**Behind the Confession: Relating False Confession, Interrogative Compliance, Personality Traits, and Psychopathy**

## Abstract

The present study further supports the established notion that personality traits contribute to the phenomenon of false confessions and compliance in an interrogative setting. Furthermore, the study provides an investigation into the more recent interest in the potential effect of psychopathic traits in this context. A sample of university students ($N = 607$) completed questionnaires measuring psychopathic traits, interrogative compliance, and the big five personality factors. Of these, only 4.9% ($n=30$) claimed to have falsely confessed to an academic or criminal offense, with no participant taking the blame for both types of offense. Across measures the big five personality traits were the strongest predictors of compliance. The five personality traits accounted for 17.9 % of the total variance in compliance, with neuroticism being the strongest predictor, followed by openness and agreeableness. Psychopathy accounted for 3.3% of variance, with the lifestyle facet being the only significant predictor. After controlling for the big five personality factors, psychopathy only accounted for a small percentage of interrogative compliance, indicating that interrogators should take into account a person's personality traits during the interrogation.

*Keywords*: interrogative compliance, false confession, personality traits, psychopathy, taking the blame

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One prominent goal of a police interrogation is to obtain a confession from a suspect in order to increase the likelihood of a conviction during trial proceedings. However, confessions are not always truthful (Kassin & Newman, 1997; McCormick, 1983), and consequently Garrett (2008) found that a false confession was presented as evidence in 16% of wrongful convictions. Furthermore, in 22% of trials with a false confession present, individuals were sentenced to death. Though false confessions may not be a common occurrence, their influence on a trial may be detrimental and can lead to wrongful convictions (Drizin & Leo, 2004; Garrett, 2008). The criminal justice system may rely on confessions due to a mistaken belief that people always tell the truth during encounters with the police (Kassin, 2008; Leo, 2008; Leo & Liu, 2009). In reality, in surveys of offender populations, more than 10% of prisoners claimed to have falsely confessed to the police at least once during their lifetime (Gudjonsson & Sigurdsson, 1994; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1996).

Despite the importance of addressing false confessions due to their potential influence on the outcome of a trial, there is less research as to *why* people take the blame for offenses they have not committed. The aim of the current study is to address this gap, specifically by investigating coerced-compliant confessions (for a typology of false confessions, see Kassin & Wrightsman, 1985). Coerced-compliant confessions will be investigated, as they are believed to be a direct result of police interrogation (Kassin, 2008).

### 1.1. Why do People Falsely Confess?

Most police agencies in North America use the Reid technique, an interrogation method that utilizes pressure and stressful psychological techniques (Kassin et al., 2007; Leo, 1992; Leo, 2008; Woods, 1990), broadly known as minimization and maximization (for detailed description

see Kassin & McNall, 1991), to elicit a confession (Leo, 1992). A recent Canadian study found that interrogators who used more minimization and maximization techniques were more successful at obtaining a confession (King & Snook, 2009). It has been hypothesized that certain individuals will change behaviours (i.e., change their original story) for an immediate gain (i.e., to be removed from the stressful context) and take the blame for actions they have not actually committed (Gudjonsson, 1992). This is known as compliance (Gudjonsson, 1989; Gudjonsson, 1992), when the interviewee is completely aware that their behaviours are being influenced by an external source and may not agree with the request, but they nevertheless conform to the demands of the interrogator (Gudjonsson, 1992). Applying this work to an interrogative context, Gudjonsson (1989) proposed that there are two underlying factors of compliance in interrogative settings: eagerness to please others and avoidance of conflict and confrontation.

The relationship between compliance and false confessions has been empirically established; in a forensic sample, false confessors have been found to score higher on interrogative compliance than non-false confessors (Gudjonsson, 1989; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 2001). As individuals higher on interrogative compliance may be more susceptible to falsely confessing, identifying an individual's characteristics may diminish the rates of false confession. One aim of this study is to examine the relationship between interrogative compliance and false confession and to reiterate that police need to be sensitive to individual differences, such as interrogative compliance, prior to the interrogation to minimize the chances of obtaining an inaccurate confession.

**1.2. Demographic Differences in Interrogations**

Similarly, a range of individual factors may influence an interrogation. Researchers have found that female offenders are more likely to falsely confess as compared to male offenders

(Gudjonsson & Sigurdsson, 1994; Gudjonsson et al., 2004*b*; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1996). One possible explanation for this finding is that women are significantly more compliant than men (Gudjonsson et al., 2008). However, research has not documented false confession gender differences in student samples (Gudjonsson et al.*,* 2004*a*). Ethnicity and age have also been shown to be related to interrogative compliance. People of Asian origin are reportedly more compliant in an interrogative setting than Caucasians, though both ethnicities have similar false confession rates (Klaver et al., 2008). Younger people are also more likely to falsely confess (13 to 18 years old; Goldstein et al., 2003) and have higher compliance (13 to 16 years old; Redlich & Goodman, 2003) than those who are older.

### 1.3. Personality Factors and Interrogations

Research has found robust personality differences in compliance (Gudjonsson, 1989; Gudjonsson, 2003a) and in documented false confessions (Blair, 2007; Gudjonsson & Sigurdsson, 2003). One methodological limitation of the latter has been that relatively few participants have actually falsely confessed to a crime (i.e., Gudjonsson et al.*,* 2004*a*; Gudjonsson et al., 2004*b*). Neuroticism and extraversion are two personality traits that have been associated with compliance and false confessions. Previous research has found that people high in neuroticism will be more compliant during a police interrogation (Gudjonsson, 1989; Gudjonsson et al., 2008; Gudjonsson et al.*,* 2004*a*) and will be more likely to provide a false confession (Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 2001). Extraversion, however, has been related to a reduction in interrogative compliance (Gudjonsson et al., 2004*a*).

In regards to the high rates of antisocial behaviour in an offender population, examining the relationship between antisocial personality traits and compliance has also been of special interest. According to Sigurdsson and Gudjonsson (1996), antisocial personality characteristics

(measured by the Gough Socialisation Scale; Gough, 1960) in prison inmates are positively

related to providing false confessions. This finding has been replicated in more recent inmate

samples (Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 2001) and in college students (Gudjonsson et al., 2006).

Psychoticism, a personality dimension characterized by antisocial traits (Eysenck & Eysenck,

1968) has also been established as a predictor of compliant behaviour (Gudjonsson, 1989).

**1.4. Psychopathy and the Interrogation**

Considering psychopaths commit a high density of offenses (Hare, 2003; Leistico et al.,

2008), there is a surprising lack of research on the role of psychopathy in interrogations.

Psychopathy is a personality disorder independent from psychoticism (Eysenck & Eysenck,

1978; Hare, 1982) and antisocial personality disorder (Ogloff, 2006) that consists of a collection

of interpersonal and affective personality traits and antisocial behaviours (Hare, 2003).

Psychopathy is characterized by a lack of affect and empathy and the presence of callousness,

impulsiveness, and criminal behaviour (Hare, 2003). The Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (Hare,

1991, 2003), a widely accepted tool to measure psychopathy, divides the construct of

psychopathy into four separate factors/facets: interpersonal, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial

behaviour. General compliance (compliance outside the interrogation room) has been found to be

negatively related to three different self-report psychopathy measures (Hicklin & Widiger,

2005). Furthermore, in a meta-analysis comparing personality traits and psychopathy, total

psychopathy scores were negatively related to general compliance (Decuyper et al., 2009).

Only one published study has investigated the relationship between psychopathy and

interrogative compliance. Investigating a sample of undergraduate students from the United

States, Ray and Jones (2012) found that overall psychopathy scores as measured by the

Psychopathic Personality Inventory – Revised (PPI-R; Lilienfeld & Widows, 2005) were not related to compliance, but were differentially related at the factor and content scale level.

The PPI-R is divided into two factors, Self-Centered Impulsivity (SCI) and Fearless Dominance (FD). Both factors are then broken down into scales - SCI: Machiavellian Egocentricity (ME), Rebellious Non-conformity (RN), Blame Externalization (BE), and Carefree Nonplanfulness (CN); FD: Fearlessness (F), Social Influence (SOI), and Stress Immunity (STI). There is an eighth scale, which does not load on either factor, Cold-heartedness (C). SCI was the only factor to positively predict compliance when controlling for demographic characteristics. When analyzing the component scales, ME and CN were found to be significant positive predictors. FD and C were established as negative predictors. The FD scale STI was negatively related to compliance. In combination with the previously mentioned literature on individual and personality differences, these latter findings by Ray and Jones (2012) indicate that compliance during interrogation is influenced by a wide range of factors outside a police officer's immediate control, and these researchers urged future studies to observe the role of psychopathy in false confessions.

## 1.5. Hypotheses

The aim of the current study is to identify individuals who are likely to be more compliant during a police interrogation. Based on the past literature on compliance, we hypothesized that younger people, females, and Asians would score higher on compliance compared to older people, males, and non-Asians.

Due to the well-established link between personality and compliance, we wanted to understand the extent to which psychopathic traits would predict compliance after personality was accounted for. We hypothesized that compliance would be positively related to neuroticism

and negatively related to extraversion and psychopathy. We also hypothesized that compliant

individuals would be more likely to have taken the blame for acts they did not commit.

## 2. METHOD

### 2.1. Participants, Design & Procedure

This cross sectional study examined a sample of 640 undergraduate students enrolled in first and second year psychology classes who participated for experimental credit. Thirty-three participants did not complete the majority of the measurements, leaving a sample of 607. The sample consisted of 156 (24.4%) men and 483 (75.5%) women. One participant did not indicate their gender. The average age was 20.6 (range 17-54, $SD = 4.1$) for men and 20 (range 17-48, $SD = 3.3$) for females. The sample consisted of 388 (60.6%) Caucasians, 79 (12.4%) Asians, 31 (4.8%) African-Americans, 31 (4.8%) Middle Easterners, 6 (.9%) Aboriginals, and 105 (16.4%) Biracial/Others. Most participants completed all questionnaires, but for those who missed one to three items in any self-report measures, scores were prorated.[1]

The data utilized in the current study were merged from two different studies. This was due to the low number of students reporting a false confession in each study. Both studies focused on personality traits, interrogative compliance, and taking the blame, and used identical measures in relation to the scope of this current study. The first study's sample consisted of 580 participants, accounting for 90.6% of the participants in the current study. Participants in this data set were recruited online through the university-controlled mass testing system and completed the questionnaires online as well. Participants from the second sample were from the same online testing system as the first group, although they were requested to complete the questionnaires in person at the university. Both samples consisted of participants from the same university. Since both samples had a relatively low number of participants that admitted to have

---

[1] Prorated scores were assessed by dividing the number of answered items by the total number of items. The divided value was then multiplied by the total score (or factor score when needed).

taken the blame for acts they did not commit and used identical measures, it was assessed that the two samples were more useful merged than apart. Participants in both studies were given bonus marks in their undergraduate course and were told that the purpose of this study was to examine relationships between personality and false confessions. The questionnaires took less than one hour to complete. There were no age differences, $t(636)= -1.35$, $p= .176$, or gender, $\chi^2(1, N= 639)= 0.35$, $p= .851$, between groups. Ethnicity significantly differed between the groups, $\chi^2(7, N= 640)= 17,68$, $p= .014$, although classification of ethnicity was not consistent between the groups (Aboriginal and Biracial were not classifications in the second group), which may have led to this significant finding.

**2.2. Measures**

**Self-Report Psychopathy-Short Form (SRP-SF; Paulhus et al., in press).** The SRP-SF is a self-report measure designed to assess psychopathic traits. It consists of 29 statements from which participants must indicate the degree to which they agree (e.g., I'm a rebellious person; I've often done something dangerous just for the thrill of it). Each statement is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1: "*Strongly disagree*" to 5: "*Agree strongly.*" There are four subscales included in this scale: interpersonal manipulation, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial. The long form of the SRP-SF, the SRP-III, has shown appropriate internal reliability and validity when used to assess psychopathy in university students (Neal & Sellbom, 2012; Williams et al.*,* 2007).

**Gudjonsson Compliance Scale (GCS; Gudjonsson, 1989).** The GCS measures a person's level of compliance. It consists of 20 true-false statements. The scale measures the propensity of a participant to want to please those around them by abiding to their requests and

to potentially falsely confess under pressure. The scale has been found to show satisfactory validity and reliability in both offender and student samples (Gudjonsson, 1989).

**Antisocial Behavior Scale/False Confession – Modified (ABS; Forth & Brown, 1993)**. This 24-item scale is a modified version of the Antisocial Behaviour Scale adapted to measure false confessions in this study. Participants were asked if they had committed different types of antisocial and illegal behaviours (e.g. Have you ever cheated or used someone else's work for a project? Have you ever submitted a work project done by someone else?  Have you ever damaged a parked vehicle without notifying the owner or police?) and whether or not they had ever taken the blame for that specific action even though they were not personally responsible. The last item on the measurement was an open-ended question asking participants if they have ever taken the blame for anything not explicitly stated in the previous items, and if so, they were asked to describe the action.

**NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI; Costa & McCrae, 1992).** The NEO-FFI is a short version of the more comprehensive NEO-PI-R, measuring the five factor model (FFM) of personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). This self-report measure consists of 60 statements where the participant must indicate how well the statement best represents their personal opinion. The NEO-FFI has shown excellent validity and reliability (Dollive, 1987; Holden et al*.,* 2006).

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1. Group Differences

Ethnic differences in compliance were found for total compliance scores, $F(7, 554) =$ 2.63, $p = .011$. Pre-planned contrasts between participants who identified as Asian and other ethnicities showed that Asians displayed significantly higher compliance, $t(554)= 3.12$, $p= .002$, than other ethnic groups. Tukey post-hoc comparisons found that Asians ($M= 31.87$, $SD= 3.64$) had higher total compliance scores than African-Americans ($M= 28.41$, $SD= 2.63$), $t(554)= 3.90$, $p= .003$. No other ethnic differences were significant. Gender differences were also significant, with females ($M= 30.66$, $SD= 3.86$) having higher compliance scores than males ($M= 29.36$, $SD= 3.25$), $t(561)= -3.91$, $p< .001$. Compliance was negatively related to age of participant, $r= -.10$, $p= .021$.

### 3.3. Univariate and Bivariate Analyses

Compliance was significantly positively related to neuroticism and agreeableness and negatively correlated to extraversion, openness, overall SRP-SF and three factors of the SRP-SF (interpersonal manipulation, affective, lifestyle). The measures most strongly related to compliance were neuroticism, openness, and lifestyle factors of psychopathy (Table 1).

### 3.4. Personality Traits, Psychopathy, and Compliance: Regression Analyses

A three-step hierarchical regression was conducted to investigate whether psychopathy and personality would predict total compliance. Step 1 controlled for age, gender, and ethnicity in the model, while step 2 included the "big five personality traits": neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness as measured by the NEO-FFI. Step 3 included the four SRP-SF factors (interpersonal manipulation, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial); total

psychopathy scores were left out due to multicollinearity[2] (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). The goal behind this hierarchical modelling was to examine the complementary predictive value of psychopathy on interrogative compliance after accounting for established demographic and personality predictors of compliance.[3] Step 1 accounted for 3.8% of the total variance in compliance, while step 2 significantly accounted for an additional 17.9% of the variance in compliance above step 1. The inclusion of psychopathic traits in step 3 explained 3.3% of the total variance in compliance above steps 1 and 2. When controlling for demographic characteristics and psychopathy, neuroticism and agreeableness were found to be significant positive predictors of compliance. Openness was a significant negative predictor of compliance. When controlling for demographic characteristics and the big five personality traits, lifestyle psychopathic traits were also a negative predictor of compliance. When personality was incorporated into the model, gender was no longer a significant predictor of compliance (Table 2).

### 3.5. Individual Differences in Taking the Blame

Only 4.9% (n=30) of participants indicated taking the blame for an academic or criminal offense. Only 4.3% (n=25) of the first sample and 8.3% (n=5) of the second sample reported taking the blame. No significant differences in taking the blame rates were found between samples, $\chi^2(1, N = 640) = 1.97$, $p = .160$. Of the participants who stated that they had taken the blame, 86.66% (n=26) had committed an academic offense; no participant committed both an

---

[2] A second regression was run due to multicollinearity in step 3. The aim was to see the accountability of the total SRP-SF scores' interrogative compliance variation. Step 1 (age, gender, and ethnicity) and 2 (FFI) remained identical to the original regression, but the four SRP-SF factors were replaced by total SRP-SF scores. Total psychopathy scores accounted for 1% of the variance in interrogative compliance, $F(1, 546) = 18.58$, $p= .007$, $R^2change= .010$.

[3] A separate regression was run post-hoc to see the predictive value of psychopathy on interrogative compliance without controlling for personality. Psychopathy accounted for 5.5% of variance in interrogative compliance, $F(4, 550)= 6.66$, $p< .001$, $R^2change = .055$.

academic offense and a criminal offense. Due to the small sample size of participants who said

they had taken the blame, criminal offenses and academic offenses were combined. Of those 30

individuals, 60% and 40% took the blame for a friend and acquaintance respectively.

  *T*-tests were conducted to assess whether there were personality (Table 3) and

psychopathy (Table 4) differences between participants who had taken the blame for an

academic or criminal offense they had not committed and those who had not. A priori error rates

were assessed independently for both SRP-SF and NEO-FFI through Bonferroni correction ($\alpha_{pc}$=

.010). A *t*-test was also conducted to assess interrogative compliance differences between

participants who had taken the blame and those who had not.

  Findings revealed no significant personality differences between groups after controlling

for family-wise error rate, although agreeableness approached significance, $t(587)$= 2.45, *p*=

.015; *d*= .20. Total SRP-SF results also approached significance, $t(560)$= -2.17, *p*= .038; *d*= .-22.

Interpersonal manipulation, $t(560)$= -2.70, *p*= .007; *d*= -.23, and lifestyle, $t(560)$= -3.20, *p*= .001;

*d*= -.27, were the only two factors of psychopathy with significant differences between groups.

No compliance differences were found, $t(560)$= -.55, *p*= .58; *d*= -.04 (for all other non-

significant findings and all mean scores, see Table 3 and Table 4).

## 4. DISCUSSION

  The primary goal of this study was to investigate the influence of personality traits on

compliance. Due to the high frequency of psychopathic traits in the forensic population and the

lack of research on interrogation studies, the construct of psychopathy was incorporated into the

current study to see whether it has predictive value over other personality traits. Psychopaths

have been a neglected group within the research on compliance and false confessions. The

current study is one of the first to address both interrogative compliance and taking the blame in

relation to five factor personality and psychopathic traits. Demographic differences in interrogative compliance scores supported past research (Gudjonsson et al., 2008), indicating that females had higher interrogative compliance levels than males. As predicted, participants of Asian ethnicity also scored significantly higher on interrogative compliance than participants of African-American origin. Caucasian and Asian participants did not significantly differ in interrogative compliance scores, unlike Klaver et al. (2008). However, the results from the hierarchical regression analyses indicated that ethnicity was not a significant predictor of compliance. Gender, on the other hand, was no longer significant once personality traits were included in the model. As for personality traits, there is support indicating the FFM is an important predictor of interrogative compliance. After controlling for demographics, the FFM accounted for almost one fifth of the total variance in interrogative compliance. As for psychopathy, it did not have much predictive value over interrogative compliance after accounting for the FFM traits.

Neuroticism scores were positively related to compliance (3.3%); openness and extraversion scores were negatively related to interrogative compliance. Unlike Ray and Jones (2012), however, only the lifestyle facet of psychopathy was negatively related to interrogative compliance, though this discrepancy may have been due to using a different self-report psychopathy measure.

There were no significant differences in compliance between those who had and those who had not admitted to committing a criminal or an academic offense. This could have been due to the majority of the participants who indicated taking the blame for academic offenses (87%). Possibly, compliance may only be a significant factor during an actual interrogation, which usually is not necessary in the case of an academic offence.

Further studies on false confession during police interrogations may want to limit their scope to actual criminal offences. Furthermore, lack of significance may have been due to low statistical power ($p$= .12). It should be noted that the low number of participants claiming to have falsely confessed is in part to do with a student sample. A forensic sample would prove to have a much higher rate of false confessors due to participants' naturally higher rates of contact with police interrogations and higher rates of antisocial personality traits (Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 2001).

Furthermore, due to the past empirical evidence (Gudjonsson & Sigurdsson, 1994; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1996; Steingrimsdottir et al., 2007) and theoretical underpinnings (Gudjonsson, 1989; Kassin 1997), compliance should not be disregarded as an important outcome in studies on false confessions based solely on the current study's results. Despite the low power, two of the four factors of psychopathy (interpersonal manipulation, lifestyle) differentiated between those who had taken the blame and those who had not. Interestingly, participants who had taken the blame scored higher on both these factors. The relationship between antisocial behaviour/psychopathy and false confession was unexpected, and further investigation is needed to see if this finding replicates. Antisocial traits were close to significance, although this was unlike previous studies (Gudjonsson et al., 2006; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1996; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 2001).

Lifestyle factors such as impulsivity and/or poor behaviour control may be related to interrogative compliance. This relationship may be related to the instant gratification of leaving the interrogation room after falsely confessing. Interpersonal manipulation was also found to be related to false confessions. One possible explanation for this association may have been to cover

up a more serious offense, although lack of significance may have been a consequence of low statistical power (Cohen, 1992).

**4.1. Limitations**

Cronbach's alpha was poor with a few measures (NEO:FFI Extraversion and Openness, SRP-SF Antisocial), which may have undermined the accuracy of the measured personality traits. Previous studies have indicated good reliability for the NEO-FFI (Paulhus & Bruce, 1992; Yeung et al., 1993), and no published study has assessed the internal consistency of the SRP-SF factor scores; this requires further investigation. Although the NEO-FFI is a conveniently shorter measure to complete, it may prove valuable to investigate compliance and false confession in relation to a more in-depth facet level of personality measurement (Saucier, 1998).

Although university samples have been used in past research on compliance (Kassin & Kiechel, 1996; Ray & Jones, 2012) and psychopathy (Miller, Watts, & Jones, 2011; Paulhus & Williams, 2002), university students are not the ideal sample when studying the effects of personality in an investigative setting, as most have never actually been in a police interrogation room. One should therefore be cautious about extending these findings to a forensic population. However, despite the limited ecological validity of this study and the weak effect size of personality, psychopathy, and compliance between those who had taken the blame and those who had not, these results should not be disregarded. As explained above, psychopathy has only recently been introduced as a personality factor relating to interrogations. Future studies should build on this foundation and expand towards testing a forensic population, even though a student population is crucial in exploring taking the blame for academic offenses. As mentioned previously, there is support towards a higher rate of false confession in forensic samples (10%; Gudjonsson & Sigurdsson, 1994; Sigurdsson & Gudjonsson, 1996) than in the university student

sample in the present study (4.9% for either an academic or criminal offense) or in previous student samples (1.2% to 1.7% for a criminal offense; Gudjonsson et al., 2004; Gudjonsson et al., 2008). Also, offenders may prove to falsely confess to harsher offenses.

## 4.2. Implications

It appears that people with specific personality traits such as neuroticism and agreeableness may be more likely to show compliance during a police interrogation. It is questionable whether the current interrogative practice is suitable for obtaining reliable and correct information. The commonly utilized Reid model in North America emphasizes the use of psychological pressure and manipulation techniques and has been shown to lead to increased compliance (Kassin & Kiechel, 1996). Consequently, there has been growing concern about the emphasis of the Reid technique on the rate of false confessions (Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; Kassin, 1997). A viable alternative that has been found to be successful in Britain is the PEACE model (the model is designed to take into account the suspect's vulnerabilities that may lead to false confessions; Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; Shawyer et al., 2009). Gender and ethnicity must also be taken into account when interrogating a suspect. It may be wise for interrogators to be aware of the significantly higher levels of interrogation compliance in certain groups and plan their interrogation accordingly.

## 5. REFERENCES

Blair, J. P. (2007). The roles of interrogation, perception, and individual differences in producing compliant false confessions. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *13*(2), 173-186.

Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical power analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *1*(3), 98-101.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. J. (2009). A meta-analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial pd- and ffm associations. *European Journal of Personality*, *23*, 531-565.

Dollive, R. H. (1987). A review of the NEO personality inventory. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *66*(2), 107-108.

Drizin, S. A., & Leo, R. A. (2004). The problem of false confessions in the post-DNA world. *North Carolina Law Review*, *84*, 891-1003.

Eysenck, H.J., & Eysenck, S.B.G. *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire.* San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Services, 1975.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1968). A factor study of psychoticism as a dimension of personality. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *Spec Iss*(1968), 15-31.

Eysenck, S. B., & Eysenck, H. J. (1978). Impulsiveness and venturesomeness: Their position in a dimensional system of personality description. *Psychological Reports*, *43*(3), 1247-1255.

Forth, A. E. & Brown, S. L. (1993). *The Antisocial Behaviors Scale.* Unpublished test, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Garrett, B. (2008). Judging innocence. *Columbia Law Review, 108*,

99-142.

Goldstein, N. E. S., Olubadewo, S., Redding, R., & Lexcen, F. (2005). Mental health disorders:

The neglected risk factor in juvenile delinquency. In K. S. Heilbrun, N. E. S. Goldstein, &

R. E. Redding (Eds.), *Juvenile delinquency: Prevention, assessment, and intervention* (pp.

85-110). New York: Oxford University Press.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1989). Compliance in an interrogative situation: A new scale. *Personality*

*and Individual Differences*, *10*(5), 535-540.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1992). *The psychology of interrogations, confessions, and testimony*.

Chichester: Wiley.

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Pearse, J. (2011). Suspect interviews and false confessions. *Current*

*Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*, 33-37.

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Sigurdsson, J. F. (1994). How frequently do false confessions occur? An

empirical study among prison inmates. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *1*, 21-26.

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Sigurdsson, J. F. (2003). The relationship of compliance with coping

strategies and self-esteem. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *19*(2), 117-123.

Gudjonsson, G. H., & Sigurdsson, J. F. (2004). Motivation for offending and personality. *Legal*

*and Criminological Psychology, 9*, 69–81.

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., Bragason, O. O., Einarsson, E., & Vladmimarsdottir, E. B.

(2004*a*). Compliance and personality: The vulnerability of the unstable introvert. *European*

*Journal of Personality*, *18*, 435-443.

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., & Einarsson, E. (2004*b*). The role of personality in relation to confessions and denials. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *10*(2), 125-135.

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., & Einarsson, E. (2007). Taking the blame for antisocial acts and its relationship with personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *43*, 3-13.

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., Einarsson, E., & Einarsson, J. H. (2008). Personal versus impersonal relationship compliance and their relationship with personality. *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, *19*(4), 502-516.

Gudjonsson, G.H., Sigurdsson, J.F., Finnbogadottir, H. & Smari, U. J. (2006). The relationship between false confessions and perceptions of parental rearing practices. *Development and Aging, 47*(5), 361-368.

Goldstein, N. E. S., Condie, L. O., Kalbeitzer, R., Osman, D., & Geier, J. L. (2003). Juvenile offenders' Miranda rights comprehension and self-reported likelihood of offering false confessions. *Assessment, 10(4),* 359-369.

Gough, H. (1960). Theory and measurement of socialization. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(1), 23-30.

Hare, R. D. (1982). Psychopathy and the personality dimensions of psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *3*(1), 35-42.

Hare, R. D. (1991). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health System.

Hare, R. D. (1993) *Without conscience: The disturbing world of the psychopaths among us*. NY: Pocket Books.

Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (2nd ed.).* Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.

Hicklin, J., & Widiger, T.A., (2005) Similarities and differences among antisocial and

    psychopathic self-report inventories from the perspective of general personality

    functioning. *European Journal of Personality, 19*, 325-342.

Holden, R. R., Wasylkiw, L., Starzyk, K. B., Book, A. S., & Edwards, M. J. (2006). Inferential

    structure of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory: Construct validity of the big four personality

    clusters. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *38*(1), 24-40.

Kassin, S.M. (1997). The psychology of confession evidence. *American Psychologist, 52*, 221–

    233.

Kassin, S. M. (2007). Internalized false confessions. In M. P. Toglia, J. D. Read, D. F. Ross, &

    R. C. L. Lindsay (Eds.), *The handbook of eyewitness psychology*, Vol. 1: *Memory for*

    *events* (pp. 175–192). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Kassin, S. M. (2008). False confessions: Causes, consequences, and implications for reform.

    *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*(4), 249-253.

Kassin, S. M., & Kiechel, K. L. (1996). The social psychology of false confessions: Compliance,

    internalization, and confabulation. *Psychology Science*, *7*, 125-128.

Kassin, S. M., Leo, R. A., Meissner, C. A., Richman, K. D., Colwell, L. H., Leach, A. M., & La

    Fon, D. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: A self-report survey of police

    practices and beliefs. *Law and Human Behavior, 31*, 381-400.

Kassin, S. M., & McNall, K. (1991). Police interrogation and confessions: Communicating

    promises and threats by pragmatic implication. *Law and Human Behavior*, *15*, 233-251.

Kassin, S. M., & Neumann, K. (1997). On the power of confession evidence: An experimental

    test of the fundamental difference hypothesis. *Law and Human Behavior*, *21*(5), 469-484.

Kassin, S.L. & Wrightsman, L., (1985) Confession evidence. In S. M. Kassin & L. S. Wrightsman (eds.) *The psychology of evidence and trial procedure* (pp 67-94), Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Kassin, S.M., Drizin, S.A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G.H., Leo, R.A., & Redlich, A.D. (2010). Police-induced confessions, risk factors, and recommendations: looking ahead. *Law and Human Behavior, 34*, 49-52.

King, L. & Snook, B. (2009). Peering inside the Canadian interrogation room: An examination of the Reid model of interrogation, influence tactics, and coercive strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 36*, 674-694.

Klaver, J.R., Lee, Z., & Rose, V.G. (2008). Effects of personality, interrogation techniques and plausibility in an experimental false confession paradigm. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 13*, 71-88.

Leistico, A-M, R., Salekin, R. T., DeCoster, J., & Rogers, R. (2008). A Large-scale meta-analysis relating the hare measures of psychopathy to antisocial conduct. *Law and Human Behaviour, 32*, 28-45.

Leo, R. A. (1992). From coercion to deception: the changing nature of police interrogation in America. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, *18*, 35-59.

Leo, R. A. (2008). *Police interrogation and American justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Leo, R. A., & Liu, B. (2009). What do potential jurors know about police interrogation techniques and false confessions? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *27*, 381-399.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Widows, M. R. (2005). *Psychopathic personality inventory revised: Professional manual.* Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

McCormick, C. T. (1983). *Handbook of the law of evidence*. St. Paul, MN: West.

Meissner, C. A., & Russano, M. B. (2003). The psychology of interrogations and false

confessions: Research and recommendations. *The Canadian Journal of Police & Security*

*Services*, *1*(1), 53-64.

Neal, T. M. S., & Sellbom, M. (2012). Examining the factor structure of the Hare Self-Report

Psychopathy Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94*, 244-253.

Ogloff, J. R. P. (2006). Psychopathy/antisocial personality disorder conundrum. *Australian and*

*New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 40*, 519-528.

Paulhus, D. L., & Bruce, M. N., (1992). The effect of acquaintanceship on the validity of

personality impressions: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social*

*Psychology*, *63* (5), 816-824.

Paulhus, D. L., Neumann, C. S., & Hare, R. D. (in press). *Manual for the Self-Report*

*Psychopathy Scale (4th ed.).* Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism,

machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*, 556-563.

Ray, J. V., & Jones, S. (2012). Examining the relationship between self-reported compliance and

psychopathic personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *52*, 190-194.

Redlich, A.D., & Goodman, G.S. (2003). Taking responsibility for an act not committed: the

influence of age and suggestibility. *Law and Human Behavior, 27*, 141-156.

Saucier, G. (1998) Replicable item-cluster subcomponents in the NEO five-factor inventory.

*Journal of Personality Assessment, 70*(2), 263-276.

Shawyer, A., Milne, R. & Bull, R. (2009). Investigative interviewing in the UK. In T.

    Williamson, R. Milne & S. Savage (Eds.). *International developments in investigative*

    *interviewing* (pp. 24-38). Willan Publishing.

Sigurdsson, J. F., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (1996). The psychological characteristics of 'false

    confessors': A study among Icelandic prison inmates and juvenile offenders. *Personality*

    *and Individual Differences*, *20*(3), 321-329.

Sigurdsson, J. F., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2001). False confessions: The relative importance of

    psychological, criminological and substance abuse variables. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *7*,

    275-289.

Steingrimsdottir, G., Hrafnhildur, H., Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., & Thomas, N.

    (2007). False confessions and the relationship with offending behaviour and personality

    among Danish adolescents. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *12*, 287-296.

Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four-factor structure of

    psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *88*(2),

    205-219.

Woods, R. S. M. (1990). *Police interrogation*. Toronto, ON: Carswell.

Yeung, A. S., Lyons, M. J., Waternaux, C. M., Faraone, S. V., Tsuang, M. T., (1993). A family

    study of self-reported personality traits and DSM-III-R personality disorders. *Psychiatry*

    *Research*. *48*, 243-255.

## Appendix

Table 1

*Zero-order correlations, means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas for NEO-FFI, SRP-SF, and GCS*

|        | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | 6      | 7      | 8      | 9      | 10    | 11    |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| 1. N   | -      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |       |       |
| 2. E   | -.37** | -      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |       |       |
| 3. O   | -.05   | .01    | -      |        |        |        |        |        |        |       |       |
| 4. A   | -.20** | .27**  | .10*   | -      |        |        |        |        |        |       |       |
| 5. C   | -.30** | .23**  | -.06   | .27**  | -      |        |        |        |        |       |       |
| 6. SRP | .10*   | -.09*  | .07    | -.44** | -.31** | -      |        |        |        |       |       |
| 7. IM  | .10*   | -.15** | .07    | -.41** | -.27** | .91**  | -      |        |        |       |       |
| 8. AF  | .06    | -.16** | .06    | -.44** | -.24** | .89**  | .80**  | -      |        |       |       |
| 9. LS  | .09*   | -.09*  | .11*   | -.33** | -.34** | .84**  | .67**  | .66**  | -      |       |       |
| 10. AS | .10*   | -.11*  | -.03   | -.32** | -.22** | .79**  | .61**  | .60**  | .55**  | -     |       |
| 11. GCS| .35**  | -.14** | -.22** | .12*   | -.03   | -.17** | -.12*  | -.17** | -.23** | -.05  | -     |
| Mean   | 22.00  | 26.68  | 26.64  | 30.34  | 29.60  | 51.42  | 12.96  | 12.85  | 14.33  | 11.29 | 10.35 |

| SD | 7.68 | 5.31 | 5.89 | 6.26 | 6.78 | 16.65 | 5.40 | 4.68 | 4.85 | 4.43 | 3.76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alpha | .84 | .68 | .65 | .76 | .81 | .92 | .86 | .79 | .79 | .65 | .74 |

*Note*: N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; SRP-SF= Self-Report of Psychopathy – Short Form; IM = Interpersonal Manipulation; AF = Affective; LS = Lifestyle; AS = Antisocial; GCS= Gudjonsson Compliance Scale.

$* p < .01, ** p < .001$.

Table 2

*Linear regression for GCS by the NEO-FFI, SRP-SF, age, gender, and ethnicity*

| | GCS | | | F | Adj. $R^2$ | $R^2$ change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | B | SE | β | | | |
| Model 1 | | | | 6.452 | .029 | .034** |
| Age | -.085 | .042 | -.085 | | | |
| Gender | 1.230* | .365 | .142 | | | |
| Ethnicity | .120 | .059 | .086 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Model 2 | | | | 19.747 | .213 | .190** |
| Age | -.060 | .038 | -.060 | | | |
| Gender | .370 | .341 | .043 | | | |
| Ethnicity | .087 | .053 | .062 | | | |
| Neuroticism | .175** | .021 | .359 | | | |
| Extraversion | -.050 | .029 | -.071 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Openness | -.135** | .024 | -.215 | | | |
| Agreeableness | .128** | .025 | .214 | | | |
| Conscientiousness | .015 | .023 | .027 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Model 3 | | | | 15.674 | .241 | .033** |
| Age | -.061 | .038 | -.061 | | | |
| Gender | .124 | .365 | .014 | | | |
| Ethnicity | .064 | .053 | .045 | | | |
| Neuroticism | .179** | .020 | .368 | | | |
| Extraversion | -.003 | .031 | -.004 | | | |
| Openness | -.120** | .024 | -.192 | | | |
| Agreeableness | .097** | .026 | .163 | | | |
| Conscientiousness | -.017 | .024 | -.031 | | | |
| Interpersonal | .074 | .046 | .107 | | | |
| Affective | -.041 | .056 | -.052 | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lifestyle | -.196** | .045 | -.254 |
| Antisocial | .039 | .048 | .040 |

*Note*: GCS = Gudjonsson Compliance Scale; SRP-SF = Self-Report Psychopathy – Short Form; NEO-FFI = Personality Inventory –

Five Factor Inventory (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, & Conscientiousness).

*p < .01, **p < .001.

Table 3

*T-test results for personality differences between participants who took the blame for an academic or criminal offense and those who did not*

| | Mean score | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Took the blame | Did not take the blame | *t*-value | *Cohen's d* |
| Neuroticism | 24.41 | 21.87 | -1.77 | -.15 |
| Extraversion | 27.07 | 26.66 | -.41 | -.03 |
| Openness | 26.60 | 26.63 | .31 | .00 |
| Agreeableness | 27.63 | 30.49 | 2.45 | .20 |
| Contentiousness | 28.40 | 29.66 | .99 | .08 |

*Note:* no significance after adjusting for family wise error rate.

*p < .01 (Bonferroni adjusted).*

Table 4

*T-test results for psychopathy differences between participants who took the blame for an academic or criminal offense and those who did not*

| | Mean score | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Took the blame | Did not take the blame | *t*-value | Cohen's *d* |
| SRP-total | 61.00 | 53.24 | -2.17 | -.22 |
| SRP-Interpersonal | 15.53 | 12.81 | -2.68* | -.23 |
| SRP-Affective | 14.20 | 12.77 | -1.62 | -.14 |
| SRP-Lifestyle | 17.07 | 14.18 | -3.20** | -.27 |
| SRP-Antisocial | 13.13 | 11.18 | -.99 | -.08 |

*Note*: SRP = Self-Report Psychopathy.

*p < .01, ** p < .002 (Bonferroni adjusted).*