

Gender Differences in Interview Tactics with Suspects

Tajana Ljubin Golub¹, Josip Pavliček²

Police interviewing of suspects is one of the cornerstones of the criminal investigation process, but only recently has it been the topic of research interest. Since there was no published research on suspects' interviewing in Croatia, the aim of this study was to research self-reported frequency of use of different interviewing techniques and to analyse gender and age differences. Correlational analysis was employed and a questionnaire was designed for the purpose of the study. The participants were 99 police inspectors from criminal police departments representing all Police Administrations in Croatia, of whom 43 were female and 50 were male, with the mean age of 32 years. The three most often used interviewing techniques for both male and female officers are confronting the suspect with evidence of his guilt (the most often used male and the second most often used by female officers), highlighting contradictions in suspect's statements (the most often used by female and the second by male police officers), and highlighting contradictions with other suspects' statements (the third most frequently used by both male and female police officers). Gender differences were found in three out of 13 interviewing techniques. The correlation pattern between frequency of use of the various techniques and age and length of police experience, was different for male and female police officers. The main finding is that younger male police officers use accusatory techniques more often than older police officers, independent of their interviewing experience, suggesting that these group is at risk for getting false confessions. The importance of the research is that this is the first attempt to describe investigative interviewing in Croatia. This could further serve for planning the education of police officers in investigative interviewing.

Keywords: police, investigative interviewing, gender differences, suspects

UDC: 351.74:343.98

1 Introduction

The primary goals for police investigators are to obtain information, gather evidences and seek the truth. Although there is a trend in criminal investigation to gather physical evidences as much as possible, personal evidence, such as statements of witnesses and suspects are not only regular and important, but also in some cases irreplaceable and crucial. Therefore, the aim of the suspect interview is to elicit valid and reliable information and admissions from suspects (Memon, Vrij, & Bull, 2003). However, only in last twenty years has research attention been paid to police interviews with a suspect.

Previous research investigating police interviewing styles (e.g. Baldwin, 1992; Bull & Cherryman, 1995; Bull & Soukara,

2010; Clarke & Milne, 2001; Griffiths & Milne, 2006; Leo, 1996; McGurk, Carr, & McGurk, 1993; Moston, Stephenson, & Williamson, 1992) was mostly conducted in the UK and USA. Baldwin (1992) analysed 600 interviews from various stations in the UK and found that 24.8% were not very well conducted and 11.5% were poorly conducted. Wald, et al.'s observational study (Wald, Ayres, Hess, Schantz, & Whitebread, 1967) found that the most common technique was to confront the suspect with evidence or with the assertion that there was a witness.

The traditional approach to questioning relied on coercively persuading a suspect to confess (Inbau, Reid, & Buckley, 1986), is ethically questionable (e.g. Gudjonsson, 2003; Vrij, 2003), but also ineffective (see Holmberg & Christianson, 2002), and unlawful in some countries (Memon et al., 2003), including Croatia (Code of police tasks and powers, 2009). In other words, evidence obtained through threatening, manipulating and deceiving a suspect will not be allowed in court. On the other hand, changes in the regulation of interview conducting such as the Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE) Act of 1984 (Home Office, 1985; Bull & Soukara, 2010) served as the basis for the alternative concept of investigative interviewing designed to encourage an ethical and cooperative ap-

¹ Tajana Ljubin Golub, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Applied Psychology, Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: tajana.ljubingolub@ufzg.hr

² Josip Pavliček, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer of Criminal Law and Criminology, Police College, Croatia. E-mail: jpavlicek@fkz.hr

Note. The research was conducted while the first author was employed at the Police College.

proach to the investigation. Williamson (1993) found in the sample of the London police detectives (N = 80) that the majority of detectives have moved away from questioning purely to obtain a confession, towards more professional questioning that is more than merely examining and collecting the evidence. He identified four ideal interrogation styles from a subjective analysis of tape recordings. Twenty-one detectives identified themselves with the »collusive« style (characterized as co-operative, helpful, and problem solving, aimed at securing a confession); sixteen officers identified with the »counseling« style (co-operative, unemotional, non-judgemental, aimed at securing evidence); eleven officers identified with the »business-like« style (confrontational, factual, formal, aimed at securing evidence) and five officers identified with the »dominant« style (confrontational, impatient, emotional, aimed at securing confession).

Interview style and tactics seem to depend on some contextual variables, such as weight of evidence, investigator's presumptions about the case or the suspect, offence seriousness, and personality variables. An accusatorial interrogation style was often used in cases where there was strong evidence against the suspect, and when the evidence was less strong, the interrogation approach was more information gathering (Moston et al., 1992). Both an experimental study of Kassir, Goldstein, and Savitsky (2003) using mock interrogators and suspects, and a study by Weber (2007) involving retired police officers found the influence of the presumption of guilt on the types questions interrogators ask, with presumed guilt prompting more aggressive and confession-oriented tactics. Leo (1996) observed use of interrogation techniques by current officers and found that the most frequent tactics used by interrogators were: appealing to the suspect's self-interest and confronting the suspect with existing evidence of guilt. In a more recent study, Kassir et al. (2007) found that the most common self-reported interrogation tactics were to physically isolate suspects, identify contradictions in suspects' accounts, establish rapport, confront suspects with evidence of their guilt, and appeal to self-interests. Similarly, Culhane, Hosch, and Heck (2008) found that current law officers recruited in El Paso (Texas), Lake City (Florida), and Totowa (New Jersey) in the USA, favored the use of »passive« interrogation techniques (e.g., using praise or flattery on the suspect, appealing to a suspect's self-interest, appealing to the importance of cooperation by the suspect, minimizing the moral seriousness of the offense, offering moral justifications and psychological excuses for the crime). Their endorsement of »aggressive« techniques (e.g. yelling at suspect, touching the suspect in an unfriendly manner) was minimal. The use of passive techniques was positively correlated with legal authoritarianism, while the use of aggressive techniques with social dominance.

Previous research also found that the use of specific techniques is related to investigator characteristics, such as age, personality, training, working experience in police and specific experience in conducting interviews (e.g., Culhane et al., 2008; Kassir et al., 2007). In Kassir et al.'s study (2007), respondents with greater experience in law enforcement were more likely to use of Threatening the Suspect and Presentation of Evidence tactics and those who had greater experience in interviewing measured as the number of interrogations conducted were significantly more likely to employ Threatening the Suspect tactic but were less likely to employ Confrontation tactics. On the contrary, those who had attended specialized training in interrogation were more likely to use Isolation, Rapport and Minimalization cluster of tactics and the Presentation of Evidence tactics (Kassir et al., 2007: 395). Based on this, the authors proposed that »the investigator characteristics associated with a tendency to presume guilt are predictive of more frequent use of psychologically manipulative and confrontational techniques in everyday practice.« In the Culhane et al. study (2008), the authors divided interrogation techniques into aggressive (e.g., yelling at suspect), passive techniques (e.g. appeal to suspect's self-interest), and others (e.g. confront suspect with evidence of guilt). They found that a participant's age was significantly correlated with the authoritarianism and with the endorsement of passive interrogation techniques.

In contrast to studies using sample of police officers, some used a sample of offenders' experiences with interrogations. Holmberg and Christianson (2002) conducted a study with a sample of murderers and sexual offenders, and identified two main interrogation styles; one characterized by humanity and the other by dominance. The dominant style is condemning and aggressive, and the humanity style is characterized by sympathy, empathy and interest in the suspect as human being. Based on the fact that the dominant style was associated with less admission than the humanity style, it was suggested that suspects' feelings of being respected by an investigator increased the probability of confession.

Recent researches (Hartwig, Granhag, Strömwall, & Kronkvist, 2006; Hartwig, Granhag, Strömwall, & Vrij, 2005) have investigated the effectiveness of interviewing and found the effects of »early« versus »late« revelations by interviewers of the evidence they have and have also found that strategically using the evidence in interviews increase the deception detection accuracy rate. Griffiths's and Milne's study (Griffiths & Milne, 2006) points to the importance of questioning. They found that providing encouragement with probing questions, for the suspect to supply an account before identifying inconsistencies was a very effective technique in uncovering possible crime.

Based on the literature mentioned above, it is obviously important to gain insight into police perspectives on the methods they use most often in police interviewing of suspects. According to our knowledge, there has been no published research on police interviewing suspects in Croatia. Because of that, and because there is no research on gender differences, to fill the gap these issues have attracted attention in recent research.

The specific aims of this study were: (a) to establish a self-report frequency of use of different interviewing techniques; (b) to compare male and female police officers in frequency of use of different investigative interviewing techniques; (c) to determine whether there is correlation between individual techniques of interviewing and interviewing experience in male and female police officers; and, (d) to find out whether there is relation between the interviewer's age and use of individual techniques while controlling for the experience in police interviewing.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

Ninety-nine police inspectors from criminal police departments representing all Police Administrations in Croatia participated in this study, of whom 43 were female and 50 were male (6 subjects had not designated gender). The mean age was 33 years ($SD = 5.18$, range 25 - 49), with no statistical difference in age between males and female (males $M = 33.2$; $SD = 5.38$; females $M = 32.2$; $SD = 4.64$; $t = 0.968$, $df = 89$, $p = 0.336$). The average length of experience in interviewing within the police was 4 years ($M = 47.30$; $SD = 46.595$; in months), with no statistical difference in interviewing experience between males and female (males $M = 56.33$; $SD = 53.90$; females $M = 38.40$; $SD = 37.37$; $t = 1.872$; $df = 90$, $p = 0.065$). There was a wide range in the reported months of experience in interrogations of suspects in which the officers participated (as low as 1 and as high as 258 months). One participant had never interviewed the suspect and was not included in the analysis.

2.2 Procedure

All participants attended the in-service, advanced training course on juvenile crime (provided by Police Academy from 2005–2008) and were asked to participate in the survey and complete the questionnaire during the course. No one refused to participate in the survey, and the questionnaire was completed voluntarily and anonymously.

2.3 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed for the purpose of the study and included demographic and biographical data (gender, age, experience in interviewing measured in months, and the list of 13 different interview tactics for interviewing suspects. The respondents were asked to rate on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = never, 2 = very rarely, 3 = rarely, 4 = often, 5 = very often, 6 = all the time) how often they had used each of the tactics when interviewing a suspect.

3 Results and discussion

Interviewing is considered to be the important part of the investigation process (Milne, Shaw, & Bull, 2007) and therefore currently new research in this topic is very useful. This survey study of police inspectors' view of their interviewing was the first of its kind in Croatia.

Table 1: Self-reported frequency of use of 13 techniques on a 1 (never) to 6 (always) scale

Interviewing techniques	Male police detectives							Female police detectives							Hi ²
	1	2	3	4	5	6	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	M (SD)	
Highlighting contradictions with witness's statement	0	10	42	22	20	6	3.7 (1.09)	0	9	37	42	7	5	3.6 (0.93)	5.953
Highlighting contradictions in suspect's statements	2	4	22	28	34	10	4.2 (1.14)	0	0	37	26	19	19	4.2 (1.14)	7.735
Highlighting contradictions with other suspects' statements	0	4	32	32	26	6	4.0 (1.00)	2	9	30	37	12	9	3.8 (1.16)	5.178
Confronting the suspect with evidence of his guilt	4	2	25	25	22	22	4.3 (1.34)	0	5	30	28	21	16	4.1 (1.17)	3.084
Appealing to the suspect's conscience or morale	0	4	34	44	10	8	3.8 (0.96)	9	14	42	26	5	5	3.2 (1.18)	11.184*
Appeal to suspect's to confess in order to finish unpleasant interrogation	4	12	28	30	14	12	3.8 (1.31)	10	7	46	29	5	2	3.2 (1.08)	8.298
Convincing the suspect that truth will eventually come to light	10	12	30	28	14	6	3.4 (1.33)	7	17	29	33	10	5	3.4 (1.23)	1.242
Accusing the suspect of the crime	36	24	36	4	0	0	2.1 (0.94)	57	26	12	5	0	0	1.6 (0.88)	7.610 [#]
Using milder forms of psychological pressure	10	22	32	28	8	0	3.0 (1.12)	12	16	47	16	7	2	3.0 (1.14)	4.307
Influencing the suspect's evaluation of the consequences of the confession	14	24	28	26	6	2	2.9 (1.23)	33	26	30	9	2	0	2.2 (1.09)	8.701
Emphasizing possible positive consequences of the confession	12	14	34	28	10	2	3.2 (1.22)	21	16	35	23	2	2	2.8 (1.23)	3.552
Offering excuses for the suspect's behavior	68	12	16	4	0	0	1.6 (0.91)	79	12	7	2	0	0	1.3 (0.72)	2.182
Emphasizing possible negative consequences of not confessing the crime	12	10	32	24	20	2	3.4 (1.31)	21	19	40	14	2	5	2.8 (1.28)	10.552*

Note: All data are shown in percentages. 1-never; 2-very rare; 3-rare; 4-often; 5-very often; 6-always. Due to missing data, N vary through analyses: from 91 do 93 in chi-square analysis and percentage data, and from 97 do 99 while calculating M and SD for techniques.

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; # p < 0.10

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the self-reported frequency of use of various interrogation techniques. The three most used interviewing techniques for both male and female officers are: (1) confronting the suspect with evidence of his guilt (the most often used in male and the second in female officers), (2) highlighting contradictions in suspect's statements (the most often used in female and the second in male police officers), and (3) highlighting contradictions with other suspects' statements (the third most frequently used in both male and female police officers). It seems therefore that the typical techniques used in police interviewing of suspects, e.g. those most frequently used by male and female police officers, are the same. What is common in these techniques is a direction of interviewer attention to evidence and to logical contradiction

in suspect's statement. The frequent use of confronting the suspect with evidence of his guilt found in this study is also in line with the results of Kassin et al.'s study (2007), and the study of Wald et al. (1967). These techniques are not considered to be psychologically demanding such as those using psychological pressure or offering excuses for the suspect's behavior. Previous research found that police interviewing tactics have only a limited effect on the outcome of the interview and the confessions are the most likely outcome when evidence is strong (Moston & Endelberg, 2011). Therefore it seems that confronting the suspect with evidence is a fruitful technique used by police officers.

In contrast, the less frequently used technique by both male and female police officers is offering excuses for the sus-

pect's behavior and accusing the suspect of the crime, which place higher psychological and emotional demands on the interviewer and suspect. Furthermore, the technique of offering excuses for the suspect's behavior requires psychological understanding of the suspect's motive and personality, and also requires the interviewer's cognitive empathy. The rare use of these techniques points to the possibility of broadening the techniques which interviewers can use by further education of interviewers, especially in the demanding techniques.

It should also be noted that use of some techniques is limited by the case characteristics. For example, the technique of highlighting contradictions with the witness's statement is not possible to use if there is no witness in the case. This is also the technique of confronting the suspect with the other suspect's statements, if there is only one suspect. On the contrary, some other techniques, such as convincing the suspect that the truth will eventually come to light may be used in the majority of cases and the frequency of use depends upon the appropriateness of the use and the skill of an investigator.

Table 2: Zero-order correlation coefficients among variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Age	-	396**	037	-007	-060	-171	064	-092	-218	-305*	-179	-338	-192	039	-596**
2. Experience in interviewing suspects ^b	459**	-	175	169	-086	-059	090	177	-056	-105	-157	-027	100	-134	-328*
3. Highlighting contradictions with witness's statement	-123	-006	-	636**	630**	427**	090	073	-024	162	156	-049	175	070	-009
4. Highlighting contradictions in suspect's statements	-100	143	633*	-	739**	468**	121	197	138	138	158	186	067	217	038
5. Highlighting contradictions with other suspects' statements	-019	043	524*	760**	-	375**	360*	246	083	-085	257	248	120	035	131
6. Confronting the suspect with evidence of his guilt	119	-032	601**	679**	662*	-	-019	095	071	-088	246	127	302*	007	196
7. Appealing to the suspect's conscience or morale	179	066	213	369*	224	348*	-	408**	296*	-212	348*	076	093	-106	063
8. Appeal to suspect's confess in order to finish unpleasant interrogation	130	246	100	327*	156	313*	641**	-	536**	-016	158	140	065	-150	128
9. Convincing the suspect that truth will eventually come to light	-221	-190	270	399**	339*	436**	578**	450**	-	005	-158	-004	059	-064	088
10. Accusing the suspect of the crime	-063	165	020	-068	-005	-012	074	151	163	-	173	129	-100	352*	142
11. Using milder forms of psychological pressure	-197	-206	103	003	067	038	-015	043	144	-080	-	374*	223	190	387**
12. Influencing the suspect's evaluation of the consequences of the confession	-017	-032	046	022	029	011	175	150	020	107	158	-	391**	243	541**
13. Emphasizing possible positive consequences of the confession	028	044	-041	-019	-076	073	538**	450**	404**	092	064	326*	-	-120	245
14. Offering excuses for the suspect's behavior	120	022	342*	187	161	258	219	136	248	385*	-107	176	-020	-	154
15. Emphasizing possible negative consequences of not confessing the crime	028	070	005	200	128	298	475**	546**	558**	238	207	-021	517**	206	-

Note: Correlation coefficients for male sample are provided above the diagonal and for female sample below the diagonal, decimals are omitted.

N varied due to missing data from 47 to 50 in male sample and from 41 to 43 in female sample; ^b in months;

* $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

The second aim of the research was to analyze gender differences in the frequency of use of different investigative interviewing techniques. As shown in Table 2, out of 13 interviewing techniques gender differences were found in only three. Male police officers, in comparison to female police officers, more often use appealing to the suspect's conscience or morality ($hi2 = 11.184$, $p < 0.05$), accusing the suspect of the crime ($hi2 = 7.610$, $p < 0.10$), and emphasizing possible negative consequences of not confessing the crime ($hi2 = 10.552$, $p < 0.10$).

It should also be noted that in the literature it can be found that sometimes unethical or even illegal techniques are used which can elicit false confessions (e.g. Gudjonsson, 2003). Accusing the suspect of the crime can in some circumstances lead to some type of false confession. Internalized persuaded false confessions typically unfold in three sequential steps. First, the interrogator causes the suspect to doubt his innocence, secondly, the interrogator must supply the suspect with the reason that satisfactorily explains how he could have done it without remembering it, and finally, once the suspect has accepted responsibility for the crime, the interrogator pushes him to supply the details of how and why he did it (Leo, 2008).

Better training in investigative interviewing skills is well expected to diminish the use of such techniques, since police officers will have other more appropriate techniques. This is especially important when there is less case evidence, because police officers evaluate that in such a case, interviewing techniques are of greater importance (Häkkinen, Ask, Kebbell, Laurence, & Granhag, 2009).

The third aim of the research was to determine whether there is correlation between individual techniques of interviewing and interviewing experience in male and female police officers. In male police officers, officers with less experience in interviewing more often use the technique of emphasizing possible negative consequences of not confessing the crime ($r = -.328$, $p < 0.05$). In female police officers, there was no significant correlation between frequency of use of any technique and interviewing experience.

The fourth aim of the research was to determine whether there is relationship between the interviewer's age and use of individual techniques while controlling for the experience in police interviewing. As expected, there was positive correlation between age and experience in interviewing in both males ($r = 0.396$, $p < 0.01$) and females ($r = 0.459$, $p < 0.01$), showing that older police officers have more working experience and more interviewing experience. In male police officers, younger officers more often use accusing the suspect of the crime ($r = -0.305$, $p < 0.05$), influencing the suspect's

evaluation of the consequences of the confession ($r = -0.338$, $p < 0.05$) and emphasizing possible negative consequences of not confessing the crime ($r = -.596$, $p < 0.01$). In order to find the relationship between age and use of individual interviewing techniques, besides the influence of experience in interviewing, partial correlation was calculated. All of these forementioned correlations remained significant after controlling for experience in police interviewing, e.g. between age and accusing the suspect of the crime (partial $r = -.309$, $p < 0.05$), influencing the suspect's evaluation of the consequences of the confession (partial $r = -0.363$, $p < 0.05$) and emphasizing possible negative consequences of not confessing the crime (partial $r = -.540$, $p < 0.01$). Younger male police officers use these techniques more often than older police officers, independent of their interviewing experience.

These techniques can be considered as those putting higher pressure on suspects, and their frequent use may be related to personality characteristics of younger males, such as increased aggressiveness. In female police officers, there was no significant correlation between frequency of use of any technique and age. It seems that younger male police officers are a specific group in terms of interviewing, when compared to older male police officers and females. It should be discovered what the basis of such result is, and personality variables such as social dominance and aggressiveness show promise for future investigations. The efficacy of interviewing this group in comparison to other groups should also be investigated, and especially in relation to the type of suspect and case characteristics. However, it seems that younger male police officers are at risk of getting false confessions from suspects, and especially from vulnerable suspects, because of the more frequent use of these accusatory techniques. Namely, use of manipulative/coercive interrogation techniques and suspects' vulnerabilities are the main causes of false confession (Kassin et al., 2010).

While the present survey provides new information about investigators' self-reported interrogation practices, it has several methodological limitations need to be mentioned. First, based on the literature review, sixteen interrogation techniques were chosen to be included in the questionnaire, and it may well be that at least some participants use some other technique. Future research should use a broader spectrum of techniques. The second limitation concerns the sample characteristics. The sample in this study was a convenience sample of police officers attending training in juvenile delinquency and child abuse at the Police Academy, after which they get a license for Special police unit aimed at working in cases where victims and perpetrators are children (e.g. child abuse, juvenile delinquency). They have work experience in various police jobs and activities, including investigations and interrogations, and they all have a college degree. Police detectives working on

investigation and interrogation are not obliged to have a college degree, and it may be that this sample therefore does not represent the police detectives in general. Additionally, police officers and also investigative police officers are mostly men, and this sample does not represent this either. Female police officers are often selected and trained to work in Special Units for Juvenile Delinquency, and this unit has a different proportion of males vs. females than other units.

The second limitation is the source of the data themselves. Data are from one source, e.g. self-reported by participants and not corroborated by observational data. However, observational studies also had limitations (e.g. data are limited to the sessions that researchers are permitted to monitor).

Finally, this research included only legal techniques of interviewing, which does not exclude the possibility that police officers in practice use sometimes other unethical or even illegal techniques.

As stated by Häkkinen et al. (2009), »rules are typically general and prohibit only the most extreme strategies for unethical interviewing«. The Croatian Criminal procedure act (1997, 2011) also defines the general rules about interviewing, and specifically points to illegal tactics. In that way, article 277 of Criminal procedure act points that the questions must be clear and determinate, so that the suspect can understand them. It is forbidden to use force, threat, deceits or similar means to obtain a suspect's statement or confession. Also, there is a general principle which suggests that in the first step suspect's uninterrupted presentation about all the facts and circumstances regarding the evidence against him should be obtained, and after that the suspect shall be asked questions, if that is necessary, to fill in gaps or remove contradictions and ambiguities in his statement. It is also forbidden to deceive the suspect and to lead him with suggestible questions.

It should be also noted that police interview is the first and informal stage in collecting information and this information has no evidence value in further formal criminal procedure. The current Criminal procedure act (2011) differentiates specifically between police informal gathering data and interviewing suspects and more formal investigation which should be done by an interrogator (either the police investigator or the state attorney). It may be that interviewing techniques used in more formal contexts are different from those reported in this study, e.g. less accusatory. Also, the current Croatian Criminal procedure act (2011), as well as the former one (1997), do not obligate police to record informal interviewing of suspects, but only formal interrogation should be taped.

References

1. Baldwin, J. (1992). *Video taping police interviewing with suspects – an evaluation*. London: Home Office, Police Research Group.
2. Bull, R., & Cherryman, J. (1995). *Helping to identify skills gaps in specialist investigative interviewing*. London: Home Office.
3. Bull, R., & Soukara, S. (2010). Four studies of what really happens in police interviews. In G. D. Lassiter, & C. Meissner (Eds.), *Police interrogations and false confessions* (pp. 81–95). New York: American Psychological Association.
4. Clarke, C., & Milne, R. (2001). *National evaluation of the PEACE investigative interviewing course*. Police Research Award Scheme Report No. PRAS/149. London: Home Office.
5. Code of police tasks and powers. (2009). *Official Gazette*, (76/09).
6. Criminal procedure act. (1997). *Official Gazette*, (110/97).
7. Criminal procedure act. (2011). *Official Gazette*, (121/11).
8. Culhane, S. E., Hosch, H. M., & Heck, C. (2008). Interrogation technique endorsement by current law enforcement, future law enforcement, and laypersons interrogation technique endorsement. *Police Quarterly*, 11(3), 366–386.
9. Griffiths, A., & Milne, R. (2006). Will it all end in tiers? Police interviews with suspects in Britain. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative interviewing: Rights, research and regulation* (pp. 167–189). Cullompton: Willan.
10. Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook*. Chichester: Wiley.
11. Häkkinen, H., Ask, K., Keibell, M., Laurence, A., & Granhag, P. A. (2009). Police officers' view of effective interview tactics with suspects: The effect of weight of case evidence and discomfort with ambiguity. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 23(4), 468–481.
12. Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Kronkvist, O. (2006). Strategic use of evidence during police interviews: When training to detect deception works. *Law and Human Behavior*, 30(5), 603–619.
13. Hartwig, M., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Vrij, A. (2005). Detecting deception is a strategic disclosure of evidence. *Law and Human Behavior*, 29(4), 469–484.
14. Holmberg, U., & Christianson, S.-Å. (2002). Murderers' and sexual offenders' experiences of police interviews and their inclination to admit or deny crimes. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 20(1–2), 31–45.
15. Home Office. (1985). *Police and criminal evidence act 1984*. London: HMSO.
16. Inbau, F. E., Reid, J. E., & Buckley, J. P. (1986). *Criminal interrogation and confessions* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.
17. Kassin, S. M., Drizin, S. A., Grisso, T., Gudjonsson, G. H., Leo, R. A., & Redlich, A. P. (2010). Police-induced confessions: Risk factors and recommendations. *Law and Human Behavior*, 34(1), 3–38.
18. Kassin, S. M., Goldstein, C. J., & Savitsky, K. (2003). Behavioral confirmation in the interrogation room: On the dangers of presuming guilt. *Law and Human Behavior*, 27(2), 187–203.
19. Kassin, S. M., Leo, R. A., Meissner, C. A., Richman, K. D., Colwell, L. H., Leach, A.-M., et al. (2007). Police interviewing and interrogation: A self-report survey of police practices and beliefs. *Law & Human Behavior*, 31(4), 381–400.
20. Leo, R. A. (1996). Inside the interrogation room. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 86(2), 266–303.
21. Leo, R. A. (2008). *Police interrogation and American justice*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

22. McGurk, B., Carr, J., & McGurk, D. (1993). *Investigative interviewing courses for police officers: An evaluation*. London: Home Office.
23. Memon, A., Vrij, A., & Bull, R. (2003). *Psychology and the law: Truthfulness, accuracy and credibility* (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley.
24. Milne, R., Shaw, G., & Bull, R. (2007). Investigative interviewing: The role of research. In D. Carson, R. Milne, F. Pakes, K. Shalev, & A. Shawyer (Eds.). *Applying psychology to criminal justice* (pp. 65–80). Chichester: Wiley.
25. Moston, S., & Engelberg, T. (2011). The effects of evidence on the outcome of interviews with criminal suspects. *Police Practice and Research*, 12(6), 518–526.
26. Moston, S., Stephenson, G. M., & Williamson, T. M. (1992). The effects of case characteristics on suspect behaviour during police questioning. *British Journal of Criminology*, 32(1), 23–40.
27. Vrij, A. (2003). We will protect your wife and child, but only if you confess. In P. J. van Koppen, & S. D. Penrod (Eds.), *Adversarial versus inquisitorial justice: Psychological perspectives on criminal justice systems* (pp. 55–79). New York: Kluwer Academic.
28. Wald, M., Ayres, R., Hess, D. W., Schantz, M., & Whitebread, C. H. (1967). Interrogations in New Haven: The impact of Miranda. *Yale Law Journal*, 76(8), 1519–1648.
29. Weber, Y. (2007). *The effects of suspect history and strength of evidence on police interviewing styles* (Honours thesis). James Cook University, Department of Psychology.
30. Williamson, T. M. (1993). From interrogation to investigative interviewing: Strategic trends in police questioning. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 3(2), 89–99.

Razlike med spoloma pri taktikah razgovorov z osumljenci

Izr. prof. Tajana Ljubin Golub, Učiteljski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Hrvatska. E-pošta: tajana.ljubingolub@ufzg.hr

Viš. pred. Josip Pavliček, Visoka policijska škola, Hrvatska. E-pošta: jpavlicek@fkz.hr

Policijski razgovor z osumljencem je eden od temeljev procesa kazenske preiskave, vendar je šele pred kratkim postal predmet raziskovalnega zanimanja. Ker do sedaj še ni bila objavljena nobena raziskava o razgovorih z osumljenci na Hrvaškem, je cilj pričujoče študije raziskati pogostost samoporočanja o uporabi različnih tehnik razgovorov in analizirati razlike med spoloma in starostnimi skupinami. Uporabili smo analizo korelacij in za namen študije oblikovali vprašalnik. V študiji je sodelovalo 99 policijskih inšpektorjev iz kriminalističnih policijskih oddelkov vseh policijskih uprav na Hrvaškem, med katerimi je bilo 43 žensk in 50 moških, s povprečno starostjo 32 let. Tri najbolj pogosto uporabljene tehnike razgovorov tako pri moških kot ženskih policijskih inšpektorjih so soočenje osumljenca z dokazi o njegovi krivdi (najbolj pogosto uporabljena taktika pri moških in druga najbolj pogosto uporabljena taktika pri ženskih policijskih inšpektorjih), izpostavljanje nasprotij v izjavah osumljenca (najbolj pogosto uporabljena taktika pri ženskah in druga najbolj pogosto uporabljena taktika pri moških policijskih inšpektorjih) in poudarjanje nasprotij z izjavami drugih osumljencev (tretja najbolj pogosta taktika tako pri policistih moškega in ženskega spola). Razlike med spoloma so bile ugotovljene v treh od 13 tehnik razgovora. Vzorec korelacije med pogostostjo uporabe različnih tehnik in starostjo ter dolžino policijskih izkušenj je bil drugačen za moške in ženske policijske inšpektorje. Glavna ugotovitev je, da mlajši moški policisti uporabljajo obtožilne tehnike pogostejše kot starejši policisti, neodvisno od njihovih izkušenj izpraševanja, kar kaže na to, da so to rizične skupine, ki lahko pridobijo lažna priznanja. Pomembnost raziskave je v tem, da je to prvi poskus opisa preiskovalnih razgovorov na Hrvaškem. To lahko nadalje služi za načrtovanje izobraževanja policistov pri preiskovalnih razgovorih.

Ključne besede: policija, preiskovalni razgovor, razlike med spoloma, osumljenci

UDK: 351.74:343.98