

Personality Styles and Suggestibility: A Differential Approach

RUTE PIRES^{1*}, DANILO R. SILVA¹, ANA SOUSA FERREIRA^{1,2}

¹*Faculty of Psychology, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal*

²*UNIDE & CEAUL, Research Unit in Business Development & Center of Statistics and Applications, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal*

Abstract

This study addresses the relationship between personality styles measured with the Portuguese adaptation of the Millon Index of Personality Styles *Revised* – MIPS-R and interrogative suggestibility assessed by the Portuguese adaptation of the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale – GSS1. Hypotheses predicted individual differences in suggestibility and that these differences correspond to differences in individuals' personality styles. The study was conducted with a sample of 258 individuals ($M_{\text{age}} = 31.8$ years, $SD = 12.0$). Results showed that there were individual differences in suggestibility and that these differences corresponded to certain personality characteristics, mainly related to the Thinking Styles and some Behaving Styles.

Keywords: *Forensic Psychology; Suggestibility; Personality styles; GSS1; MIPS-R*

1. Introduction

This study aims to understand the relationship between personality styles measured by the Millon Index of Personality Styles *Revised* (MIPS-R)¹ and

Address correspondence to Rute Pires, Faculdade de Psicologia, Universidade de Lisboa, Alameda da Universidade, 1649-013 Lisboa, Portugal; Email: rpires@fp.ul.pt

interrogative suggestibility measured through the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale, GSS1 (Gudjonsson, 1997). In order to accomplish this goal, we carried out a cross-cultural adaptation of the MIPS-R and the GSS1 (Pires, 2011). These preliminary studies were authorized by the publishers of the tests and their results will be briefly presented in the section on instruments.

This study is within the scope of forensic psychology which is related to the application of psychology to questions and issues regarding law and the legal system (Fonseca, 2006). In most Western countries, the legal system places great importance on testimony in determining the facts of a crime. As the eyewitness can describe and identify the offenders, report conversations and remember details of the event, his/her testimony is, after confession, the most incriminating evidence in the conviction of a defendant (Yarmey, 2006). However, in recent years, a disturbing number of justice miscarriages have been brought to light, confirming the fallibility of human memory and therefore, the vulnerability of the descriptions and identifications made by witnesses.

The vulnerabilities of eyewitness testimonies have long been recognized by experimental psychologists (Davis & Loftus, 2007; Neuschatz, Lampinen, Toglia, Payne, & Cisneros, 2007). Since suggestibility is one of the variables that influences the accuracy of a witness testimony (Gudjonsson, 2003), it seems of crucial importance to understand which cognitive and personality variables account for individual differences in interrogative suggestibility.

¹ “MIPS” is a registered trademark and “Millon” is a trademark of DICANDRIEN, Inc. Copyright © 1991, 1993 DICANDRIEN, Inc. All rights reserved. Published and distributed exclusively by NCS Pearson, Inc. Reproduced by permission.

Traditionally, there are two suggestibility approaches: the individual differences approach and the experimental approach. As the option for the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales suggests, this study is based on the individual differences approach, through which, by means of standardized instruments, we seek to identify people as being more or less suggestible, relating the different degrees of suggestibility with cognitive and personality variables. Another well illustrated perspective in the work of Loftus and colleagues on the effect of misinformation (Davis & Loftus, 2007), is the experimental approach of suggestibility that sets out to study the conditions under which suggestions affect the memory of events.

Research on individual differences in vulnerability to suggestion relates suggestibility to several cognitive and personality variables. Considering the former, intelligence and memory have been found to relate negatively to suggestibility (Gignac & Powell, 2006; Polczyk et al., 2004). As for the latter, acquiescence and agreeableness have been associated with suggestibility, with people more cooperative and acquiescent being more vulnerable to suggestion (Eisen, Morgan, & Mickes, 2003; Gudjonsson, 2003). Social desirability has also been found to relate positively with suggestibility and, conversely, assertiveness has been negatively related to suggestibility (Gudjonsson, 2003). Moreover, research has shown that people with low self-esteem and insecure attachment styles are prone to suggestibility (Alexander, Quas, & Goodman, 2002; Howie & Dowd, 1996; Nurmoja & Bachmann, 2008). Nevertheless, with regard to some personality variables there are controversial results instilling further research.

Millon's personology model (Davis, 1999; Millon, 2004; Weiss, 2008), which embodies a) a theory, b) a nosology of mental disorders logically derived from theory, c) instruments, such as the MIPS-R, that enable the hypothesis of the theory to be

validated and d) a therapeutic model, is one of the most comprehensive and coherent contemporary theories in the field of personality and psychopathology.

The MIPS-R covers the normal range of personality functioning. Its scales assess individuals' orientation toward obtaining reinforcement from the environment (Motivating Styles), their cognitive style of dealing with information (Thinking Styles) and their style of relating to others (Behaving Styles). These latter styles are considered to be normal range variations of Millon's personality disorders.

Given that the MIPS-R provides a comprehensive picture of the personality inclinations that characterize the individual, it may be used to clarify conflicting findings on the relations between suggestibility and personality variables.

Considering the relations between suggestibility and neuroticism, Gudjonsson (2003) found a weak but significant correlation, which was not confirmed by the Polish adaptation of the GSS1 and the five personality factors assessed by the NEO Five Factor Inventory (Polczyk, 2005). The results of the GSS2 with the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-P-R, Leibman et al., 2002) and with a shortened version of the NEO-P-R (Nurmoja & Bachman, 2008) also point to independence between interrogative suggestibility and the basic traits of personality.

Regarding the relations between suggestibility and anxiety, Gudjonsson (2003) found that suggestibility relates more to state anxiety triggered by interrogative pressure than to a predisposition to experiencing anxiety (trait anxiety). In a psychiatric sample, Wolfradt and Meyer (1998) also found that suggestibility correlated positively with anxiety. Although these findings support the theoretical model of Gudjonsson and Clark, there are also studies that point to independence between suggestibility and anxiety in normal samples (Pires, Silva, & Ferreira, 2013; Polczyk, 2005).

High scores on the Pain-Avoiding, Passively Accommodating, Anxious/Hesitating, Dissatisfied/Complaining and Negative Impression scales of the MIPS-R suggest maladjustment and psychological distress and are positively and significantly related to the Neuroticism scale of the NEO-PI-R (Millon, 2004; Pires, 2011). Therefore, the relationship between these MIPS-R scales and the GSS1 may enlighten the relationship between neuroticism/anxiety and suggestibility.

Another controversial issue requiring clarification is the relation between introversion and suggestibility. While Ward and Loftus (1985) found that introverts and intuitive individuals were more vulnerable to suggestion, Trouvé and Libkuman (1992) found introverts to be less suggestible. Given that the MIPS-R Thinking Styles scales are theoretically grounded in Jung's personality typology, it may be that their relations to suggestibility contribute towards clarifying the above mentioned conflicting findings.

The present study is the first to have collected Portuguese data on interrogative suggestibility and its relations to the MIPS-R personality styles. Considering the controversial and, therefore, inconclusive findings previously presented, it contributes to the understanding of exactly which personality factors account for individual differences in interrogative suggestibility. Accordingly, the hypotheses investigated in this study are as follows: (1) the Pain-Avoiding, Passively Accommodating, Anxious/Hesitating, Dissatisfied/Complaining and Negative Impression scales of the MIPS-R are expected to relate positively to suggestibility; (2) the Dutiful/Conforming, Submissive/Yielding and Cooperative/Agreeing scales of the MIPS-R, whose high scores suggest compliance with standards, strong loyalties and attachments to others and self-control, are expected to relate positively to suggestibility; (3) the Confident/Asserting and Dominant/Controlling scales of the MIPS-R, whose high scores suggest self-assurance and social aggressiveness, are expected to relate

negatively to suggestibility; (4) the MIPS-R Positive Impression scale, whose high scores may identify individuals who are portraying themselves in a positive light in the test, is expected to relate positively to suggestibility; (5) finally, we expect the relations between suggestibility and the MIPS-R Thinking Styles scales to contribute towards clarifying the relationships between introversion and suggestibility.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. *Participants*

This study was conducted with a sample of 258 individuals from the general population, 139 women (53.9%) and 119 men (46.1%). The mean age was 31.8 years and the standard deviation was 12.0 (minimum age of 18 years, maximum age of 64 years). As for schooling, 17.1% had had 9 years, 43.4% had completed twelve years, 39.5% had had higher education. The criteria for inclusion in the sample were: Portuguese nationality, age between 18 and 64 years and education level at or above the 9th grade. The exclusion criteria were: suspicion of learning disabilities, history of mental health problems, unanswered items, omission of biographical data (i.e., gender, age and education) and MIPS-R reports with low Consistency scale scores (i.e., less than two).

2.2. *Measures*

MIPS-R (Millon, 2004). The MIPS-R is a 180-item, True/False inventory designed to measure personality styles of adults aged from 18 to 65 years or more. Most MIPS-R items require eight years of prior schooling in order to complete and most individuals finish it in 30 minutes.

The MIPS-R consists of 12 pairs of scales that represent theoretically opposite concepts. For instance, the Pleasure-Enhancing (1A) and Pain-Avoiding (1B) scales are considered a pair. People with high scores on 1A develop attitudes and behaviours that generate pleasure, feelings of achievement and which, therefore, enrich their lives. Conversely, people with high scores on 1B focus on the hardships of life and are easily discouraged by disappointment and minor problems.

Table 1 presents the MIPS-R scales.

(Insert Table 1)

In addition to these scales, the MIPS-R comprises a Consistency scale which is an indicator of inconsistent responding and two scales designed to measure distortions in individuals' responses: the Positive Impression scale contains a set of items designed to identify individuals who wish to create a positive impression of themselves; the Negative Impression scale pertains to identify individuals who may have tried to give a negative picture of themselves.

The internal consistency reliability of the Portuguese adaptation of the MIPS-R scales is satisfactory. In this sample, the median coefficient alpha was .74, ranging from a low of .63 for the Self-Indulging scale to a high of .84 for the Anxious/Hesitating scale. Test-retest reliability was assessed in a sample of 51 individuals with an interval between the first and the second application that ranged from 4 weeks minimum to 9 weeks maximum. The median retest reliability was high: .83. Both internal-consistency reliability and retest reliability results are similar to those obtained in other adaptations of the MIPS-R (Millon, 2001; Sánchez López & Casullo, 2000).

As for the validity of the Portuguese adaptation of the MIPS-R, several methods of univariate and multivariate analysis confirmed the internal structure of the test. Not only the means and standard deviations of the Portuguese MIPS-R scales are akin to

those obtained with the original test but also in both Portuguese and original data there is a clear differentiation between scales that are suggestive of maladjustment (Passively Accommodating) and scales that contribute to emotional adjustment (Dutiful/Conforming). The external validity of the Portuguese adaptation of the MIPS-R was studied with the Portuguese adaptation of the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 2000; Lima, 1997). The correlations pattern obtained indicates a correspondence between Portuguese data and the original test data.

GSSI (Gudjonsson, 1997). The Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale, GSS1, was developed to measure interrogative suggestibility which is the degree to which, in the context of a close social interaction, people accept messages transmitted through formal questioning and, consequently, change their behaviour (Gudjonsson, 1997, 2003). It consists of a narrative of a fictional robbery that can be read by the interviewer or played from a tape recording, after which there is an immediate and a delayed recall phase (with an interval of around 50 minutes). After the delayed recall phase, the individual answers 20 questions, 15 of which are misleading questions. At the end of the 20 questions, the individual is informed that he/she has made some mistakes (even if he/she has not made any) and, therefore, must answer the questions again, this time, with more accuracy.

The GSS1 provides information on various memory and suggestibility indicators. Regarding the four suggestibility measures, Yield 1 refers to the number of suggestions that the individual accepts prior to negative feedback. Yield 2 refers to the number of suggestions that the individual accepts after the negative feedback has been administered. Shift refers to the frequency with which the individual changes a previously given response as a result of negative feedback. Total Suggestibility is the

sum of Yield 1 and Shift and provides an overall measure of the degree of vulnerability to suggestion.

In this sample, the Cronbach's alpha for Yield 1, Yield 2 and Shift were .74, .76 and .58, respectively. In the original scale the alpha coefficients for Yield 1 and Shift were .77 and .71, respectively. Test-retest reliability was assessed with the same sample of 51 individuals that was used for the study of the Portuguese MIPS-R test-retest reliabilities. The temporal stability for Yield 1, Yield 2, Shift and Total Suggestibility were $r_s = .39, p < .01$, $r_s = .46, p < .01$, $r_s = .11$ and $r = .32, p < .05$, respectively.

As for the internal structure of the Portuguese adaptation of the GSS1, given the dichotomous nature of GSS1 data (true/false), a correspondence analysis of the answers to Yield 1, Yield 2 and Shift items was performed. Two factors in which items were grouped in accordance with their content were obtained (e.g., item 2 of Yield 1, item 2 of Yield 2 and item 2 of Shift load on Factor 1).

Table 2 shows the composition of each factor with respective loadings.

(Insert Table 2)

Gudjonsson (1997) factor analysed the answers to Yield and Shift items and, using Varimax rotation, obtained two factors, with Yield 1 leading questions loading on Factor 1 and Shift items loading on Factor 2. Correspondence analysis did not confirm the GSS1's original factorial structure.

Finally, the external validity of the Portuguese adaptation of the GSS1 was shown through the relationships between suggestibility and the five factors of personality (Costa & McCrae, 2000; Lima, 1997) and the relationships between suggestibility and anxiety (Silva, 2006; Spielberger, 1983). The results pointed to independence between suggestibility and personality, as well as between suggestibility

and anxiety (Pires, Silva, & Sousa Ferreira, 2013). These results are in line with Liebman et al. (2002) and Polczyk's (2005) findings.

2.3. Procedure

The experimental sessions were individual and took place at the Faculty of Psychology, University of Lisbon. Volunteers' participation in the study was informed and consented. Each session lasted approximately 40 minutes, during which the volunteer answered the GSS1, whose story was played from a tape recorder, and the MIPS-R. At the end of the session, participants completed a biographical information questionnaire that enabled global characterization of the sample.

3. Results

Table 3 presents the relationship between the scores of MIPS-R and the GSS1.

(Insert Table 3)

There were weak but positive and highly significant correlations between the Realistic/Sensing and the Dutiful/Conforming styles and Total Suggestibility, Yield 1 and Yield 2. The Thought-Guided, the Conservation-Seeking, the Other-Nurturing, the Cooperative/Agreeing and the Positive Impression scales were also found to be positively related to suggestibility. The Innovation-Seeking style related negatively to suggestibility. Theoretically, due to the impact of negative feedback on the interviewee's mood (Gudjonsson, 2003), we would expect relations between Shift and some of the Behaving or maladjustment MIPS-R styles, however in these results Shift did not relate to any of the MIPS-R styles.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to test whether MIPS-R styles mean scores differed in three groups of individuals with different degrees of

vulnerability to suggestion. The Total Suggestibility result (Yield 1 + Shift) was used as a measure of the degree of vulnerability to suggestion. Individuals who presented results in Total Suggestibility at or above one standard deviation from the mean were considered highly suggestible (Group 3) and individuals whose results were below one standard deviation from the mean were considered to be low in suggestibility (Group 1). Individuals who had an average degree of suggestibility were included in Group 2. Group 3 was composed of 54 individuals, Group 1 consisted of 56 individuals and Group 2 was composed of 148 individuals.

There was a significant effect of vulnerability to suggestion at least on one of the MIPS-R personality styles: Roy's Largest Root = .211, $F(26,231) = 1.872$, $p = .008$, $\eta^2_p = .17$, $\pi = .99$. The size effect was median and the power of the test was high (Mâroco, 2010)

Table 4 presents the MIPS-R styles significantly affected by vulnerability to suggestion which were identified by One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

(Insert Table 4)

Apart from the Realistic/Sensing and the Dutiful/Conforming styles, the effect of suggestibility on the other styles should be read with prudence since the power of the tests and/or the size effect were low ($\pi \leq .80$ and $\eta^2_p \leq .05$, respectively).

Multiple comparisons (post-hoc Tukey HSD) clarified which groups of individuals were significantly different in relation to the personality styles mentioned. In the Realistic/Sensing, the Conservation-Seeking and the Dutiful/Conforming styles, the highly suggestibility group obtained significantly higher scores than the group of people with lower suggestibility ($p = .002$, $p = .012$ and $p < .001$, respectively). In the Imaginative/Intuiting and the Innovation-Seeking styles, the low suggestibility group obtained significantly higher scores than the group of people with high suggestibility (p

= .042 and $p = .008$, respectively). Highly suggestible people obtained significantly higher scores than the group of people with average suggestibility in the Cooperative/Agreeing style ($p = .028$). Although not significantly, highly suggestible people obtained higher mean scores than the group of people with low suggestibility in the Passively Accommodating style.

4. Discussion

This study investigated the relationships between suggestibility and personality styles. Furthermore, it set out to identify which personality styles characterized people with varying degrees of suggestibility.

Gudjonsson (2003) found a positive and significant, although weak, relationship between interrogative suggestibility and neuroticism. In MIPS-R and in its Portuguese adaptation, the scales Pain-Avoiding, Passively Accommodating, Anxious/Hesitating, Dissatisfied/Complaining and Negative Impression also obtained positive and significant relations with the Neuroticism scale of NEO-PI-R, suggesting a general maladjustment factor (Millon, 2004; Pires, 2011). Therefore, these scales were expected to differentiate people with different degrees of vulnerability to suggestion. This prediction (hypothesis 1) was not confirmed, pointing to independence between suggestibility and psychological maladjustment. These results are in line with aforementioned findings (Leibman et al., 2002; Pires et al., 2013; Polczyk, 2005).

The obtained results partially support the second hypothesis, with people who scored higher in the Dutiful/Conforming and Cooperative/Agreeing styles being more vulnerable to suggestion. Thus, people more vulnerable to suggestion related to authority in a respectful and cooperative manner, were self-controlled and lacked spontaneity. From an interpersonal point of view, they were friendly, had strong

attachments and loyalties to others and tended to hide negative feelings. However, the Submissive/Yielding style did not relate to suggestibility, possibly since it characterizes people who tend to act in self-demeaning ways, accustomed to suffering rather than to enjoyment, being less related to acquiescence and agreeableness than to pathological ways of relating to others.

The third hypothesis that, based on the negative relation between assertiveness and suggestibility reported by Gudjonsson (2003), predicted self-assured and social aggressive individuals (Confident/Asserting and Dominant/Controlling styles) to be less vulnerable to suggestion was not confirmed. According to Millon's personality theory, the Behaving Styles scales represent interpersonal ways of relating to others that are "located at one end of a continuum that shades progressively into the moderately severe personality disorders of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders" (Millon, 2004, p.6). The Confident/Asserting style, the Dominant/Controlling style and the aforementioned Submissive/Yielding style (hypothesis 2) are the normally functioning pole of Millon's Narcissistic Personality Disorder, Sadistic Personality Disorder and Masochist Personality Disorder, respectively. In our study, the MIPS-R personality styles potentially related to maladjustment did not relate to suggestibility.

The fourth hypothesis was confirmed, with people who create an overly positive impression of themselves (Positive Impression scale) being more vulnerable to suggestion. This finding is in line with the relation between suggestibility and social desirability reported by Gudjonsson (2003).

Finally, the fifth hypothesis pertained to clarify the conflicting results on the relation between introversion and suggestibility (Trouvé & Libkuman, 1992; Ward & Loftus, 1985). In this study, intuitive and creative individuals, who valued the symbolic and the unknown (Imaginative/Intuiting and Innovation-Seeking styles), were less

vulnerable to suggestion than individuals who trusted on real and observable experience and were orderly and conservative in processing new knowledge (Realistic/Sensing and Conservation-Seeking styles). Since the Externally Focused and the Internally Focused Thinking Styles did not relate to suggestibility, further research towards clarifying the relations between introversion and suggestibility should be performed.

There may be limitations to this study, the first being psychometric problems of the Shift subscale which, in the Portuguese adaptation, had low internal consistency and was not a reliable measure with regard to temporal stability. For further research more studies need to be performed on the psychometric properties of Shift and consequently Total Suggestibility. Another limitation may be the high education level of the sample, which could have influenced participants' reaction to the psychological tests. Further research with a sample representing different levels of education and schooling is advisable.

In conclusion, this study showed that there were individual differences in suggestibility and that these differences corresponded to certain personality characteristics, mainly related to the Thinking Styles and some of the Behaving Styles. Individuals who value real and observable experiences, who interpret new information in conventional and traditional ways, who tend to behave in a formal and proper manner in social situations, being self-controlled and not acting spontaneously, who relate to others in an amenable manner, eventually covering negative feelings and trying to please others, are prone to suggestibility.

5. References

Alexander, K. W., Quas, J. A., & Goodman, G. S. (2002). Theoretical advances in understanding children's memory for distressing events: The role of attachment.

Developmental Review, 22, 490-519.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2000). *NEO PI-R, Inventário de Personalidade NEO Revisto. Manual profissional*. Adaptação de M. P. Lima & A. Simões [NEO PI-R, NEO Personality Inventory-Revised, professional manual. Portuguese adaptation of M. P. Lima & A. Simões]. Lisbon: CEGOC-TEA.

Davis, D., & Loftus, E. F. (2007). Internal and external sources of misinformation in adult witness memory. In R. C. L. Lindsay, D. F. Ross, J. D. Read, & M. P. Toglia (Eds.), *The handbook of eyewitness psychology* (Vol. 1: Memory for events, pp. 195-237). New Jersey, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Davis, R. D. (1999). Millon: Essentials of his science, theory, classification, assessment, and therapy. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 72(3), 330-352.

Eisen, M. L., Morgan, D.Y., & Mickes, L. (2002). Individual differences in eyewitness memory and suggestibility: Examining relations between acquiescence, dissociation and resistance to misleading information. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33(4), 553-572.

Fonseca, A. C. (2006). Psicologia forense: Uma breve introdução [Forensic psychology: A brief introduction]. In M. R. Simões, M. C. T. Simões, & M. S. Pinho (Eds.), *Psicologia forense* (pp. 3-23). Coimbra: Almedina.

Gignac, G. E., & Powell, M. B. (2006). A direct examination of the nonlinear (quadratic) association between intelligence and suggestibility in children. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20, 617-623.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1997). *The Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales manual*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). *The psychology of interrogations and confessions. A handbook*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

- Howie, P. M., & Dowd, H. J. (1996). Self-esteem and the perceived obligation to respond: Effects on children's testimony. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 1*(2), 197-209.
- Liebman, J. I., McKinley-Pace, M. J., Leonard, A. M., Sheesley, L. A., Gallant, C. L., Renkey, M. E., & Lehman, E. B. (2002). Cognitive and psychosocial correlates of adults' eyewitness accuracy and suggestibility. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 49-66.
- Lima, M. P. (1997). *NEO-PI-R: Contextos teóricos e psicométricos – “Ocean” ou “Iceberg”?* [NEO-PI-R: Theoretical and psychometric contexts – “Ocean” or “Iceberg”?] (Doctoral thesis, Coimbra University, Coimbra, Portugal).
- Marôco, J. (2010). *Análise estatística com o PASW Statistics (ex-SPSS)* [Statistics analysis with PASW Statistics (ex-SPSS)]. Pêro Pinheiro: ReportNumber.
- Millon, T. (2001). *Inventario de Estilos de Personalidad de Millon, manual*. Adaptación de M. P. Sánchez López, J. F. Díaz Morales, & M. E. Aparicio García. Madrid: TEA Ediciones.
- Millon, T. (2004). *Millon Index of Personality Styles-Revised, manual*. Minneapolis, MN: Pearson Assessments.
- Neuschatz, J. S., Lampinen, J. M., Togli, M. P., Payne, D. G., & Cisneros, E. P. (2007). False memory research: History, theory, and applied implications. In R. C. L.
- Nurmoja, M., & Bachmann, T. (2008). On the role of trait-related characteristics in interrogative suggestibility: An example from Estonia. *Trames, 12*(62/57),4, 371-381.
- Pires, R. (2011). *Estilos de Personalidade e vulnerabilidade à sugestão no contexto de uma relação interpessoal* [Personality styles and interrogative suggestibility] (Doctoral thesis, Lisbon University, Lisbon, Portugal).

- Pires, R., Silva, R. D., & Ferreira, A. S. (2013). Portuguese adaptation of the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales (GSS1 and GSS2): Empirical findings. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*(2), 251-255.
- Polczyk, R. (2005). Interrogative suggestibility: Cross-cultural stability of psychometric and correlational properties of the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*(1), 177-186.
- Polczyk, R., Wesolowska, B., Gabarczyk, G., Minakowska, I., Supska, M., & Bomba, E. (2004). Age differences in interrogative suggestibility: A comparison between young and older adults *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18*, 1097-1107.
- Sánchez López, M. P., & Casullo, M. M. (Eds.)(2000). *Estilos de personalidad. Una perspectiva iberoamericana*. Madrid: Miño y Dávila Editors.
- Silva, D. R. (2006). O Inventário de Estado-Traço de Ansiedade (STAI) [The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI)]. In M. M. Gonçalves, M. R. Simões, L. S. Almeida, & C. Machado (Coords.), *Avaliação psicológica: Instrumentos validados para a população* (2ª ed., Vol.1, pp. 45-60). Coimbra: Quarteto.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1983). *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, STAI (Form Y)*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Trouvé, R. J., & Libkuman, T. M. (1992). Eyewitness performance of personality types as a function of induced arousal. *The American Journal of Psychology, 105*(3), 417-433.
- Ward, R. A., & Loftus, E. F. (1985). Eyewitness performance in different psychological types. *The Journal of General Psychology, 112*(2), 191-200.
- Weiss, L. G. (2008). The Millon Index of Personality Styles Revised (MIPS Revised). In T. Millon & C. Bloom (Eds.), *The Millon inventories. A practitioner's guide to personalized clinical assessment* (2nd ed., pp. 643-670). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Wolfradt, U., & Meyer, T. (1998). Interrogative suggestibility, anxiety and dissociation

among anxious patients and normal controls. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 425-432.

Yarmey, D. A. (2006). Depoimentos de testemunhas oculares e auriculares [Eye and auricular witness testimony]. In M. R. Simões, M. C. T. Simões, & M. S. Pinho (Eds.), *Psicologia forense* (pp. 227-258). Coimbra: Almedina.

Table 1. – The MIPS-R personality styles

Motivating Styles	Thinking Styles	Behaving Styles
1A. Pleasure-Enhancing	4A. Externally Focused	8A. Asocial/Withdrawing
1B. Pain-Avoiding	4B. Internally Focused	8B. Gregarious/Outgoing
2A. Actively Modifying	5A. Realistic/Sensing	9A. Anxious/Hesitating
2B. Passively Accommodating	5B. Imaginative/Intuiting	9B. Confident/Asserting
3A. Self-Indulging	6A. Thought-Guided	10A. Unconventional/Dissenting
3B. Other-Nurturing	6B. Feeling-Guided	10B. Dutiful/Conforming
	7A. Conservation-Seeking	11A. Submissive/Yielding
	7B. Innovation-Seeking	11B. Dominant/Controlling
		12A. Dissatisfied/Complaining
		12B. Cooperative/Agreeing

Table 2. – Correspondence analysis of the GSS1 items

Items	F1
2. Did the woman have one or two children? (Yield 2)	.5812
2. Did the woman have one or two children? (Yield 1)	.4801
15. Were the assailants tall or short? (Yield 2)	.4710
6. Were the assailants black or white? (Yield 2)	.4590
6. Were the assailants black or white? (Yield 1)	.4559
15. Were the assailants tall or short? (Yield 1)	.4273
2. Did the woman have one or two children? (Shift)	.3361
10. Were the assailants convicted six weeks after their arrest? (Shift)	.2869
16. Did the woman's screams frighten the assailants? (Yield 2)	-.2716
1. Did the woman have a husband called Simon? (Shift)	-.3006
16. Did the woman's screams frighten the assailants? (Yield 1)	-.3109
4. Was the woman's name Anna Wilkinson? (Yield 1)	-.3112
14. Did one of the assailants shout at the woman? (Yield 1)	-.3193
14. Did one of the assailants shout at the woman? (Shift)	-.3634
13. Was the woman from South Croydon? (Shift)	-.3682
14. Did one of the assailants shout at the woman? (Yield 2)	-.4240
4. Was the woman's name Anna Wilkinson? (Shift)	-.4407
4. Was the woman's name Anna Wilkinson?? (Yield 2)	-.4494
Items	F2
13. Was the woman from South Croydon? (Shift)	.4295
11. Did the woman's husband support her during the police interview? (Yield 2)	.3963
12. Did the woman hit one of the assailants with her fist or handbag? (Yield 1)	.3554
4. Was the woman's name Anna Wilkinson? (Shift)	.3012

15. Were the assailants tall or short? (Yield 1)	.2912
6. Were the assailants black or white? (Yield 1)	.2659
15. Were the assailants tall or short? (Yield 2)	.2468
3. Did the woman's glasses break in the struggle? (Yield 1)	.2294
10. Were the assailants convicted six weeks after their arrest? (Shift)	-.2504
7. Was the woman taken to the central police station? (Shift)	-.2589
2. Did the woman have one or two children? (Shift)	-.3030
5. Was the woman interviewed by a detective sergeant? (Shift)	-.4268
1. Did the woman have a husband called Simon? (Shift)	-.6978

Table 3. – Correlations between the MIPS-R styles and the GSS1

	Total Suggestibility	Yield 1	Yield 2	Shift
Pleasure-Enhancing	.01	.04	.01	-.05
Pain-Avoiding	.05	.02	.04	.09
Actively Modifying	-.02	.01	.03	-.05
Passively Accommodating	.06	.06	.03	.05
Self-Indulging	-.07	-.04	-.04	-.05
Other-Nurturing	.13*	.10	.11	.09
Externally Focused	.04	.07	.02	-.01
Internally Focused	-.03	-.03	.01	-.01
Realistic/Sensing	.20**	.22**	.17**	.09
Imaginative/Intuiting	-.09	-.08	-.06	-.05
Thought-Guided	.10	.14*	.13*	.01
Feeling-Guided	.05	.01	.03	.06
Conservation-Seeking	.12	.14*	.17**	.03
Innovation-Seeking	-.12	-.12*	-.13*	-.05
Asocial/Withdrawing	-.07	-.07	-.03	-.03
Gregarious/Outgoing	.05	.07	.05	.00
Anxious/Hesitating	.05	.01	.06	.09
Confident/Asserting	.00	.01	.03	-.02
Unconventional/Dissenting	-.01	.00	-.01	-.02
Dutiful/Conforming	.23**	.25**	.26**	.11

Submissive/Yielding	.09	.06	.07	.10
Dominant/Controlling	-.01	.02	.01	-.03
Dissatisfied/Complaining	-.02	-.02	-.02	-.01
Cooperative/Agreeing	.13*	.10	.13*	.10
Positive Impression	.11	.08	.14*	.10
Negative Impression	.12	.10	.12	.10

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Table 4. – MIPS-R styles significantly affected by suggestibility (ANOVA)

MIPS-R styles	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p	π
Passively Accommodating	3.23	.041	.03	.61
Realistic/Sensing	5.96	.003	.05	.88
Imaginative/Intuiting	3.39	.035	.03	.63
Conservation-Seeking	5.89	.003	.04	.87
Innovation-Seeking	5.23	.006	.04	.83
Dutiful/Conforming	7.70	.001	.06	.95
Cooperative/Agreeing	3.46	.033	.03	.65