a study by Sutherland and Hayne (2001), for example, participants viewed a video of a two-year old child getting separated from his caregiver at a shopping mall, and then researchers asked participants misleading questions such as “Mary was given a white bear. Who gave her the bear?”, when in the video the bear was actually green. At the end of the experiment, participants had to answer question about the misled information (“What color was the bear?”), and the results confirmed Loftus’ findings about memory distortions due to misleading post-event information.

Luke et al. (2017) adapted the ME paradigm to a police interrogation to investigate the effects of bait questions on jurors’ perceptions of guilt. Luke et al. (2017) first had participants read a police report describing a robbery. The police report contained accurate information (e.g. “the perpetrator pried the cash drawer open using a crowbar”). The participants were told this was the final report sent to the prosecutor’s office. Then participants watched the interrogation of the suspect. Amongst the questions the detective asked, there were bait questions with misleading information (e.g. “Is there a reason a screwdriver we found in your brother’s car would match the marks we found on the cash drawer?”), or neutral questions for the control
BAIT QUESTIONS AS SOURCE OF MISINFORMATION.

items ("Is there some reason a metal tool we found in your brother’s car would match the marks we found on the cash drawer?“). Screwdriver being the misled item in this case. Lastly, after a brief delay, Luke et al. (2017) tested participants’ memory with a forced-choice recognition test. Importantly, participants were specifically asked what they had read in the police report (e.g. “The cash drawer was opened with...” screwdriver or crowbar). The goal was to see whether the post-event information had contaminated their original memory of the event. It did. Luke et al. (2017) found that the bait questions contaminated the accuracy of the jurors’ memory. That is, they were more likely to report that the cash drawer was opened with a screwdriver, rather than a crowbar. Additionally, participants believed that more incriminating evidence against the suspect existed, than what was actually found by the police. In the final experiments, Luke et al. (2017) introduced an Evidence Checklist to test participants about the number of incriminating evidence items (e.g. witness, fingerprints) they remembered being collected. Participants simply indicated whether they “Remembered” the evidence existed, “Knew” the evidence existed, were just guessing or believed it to be “New Evidence”. What Luke et al. (2017) found, is that participants believed that more incriminating evidence existed than what they had read in the police report. Specifically, participants indicated to have some memory of items that have been introduced only by the bait questions, but did not actually exist.

Luke et al. (2017) also tested the effectiveness of warnings. After all, any good defense attorneys would warn jurors about the possible problems with a confession that was affected by bait questions. At the least, they would challenge the incriminating evidence provided by the bait questions. However, warnings that were delivered before or after participants watched the interrogation film had little effect. Even in cases where people noticed the discrepancies between the evidence suggested during the interrogation and the police report, people appear to have
assumed that police chose to leave that information out of the report. They did not believe that the pieces of evidence didn’t really exist (Luke et al., 2017). These findings suggest that bait questions can create memory errors and contaminate the original memory of a specific event. But how? Luke et al. (2017) suggested that the most likely explanation for their effect was a source monitoring error.

**Source Monitoring**

The Source Monitoring Framework offers an explanation as to why bait questions can affect memory (Johnson, Hashtroudi & Lindsay, 1993; Lindsay, 2008). Generally speaking, individuals do not label the source of information as they acquire it, and it is only when they are trying to remember a particular piece of information that they attribute it to a specific source (Johnson et al., 1993). A source monitoring memory error (or *source misattribution*) happens when people attribute a specific memory to the wrong source of information. For example, reading about the news in a newspaper and subsequently attributing the source of your knowledge to a TV show. Source monitoring decisions can happen without our active knowledge and on the basis of previously activated and automatic schemas (*heuristic judgments*). Alternatively, they can be slower and more controlled, for example, assessing the relationship with other memories to retrieve a plausible origin of the information (*systematic judgments*; Chaiken, Lieberman & Eagly, 1989). Moreover, source monitoring errors can happen because the source of the information has not been encoded accurately or because there is a disruption in the judgment processes while retrieving the information (Lindsay, 2008). Indeed, content and source similarity are factors that increase susceptibility to the misinformation effect (Lindsay, 2008). For example, applied to Luke et al. (2017)’s studies, jurors learn about similar pieces of information (e.g. actual evidence collected was *blood* but detective suggests *saliva* during the
interrogation) and they also happen to gain their knowledge from similar sources (e.g. police reports and police interrogations). Because of these factors, jurors will be more likely to confuse the evidence (Luke et al., 2017; Vornik, Sharman, & Garry, 2003).

**Jurors’ Judgment and Decision-Making**

Throughout a trial, jurors face several cognitive and social challenges that test their memories, reasoning, bias and decision-making (Bornstein & Greene, 2011). Although jurors all attend to the same information, their perception and memories often differ, even in the absence of misinformation. Indeed, there are additional elements in a trial that likely influence the accuracy of the information jurors acquire, and therefore their final judgments on verdict. Jurors have to critically analyze the information they receive from different sources about the evidence of the case. Thus, the way they process that information, and ultimately remember it, is influenced by their own biases and expectations (Carlson & Russo, 2001).

Extensive research in decision-making and the theory of dissonance (Festinger, 1957) has repeatedly shown how individuals tend to seek out information that supports their beliefs when facing a decision (selective exposure to information effect), to reduce the internal discomfort that would follow a dissonant decision (Jonas et al., 2001). As jurors acquire new information, they have to use their judgment to make decisions under uncertainty, not having all the possible relevant information they need. Based on the research of Tversky & Kahneman (1974), we know that individuals rely on heuristics and biases when they face those types of decisions. Critically, biases infer predictable systematic errors that we can account for. Here, we are interested in examining how race and age can influence jurors’ perception and memory when inconsistency about the evidence arises and they have to decide between two conflicting pieces of information.

**Race of the Suspect**
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Previous research has shown that jurors’ perceptions can be influenced by implicit biases towards attributes of the suspect (Haegerich, 2013). Therefore, here, we investigate whether manipulating the race and age of the suspect could increase the magnitude of the misinformation effect Luke et al. (2017) observed in their paradigm. If so, then bait questions may be even more concerning when used with certain groups of people.

The first specific attribute of the suspect that we are interested in manipulating is their race. Extensive jury deliberation research has shown that jurors are often influenced by their implicit racial biases (Foley & Chamblin, 1982; Haegerich, 2013; Morrison et al., 2016; Galdi et al., 2008). In a study by Morrison et al. (2015), for example, implicit race biases were associated with systematic memory errors (biased interpretations of ambiguous information), as well the use of confirmation biases to sort through the ambiguous evidence. In their experiment, implicit biases influenced the way participants processed case-relevant information and consequently reached a legal judgment based on that information.

The fact that racial biases can have such an influential role in jurors’ decision-making, is a particularly critical issue given the nature of racial discrimination and injustice in United States as a result from those biases. For example, previous research shows that African American suspects are more likely than others to be perceived as guilty of a crime (Walker, 2004); and racial minorities tend to get longer sentences for the same offenses compared to White individuals (Hagan & Peterson, 1995). Indeed, the race of the suspect seems to play an important role in how jurors perceive the evidence they are provided with in a case, often believing more incriminating evidence and judging African-American suspects more harshly than Caucasians (Reynolds, 2013). Even though jurors are constantly reminded by judges and lawyers to avoid
the influence of biases and stereotypes, research suggests jurors are still affected by their biases (Haegerich, 2013).

Although research has focused on how the race of the defendant could affect a jury’s deliberation (Sommers, 2007), the research has often produced inconsistent findings. Typically, because the racial composition of the jurors was not taken into consideration; nor was the race of the defendant. For example, Foley and Chamblin (1982) found that the race of the defendant, the mock jurors and victim, influenced the verdict and the perceived culpability of a defendant. That is, when participants were asked to rate the likelihood of the defendant’s guilt, both White and Black mock jurors found the White suspect guiltier than the Black suspect. However, other studies have shown that overall Black jurors are less likely to find defendants guilty—whether the defendant is Black or White—and even less when the defendant is Black (King, 1993).

Taken together, based on this body of research, we expect to find a greater magnitude misinformation effect when our suspect is Black compared to White. Put differently, we expect participants will commit more memory errors when viewing an interrogation with a Black suspect compared to a White suspect.

**Juveniles and Deceptive Interrogations**

Additionally, we are interested in investigating whether the age of the suspect contributes to the magnitude of Luke et al. (2017)’s misinformation effect. Research suggests that in the context of a police interrogation, adults and juveniles respond differently to the same tactics. This is likely due to cognitive development—that is, juveniles are not fully matured. Interrogation tactics that contain deception could therefore have a stronger impact on juveniles, and make them more vulnerable to the misinformation effect. Moreover, juveniles could be more likely to display deceptive cues (e.g. nervousness, not making eye contact, sweating), making it
more likely for a juror who views the interrogation to perceive them as guilty (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). The reason why juveniles would show more deceptive cues is that juveniles—or vulnerable subjects in general—are particularly affected by interactions with authority figures (e.g. detectives), and they could be more negatively affected by the pressure and coercion, therefore appearing more deceptive. Group dynamics situations, where an authority figure is present, often induce the vulnerable subject to follow the lead of the more powerful one, and to, in other words—obey (Milgram, 1965). That would result in juveniles complying with bait questions and therefore look guiltier in the eyes of the jurors during their deliberation.

Keeping the authority factor in mind is important because jurors could potentially perceive the evidence suggested during the bait questions as more likely to be real. Importantly, as Gross (2005) noted, “False confessions are heavily concentrated among the most vulnerable groups of innocent defendants.” Indeed, in a descriptive study examining 328 of the exoneration cases, young suspects (12 – 15 years old) had a much higher rate of false confessions, 75% compared to only 13% of the adults (Gross, Jacoby, Matheson, Montgomery, & Patil, 2005). Juveniles have a tendency to avoid conflict, which is why they are more likely to comply and provide information, even false information, in order to satisfy the authority figure in front of them (Leo, 2009).

Moreover, research with juveniles shows how the language used to interact with younger individuals can also make a big difference. For example, questions with double negatives, difficult vocabulary or rhetoric, have led minors to misinterpret the question and provide inaccurate reports (Perry et al., 1995). A juror watching the recorded video of the interrogation could be easily misled by the responses of the young suspect answering bait questions, as well as the expression of his/her behavior while answering those questions. Young suspects could show
behaviors that are often linked to cues of deception (lack of eye contact, response latency), simply because they are stressed and confused, or perhaps fear the police officer (Ceci, 1994; Drizin & Leo, 2004).

Even though the Supreme Court ruled in 2005 (*Roper v. Simmons*) that suspects under the age of 18 are more vulnerable to deceptive techniques—therefore more likely to comply with authority figures such as detectives—the reality is that no specific guidelines have been provided to criminal justice professionals. Therefore, detectives still use the same type of interrogation techniques with adults and youth (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). In fact, according to the Reid Technique founder, “Principles discussed with respect to adult suspects are just as applicable for use with the young ones”, including the use of complex adult-like language that might interfere with the juvenile’s understanding of facts (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007).

Moreover, Meyer & Reppucci (2007) surveyed law enforcement officers about how they interrogate suspects, the specific techniques they use, and their knowledge on developmental cognitive differences between adults and youth. The results of the study revealed that law enforcement officers understand the general differences between youth and adults (in language comprehension, body language and deception cues, suggestibility and cognitive development), but still use the same techniques to interrogate them. They seem to believe there is a difference between youth in general and youth in the context of the criminal justice (Meyer & Reppucci, 2007). Thus, it is clear that the legal system does not adequately understand, and subsequently account for, how adolescents may be disproportionately affected by strategies and tactics intended for adults (Dawson, 1990).

Jurors’ stereotypes about juvenile offenders could also factor in perception on the evidence and influence their judgments of guilt. In Haegerich and Bottoms (2004) two types of
juvenile offenders’ stereotypes were identified: *wayward youths* (relatively innocuous offenders) and *superpredators* (cold and calculating). People who perceive juveniles through the lenses of the first stereotype, usually attribute their behavior to situational factors (e.g. peer influence or dysfunctional family dynamics), and are more inclined to advocate for rehabilitation of the offenders rather than punishment. Alternatively, individuals who see juvenile offenders more as predators, believe that their criminal behavior is the result of dispositional factors—that they are immoral and violent by nature and should therefore be punished (Haegerich, 2004). Jurors deliberating on a case with a juvenile suspect could embrace either stereotype and thus be biased in their decision-making (Stevenson et al., 2009).

The Current Study

The primary goal of this research is to investigate whether the effects found in Luke et al. (2017) could be replicated with juveniles as suspects (H1, main effect of *ItemType*) and whether Luke et al. (2017)’s misinformation effect is magnified when the suspect is Black compared to White (H2, main effect of *SuspectRace*). Simply put, we expect to see more memory errors when viewing the interrogation with the Black suspect rather than the White suspect. To elaborate, we have participants read a police report containing the actual evidence collected during an investigation of a convenience store robbery, we then show participants a video of an interrogation where the detective uses bait questions with the juvenile suspected of that same robbery, and therefore introduces misleading information into the trial. Because we manipulate the race of the suspect, participants will either view the interrogation with the White or Black suspect. Finally, we test their memory by presenting forced-choice type of questions regarding the evidence collected during the investigation.
In Study Two, we also investigate whether the way the suspect behaves and responds to the bait questions affects jurors’ perception and accuracy in remembering evidence about the case (H3, main effect of SuspectResponse).

**Study 1**

**Method**

**Research Design**

In our first study, we used a 2 (SuspectRace: Black/White) x 2 (ItemType: Misled/Control) mixed design. The between-subjects variable is the Race of the Suspect and the within-subjects variable is the Item Type. We predicted participants would be more susceptible to the misinformation effect—here, remembering more misleading evidence as actually being real—when they viewed the interrogation of a Black suspect compared to a White suspect. In addition, we compared the average magnitude of the misinformation effect that occurred (the difference in misled-control item accuracy) with the suspect being a juvenile with the average magnitude of the effects observed in Luke and colleagues (2017) with adults. We expected to observe, here, a higher magnitude, meaning to have participants committing more memory errors when the suspect is a juvenile rather than an adult.

**Participants**

A power analysis suggested that a sample of \( N = 148 \) would be adequate to detect a small effect (\( f = .15 \)) with \(.95 \) power. We recruited \( N = 201 \) participants (77 males and 124 females)—with an average age of 40-years-old (range: 21-76)—to account for the exclusion of participants who failed to follow instructions. Of the total, 106 participants viewed the recorded interrogation with the White juvenile suspect, and 95 participants the one with the Black juvenile suspect. All
participants were recruited through Amazon MechanicalTurk. Most participants identified their highest level of education as having finished an undergraduate degree (45.8%). All participants resided in the United States of America.

**Procedure and Materials**

We used the methodology described by Luke et al. (2017), with modified materials. Briefly, Luke et al. adapted the classic three-phase ME paradigm (Loftus et al., 1978), to determine whether bait questions are a vehicle by which misinformation can enter the courtroom. We have made several changes here: our interrogations include juvenile suspects, not adults; we changed the liquor store robbery to a convenience store robbery and modified the suspect’s alibi from a bar to a basketball court, to adapt the scenario to a juvenile rather than an adult. Consistent with the new scenario, we also changed some of the evidence present in the interrogation (e.g. from “saliva on a whiskey bottle” to “saliva on a soda bottle”).

Participants completed the entire survey online, on Qualtrics, and they all followed the same procedure regardless of their condition. All participants read and provided the Informed Consent before beginning the study and we explained that their responses would be kept confidential and that they had the right to stop the experiment at any time. At the end of the study we debriefed all participants. The entire study consisted of three main phases: read a police report of a mock crime; watch a 12–minute police interrogation where a detective interviews a suspect on that same case; answer questions on the evidence of the case in two types of memory tests. I elaborate below.

**Event Phase.** During the event phase of the experiment, participants were given a mock police report describing the crime: a convenience store robbery (see Appendix). We explained to the participants that this police report contained all of the pieces of evidence and information
used by the district attorney to press charges against the suspect. We emphasized that the 
interrogation they would see later in the procedure (Post-Event Information Phase) occurred 
before the report was written. In the police report, participants read about several pieces of 
evidence from the convenience store robbery that linked the suspect to the crime (Table 1). As in 
Luke et al. (2017), we used two different police reports (A and B) to counterbalance the pieces of 
evidence provided to the participants. For example, half of the participants learned that the 
fingerprints of the suspect were found on the pocketknife collected from the crime scene; the 
other half read that skin cells belonging to the suspect were found on that same pocketknife. The 
following table (Table 1) contains the critical pieces of evidence in Report A, Report B, and how 
they are referred to when they are Control items.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Versions</th>
<th>Version A</th>
<th>Version B</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Crowbar</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td>Metal Tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fingerprints</td>
<td>Skin Cells</td>
<td>Forensic Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hair</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
<td>Trace Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Saliva</td>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>Biological Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Bracelet</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Credit Cards</td>
<td>Driver Licenses</td>
<td>Identifying Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tear</td>
<td>Stain</td>
<td>Distinctive Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Smartphone</td>
<td>iPod</td>
<td>Electronic Device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Boots</td>
<td>Sneakers</td>
<td>Footwear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Witness</td>
<td>Surveillance Footage</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The first two columns indicate the two versions of the evidence. The “neutral” column 
indicates how the evidence was described in the film when the evidence was a control item.

After reading the mock police report, participants were asked to complete a 12-minute 
card-sorting filling task before proceeding to the next phase.
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**Post-Event Information Phase.** Participants were randomly assigned to one of the eight versions of the taped interrogation, corresponding to the four counterbalancing conditions. All of the videos are approximately 12-minutes long, recorded in the same room and following the same scripted interview (attached in the Appendix). The scripted interview contained three different versions of every piece of evidence. We filmed each bait question three times, only modifying the specific piece of evidence, for example, “Do you think it’s possible in your bedroom we would find [a bracelet] OR [a watch] OR [jewelry] that was reportedly taken from a customer during the convenience store robbery?” To avoid confounds, the actor playing the detective in the mock interrogation remained the same throughout the entire study. Only the suspect differed, and was played by two separate actors: one was Black and one was White. They were both 14 years old. The filmed interrogation also contained control bait questions such as, “Is there any reason we would find forensic evidence that matches you on the pocketknife from the scene?” – functioning as our **control items.** These questions do not contain specific, misleading pieces of evidence. In summary, the materials were fully counterbalanced, such that every single piece of evidence appears the same amount of times throughout the experiment.

Next, participants were given another card-sort filling task (3-minutes long), similar to the one they did before.

**Test Phase.** Participants completed a forced-choice recognition test with two alternatives. We instructed participants to rely only on their recollection from the police report--not the interrogation. The recognition test contained twenty items, with ten questions about pieces of critical evidence, and the other functioning as control (**neutral**) items. An example of a question on the recognition test was: “The cash drawer was opened with a .... “; with the answer being
either a “Screwdriver” or a “Crowbar.” We also asked participants to rate their confidence levels on a 5-points scale (1=not at all; 5=very) after each question.

Next, we administered a “Memory Checklist” to see whether participants came to believe that the misleading pieces of evidence existed. Participants read a list of 30-items of evidence (e.g. suspect’s fingerprints) and were asked to rate their memory for each item (“Remember the evidence,” “Know the evidence,” “Guess the evidence,” “New Evidence”). Importantly, we told them to only select “Remember,” “Know,” or “Guess” if they believe the evidence really existed. Of those 30 items, 10 pieces of evidence were actually new, 10 pieces of evidence were from the report (control items), 5 pieces of evidence were from the film (misled items), and 5 were misled items they were not directly exposed to. We did not analyze this data in this study.

Finally, we asked participants three follow-up questions (e.g. “Do you think that the suspect being interrogated in the film you watched robbed the convenience store?”) to examine the degree to which they thought the suspect was actually guilty. They could indicate that the suspect was guilty, or not-guilty. We also asked questions probing whether participants were aware of our hypotheses, for example “What do you think the purpose of the study is?” – to ensure their pre-existing biases did not affect our results. Finally, we asked participants five demographic questions (e.g. “What year were you born” or “What country have you lived in for most of your life?”) and debriefed them (attached in the Appendix).

Results and Discussion

The primary goal of this research was to investigate whether bait questions could be a vehicle for misinformation and if the effects found in Luke et al. (2017) could be replicated with juveniles as suspects (H1, main effect of ItemType). Additionally, we were interested in examining whether manipulating the race of the suspect being interrogated would change the
magnitude of the misinformation effect in jurors viewing the interrogation (H2, main effect of SuspectRace). Finally, we wanted to investigate whether the age of the suspect also affects jurors’ accuracy in remembering evidence about the case (H3).

Accuracy. To address our first hypothesis (ItemType accuracy), we examined the number of memory errors participants committed throughout our study (regardless of their SuspectRace condition) and measured the difference in memory errors for control and mislead items (within-subjects variable). Recall the control items were the pieces of evidence that were not misled through the use of bait questions in the Post-Event Information phase (e.g. participants read “red sweatshirt with the same kind of tear” in the report, then heard “red sweatshirt with the same kind of distinctive marking” in the interrogation). Our misled items, were the pieces of evidence that clearly different from the report to the interrogation (e.g. the detective saying “red sweatshirt with the same kind of stain” during the interrogation, introducing a misleading additional piece of evidence). To measure the difference between control and misled items, we calculated the average of both across participants, and then compared the mean values (accuracy percentages) using a 2x2 mixed-design ANOVA (both for the Black and White suspect condition).

We found a significant main effect for ItemType (Misled/Control), F (1,199) = 97.96, p < .001, \( \eta_p^2 = 0.33 \). Participants’ memory for control items was significantly better (\( M = 75.1\% \), SD = 22.8\%) than misled items (\( M = 53.2\% \), SD = 25.8\%). This result reveals that bait questions produce the misinformation effect and therefore confirms the previous study by Luke (2017) and our first hypothesis.

To investigate our second hypothesis, we compared the average results from both conditions (Black or White suspect being interrogated) using a mixed ANOVA test to see if there was a difference between participants who viewed the interrogation with the White or Black
suspect. We did not, however, find a significant main effect for SuspectRace, $F(1, 199) = 0.008$, $p = .093$, because memory for the evidence with the White suspect ($M= 54.7\%$, $SD= 24.6\%$) was not significantly different than the ones with the Black suspect ($M= 51.6\%$, $SD= 27.3\%$). Even when we looked at the interaction between our within-subjects (ItemType) and between-subject (SuspectRace) variables, we did not find a significant effect, $F(1, 199)=0.008$, $p=0.93$.

We also predicted the misinformation effect magnitude would be greater for juvenile suspects than for adult suspects in Luke and colleagues (2017). As Figure 1 shows, we calculated a Cohen’s $d$ for our ME magnitude by comparing control items and misled items regardless of suspect race condition, because that variable had no effect on the ME. Our findings do not support our hypothesis. The effect size we found with juveniles ($d= 0.70$) is not greater than the effect size found in Luke et al. (2017) with adults ($d=0.77$). Indeed, our findings show reveal a stable misinformation effect.

**Figure 1.** *Magnitude of the Misinformation effect: Comparison of mean accuracy for Control and Misled Items.*
**Guilty-measure.** At the end of the survey, we asked participants if they believed the suspect was guilty. In accordance with the previous study of Luke et al. (2017), the vast majority of participants believed the suspect was guilty of the crime. However, when we compared the results between the between-subjects condition (White/Black), we found a significant difference between the two conditions. 97 out of 105 of the participants who viewed the interrogation with the White suspect, believed him to be guilty; while only 69 out 94 of the participants who viewed the interrogation with the Black suspect believed him to be guilty, ($\chi^2 = 12.91, p < 0.001$). We also ran a t-test to see whether there was a difference in participants’ confidence of guilt (to which degree they believed the suspect was guilty or not-guilty), between the White and Black suspect condition. Here, we found a similar trend, with participants being more confident that the White suspect was guilty ($M = 82.69, SD = 20.33$), compared to the Black suspect ($M = 68.63, SD = 28.59$).

**Study 2**

Our second study followed the same methodology of Study 1, but we adapted some of the materials to account for limitations we encountered in Study 1 (e.g. having actors playing the suspects). Moreover, we modified the research design and included a between-subjects variable `SuspectResponse` to account for the suspects’ behaviors and response styles during the interrogations. While we explored implicit biases related to intrinsic factors of the suspects (e.g. race, age), previous research shows how biases related to the suspect’s behavior can also be highly influential (Haegerich & Bottoms, 2004).
The fact that participants in our first study perceived the White suspect as guilty at higher rates than the Black suspect—in contrast to our initial hypothesis on SuspectRace—led us to hypothesize that some other features of the White suspect, or his own behavior, could be key in the context of how jurors process information about the evidence. In our case, for example, we were concerned that in our videos, the White suspect may have appeared more nervous and agitated than the Black suspect, which may have made the White suspect look guiltier. In short, differences in acting ability (e.g. agitation and nervousness) may have confounded our results in Study 1. To account for this issue, we decided to change the materials of our study, and translate the videos of the interrogations into transcripts of that same interrogations. This gave us the opportunity to not only control for the suspect’s behavior or acting ability, but also to manipulate and investigate whether different suspect’s responses or behavior could create a difference in the ME. This is why we introduced a new independent manipulation: SuspectResponse. A suspect who responds to deceptive tactics such as the bait questions with a firmer rejection, negating the evidence, will most likely look more confident than someone who complies, offer explanations to the bait questions scenario and looks agitated.

Previous research on mock juries has found that the way interrogations are conducted, the interrogator and suspect’s behaviors, can influence neutral observers’ perception and alter their presumption of guilt towards the suspects (Akehurst & Vrij, 1999) as well as their processing of the evidence (Haegerich & Bottoms, 2004). In a study conducted by Akehurst & Vrij (1999), for example, suspects who were more defensive as a reaction to guilty-driven questions and deceptive tactics were perceived as guilty far more often than the suspects who behaved more confidently.

To test our hypothesis about SuspectResponse, we manipulated the way our suspect
responds to bait questions and behaves, by giving participants either an Explanatory or a Rejection type of response of the interrogation. We predict that participants in the Explanatory condition (suspect complying with the hypothetical evidence) will commit more memory errors. We are also interested in looking at the interaction between SuspectRace and SuspectResponse for Misled Items (H4, 3-way interaction). What we predict here is higher magnitude of misinformation effect for the interaction of SuspectRace and SuspectResponse for the Black-Suspect/Explanatory-Response condition, in other words, an overall lower memory accuracy for the evidence when participants view the interrogation with the juvenile Black suspect who reacts to bait questions complying with the hypothetical scenarios provided by the detectives.

Additionally, most previous research on jury deliberation and race discrimination, has examined how the race of the suspect affects the verdict, but has failed to investigate whether the race of the jury member plays a role (Sommers, 2007). By asking participants in Study 2 to indicate their own race along with the other demographic questions, we aimed to investigate how the racial composition of a jury could influence race implicit biases.

**Research Design**

This second study is a 2 (SuspectRace: Black/White) x 2 (ItemType: Misled/Control) x 2 (SuspectResponse: Explanation/Rejection) repeated measure mixed design. The between-subject variables are the SuspectRace and the SuspectResponse. We predicted participants would be more susceptible to the misinformation effect—here, remembering more hypothetical evidence as actually being real—when reading the interrogation of a Black suspect compared to a White suspect (H1). We also predicted that participants who read the transcript with the Explanatory response, would commit more memory errors than the participants who read the transcript with the Rejection response (H2).
Participants

A power analysis suggested a sample of \( N=200 \) would be adequate to detect a small effect \((f= .15)\) with .95 power. We recruited a larger sample of participants \((N= 378)\) to account for exclusions of participants who failed to follow the instructions. We recruited participants through Amazon MechanicalTurk until we reached our target sample and had a total of 211 participants post-exclusions, with 73 males and 138 females, and an average age of 45-years-old (range: 20-77). As in Study 1, we introduced Manipulation, Instructional and Attentional Checks that allowed us to account for the participants that we needed to exclude. We created several follow-up questions at the end of the survey (e.g. “Did you speak to anyone during the time of the experiment?”). We excluded participants if they failed to follow instructions (e.g. stopping throughout the study, engaging in another task during the study), encountered technical issues, or failed the manipulation check question (”How old do you think the suspect is?”). Most participants identified their highest level of education as having finished an undergraduate degree (43.6%). All participants resided in the United States of America.

Procedure and Materials

We changed some of the materials used previously to address some of the limitations we encountered in Study 1. In our previous study we had participants reading the police reports, and then watching the videos of the interrogations containing bait questions, with different individuals playing the part of the “suspect”. Having different actors impersonating the suspects inherently introduced biases and confounds, depending on how those individuals behaved or spoke (e.g. more or less confident). Here, we simply used text, rather than video, and participants read the text alongside a photograph of the detective and suspect. This design change allowed us to manipulate elements of the suspects' behaviors, our SuspectResponse variable. Participants in
the *Explanation* condition read responses from the suspect that were more hesitant (e.g. pausing or showing doubts) and collaborative (e.g. showing compliance and offering explanations to the hypothetical evidence). Participants in the *Rejection* condition, read confident rejections of the bait questions.

Also, we introduced the RWA (Right-wing Authoritarianism) scale and the Modern Racism Scale to analyze more directly how implicit bias might influence our results. The RWA scale is used to determine to measure public opinions regarding general social issues, such as religious freedom or gay and women’s rights. An example of a statement used in the scale is “*Women should have to promise to obey their husbands when they get married*”, to which participants have to indicate their attitude on a Likert Scale ranging from *Very Strongly Disagree* to *Very Strongly Agree*. The MRS, on the other hand, measures individuals’ attitudes towards racial beliefs by asking to rate statements such as “*Blacks are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights*”.

For the same reason we added the scales, we also introduced a new demographic question, asking participants to identify their own race to examine whether there is an interaction between the suspect and participant’s race that might amplify the misinformation effect.

**Results**

**Accuracy.** To investigate our hypotheses, we used a repeated measured ANOVA where *ItemType* was the within-subjects variable, and *SuspectRace* and *SuspectResponse* were the two between-subjects variables. As in Study 1, we observed an effect of *ItemType* (H1) $F(1, 199) = 97.96, p < .001, \eta^2_p = 0.33$. That is, participants were significantly less accurate for mislead items (M=51%, SD=26.2%) than control items (M=84%, SD=21.3%).
To investigate our second hypothesis, *SuspectRace* (H2), we again compared the average results from participants who either read the transcript with the Black or White suspect, and tested whether there was a difference between the two groups in terms of accuracy. We did not, however, find a significant main effect for *SuspectRace*, $F(1,207) = 2.677, p = .093$, because memory for the misled evidence with the White suspect ($M = 49.3\%, SD = 26.7\%$) was not significantly different than the ones with the Black suspect ($M = 52.7\%, SD = 25.6\%$). We also wanted to investigate whether the race of the participants would affect our results. However, the vast majority of the participants we recruited identified as White (117 out of 211); the fact that participants believed the White suspect to be guiltier, suggests an opposite trend from the research on race biases. In future studies we should investigate this issue further and control for the participants’ race.

We also predicted the misinformation effect magnitude would be greater when the *SuspectResponse* was in the form of an Explanation rather the Rejection (H3). However, this hypothesis was not supported by our data. We did not find a significant main effect comparing the Explanatory Response ($M=50.3\%, SD=25.7\%$), with the Rejection Response ($M=52\%, SD=22.7\%$).

**Guilty-Measure.** Consistently with Study 1, at the end of the survey we asked participants to indicate whether they believed the suspect was guilty or not. As in Study 1, most participants believed the suspect to be guilty ($M=82.87\%, SD=17.39\%$), replicating previous results. We then compared guilty ratings among conditions to see whether there was any significant difference between *SuspectRace* (Black/White) and *SuspectResponse* (Explanation/Rejection). Our results showed no significant difference for main effect in *SuspectRace*, $F(1,205)= .64, p=.42$, and no main effect for *SuspectResponse*, $F(1,205)= .98, p=.32$. We also did not find an interaction
between *SuspectRace* and *SuspectResponse* for guilty-ratings, $F(1,205)=2.23$, $p=.13$. We, however, noticed an unusual trend for guilty ratings of the White suspect comparing *SuspectResponse*: participants in the Explanation Response conditions believed the suspect to be guiltier ($M=86.55\%, \ SD=12.73\%$), than the ones in the Rejection Response ($M=81.31\%, \ SD=19.20\%$).

**General Discussion**

The purpose of this research was to investigate whether the use of bait questions during police interviews would lead to a misinformation effect in jurors who viewed the tape of an interrogation of a juvenile suspect. We also investigated whether racial biases, would affect the magnitude of the misinformation effect we expected to observe. Our results from Study 1 & 2 suggest that bait questions are a vehicle for the misinformation effect and can alter jurors’ perception of a case. As an extension of Luke et al. (2017), we replicated the previous results after creating new materials to adapt the crime to a juvenile suspect scenario. As in Luke et al. (2017), participants committed significantly more memory errors for misled items compared to control items (when bait question introduced misleading evidence compared to neutral evidence), suggesting that bait questions lead to a misinformation effect. Additionally, participants overwhelmingly believed suspects to be guilty, which suggests that they incorporated into memory the evidence introduced by the bait questions as “existing” and being incriminating for the suspect. The hypothetical connotation of the question was therefore ignored.

However, the results of Study 1 and 2 for our between-subject variables (related to *SuspectRace* and *SuspectResponse*) showed no significant differences. Our hypothesis that the magnitude of the misinformation effect would be greater when the suspect was Black or when
the suspect would respond to bait question providing explanations—were therefore not supported.

Additionally, the results showed no significant difference in the magnitude of the effect size between the experiment conducted by Luke et al. (2017) using adult suspects and the current study with juveniles. This contradicts our prediction that, because juveniles are more susceptible than adults to deceptive police techniques, such as bait questions, jurors might commit more memory errors when the suspect is a juvenile. The fact that we did not find differences across conditions for *SuspectRace* and *SuspectResponse*, while we did find, again, strong evidence for bait questions being a vehicle for the misinformation effect, suggests that the effect of bait questions on memory accuracy is so strong that other variables might be very difficult to detect. For example, in Luke et al. (2017) highly specific *warnings* were used to attempt to mitigate the effects of bait questions, but the attempt failed. Here, we hypothesized that implicit biases could perhaps alter (likely amplify) the magnitude of the ME, and again, our results did not support that hypothesis. In other words, by using bait questions during interrogations, detectives introduce misleading evidence into a trial that will inevitably activate the ME in jurors, regardless of any other characteristic of the suspect or of his behavior. While stereotypes and biases in general might alter some of the information and decision-making processing, when facing such conflicting evidence, individuals tend to be confused and misled overall. This is troubling, considering that jurors should be evaluating relevant evidence, and given that the stakes for their judgment are so high.

We suggested that the Source Monitoring Framework could provide us with an explanation as to why bait questions can so strongly affect people’s memory, and the results of our study seem to point towards the direction of *systematic judgment* errors, more than *heuristic*
ones. Perhaps, jurors base their source monitoring decisions more on plausible explanations and associations from the information to the source (e.g. jurors remember the evidence introduced by the bait question as “existing” because detectives interrogated the suspect about that evidence), than on previously activated schemas and biases (e.g. jurors remember the evidence because they have implicit biases on the suspects). In other words, people seek to build a coherent representation when they connect the information with its source, and we believed that their biased schemas about certain individuals would steer the judgment throughout this process. However, our results suggest that in the context of bait questions the source monitoring errors might be driven by other factors.

While at first glance the fact that implicit biases do not have an effect might look positive (i.e. people are not as biased and driven by stereotypes as we might think), it also demonstrates the high degree of harm bait questions can cause. This fact leads to another important question: how often are bait questions used by law enforcement trained with techniques such as the Reid Techniques? If bait questions are such damaging weapons against memory accuracy and can potentially lead jurors to convict innocent people, we need to understand if certain individuals might be more negatively affected by these tactics. The fact that we did not find differences depending on the age, race or behavior of the suspect should inspire future research to focus on what happens before bait questions are used, instead of after. If bait questions are responsible for such a strong ME, so strong that it undermines other factors that are consistently influential in jury decision-making, then it is important to look back at which individuals face the danger of those techniques. According to Inbau (2001), deceptive tactics such as bait questions are to be used when detectives believe the suspect is guilty. Law enforcement trained with the Reid Techniques, or who generally use deceptive tactics, believe they are capable of knowing which
suspicts are lying and which ones are telling the truth, and they will only deceptive tactics with guilty suspects. However, research on lie detection, shows how detectives, even the ones trained with the Reid Techniques, are not good at all at detecting lies or guilty suspects (Bond & DePaulo, 2006). So, how do they make such determination? Which individuals are more likely to be perceived as guilty, and why?

In addition, detectives’ own biases and perception of the suspect’s guilt could trigger the use of those techniques. Recent research, for example, shows how the race of the suspect might not just be worth noting in relationship to jurors and implicit biases they might have; but it could also have implications on how detectives handle the interrogations and what type of tactics they decide to use—because of their own biases (Khan, Steele, McMahon & Stewart, 2017). In their study, Khan et al. (2017) investigated how the escalation of the use of force during police interrogations differs over time, whether the suspect is Black or White. The results showed how the use of force escalated more quickly in interactions with African-American suspects rather than Caucasians, when detectives had less information about the case. This result suggests that the escalation of the use of force might be influenced by racial bias rather than actual evidence (Khan et al., 2017). We do know that race can affect crucial aspects of the criminal justice system (e.g. jury deliberation, police-suspect interactions during an investigation), it is therefore possible that race can also affect the way interrogations unfold and whether detectives draw upon more deceptive tactics or not. Although we did not manipulate the way the detective’s behavior is affected by the race of the suspect in this current study—in future studies we could manipulate this factor to see whether it has an effect on the ME.

Furthermore, the fact that research on false confessions and juvenile convictions (Gross, 2005; Gross et al., 2005) has extensively shown that some individuals are already more
vulnerable to certain situations (e.g. juveniles and deceptive interrogations), when we find troubling evidence in regard to systematic law enforcement practices, such as the use of bait questions, we need to investigate whether those vulnerable subjects are more negatively affected by them.

Limitations

There are certainly some limitations to the current study, which is why future research on the subject is important. First, as often happens in studies that relate to jury deliberation, it is hard to create the same implications for our participants as they would have in a real trial. For practical and ethical reasons, we cannot put participants through a plausible trial, and even though we instruct them to behave as mock jurors, the stakes are very different, and they are aware of being part of a study (e.g. they know their judgment will not really send anyone to jail). Participants are aware that the suspect in the video (or portrayed in the transcripts) will not really face negative consequences, so they know that their judgment’s is not as crucial as it would be on a bench trial where the life of an individual and justice are at stake. This is a big limitation of research in this field, affecting how participants engage in these studies, including how much attention they pay and how well they follow the instructions provided. Linked to this issue, we recruited participants online, rather than having them come into the lab. Even though we introduced specific questions in the survey to make sure to exclude participants who did not follow the survey instructions (e.g. “Did you complete the survey in one session?” “Did you speak to anyone during the survey?”), we still had little control over the way by which each participant went through the study or the environment they were in during testing.

Implications
Bait questions can activate the misinformation effect and introduce false information into a trial, whether the suspect is an adult or a juvenile. Even though our hypotheses were not supported here, it is possible that other factors influenced our results and future research could still find a significant relationship between the attributes we are interested in and the size of the misinformation effect. For example, in the case of our race manipulation, it is possible that the race of the participant was responsible for the effect; and/or how the crime and suspect did or did not fit their racial stereotype. The implications of those findings would be troubling because they could suggest that implicit biases have an effect on the way jurors perceive a suspect, and that bait questions can be used as tool of additional discrimination. While we did not find a significant difference when comparing adults and juveniles, as well as the different types of responses (Explanation/Rejection), future research should further investigate how suspect’s behavior and other intrinsic characteristics of the suspect can alter the magnitude of the misinformation effect. Adolescences, for example, might not fully understand the hypothetical connotation of the bait questions, and therefore answer in more ambiguous ways, which, again, would make them look guiltier. Acknowledging that juveniles could be more susceptible to bait questions is a key point in understanding how deceptive tactics can affect some individuals more than others. For example, after the case of Brendan Dassey—in which the juvenile suspect (with significant intellectual and social limitations) had to face highly deceptive interrogations—the Supreme Court is now considering revising *Roper v. Simmons* (2005) to defend juveniles to a higher degree and review whether certain confessions obtained with the use of deceptive tactics can be considered voluntary or not. This provides clear evidence of how the issue remains relevant and why further research is needed.
While our results did not support our hypotheses in this current study, they provided us with meaningful insights on how other factors can possibly interact with the misinformation effect activated by the bait questions in police interrogations—which will help orient future research on these topics.
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Appendix

Highly Specific Misinformation Warning

Sometimes during an interrogation, police officers will ask hypothetical questions about evidence. For example, "Is it possible we could find your fingerprints at the scene of the crime?" This is done to see if the person being questioned changes his or her story. These questions sometimes contain incorrect information. Thus, you may notice (may have noticed) incorrect information during the interrogation.

There are several of these questions about evidence in the interview you are going to watch (you will watch). Five of these questions refer to evidence that does not exist and was not actually collected by the police. These questions are about:

[Odd numbered items misled]
1. What was used to open the cash register
2. The evidence found in the ski mask
3. The jewelry stolen from victims at the liquor store
4. Distinctive markings on the suspect's clothing
5. The type of footwear matching a shoeprint

[Even numbered items misled]
1. Evidence found on the gun
2. Evidence found on the broken bottle
3. Identifying documents found in stolen wallets
4. An electronic device stolen from a victim at the liquor store
5. The evidence that placed the suspect at the scene

Scripted Interview used with the two juvenile suspects, Black and White, containing Bait Questions.

Study 1

INTERROGATION SCRIPT

Intro/The Basketball Court Alibi

CALHOUN: Can you state your name for the record?

MORGAN: My name is Matthew Morgan.
CALHOUN: And for the record, are you speaking to me voluntarily?

MORGAN: Yes. Yes, I am.

CALHOUN: Great. Thanks, Matthew. A few days ago, around six o’clock, there was an armed robbery at a convenience store. Detective Brady has talked to you a little about this already, right?

MORGAN: Yeah.

CALHOUN: Okay. I don’t want to take up too much of your time, so I won’t go over all the details with you again if Detective Brady already talked to you about that.

MORGAN: That’s okay.

CALHOUN: We’re looking into that robbery, as you know, so I’m going ask you some questions about some things we’ve found and about what you’ve been doing for the last few days. All right?

MORGAN: Yeah, that’s fine.

CALHOUN: Okay. Good. Let me start by asking you what you were doing on the afternoon of October 9.

MORGAN: October 9?

CALHOUN: Yeah. What were you doing?

MORGAN: I think I was out at the basketball court. It’s just a few blocks from my apartment, maybe about half a mile.

CALHOUN: Okay. When were you there?

MORGAN: Maybe from five to seven that night. I went there after school, so...

CALHOUN: You talked to anyone there?

MORGAN: Yeah, I mean. I was playing basketball with my friends, so yeah, sure…My friends Tommy and Jack were definitely there – they’re usually with me. Not sure who else was there. I go there a lot, so sometimes it blurs together, you know?

CALHOUN: If I ask the people you named if you were there, they’d say you were there?

MORGAN: Yeah, sure. They should. I mean, I don’t know why they wouldn’t.

CALHOUN: Okay. What did you do there?

MORGAN: At the basketball court? I mean, we just played for a while. Hang out with my friends. Just what we usually do after school, you know.

CALHOUN: All right. Did you go to a convenience store at all?

MORGAN: That day, no, I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: Did you go anywhere else?
MORGAN: Not that I remember. I think I went straight home after playing.

CALHOUN: How did you get home?

MORGAN: I walked. The court isn’t too far from my place. Short walk.

CALHOUN: All right. So these people that you mentioned – if I were to talk to them, is there a reason anyone would say they didn’t see you there?

MORGAN: Sure. Like, if you asked Tommy or Jack, they’d say I was there, I think. I mean, if they haven’t forgotten.

CALHOUN: You think they could have forgotten?

MORGAN: I mean, I told you -- I go there a lot. So maybe, yeah. They go there a lot too, so maybe they would forget, but I don’t know. You’d have to ask them.

CALHOUN: Okay.

Car (standard)

CALHOUN: You have a brother, right?

MORGAN: Yes, that’s right. Mike.

CALHOUN: What kind of car does he have?


CALHOUN: Do you know where he keeps the keys?

MORGAN: Yeah, of course I do.

CALHOUN: Do you ever drive the car without him?

MORGAN: No, I don’t. And the car actually went missing a few days ago.

CALHOUN: When exactly?

MORGAN: I think four or five days ago.

CALHOUN: Did he report it stolen?

MORGAN: Yeah. I mean, my parents did. Mike was out of town to visit his girlfriend when it happened. But my parents called it in when they saw it was gone. It should be- You should have a record of it. I mean, there should be a report, no?

CALHOUN: If they reported it, yeah, there should be a report. I’ll look that up. But his car, it’s a Ford Taurus?

MORGAN: Yeah, that’s what I said. I think you guys found it.

CALHOUN: That’s right. We found did find a black Ford Taurus in an alley. There were some things we found in it. I want to ask you about some of that stuff. What kind of stuff does your brother keep in the car?
MORGAN: I’m not really sure. Just normal stuff, I guess. I know he usually keeps a spare jacket in it. Some tools in the trunk. Probably CDs, you know.

CALHOUN: All right. Is there a reason we would find a baseball bat in there?

MORGAN: A bat?

CALHOUN: Yeah. Like, an aluminum bat.

MORGAN: Yeah. I think I’ve seen that in the car, he keeps it in the trunk.

CALHOUN: Okay. We found that there. So that belongs to your brother?

MORGAN: Yeah, that’s right. He keeps it in there for protection. You know, just in case. He’s never actually used it, though.

CALHOUN: All right.

Tool

CALHOUN: You know how the cash drawer at the convenience store was pried open?

MORGAN: Yeah, Detective Brady told me that.

CALHOUN: Yeah, it was pried open. Is there some reason a [crowbar]/[screwdriver]/[metal tool] we found in your brother’s car would match the marks we found on the cash drawer?

MORGAN: The marks on the cash drawer?

CALHOUN: Yeah, is there a reason-

MORGAN: No, I don’t think that would- I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: There’s no reason?

MORGAN: I mean, there are tools in the car.

CALHOUN: Could one of them match the marks on the cash drawer?

MORGAN: I guess maybe. I mean, he keeps the tools in the car, so, like, maybe.

Pocketknife evidence

CALHOUN: What about a pocketknife?

MORGAN: A pocketknife? What about a pocketknife?

CALHOUN: Do you own a pocketknife?

MORGAN: No, I don’t.

CALHOUN: We found a pocketknife in car trunk.

MORGAN: In the trunk?
CALHOUN: Yeah, in the trunk. I know you said you don’t have a pocketknife, but is there some reason we would find [your skin cells]/[your fingerprints]/[individuated evidence linked to you] on that pocketknife? That pocketknife we found in the trunk.

MORGAN: I have no idea. That doesn’t make any sense.

CALHOUN: Is there some reason-

MORGAN: No, no. I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: All right.

Mask trace

CALHOUN: Under the driver’s seat of your brother’s car, we also found a ski mask.

MORGAN: A ski mask?

CALHOUN: Yeah.

MORGAN: That’s weird.

CALHOUN: Is it possible the ski mask belongs to you or your brother?

MORGAN: I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: Okay. It was under the seat. If we had our forensics guys check it out, do you think they’d find [sweat]/[hair]/[trace evidence] that matches you in there?

MORGAN: I guess it could be mine. I don’t know.

CALHOUN: So...

MORGAN: I don’t know. I don’t think it’s mine, so no, I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: So that’s not possible?

MORGAN: It’s possible. It’s just not, you know- I don’t know for sure. I don’t want to say no for sure.

CALHOUN: Okay.

Bottle biological evidence

CALHOUN: We also found an empty soda bottle in the car.

MORGAN: Where?

CALHOUN: It was in your brother’s car. The bottle was empty, but if we were to check the mouth of that bottle, do you think we would find [your saliva]/[your blood]/[biological evidence linked to you]? Is that possible?

MORGAN: I don’t think so. I don’t remember drinking anything in that car recently.

CALHOUN: So you do ride that car sometimes?

MORGAN: Yeah, I mean. Sure. My brother drives me around to school and stuff, you know. But I don’t remember drinking any soda – maybe I didn’t notice.
CALHOUN: Yeah. So there’s no reason we’d find that?

MORGAN: I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: Okay.

**Jewelry**

CALHOUN: Let me ask you about some other stuff now. We’re still sorting through a lot of the things we saw in your bedroom, but some things there are raising some questions.

MORGAN: What kind of questions?

**CALHOUN:** Well, for instance, *do you think it’s possible in your bedroom we would find [a bracelet]/[a watch]/[jewelry] that was reportedly taken from a customer during the convenience store robbery?*

MORGAN: I don’t know why that would be, no. No, I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: Not possible?

MORGAN: Well, I guess, sometimes friends come over and leave their stuff behind by mistake. Someone could have left it behind.

CALHOUN: All right, yeah. Well, have you had anyone over in the last week?

MORGAN: Yeah, I had some people over at our house.

CALHOUN: How many people were over?

MORGAN: Maybe six or seven.

CALHOUN: If I talk to those people, do you think any of them is going to say they left that stuff behind?

MORGAN: I don’t know.

CALHOUN: You don’t know?

MORGAN: You should ask them.

CALHOUN: Okay.

**Cards**

**CALHOUN:** *In your bedroom, could there have been [credit cards]/[driver licenses]/[identifying documents] from customers from the convenience store?*

MORGAN: In my bedroom?

CALHOUN: Yeah. In your bedroom.

MORGAN: I don’t- I don’t think so, no.

CALHOUN: No?
MORGAN: Yeah, no. I don’t think so. I can’t see how that stuff would have gotten there. I mean, maybe somebody left it there by mistake, or I don’t see how it could be there.

CALHOUN: Okay.

**Sweatshirt**

CALHOUN: *Let me ask you about something else. Is there a reason we would have found a red sweatshirt in your bedroom with the same kind of [tear]/[stain]/[distinctive marking] the perp for had on his sweatshirt?*

MORGAN: Uh... I don’t know. I have a red hoodie, yeah, but I don’t really know about what you’re talking about. I didn’t see this robbery, but I guess it’s possible I have a similar hoodie. It’s possible.

CALHOUN: It’s possible?

MORGAN: Yeah. It could happen.

**Electronic device**

CALHOUN: Okay. You know how I mentioned that the guy we’re looking for took things from the customers in the store?

MORGAN: Yeah, I remember.

CALHOUN: *One of the customers said the guy took [a smartphone from him]/[an iPod from him]/[an electronic device from him]. If we check through the stuff in your bedroom, do you think we’re going to find a device like that one?*

MORGAN: Like that guy’s?

CALHOUN: Yeah. Is there a reason we’d find his device in your place?

MORGAN: No, I don’t think so. I guess one of my friends could have left something like that in my bedroom by mistake – but I don’t think so.

CALHOUN: Okay. All right.

**Footwear**

CALHOUN: Let me ask you about something else. In the convenience store, we found a footprint. It seems like the guy we’re looking for tracked mud in and left this muddy footprint.

MORGAN: Okay. So…?

CALHOUN: *I’m getting to it. Do you think it’s possible we would find [a pair of boots]/[a pair of sneakers]/[some footwear] in your bedroom that would match that footprint?*

MORGAN: Is it possible? Yeah, I guess it’s possible. Lots of shoes are the same.

CALHOUN: You think it’s possible?

MORGAN: Yeah, I think maybe it’s possible I have the same shoes or something. Why not. I’m not saying I did anything, I’m just saying it’s possible.

CALHOUN: It’s possible we’d find something that matches that footprint?
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MORGAN: Sure, maybe that could happen.

CALHOUN: Yeah, all right.

Observer

CALHOUN: Your brother's car is black, right?

MORGAN: Yeah, a black Ford Taurus.

CALHOUN: Right. Okay. *Is there some reason [a witness would report seeing you]/[surveillance camera footage would show you]/[you would be observed] getting out of a black car and putting on a ski mask near the convenience store that was robbed?*

MORGAN: I guess it could be someone who looks like me. I mean, lots of guys look like me, I think.

CALHOUN: So you could have been seen there?

MORGAN: I'm saying maybe someone who looks enough like me.

CALHOUN: But it's possible?

MORGAN: Yeah, I mean- Again, I'm not saying I did anything like that. I'm just saying there are people who look a lot like me, and maybe this guy looked a lot like me.

Defensive wound

CALHOUN: There's another thing I want to ask you about.

MORGAN: Okay.

CALHOUN: During the robbery, there was a fight between one of the customers and the perp- the guy we're looking for.

MORGAN: Yeah…?

CALHOUN: Yeah. When you came into the station, we checked out the stuff you had in your pockets and took some pictures of you. We noticed you had a wound on your arm. Your left arm.

MORGAN: Yeah, I know. It's really just a scratch. No big deal, really.

CALHOUN: *Yeah, but that wound – is there a reason that wound would have [a bitemark]/[the DNA]/[unique evidence] that matched the person who got into the fight with the perpetrator?*

MORGAN: I got hurt playing ball in the park with my friends.

CALHOUN: So...

MORGAN: So no, I don't think that's possible.

CALHOUN: No? Okay. When did you get hurt?

MORGAN: A couple days ago.

CALHOUN: Do you remember exactly?
MORGAN: I don’t know exactly, but it was a couple days ago. I was in that the park about a mile from my place.

CALHOUN: And you were with friends?

MORGAN: Yeah. Four or five people I know there.

CALHOUN: If I talk to those people, are they going to be able to tell me about how you got hurt?

MORGAN: I don’t know if they’ll even remember, but yeah, they should. They should be able to. The thing is, it was no big deal, so they might not remember.

CALHOUN: All right. Okay.

Closing

CALHOUN: I haven’t got anything else to ask you for now, I think.

MORGAN: OK. So, what now?

CALHOUN: We’ve got to look into a few more things. I’m going to check on some things, some of the things we talked about. After that, I’m probably going to have some more questions for you, if that’s all right.

MORGAN: Yeah, that’s OK.

CALHOUN: Good. Thanks for cooperating with this investigation. I’m going to ask the officer outside to see you out, okay?

MORGAN: Okay.

*Study 2 Examples of Response Style: Explanation / Rejection.*

Explanation Response

**Bottle biological evidence**

CALHOUN: We also found an empty soda bottle in the car.

MORGAN: Where?

CALHOUN: *It was in your brother’s car. The bottle was empty, but if we were to check the mouth of that bottle, do you think we would find [your saliva]/[your blood]/[biological evidence linked to you]? Is that possible?*

MORGAN: I don’t think so. I don’t remember drinking anything in that car recently.

CALHOUN: So you do ride that car sometimes?
MORGAN: Yeah, I mean. Sure. My brother drives me around to school and stuff, you know. But I don’t remember drinking any soda – maybe I didn’t notice.

CALHOUN: Yeah. So there’s no reason we’d find that?

MORGAN: I don’t think so. I mean, unless I have forgotten. Perhaps it’s very old and I don’t remember.

CALHOUN: Okay.

Rejection Response

Bottle biological evidence

CALHOUN: We also found an empty soda bottle in the car.

MORGAN: Where?

CALHOUN: It was in your brother’s car. The bottle was empty, but if we were to check the mouth of that bottle, do you think we would find [your saliva]/[your blood]/[biological evidence linked to you]? Is that possible?

MORGAN: I haven’t been drinking anything in that car recently.

CALHOUN: So you do ride that car sometimes?

MORGAN: Yeah, I mean. Sure. My brother drives me around to school and stuff, you know. But I haven’t been drinking anything in the car recently.

CALHOUN: So there’s no reason we’d find that?

MORGAN: No.

CALHOUN: Okay.
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Informed Consent

Jay College Department of Psychology
Title of Research Study: Watching a Criminal Investigation
Principal Investigators: Matilde Ascheri & Deryn M. Strange, PhD, Associate Professor John Jay College

You are invited to participate in a research study under the direction of Matilde Ascheri, a BA/MA student at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and Dr. Deryn Strange, an Associate Professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, USA. Thank you for your interest in participating. You are being asked to participate in this research study because you are an MTurk user over the age of 18. There will be approximately 2950 total participants. In this study, you will see facts and evidence from an investigation of a crime. At the end of the study, you will answer some questions about your opinions of the case. The study should take no more than 45 minutes total and you will be compensated $0.75 for your participation. Your participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person’s everyday use of a computer and the Internet, and confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. Only your responses to each task will be recorded. We will also maintain your MTurk identification number for compensation purposes. However, your survey responses will be de-identified and not attached to your worker ID. In accordance with the requirements of some scientific journals and organizations, your coded, anonymous data may be shared with other competent researchers or used in other related studies. Your participation in this research is voluntary and you can stop participating at any time. Although there are no direct benefits to you, your participation will help to expand the scientific literature. If you have any questions comments, or concerns, you can contact Matilde Ascheri (email: Matilde.ascheri@jjay.cuny.edu) or Dr. Deryn Strange (email: dstrange@jjay.cuny.edu). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or if you would like to talk to someone other than the researchers, you can contact CUNY Research Compliance Administrator at 646-664-8918. By clicking “Continue” you are consenting to participate in the study.

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE: I have read and understood the information about this research project. I understand the purpose of this research, what will happen if I participate, and what will
happen to the information I provide. I understand the measures in place to protect my privacy and confidentiality, such that the information I provide will be coded by a number that does not identify me. I understand that I can withdraw my consent at any time prior to the end of my scheduled participation, and I do not have to give a reason.

☐ Yes, I consent to participate in this research. (1)
☐ No, I do not consent to participate in this research. (2)

If No, I do not consent to par... Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q22 Welcome to the survey. Before we begin, we need you to answer a few questions about you and your background. We are asking you these questions for two reasons: [1] when we analyze the data from everyone who has participated, we want to be able to classify responses by certain broad categories such as age, country or interests; [2] We want to be able to detect bots as well as people who are not really taking this HIT seriously. As you might expect, those kind of responses can really cause problems in research.

(Age) What year were you born (please answer in 4 digits)

(country) What country have you lived in for most of your life?

(country) What country do you live in now?

(Sex) Are you

☐ Male (1)
☐ Female (2)

(Education) What is the highest level of education you have completed?

☐ Did not finish high school (1)
☐ Finished high school (2)
☐ Finished undergraduate degree (4 year or equivalent) (3)
☐ Finished Masters/PhD (4)

Q334 During this experiment, we ask that you comply with certain requirements to make sure you perform your best.

Q32 First, please maximize the size of your web browser so that it covers your entire screen.

☐ I have done that (1)
☐ I have not done that (2)

Q330 Please complete the experiment in a single session, and do not leave the experiment to engage in other tasks. So don't check your mail, look at Facebook, send or read a text message, get up for a drink, etc.

☐ I understand that (1)

Q331 Please do not use your web browser's back or refresh buttons at any point during the experiment.
I understand that (1)

Q332 Finally, because this experiment requires your close attention, we ask that you complete the experiment in an environment that is free of noise and distraction. Please do not speak to anyone, or have anyone near you. Ideally, you would be alone in a quiet room, or in a room where other people are quiet (such as a library).

I understand that (1)

Q333 Thank you for your help with these matters. Continue to the next page when you're ready to begin.

Q218 In today's study, your first task is to read a police report for a robbery. The police report is the final summary of facts that was sent to the District Attorney for prosecution. Once you have finished reading the report below, you will be able to advance to the next page. Click the continue button to read the report.

(counterbalancing version A)
At 2200 on October 9, Officer Wilkes responded to a report of an armed robbery of a convenience store at [redacted]. A clerk and three customers were in the store when it was robbed. Witnesses reported that the perpetrator, a male approximately 5'7", entered the store holding a knife and wearing a ski mask. Witnesses report that the perpetrator was wearing a red sweatshirt with a prominent tear on the right sleeve. Witnesses also reported that the perpetrator smelled heavily of body odor and that he tracked mud and dirt into the store when he entered. The perpetrator demanded that the clerk open the cash register. When the clerk said he was unable to do so, the perpetrator pried the cash drawer open using a crowbar. The perpetrator took all the cash from the drawer and placed it in a backpack.

The perpetrator then demanded that the customers surrender their belongings. He took each of their wallets, electronics, and took jewelry from one customer, Mrs. [redacted]. One customer, Mr. [redacted], physically resisted the perpetrator, struggling with him for several seconds before the perpetrator struck Mr. [redacted] in the head with the handle of his knife. This injury incapacitated Mr. [redacted], who was later treated at [redacted] Hospital. On the way out of the store, the perpetrator took a bottle of soda from a shelf. Witnesses reported seeing the perpetrator getting into a black sedan and driving away from the scene.

Three days after the robbery, Officer Harris responded to a report of an abandoned vehicle in an alley behind [redacted]. At 1930 he located the vehicle and called for a forensics team to take it into custody for analysis. The vehicle was a black late '90s Ford Taurus matching the description of the car used during the robbery.

Using records of the Department of Motor Vehicles, Detective Brady located the residence of the owner, Gregory Morgan, of the vehicle at [redacted]. He met the
younger brother of the vehicle’s owner (Matthew Morgan, age 15) at the owner’s residence, asked to interview him, and asked to search the residence. In plain view, Brady found a backpack in Morgan’s bedroom. Inside the backpack were several wallets. Credit cards found in the wallets matched the names of the robbery victims. A bracelet found in the backpack matched the description of the jewelry taken during the robbery. Brady also found a sweatshirt in Morgan’s bedroom that matched the description given by robbery witnesses. Upon the discovery of these items, Detective Brady arrested Matthew Morgan. With the assistance of Officer Wilkes, Detective Brady collected further evidence regarding the robbery. An eyewitness reported seeing a male matching the suspect’s description getting out of a black sedan and putting on a ski mask near the convenience store.

Inside the suspect’s vehicle, forensics discovered a black ski mask under the driver seat. On the inside of the mask, forensics recovered hair samples. These samples matched the suspect. Forensics also found an empty soda bottle and recovered samples of blood from the mouth of the bottle. These samples matched the suspect. In the back seat of the car, forensics found a metal tool that matched the tool marks on the cash register in the liquor store. In the trunk of the car, forensics found a black Victorinox pocketknife. Fingerprints matching the suspect were found on the handle of the knife. The trunk of the car also contained several oily rags, a lug wrench, and an aluminum baseball bat.

In the suspect’s apartment, several other places of evidence were found. A forensics team discovered a pair of boots that matched a muddy footprint found on the floor of the liquor store. Under the suspect’s bed, forensics also found a smartphone that a victim, Mr. ________, reported the perpetrator had taken during the robbery.
When the Morgan was taken into custody, his person was searched for evidence. His personal effects included a canvas wallet, $54 in cash, a set of five keys, and a mobile phone. Forensics discovered that a bite mark matching Mr. [redacted] (the customer who physically confronted the perpetrator) was found on the suspect’s left arm.

After Morgan was arrested, he was questioned by Detective Calhoun (see separate report).
Q219 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)

Q220 In today's study, your first task is to read a police report for a robbery. The police report is the final summary of facts that was sent to the District Attorney for prosecution. Once you have finished reading the report below, you will be able to advance to the next page. Click the continue button to read the report.

(counterbalancing version B)
At 2200 on October 9, Officer Wilkes responded to a report of an armed robbery of a convenience store at [redacted]. A clerk and three customers were in the store when it was robbed. Witnesses reported that the perpetrator, a male approximately 5'7", entered the store holding a gun and wearing a ski mask. Witnesses report that the perpetrator was wearing a red sweatshirt with a prominent stain on the right sleeve. Witnesses also reported that the perpetrator smelled heavily of body odor and that he tracked mud and dirt into the store when he entered. The perpetrator demanded that the clerk open the cash register. When the clerk said he was unable to do so, the perpetrator pried the cash drawer open using a screwdriver. The perpetrator took all the cash from the drawer and placed it in a backpack.

The perpetrator then demanded that the customers surrender their belongings. He took each of their wallets, electronics, and took jewelry from one customer. Mrs. [redacted], one customer, Mr. [redacted], physically resisted the perpetrator, struggling with him for several seconds before the perpetrator struck Mr. [redacted] in the head with the handle of his knife. This injury incapacitated Mr. [redacted], who was later treated at [redacted] Hospital. On the way out of the store, the perpetrator took a bottle of soda from a shelf. Witnesses reported seeing the perpetrator getting into a black sedan and driving away from the scene.

Three days after the robbery, Officer Harris responded to a report of an abandoned vehicle in an alley behind [redacted]. At 1930 he located the vehicle and called for a forensics team to take it into custody for analysis. The vehicle was a black late '90s Ford Taurus matching the description of the car used during the robbery.

Using records of the Department of Motor Vehicles, Detective Brady located the residence of the owner, Gregory
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Morgan, of the vehicle at [redacted]. He met the younger brother of the vehicle's owner (Matthew Morgan, age 15) at the owner's residence, asked to interview him, and asked to search the residence. In plain view, Brady found a backpack in Morgan's bedroom. Inside the backpack were several wallets. Driver licenses found in the wallets matched the names of the robbery victims. A watch found in the backpack matched the description of the jewelry taken during the robbery. Brady also found a sweatshirt in Morgan's bedroom that matched the description given by robbery witnesses. Upon the discovery of these items, Detective Brady arrested Matthew Morgan. With the assistance of Officer Wilkes, Detective Brady collected further evidence regarding the robbery. Surveillance camera footage showed a male matching the suspect's description getting out of a black sedan and putting on a ski mask near the convenience store.

Inside the suspect's vehicle, forensics discovered a black ski mask under the driver seat. On the inside of the mask, forensics recovered sweat samples. These samples matched the suspect. Forensics also found an empty soda bottle and recovered samples of saliva from the mouth of the bottle. These samples matched the suspect. In the back seat of the car, forensics found a metal tool that matched the tool marks on the cash register in the liquor store. In the trunk of the car, forensics found a black Victorinox pocketknife. Skin cells matching the suspect were found on the handle of the knife. The trunk of the car also contained several oily rags, a lug wrench, and an aluminum baseball bat.

In the suspect's apartment, several other pieces of evidence were found. A forensics team discovered a pair of sneakers that matched a muddy footprint found on the floor of the liquor store. Under the suspect's bed, forensics also found an iPod that a victim, Mr. [redacted], reported the perpetrator had taken during the robbery.
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When the Morgan was taken into custody, his person was searched for evidence. His personal effects included a canvas wallet, $54 in cash, a set of five keys, and a mobile phone. Forensics discovered that a bite mark matching Mr. (the customer who physically confronted the perpetrator) was found on the suspect’s left arm.

After Morgan was arrested, he was questioned by Detective Calhoun (see separate report).
Q221 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Q2126 Your next task is a card matching task. Your job is to turn two cards over and find matching pairs. After a certain amount of time has passed you will automatically advance to the next page. You will not be able to manually advance the survey. If you finish the game before the allotted time has passed, start a new game.

Q2128 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Q454 Next, you will watch a video. During the investigation, a police officer arrested and interrogated a suspect about his involvement in the convenience store robbery. The video that you will watch next is from that interrogation. All of the questions asked in the interrogation are in the film. However, we have edited out various interruptions, bathroom breaks, etc. to cut down on the length of the video. Please proceed to the next screen to view the interrogation video.

Q1225 You will now be asked some questions about the police report you read. We are testing your memory for the report. Each question has two parts: 1) the first part asks you about a particular item in the report; 2) the second part asks you how confident you are with your answer. Here is a sample question.

Q1226 The crime the police were investigating was a ________________
○ Robbery (1)
○ Murder (2)

Q1227 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
○ Not at all confident (1)
○ (2)
○ (3)
○ (4)
○ Very confident (5)

Q1228 WHEN YOU HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD HOW TO ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS, CLICK NEXT TO BEGIN THE TEST.
Q1229 When he was arrested, the suspect had a _____________ in his possession
- Pocketknife (1)
- Zippo Lighter (2)

Q1230 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1231 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1232 The cash drawer was opened with a _____________
- Crowbar (1)
- Screwdriver (2)

Q1233 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1234 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1235 Forensics found the suspect's _____________ on the empty soda bottle.
- Saliva (1)
- Blood (2)
Q1236 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1237 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1238 The suspect's backpack contained the missing ___________
- Bracelet (1)
- Watch (2)

Q1239 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1240 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1241 Police arrested a suspect, whose last name is ___________
- Thomas (1)
- Morgan (2)

Q1242 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)
Q1243 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Q1244 The muddy footprint from the scene of the crime matched a pair of the suspect's

☐ Sneakers (1)
☐ Boots (2)

Q1245 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
☐ Not at all confident (1)
☐ (2)
☐ (3)
☐ (4)
☐ Very confident (5)

Q1246 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Q1247 The suspects’ ________________ were found on a pocketknife found in the car from the scene.

☐ Fingerprints (1)
☐ Skin cells (2)

Q1248 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
☐ Not at all confident (1)
☐ (2)
☐ (3)
☐ (4)
☐ Very confident (5)

Q1249 Timing
First Click (1)
Last Click (2)
Page Submit (3)
Click Count (4)

Q1250 Officer Brady found the victim's wallet in a ______________ in the suspect's possession
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- Backpack (1)
- Plastic shopping bag (2)

Q1251 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1252 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1253 The robbery took place at a __________
- Liquor Store (1)
- Convenience Store (2)

Q1254 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1255 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1256 The perpetrator got into a __________ colored sedan
- Black (1)
- Blue (2)
Q1257 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1258 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1259 The police recovered an abandoned ___________ make car
- Chevrolet (1)
- Ford (2)

Q1260 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1261 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1262 On the inside of the mask, forensics found the suspect's ___________
- Hair (1)
- Sweat (2)

Q1263 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)
Q1264 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)

Q1265 The perpetrator's red sweatshirt had a prominent ____________
   ○ Stain (1)
   ○ Tear (2)

Q1266 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
   ○ Not at all confident (1)
   ○ (2)
   ○ (3)
   ○ (4)
   ○ Very confident (5)

Q1267 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)

Q1268 Forensics recovered a ____________ fro the trunk of the suspect's car
   ○ Baseball bat (1)
   ○ Hockey stick (2)

Q1269 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
   ○ Not at all confident (1)
   ○ (2)
   ○ (3)
   ○ (4)
   ○ Very confident (5)

Q1270 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)
Q1271 Witnesses report the robber smelled of ___________
- Cigarette Smoke (1)
- Body Odor (2)

Q1272 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1273 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1274 The suspect had wound on his arm with ___________ belonging to a victim that was assaulted at the convenience store
- A bite mark (1)
- DNA (2)

Q1275 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1276 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1277 ___________ showed the suspect putting on a ski mask by the location of the robbery.
- An Eyewitness (1)
- A Surveillance camera (2)
Q1278 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
○ Not at all confident (1)
○ (2)
○ (3)
○ (4)
○ Very confident (5)

Q1279 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)

Q1280 Inside the stolen wallets, Officer Brady found the victims' ______________
○ Driver's Licenses (1)
○ Credit Cards (2)

Q1281 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
○ Not at all confident (1)
○ (2)
○ (3)
○ (4)
○ Very confident (5)

Q1282 Timing
   First Click (1)
   Last Click (2)
   Page Submit (3)
   Click Count (4)

Q1283 The perpetrator was wearing a ____________ on his head during the robbery
○ Ski mask (1)
○ Ball cap (2)
Q1284 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1285 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q1286 A ____________ belonging to a robbery victim was found under the suspect's bed
- Smartphone (1)
- iPod (2)

Q1287 How confident are you that your answer is correct?
- Not at all confident (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Very confident (5)

Q1288 Timing
- First Click (1)
- Last Click (2)
- Page Submit (3)
- Click Count (4)

Q175 On the next page, you will have a list of pieces of evidence. Some of this evidence exists and would be used against the suspect at trial. Some of it does not exist. Please rate your memory for each piece of evidence by selecting one of four options:
Remember: You believe this evidence exists and was collected by the police, and have a clear, specific memory for learning about the evidence, such as who said it.
Know: You believe this evidence exists and was collected by the police, and have a general sense of familiarity for that piece of evidence, but cannot remember specific details.
Guess: You believe this evidence exists and was collected by the police, but you are guessing.
New Evidence: You do not believe this evidence exists. This evidence was not collected by the police.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remember (1)</th>
<th>Know (2)</th>
<th>Guess (3)</th>
<th>New Evidence (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screwdriver Toolmarks (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowbar Toolmarks (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Skincells (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Fingerprints (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Sweat (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Hair (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Saliva (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Blood (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Driver's Licenses (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Credit Cards (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweatshirt Stain (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweatshirt Tear (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen iPod (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Smartphone (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Sneaker Prints (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Boot Print (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance Camera (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyewitness (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Watch (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Bracelet (20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect's Handwriting (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals on Suspect's Clothing (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2088 Thank you. Next, we have a few more questions about the film.

Q2089 Do you think that the suspect being interrogated in the film you watched robbed the convenience store?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q148 How certain are you that the suspect is guilty or innocent? 0=Extremely confident he is innocent 50=Completely unsure 100=Extremely confident he is guilty

Move this slider to indicate your confidence (1)

Q2091 Did you notice anything unusual about the case report or interrogation film? If so, please explain below.

Q25 Thanks. Now we just have a few more questions.

Q177 What do you think the purpose of this study is?
Q178 Do you know what the Misinformation Effect is?
○ No (2)
○ Yes. Please describe below (3) ____________________

(LangFirst) What was the first language you learned to speak?

(LangPrim) What do you consider your "primary" language?

comments Do you have any comments, ideas, or feedback on what we've asked you to do today?

Q34 You will recall that we asked you to meet certain criteria and to take certain steps to avoid distractions during the experiment. Now we want to know if you really followed the rules we asked you to follow.

PLEASE NOTE: As long as you complete the survey, we are going to pay you no matter what you tell us now, so please be honest. We need your honest answer so we know how to analyze the data you have provided us. Thank you for your help.

Q36 Did you maximize the size of your web browser so that it covers your entire screen?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Q38 Did you complete the experiment in a single session, without stopping?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Q40 Did you pause or leave the experiment to engage in other tasks, even if they were other computer tasks?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Q42 Did you use your web browser's back or refresh buttons at any point during the experiment?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Q44 Did you complete the experiment in an environment that is free of noise and distraction?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Q46 Did you complete the experiment without anyone helping you?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
Q48 Did you speak with anyone at any time during the experiment?
  ✅ Yes (1)
  ✅ No (2)

Q52 Please tell us whether you used a search engine at any point during the experiment to look anything up.
  ✅ Yes, I used a search engine during the experiment. (1)
  ✅ No, I did not use a search engine during the experiment. (2)

Q417 Did you take notes at any stage during the experiment?
  ✅ Yes (1)
  ✅ No (2)

Q418 Did you (intentionally or unintentionally) rewind or restart the video in order to watch it again?
  ✅ Yes (1)
  ✅ No (2)

Q174 Did you experience any of the following technical difficulties during the survey? Check all that apply
  ❑ Video problems (video restarted or failed to play) (1)
  ❑ Card sorting task problems (task failed to load, cards were blank) (2)
  ❑ Survey or browser restarted (3)
  ❑ Other. Please Specify (4) ____________________
  ❑ None (5)

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for your participation in this study. As you may have noticed, some of the information contained in the final police report you read disagreed with information from the interrogation film you watched. If, when you took the memory test for the police report, you accidentally reported what you heard in the interrogation, then you are displaying something called the "Misinformation Effect" - the tendency for people to report incorrect information that is given after some first source. The goal of this study is to test whether the information effect can occur as a result of certain interrogation tactics. It will help us to better understand which tactics should be used in interrogations, and which ones should not. Because this study relies on supplying incorrect information, it is important that you do not talk about this study or share the goal of the study with any other mTurk worker who may take it. If you have any further questions or concerns about this study, you can contact the following: Matilde Ascheri: matilde.ascheri@jjay.cuny.edu or Dr. Deryn Strange: dstrange@jjay.cuny.edu. Thank you again for your participation! Please proceed to the next page to enter your information so we can ensure you receive payment.
WorkerID Please enter your Mechanical Turk Worker ID so that we can match your survey response with your Mechanical Turk data and pay you. You can find your Worker ID on this page: http://www.mturk.com/mturk/dashboard MAKE SURE YOU ENTER THIS CORRECTLY AS IT IS THE ONLY WAY WE CAN MATCH YOUR RECORDS AND ENSURE THAT YOU GET PAID. After you have entered your worker ID, proceed to the next page to finish the survey. There, you will receive a unique secret code to enter on mTurk. THIS IS DIFFERENT FROM YOUR WORKER ID.

Thank you.

**Counterbalancing Conditions for Study 2.**

Police report Version: A or B  
Pieces of Evidence Misled: Odd or Even (1 or 2)  
Response Style: Explanation or Rejection (E or R)  
Race of the Suspect: White or Black (W or B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Report Version A</th>
<th>Report Version B</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crowbar</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td>Metal Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fingerprints</td>
<td>Skin Cells</td>
<td>Evidence Linked to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
<td>Trace Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>Saliva</td>
<td>Biological Evidence linked to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bracelet</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Credit Cards</td>
<td>Driver’s License</td>
<td>Identifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>Stain</td>
<td>Distinctive mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>I-pod</td>
<td>Electronic device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>boots</td>
<td>sneakers</td>
<td>Footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Surveillance camera</td>
<td>You were observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (A1) REPORT A – ODD Misled Items in Transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Evidence in Report</th>
<th>Misled Items in Transcript</th>
<th>Neutral Items in Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crowbar</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fingerprints</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence Linked to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Evidence linked to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bracelet</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Credit Cards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>Stain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>boots</td>
<td>sneakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td></td>
<td>You were observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (A2) Report A – EVEN Misled Items in Transcript
CB Conditions: A2EW, A2EB, A2RW, A2RB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Evidence in Report</th>
<th>Misled Items in Transcript</th>
<th>Neutral Items in Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Crowbar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fingerprints</td>
<td>Skin Cells</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hair</td>
<td>Trace Evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blood</td>
<td>Saliva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bracelet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Credit Cards</td>
<td>Driver’s License</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tear</td>
<td>Distinctive mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>I-pod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>boots</td>
<td></td>
<td>Footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Surveillance camera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(B1) Report B – ODD Misled Items in Transcript
CB Conditions: B1EW, B1EB, B1RW, B1RB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Evidence in Report</th>
<th>Misled Items in Transcript</th>
<th>Neutral Items in Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td><strong>Crowbar</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Skin Cells</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence Linked to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
<td><strong>Hair</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saliva</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Evidence linked to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td><strong>Bracelet</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Driver’s license</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stain</td>
<td><strong>Tear</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-Pod</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sneakers</td>
<td><strong>Boots</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Surveillance Camera</td>
<td></td>
<td>You were observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B2) Report B – EVEN Misled Items in Transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Evidence in Report</th>
<th>Misled Items in Transcript</th>
<th>Neutral Items in Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Screwdriver</td>
<td><strong>Metal Tool</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Skin Cells</td>
<td><strong>Fingerprints</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
<td><strong>Trace Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saliva</td>
<td><strong>Blood</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Driver’s license</td>
<td><strong>Credit Cards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinctive Marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-Pod</td>
<td><strong>Smartphone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sneakers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Footwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Surveillance Camera</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Witness</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BAIT QUESTIONS AS SOURCE OF MISINFORMATION.