THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL INFLUENCE TACTICS ON INFORMATION PROVISION IN WITNESS INTERVIEWS

by

© Zak Keeping

A Thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

Department of Psychology

Memorial University of Newfoundland

May 2016

St. John's Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

The effect of social influence tactics on information provision was examined. Participants (N = 174) watched a video depicting vandalism in a convenience store, then were assigned at random to one of six interview conditions that varied by social influence tactic (i.e., consistency, reciprocity, authority, social proof, standard rapport, baseline). Participants were then asked to provide a detailed account of what they could remember about the video. Participants exposed to the social proof condition provided a greater number of accurate details than participants in any other condition (M_d = 0.93). The average effect size for accurate information provided in the consistency condition was medium (M_d = 0.57). There was no corresponding increase in incorrect or confabulated information provided. The potential utility of social proof as a tool for increasing information provision in police interviews is discussed.

Keywords: social influence; witness; investigative interviewing; rapport building; police.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank Dr. Brent Snook and Kirk Luther for their invaluable advice throughout this project. Both of your help with editing, statistics, writing, and design made this project possible. Thanks for helping me every step of the way.

I also appreciate the help of my thesis committee, Dr. Fowler and Dr. Button, and the direction they have provided.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council for providing me with funding throughout my Master's to complete this research.

More personally, I would like to thank my girlfriend, Aline, for keeping me motivated throughout this project and my four terms. Your support has meant so much to me.

I would also thank my MASP cohorts for their in-class help and motivation.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, thank you to my parents. Neither of you had the opportunity to go to University, but you worked hard to ensure all of your children would have the choice. I didn’t know what a Master's was (or even an Honour's) before coming to Memorial seven years ago, and have learned more than I could have imagined. My experiences have changed how I see the world, for the better. I will work hard to make this world a better place, as you both have.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Interviews with witnesses to criminal events are a fundamental aspect of criminal investigations (Baldwin, 1993). The ability to conduct a high-quality police interview requires extensive training for officers on how to use techniques that aid in the information retrieval from memory, but also on how to motivate witnesses to relay that information back to interviewers (Memon, Holley, Milne, Koehnken, & Bull, 1994). Interviewing techniques such as the cognitive interview (see Fisher & Geiselman, 1992) have been designed in an attempt to maximize those two goals. Considering that the goal of police interviews is to acquire as much information as possible, it is unsurprising that the quality and quantity of witness-provided information is the focus of many empirically-validated training programs (Haworth, 2006; Memon, Bull, & Smith, 1995). However, there is a dearth of literature on the use of motivational tools to nudge witnesses into providing quality information. Due to the numerous potential benefits of conducting an effective witness interview (e.g., exonerating an innocent person, uncovering previously unknown information, resolving the criminal investigation), there is a need for research on best practice interviewing.

For various reasons (e.g., not interested, scared of consequences of making a false statement, expectations are unclear), witnesses are often unwilling or unable to cooperate with interviewers' requests for information. In a police context, cooperation refers to the interviewee answering the interviewer's requests and/or following a set of instructions to the best of their ability (Gudjonsson, Sigurdsson, Bragason, Einarsson, & Valdimarsdottir, 2004). Considering cooperation is necessary for information acquisition,

it is not surprising that it has been researched heavily in a wide range of domains, including social relationships (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004), patient-doctor relations (Morris & Schulz, 1992; Roter et al., 1998), and teamwork (Carron, 2002). Evidently, there is multi-disciplinary demand for research on cooperation. However, the generalizability of existing research on social influence for motivating witnesses to criminal events is currently unknown. The goal of the current research is to examine the extent to which popular social influence techniques (Cialdini, 2007) may increase cooperation from witnesses, without a corresponding decrease in the quality of the provided information.

Social Influence

One broad process that may help interviewers gain interviewee's cooperation (e.g., providing information to a police officer) is social influence. Social influence refers to situations where somebody's behaviour, attitudes, or beliefs are changed by another person (Schultz, Khazian, & Zaleski, 2008). Social influence has been widely researched, and is often used in other domains as a means of fostering desired behaviours (Cialdini & Trost, 1998). Cialdini (2007) conducted a review of the empirical literature to identify the social influence tactics that increase cooperation reliably. He identified various strategies, four of which could be applied practically to information provision techniques in a police interview: (1) consistency; (2) reciprocity; (3) authority; (4) social proof. The effect of social influence on information provision in the context of investigative interviews, has never been examined empirically.

Consistency

Consistency refers to an individuals' motivation to remain constant in their attitudes, beliefs, actions, and commitments (Petrova, Cialdini, & Sills, 2007). Evidence that supports the concept of consistency has existed in social psychology since the 1950s (Festinger, 1957; Heider, 1958). The earliest empirical data on consistency of actions is probably Freedman and Fraser's (1966) foot-in-the-door (FITD) technique. The FITD technique is based on the classic door-to-door sales pitch, and operates under the premise that if somebody agrees to a small initial request, they will be more likely to agree to a later, bigger request. For example, in the seminal FITD research, Freedman and Fraser approached homeowners asking them to display a small sign in their lawn. The researchers then returned to the homeowners later, this time asking if they would display a much larger sign. In the control condition, homeowners were only contacted once (i.e., only to have the large sign put in their lawn). They found that owners who cooperated with an initial request to place a small sign on their lawn were more likely to cooperate with the later larger request. They interpreted their findings as being the result of the individuals wanting to remain consistent with their previous actions (i.e., cooperating).

Meta-analyses have confirmed the existence of the FITD technique (Burger, 1999; Guadagno & Cialdini, 2010; Pascual & Gueguen, 2005). In fact, since Freedman and Fraser, research on the foot-in-the-door technique has been generalized to various fields including electronic spending habits (Gueguen & Jacob, 2001) and willingness to donate organs (Carducci, Deuser, Bauer, Large, & Ramaekers, 1989). However, the FITD

technique does not work in all situations, as it has been shown to not increase cooperation of implicit attitudes (i.e., attitudes held without conscious awareness that may still impact behaviour; Gawronski, & Strack, 2004). The effects of the FITD technique may also be moderated by concurrent monetary incentives (Burger & Caldwell, 2003). For example, Burger and Caldwell had two groups sign a homelessness rights petition; in the experimental group, participants were paid one dollar for signing the petition, whereas in the control group there were no monetary incentives. The authors found that unpaid participants were more likely to later volunteer at a canned food drive than participants who were paid to sign the petition. They interpreted these findings as the result of a self-perception process, whereby petition-signers, who were not paid, internalized helping the homeless as a part of their personality. Conversely, paid petition-signers internalized the monetary incentive rather than the altruistic behaviour (e.g., "I don't care about the homeless, I just wanted the dollar"). The FITD effect has been found across cultures, although it seems to have greater success rates for fostering cooperation in individualistic cultures compared to collectivist cultures (Petrova et al., 2007). The discrepancy in success in these cultures is probably due to the greater number of individualists in individualistic cultures, a theory which is supported by the fact that within both individualistic and collectivist cultures, the participants who scored higher on tests of individualism were more likely to cooperate.

Considering the establishment of foot-in-the-door cooperation in social psychology, it is unsurprising that many theorists have attempted to explain the mechanisms behind the phenomenon. One theory to explain this cooperation is self-

prophecy theory (Spangenberg, & Greenwald, 1999). Spangenberg and Greenwald argued that simply asking somebody to predict their behaviour increases the likelihood that they will perform as per their prediction (e.g., if somebody states they will brush their teeth every night, they will be more likely to brush their teeth later that night). However, while FITD involves an initial action or request, self-prophecy relies on only a thought (i.e., the prediction). The results of the meta-analysis also supported the existence of a self-prophecy effect in non-laboratory settings (Spangenberg & Greenwald). Furthermore, the effects of consistency are even greater when the agreed upon commitment is made openly to others (Gopinath & Nyer, 2009).

Spangenberg and Greenwald (1999) reviewed the content of academic publications about a self-prophecy effect, noting that self-prophecy theory is closely related to other well-established theories such as cognitive dissonance. Dissonance refers to feelings of internal tension that emerge when people become aware of inconsistencies in their attitude and behaviour (Festinger, 1957). Cognitive Dissonance Theory would suggest that cooperation is therefore attained when people change their actions (e.g., agreeing to a small favour) to complement their attitude (e.g., not being hypocritical about the preceding action). Regardless of the theoretical underpinnings of consistency, the literature is clear that consistency has been shown to increase cooperation.

Reciprocity

The principle of reciprocity suggests that, when a favour is performed for somebody, that favour creates an implication that the recipient will attempt to return the favour (Cialdini, 2007). The first empirical examination of reciprocity was conducted by

Regan (1971), whereby he studied if participants would be more likely to cooperate with a favour (i.e., the request to purchase raffle tickets), if the favour-requester (a confederate) had recently given the participant a soft drink. Participants who were given the soft drink were more likely to purchase raffle tickets, and also more likely to purchase multiple raffle tickets, even though the cost of the soft drink itself was less than the cost of the tickets. Furthermore, Regan found that if the favour was not done by the favour-requester (i.e., participants were told the soft drink was from the experimenter rather than the favour-requester), there were no differences in cooperation, suggesting the effect of reciprocity may only be caused by those who provided the favour, rather than the favour itself.

In an extension of Regan's (1971) study, Goei, Lindsey, Boster, Skalski, & Bowman (2003) employed the raffle design, but included a reliable survey measure of obligation to reciprocate (among several other surveys). Goei et al. thought that the variable of "liking" was more important to cooperation than obligation. The liking hypothesis states that when Party A performs a favour for Party B, the favour increases how much Party B likes Party A. As a result, Party B will have an increased propensity to cooperate with later requests from Party A for favours. Goei et al. found a mediating relationship between liking somebody and performing a favour for them, but also found that obligation was not a self-reported reason for cooperation. In other words, favours lead to increased liking, which increases cooperation, but the increase is not caused by obligation. Although these findings lend support for the liking hypothesis, Goei et al.'s research was limited in its scope. Primarily, the sample included only women, who are

more likely to cooperate than males (Goei et al., 2003; Whatley, Webster, Smith, & Rhodes, 2010). Additionally, rather than follow the exact raffle procedure, the authors merely had participants agree to purchase tickets in the future, rather than actually purchase a raffle ticket. It is therefore unknown if the results are indicative of actual behaviours, or just perceived willingness. In short, evidence supports the liking hypothesis as a tool for cooperation, but must be considered with some degree of caution.

The body of empirical studies on reciprocity have grown since Regan's (1971) study, as researchers identify the boundary conditions of the phenomenon (Uehara, 1995). For instance, there is evidence that suggests reciprocation can occur even when the initial favour is very small (Berkowitz, 1972; Burger, Ehrlichman, Raymond, Ishikawa, & Sandoval, 2006). Goldstein, Griskevicius, and Cialdini (2012) employed a reciprocity-by-proxy strategy to see if favour recipients would cooperate with requests even if they had not been the immediate beneficiary of an original favour. In their field study, the authors left a sign for hotel guests urging them to conserve water by reusing their towels. In the experimental proxy condition, a nearby sign informed guests that a donation had been made in their name to an environmental protection organization, whereas in the control condition, no such sign existed. Analyses indicated there need not be a direct benefit in order to cooperate. That is, participants in the reciprocity by proxy condition were more likely to conserve water by keeping their towels than control counterparts. It is important to note that the lowest levels of cooperation were achieved in an incentive-by-proxy condition (i.e., if you conserve your towels, a donation will be made in your name). Goldstein et al.'s suggested it may be "the thought that counts" rather than the act itself.

Another factor that seems to impact the likelihood of future cooperation as a result of reciprocity is the immediacy of the favour to the request for cooperation (Burger, Horita, Kinoshita, Roberts & Vera, 1997). Burger et al. had confederates give student participants a free soft drink. In one condition, the confederates waited five minutes after giving the drink to request that the student deliver an envelope elsewhere on the campus. In the second condition, the participant left the experiment, and then was called back a week afterwards and asked the same request. The researchers found that students were less likely to cooperate with the request if there was a longer delay between the favour and the request. To control for the possibility of memory decay of the favour given, Burger et al. surveyed 63 participants on how they would react in three hypothetical scenarios where they were asked for favours from various people who had previously performed an act of kindness for them. However, the scripts varied in the length of time between the initial favour and the request (i.e., 1 week, 2 months, 1 year). The results were consistent with the hypothesis that as time passes, participants feel less pressure to cooperate, suggesting that the immediacy of the request is central to the principle of reciprocity.

Although the boundary limits of reciprocity as a tool for cooperation continue to be tested, there are still various opinions as to the exact theoretical underpinnings of reciprocity. Regan (1971) believed that Festinger's (1957) Cognitive Dissonance theory explained the effect of reciprocity. As mentioned previously, Cognitive Dissonance theory states that when people have cognitions or behaviours that are incompatible with their belief system, it causes a need to alter one's beliefs or behaviour to reduce the

resulting incompatibility. Logically, if people perceive reciprocity as a societal norm of social exchange (Fehr & Fischbacher, 2004), in order to maintain that norm (i.e., avoid dissonance relating to not paying back a favour), they will be obligated to reciprocate any favours.

A second theory called Social Exchange Theory (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005) suggests three alternative explanations for reciprocity: (1) reciprocity is required for interdependent exchanges (i.e., reciprocity is a product of mutual needs), (2) reciprocity is a product of cultural belief (i.e., a cultural consensus that reciprocity results in a fair equilibrium, and (3) reciprocity is an internalized norm which is individually oriented (i.e., there are individual differences in willingness to reciprocate.) Although the former two theories do not lend themselves well to empirical scrutiny, the aforementioned Petrova et al. (2007) suggest that there are individual differences within culture regarding norms of exchange. Theoretical mechanisms aside, reciprocity as a tool for cooperation is supported by experimental study and field research.

Authority

The social influence principle of authority has received a wealth of empirical attention (Burger, 2009). Ever since Milgram's (1974) obedience studies, it has been known that authority, or even the illusion of authority, could induce many to cooperate with requests (Blass, 1991). The studies, based on the notion of Nazi soldier obedience in the Second World War, required participants to deliver (what they believed to be) electric shocks to a confederate, at the request of an experimenter. Surprisingly, 65% of the participants were willing to electrocute the confederate at up to the highest setting (i.e.,

450 volts), even when the confederate screamed and pleaded for help. Such findings are not seemingly the product of historical context given Burger's (2009) recent replication of those findings, albeit using a lower maximum shock level than Milgram (150 volts).

Burger (2009) believed that the conformity found in his and Milgram's (1974) studies was the result of heuristics. Heuristics are simple decision-making strategies that people use given limited time and resources (Gigerenzer & Gassmaier, 2011; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Heuristics are particularly useful in novel situations, as people look to normative behaviours for information on how they should act. In the context of the shock administration, Burger (2009) argued that participants looked to the authority figure who held a calm and responsible demeanour during the shock administrations, leading participants to believe the shock administration was reasonable.

Burger (2009) and Milgram (1974) both noted the legitimacy of the authority figure as a factor that may affect willingness to cooperate. The authors argued that when seen as legitimate, authority figures are perceived to be knowledgeable and reasonable in their requests. This idea of legitimacy draws on French and Raven's (1959) bases of power. French and Raven defined power as the ability to influence others, and defined influence as the ability to create psychological change. As such, power is drawn from six bases: (1) reward power (i.e., the ability to create rewards for the influenced party), (2) coercive power (i.e., the ability to force the other to cooperate), (3) legitimate power (i.e., the right of one party to tell another party how to behave), (4) referent power (i.e., ability to create cooperation through identifying with and being admired by others), (5) expert power (i.e., the ability to use special knowledge and expertise to influence others), and

informational power (i.e., the possession of knowledge sought by others).

A wealth of empirical data supports the existence of bases of power (e.g., Rodin & Janis, 1982). For example, Parashos, Xiromeritis, Zoumbou, Stamouli & Theodotou (2000) surveyed schizophrenic patients on why they cooperated with regular medication schedules. Unsurprisingly, participants cited that requests from unknowledgeable parties (i.e., those who did not know much about schizophrenia) to cooperate with a medicine schedule were more likely to be met with non-cooperation than when experts (e.g., informed doctors, carefully written instructions) made similar requests. In fact, trusted doctors (i.e., authority figures) were the number one cited reason for cooperating with a medication schedule.

There is presently a dearth of research on power bases in policing. Perhaps the closest example is Steiner, Hester, Makarios & Travis' (2012) examination of authoritative power between parole officers and their parolees. The authors surveyed parole officers on what motivations they felt parolees had for following their parole orders, using survey questions which had previously been shown to be reliable and valid (see Stichman, 2003). Logistic Regression analyses using the different power bases as categorical variables indicated that parole officers were most likely to draw on their referent, legitimate, and expert power bases, as indicated by their positive ratings on statements corresponding with the aforementioned power bases.

Social Proof

Social proof (or social validation) is a principle of social influence that suggests that, when people are put in novel situations, they will look to how similar individuals

behave in that situation and then adjust their behaviour to match the other individual (Cialdini, 2007; MacCoun, 2012). Social proof is therefore a form of conformity wherein the influenced party imitates the actions of a similar party, if the similar party seems to know how to behave. Research on social proof generally follows a format where the researcher draws a comparison between the participant and an ideal individual. The ideal individual refers to a person, real or hypothetical, who is similar to the participant, but who has already cooperated with the researcher's request. For example, Schultz, Khazian, and Zeleski (2008) designed a field study where hotel guests arriving at a check-in desk were shown signs that stated other guests staying at the hotel had expressed an interest in conserving water resources. The comparison of the participant to the ideal individual, or some reference point, provides participants with clarity on how to meet the expectations in question. Social proof is a robust phenomenon that has been demonstrated to exist across individuals (Burger, Messian, Patel, del Prado, & Anderson, 2004), groups (Postmes, Haslam & Swaab, 2005), and cultures (Cialdini, Wosinska, Barrett, & Gornik-Durose, 1999). Social proof has also been demonstrated in a variety of contexts including likelihood to conserve natural resources (Schultz, Khazian, & Zaleski, 2008), laugh with others (Platow et al., 2005) and even donate organs (Anker & Feeley, 2011).

A variety of theories have been proposed to explain how social proof functions, ranging from self-evaluation to the need for affiliation (Vogel, Rose, Roberts, & Eckles, 2014). For example, Festinger (1954) posited a Social Comparison Theory (SCT), wherein individuals evaluate themselves by comparing themselves with other people. This comparison occurs when no objective means of evaluation are readily available (e.g.,

competition, percentile ranking). Self-evaluation creates a competition where the self-evaluator compares themselves relative to other parties. SCT has been demonstrated both in situations where the comparative party is superior to the evaluator in some attribute (e.g., evaluation of own personality) and when the comparative party is inferior in an attribute (Tsai, Yang, & Cheng, 2014).

Burger, Messian, Patel, Prado, and Anderson (2004) showed the social comparison effect is even greater when the comparative party is similar to the participant in some way (e.g., age, appearance, ability). The authors had a confederate ask a participant to read an eight-page essay and give them feedback. In the experimental condition, the confederate mentioned that they and the participant shared the same birthday. Despite the arbitrary nature of the shared information, participants in the shared information condition were more likely to cooperate with the confederate's request to read the essay. In terms of information provision, McGuire, London, and Wright (2011) showed that similar co-witnesses to an event can lead to changes in the quality of provided information. The authors had participants watch a video of a robbery, and then answer questions about the content of the video publically (i.e., with a co-witness present) and privately (i.e., on their own). The authors found that when recollecting, adolescents adapt peer-provided information into their witness accounts, regardless of the veracity of the information.

Although the arguments for social comparison theory as an explanation for social proof effects are convincing, they do not rule out the possibility of conformity (in the absence of social proof) as an explaining factor. Conformity refers to a societal norm

where individuals act in accordance with how they believe the majority of individuals would act in a given situation (Milgram 1974). Social proof is considered a form of conformity, with the distinguishing feature being a comparison to similar individuals rather than to a perceived majority norm (i.e., how most people behave)(Cialdini et al., 1999). As mentioned above, Milgram found conformity occurred most often in novel situations, as individuals cannot model their behaviour on their previous actions. It logically follows that a police interview, which may be a witnesses' first interaction with the police, could be seen as a novel situation, and a witness will be more likely to imagine how others behave in similar circumstances. For instance, Bartsch and Cheurprakobkit (2004) found less than half of survey respondents had interacted with the police (in any capacity) in the two years previous. Nevertheless, regardless of the hypothetical mechanisms behind social proof, there is strong empirical support for its use as a cooperation-gaining tool.

Social Influence: Ethical Applications in Police Interviewing

While it is evident that research on cooperation through social influence is promising, there is a shortage of research on cooperation and social influence as they pertain to information provision in police interviewing techniques. Consequently, it is important that any social influence techniques are designed only with the purpose to achieve the goals of ethical interviewing (e.g., information provision, information accuracy) rather than the goals of unethical interviewing (e.g., obtaining confessions, implicating non-suspects). Moreover, it must be evident that any gains in information provision are additive to the gains provided through current best-practice interviewing.

For this research project, we were primarily concerned with the amount of overall talking time (i.e., how long in duration a witness spoke), the amount of accurate information provided (i.e., the number of accurate details a witness provided), the amount of inaccurate information provided (e.g., the witness mentioned a black cat was present when a white cat was present), the amount of confabulated information provided (e.g., the witness mentioned a gun was present when no gun was present), and overall error rate (i.e., the total number of inaccurate and confabulated details recalled as a function of the total information provided).

Method

Design

A six-group between-participant design was used. In addition to a control group (standard rapport) and a baseline group, the experimental conditions included: reciprocity, consistency, social proof, and authority. Participants were assigned at random to the six treatment groups. The dependent variables were the amount of: (a) talking time, (b) accurate information provided, (c) incorrect information provided, (d) confabulations (i.e., memories that were fabricated), and (e) error rate of provided information.

Scripts

Six different scripts were created for the current study (four experimental scripts, one standard rapport script, and one baseline script). Copies of the scripts used are contained in Appendix A. Each script ended with the same open-ended question, “tell me

in as much detail as possible everything you can remember about the events you witnessed on video a few moments ago".

Baseline Script. The baseline script only asked the open-ended question "tell me in as much detail as possible everything you can remember about the events you witnessed on video a few moments ago."

Standard Rapport. The standard rapport script contained the same rapport-building preamble contained in the four experimental condition scripts. For example, the rapport building transcript involved addressing the interviewee by their preferred name, explaining the purpose of the interview, promising not to interrupt the interviewee, explaining that the interviewer would be taking notes, and asking the interviewee if they have enough time to partake in the interview.

Reciprocity. Reciprocity is most commonly instantiated as an independent variable in the form of giving a participant food and/or a beverage (Goie et al., 2003; Regan, 1971). Furthermore, Goldstein et al. (2012) suggest that even when participants do not particularly want the good provided in the reciprocal exchange (e.g., not hungry, don't like the good) they may still cooperate with later requests. It may also be important to note that real-life police interviews can last for hours, which provides ample opportunities and ethical necessity for providing a witness with food and water. In the reciprocity condition, participants were given a bottle of water and a candy (as well as access to as many additional candies as they wanted). Reciprocity has not previously been examined in a police interviewing context in terms of information provision.

Consistency. Although consistency has not been examined in a police setting in terms of information provision, Gueguen and Jacob (2001) showed that FITD technique can elicit cooperative behaviours by having participants sign a petition. The researchers found that when participants signed their name to a petition, they were more likely to donate to the petition's cause when solicited at a later time. Such a manipulation could lend itself to a police interview in the form of a contract rather than a petition. In the consistency condition, participants were asked to sign a contract which promised that the participant would "work as hard as they could" to provide accurate details about the event they witnessed. No participants refused to sign their promise to work hard agreement.

Social Proof. Social Proof has yet to be used experimentally as a tool for cooperation in interviews, in an information provision context. Perhaps the closest experimental use was in the Leal, Vrij, Warmelink, Vernham and Fisher (2015) insurance claim study. The authors had two groups; people who submitted legitimate insurance claims or participants asked to lie about insurance claims. They then gave the participants an idea of how much detail they wanted in their account, by playing a descriptive, 734 word audiotape as a reference for how much information they wanted during a later interview. Participants provided with a model statement provided more details than participants who did not listen to such a recording. It may be worth noting however, the authors used a descriptive audiotape about motor races, which may have primed the participants with the types of details to provide (e.g., car parts, driving habits).

Social proof has also been used as a cooperation garnering tool by Cialdini et al. (1999). The researchers included a "virtue description" manipulation, after they noted that

showing participants' their peers' cooperation history was a more effective tool than showing the participant their own cooperation history. Burger et al. (2004) noted that feeling similar to somebody (e.g., a friend) can amplify the impact of social proof. Evidently, a manipulation which considers both the explanation of the contents of a good statement, as well as a comparison to a similar other, could incorporate elements of social proof into a police setting.

In the social proof condition for the current study, we employed an adapted version of Leal et al.'s methods by having the interviewer show the participant a two-page transcription (albeit fake) of a previous interview, while also describing the virtues of the previous interviewee who had provided the account. In order to control for the shortcomings of the Leal et al. procedure (i.e., providing participants with information that related to the crime), the transcript participants were only shown the transcript for a few seconds (i.e., the researcher held up a piece of paper and turned it to show that both sides contained information). More specifically, participants were shown the transcript at a distance where it could not be read (i.e., nine point font from a distance of approximately six feet). Furthermore, the transcript participants were shown contained no information about the video itself; the text on the document was taken from a random Wikipedia article, and formatted to look like a transcript. To influence feelings of similarity to the "fake participant", statements describing the similarity of the participant to the fictional peer (e.g., both were students, both received interviews) were discussed as well.

Authority. Authority has also not been examined as a social influence tool in investigative interviews. However, French and Raven's (1959) power bases may easily be applied to a police interview, when stressing legitimate, expert power, and referent power. Legitimate power in police officers seems to be linked to the novelty of police interviews; somebody who is being interviewed may not know how to interact, but in most cases officers are presumed to have conducted interviews before. Similarly, expert power could be drawn from the collection of evidence prior to the interview as well as training in interview style (Zhao & Ren, 2015), suggesting the manipulation ought to involve discussion of the interviewer's training. Referent power may be imposed by stressing the moral goodness and amiability of one's features (French & Raven). Thus, by explaining the moral purposes of the interview, the interviewer may be able to establish referent power.

Supporting evidence exists for police power bases; for instance, studies have repeatedly shown that the public generally holds a positive view of police officers (Antrobus, Bradford, Murphy, & Sargeant, 2015), believing them to be courteous, respectful, honest, and hard-working (Zhao & Ren, 2015) among other favourable traits (e.g., possessing referent power). Evidently, these power bases may form strong theoretical support for the use of authority as an information-gathering tool.

The heuristic hypothesis also fits the situational attribute of a police interview. Most people do not often interact with police as witnesses, and that novelty may create a situation where cooperation with an authority figure becomes the norm. Considering the interviewee may not know how to behave in such a circumstance, the presence of a police

interviewer who seems experienced and gives directions creates the potential for cooperation.

In this experiment, the authority condition was instantiated by having the interviewer describe the virtues and relevance of the used model of interviewing, while also showing the participant a certificate of the interviewer's proficiency in this interview style.

Participants

Participants were undergraduate university students (N = 174) enrolled in psychology courses at Memorial University of Newfoundland. Participants were recruited via two methods, and both recruitment streams were randomly assigned to conditions. In the first recruitment stream, participants signed-up via an online system where participants could choose from a number of different psychology studies from various fields. Participants in the other recruitment stream were students in an undergraduate psychology course (Psychology 2150) who were instructed by the course instructor to e-mail the interviewer with an appropriate timeslot.

The mean age of participants was 21.31 years (SD = 3.89), the mean attitude towards police (on a 5-point scale; *1= very negative 5=very positive*) was 4.05 (Range = 3.86 to 4.24; SD = 0.82), and 139 participants (79.88%) were women. Only 2 individuals reported having seen the film clip used in the study before; the inclusion of these two participants did not impact the significance testing of the results. Of the 174 participants, 46 indicated their major was psychology (26.44%) and 22 indicated their major was behavioural neuroscience (12.64%), with a variety of other disciplines comprising the rest

of the sample (<10% each). Students received an incentive of one bonus point on their final course grade for participating in the study. Chi-square tests revealed no differences among the groups in terms of gender or program of study (ps > 0.05). A one-way ANOVA revealed no significant differences between the groups in terms of mean attitude towards the police $F(5, 168) = 0.835$, $p = 0.526$.

The data collection protocol for this experiment was vetted and approved by Memorial University's research ethics board (The Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research).

Materials

The materials used in the experiment included a standard informed consent form, six experimental scripts, a pen and paper distractor task (Appendix B), a demographics form (Appendix C), a manipulation check (Appendix D), a video clip, bottled water, candy bars, a fake police interviewing certificate (Appendix E), a fake pilot testing transcript (Appendix F), contracts to promise to work hard (Appendix G), video cameras, and a television screen. The video (available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a2YRMixW9u8) was a 4:48 minute clip from the film *Falling Down*, which depicted a robbery at a convenience store. The distractor task contained questions that required the participant to think about non-crime-related activities (e.g., name five animals that have the letter "e" in their name). The demographics form asked questions about participants' age, gender, program of study, and attitude towards police officers. The manipulation check involved four questions. Each of the four questions pertained to one of the experimental conditions (e.g., "…the

interviewer showed me a certificate…") and the interviewer instructed all participants that it was possible that any combination (i.e., all, none, some, just one) of the conditions could have occurred. The television screen and camera positioning were held constant throughout the experiment. The details of the scripts are discussed below.

Procedure

The study was conducted between 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM in the Psychology and Law Laboratory at Memorial University of Newfoundland during the Fall semester of the 2014 and 2015 school years, and the Winter semester of the 2014 school year. The Psychology and Law Laboratory contains two graduate student offices, two conference rooms, and an office with cubicles used for undergraduate students. The interviews were conducted in the first conference room as participants entered the laboratory. The conference room contained a boardroom table surrounded by chairs, which faced a large television screen. The walls in the conference room are composed of floor to ceiling bookshelves, and one large whiteboard that was left blank when participants partook in the experiment.

After participants had been greeted at the door to the laboratory, the participants were given an informed consent form. Once participants read and signed the informed consent form, they were instructed by the primary researcher that they would be watching a video clip that was approximately five minutes long, and that they were to "imagine themselves as a witness to the events occurring therein". The primary researcher then left the room so that the participant could watch the video clip without distraction. Participants were instructed not to pause or stop the video, and that they may only watch

the clip once. The volume of the video, the lighting in the experimental room, and the positioning of the participant were kept constant. When the participant finished watching the video clip, the interviewer returned to the room and gave the participant a distractor task. The distractor task included several questions that did not pertain to the content of the video the participant had previously watched (e.g., things one could find at the beach, animals with a letter "u" in their name)

Participants were instructed to finish as much of the distractor task as they could in five minutes, after which they would partake in an interview with the primary researcher. None of the participants finished the task within the allotted five minutes. Each interview was audio and video recorded. Once five minutes had passed, the interviewer entered the room and read the appropriate script for the participant's condition.

Once the participant had finished giving their account, they were asked "what else can you remember?" Once they had finished any additional remarks, the interviewer informed them that the interview was over, and they were going to shut off the video recording devices. When the interviewer turned the recorder off, the interviewer gave the participants a demographics form and a manipulation check (Appendix D). When the participant finished filling out the forms, they were debriefed on the purpose of the experiment, and any condition they took part in.

Statistical Analyses

Effect sizes were interpreted using Cohen's (1988) guidelines for small ($d = 0.20$), medium ($d = 0.50$) and large ($d = 0.80$) effects.

Inter-Rater Reliability of Provided Information

Each unique piece of information given by participants throughout the interviews was compiled to create a coding guide. In total, 244 correct details (Appendix H), 104 incorrect details (Appendix I), and 53 confabulated details (Appendix J) were identified. Incorrect details refer to details that truly happened in the video, but were reported inaccurately (e.g., if the participant stated the employee was wearing a white shirt, but he was actually wearing a purple shirt), whereas confabulated details refer to details that were fabricated (e.g., if the participant stated the attacker brought a gun, but the attacker did not actually bring a weapon). The details within the coding guides were scored dichotomously (i.e., present or absent). The first author, blind to each condition, coded each transcript for the presence of each of the 401 total identified pieces of information. Blindness was ensured by having a separate researcher remove identifying information from transcripts and randomizing the transcript numbers. The first author then sent the results of the coding back to the separate researcher, who kept a codebook detailing which transcript belonged to which randomized code. Furthermore, to ensure the reliability between coders, a second coder also blind to the conditions coded a random sample of 21 transcripts using the three coding guides. The mean Kappa value for correct details was 0.80 (*SD* = 0.05), suggesting substantial agreement (Sim & Wright, 2005). In terms of incorrect details, 13 of the 21 transcripts coded were found to be in perfect agreement, however this was the result of no incorrect details being mentioned in either transcript. Of the transcripts that included at least one incorrect detail, the mean kappa value was 0.45 (*SD* = 0.24), suggesting moderate agreement. Similar to how few incorrect

details were mentioned, 16 of the 21 transcripts coded for confabulations were found to be in perfect agreement (Sim & Wright). Of the transcripts that were not in agreement, the mean kappa value was 0.60 (*SD* = 0.55), suggesting substantial agreement (Sim & Wright).

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Each of the four social influence tactics will result in an increase in the amount of time that a witness spends talking.

Hypothesis 2: Each of the four social influence tactics will result in an increase in accurate information provided.

Hypothesis 3: Each of the four social influence tactics will result in a decrease in inaccurate information provided.

Hypothesis 4: Each of the four social influence tactics will result in a decrease in confabulated information provided.

Hypothesis 5: Each of the four social influence tactics will result in a decrease in error rate of provided information.

Results

Manipulation Check

Saliency of manipulations was checked using four questions about the manipulations in five point Likert format (*1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree*). One-way ANOVAs revealed significant effects of each condition for each condition's

respective manipulation, but for no other conditions (All *ps* < 0.001). Manipulation strength ranged from an average of 4.45 to an average of 4.97, where social proof was the least salient manipulation. The range of manipulation strength in non-manipulation treatments (i.e., baseline and control conditions) was 1.17-1.83.

Talking Time

The total amount of talking time was calculated in seconds for each participant. This variable was measured by using time stamps from the video recordings that began when the participant first started speaking and ended when the participant finished speaking. As this analysis was only used to justify proceeding analyses (e.g., differences in number of details provided) factors such as rate of speech were not considered. On average, participants spoke for 8.17 minutes (*SD* = 4.23). Talking time ranged between 11 seconds and 36.18 minutes, with 171 participants (98.28%) speaking for at least two minutes, and 138 (79.31%) speaking for at least five minutes. Only eight participants (4.60%) talked for longer than fifteen minutes. The mean talking times for each condition are shown in Table 1 (reported in seconds). Mean *d* values are reported in table 2.

A one-way ANOVA revealed there was a significant main effect of social influence on talking time, $F(5,168) = 4.34$, $p < 0.001$. Follow-up tests revealed medium to large effects of social proof relative to all other conditions (i.e., participants in the social proof condition spoke on average, longer than participants in both the control and baseline conditions, as well as all of the experimental conditions) ($M_d = 0.72$, *range* = 0.55 to 0.83). In addition, there were small to medium effects of consistency when

compared against all other conditions (i.e., the control, baseline, social proof, authority, and reciprocity conditions) (M_d = 0.36, *range = 0*.23 to 0.48).

Correct Information

On average, participants identified 57.32 (*SD* = 20.75) accurate details about the video. Recalled information ranged between 7 details and 119 details. One hundred and sixty-nine (97.13%) participants were able to recall at least 20 unique details of the incident. The mean details recalled and standard deviations for each condition are shown in Table 3.

A one-way ANOVA revealed a significant effect of social influence techniques on the amount of correct information provided, $F(5,168) = 6.17$, $p < 0.001$. Follow-up tests revealed the differences existed between the social proof condition and the reciprocation, authority, standard rapport, and baseline conditions (M_d = 0.93, *range* = 0.43 to 1.12), where participants in the social proof condition provided more correct details on average than the comparison groups. Although not statistically significant, the difference between the consistency condition and the standard rapport condition resulted in an effect size, *d* =0.63, suggesting a medium effect. Mean *d* values are reported in Table 4.

Incorrect Information

The total number of incorrect details provided were summed after coding. On average, participants identified 1.71 (*SD* = 1.70) incorrect details in their accounts. Incorrect information ranged between 0 details and 9 details. The mean incorrect details recalled for each condition are shown in Table 3. Considering the data did not fit a normal distribution (i.e., floor effects of incorrect information) a Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used.

The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was no statistically significant difference in incorrect information provided among the social influence conditions, $\chi^2(5) = 5.34$, $p = 0.376$. Nevertheless, effect sizes ($M_d = 0.21$., *range* = 0 to 0.52) are presented in Table 5.

Confabulated Information

The total number of confabulated details provided were summed after coding. On average, participants confabulated 0.47 details (*SD* = 0.82). Confabulated details ranged from 0 to 5 details. Mean confabulated details recalled are presented in Table 3. Considering the data did not fit a normal distribution (i.e., floor effects of confabulated information) a Kruskal-Wallis H Test was used. The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was no statistically significant difference in confabulated information provided among the social influence conditions, $\chi^2(5) = 0.509$, $p = 0.992$. Nevertheless, effect sizes ($M_d = 0.13$, *range* = 0 to 0.28) are presented in table 6.

Error Rate

An error rate for recalled information was calculated with a numerator of the sum of incorrect and confabulated details, and a denominator of total provided details (i.e., correct, incorrect, confabulated details), then converted to a percentage. Error rates ranged between 0 and 36.84. Error rates by condition are presented in Table 3. Considering the data did not fit a normal distribution (i.e., floor effects of error rate) a Kruskal-Wallis

H Test was used. The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was no statistically significant difference in incorrect information provided between the social influence

conditions, $\chi^2(5) = 8.18$, $p = 0.147$. Nevertheless, effect sizes ($M_d = 0.31$, *range* = 0.04 to 0.66) are presented in table 7.

Discussion

The goal of the current research was to test the hypothesis that social influence techniques would increase the amount of correct information provided by witnesses in the context of a police interview, without a corresponding increase in incorrect or confabulated details. The study found that witnesses who were shown and told how previous ideal interviews had unfolded (i.e., social proof condition) talked for longer periods of time and provided more accurate details. The observed increase in provided information occurred without a corresponding increase in inaccurate or confabulated information. The current study lends support to literature suggesting social proof can be used as a tool for cooperation (e.g., Cialdini 2007). It is also important to note that while the consistency condition was not statistically distinct from the other groups, the effect of the consistency condition (when compared to all other groups) had a medium-sized effect on information provision.

As previously mentioned, the principle of social proof suggests that when put in a novel situation (e.g., police interview), people look to similar others to learn how they ought to behave. This experiment involved a novel situation, paired with a manipulation that suggested similar others (i.e., an ideal previous participant) had worked diligently to provide as much accurate information as possible. The large effect size suggests that providing witnesses with such information can significantly increase the accurate information a witness provides, without a corresponding increase in either incorrect

information or confabulated information. Such a finding lends support to social comparison theory (i.e., comparing one's own behaviour to others) and conformity theory (i.e., behaving how one believes others have behaved in similar circumstances). Although all of the transcripts involved encouraging the interviewee to provide as many details as possible, and report everything they remembered, the social proof condition was the only condition which explicitly described how much detail to provide (e.g., "fifteen minutes talking time", showing a mock two page transcription).

Additionally, the findings of this experiment demonstrated a medium effect size of consistency on provided information, also without a corresponding increase in inaccurate and confabulated information. Such a finding is unsurprising in light of the principle of consistency and fulfilling self-prophecy; that is, when people promise they will do something, they feel social pressure to fulfill what they have promised. As in studies involving the FITD phenomenon, this study involved a small original favour (i.e., promising to work hard to remember accurate information), followed by a larger favour (i.e., providing a detailed account of a witnessed event). Alternatively, these findings may be explained by cognitive dissonance theory. Cognitive dissonance theory suggests that promising to work hard (e.g., signing a written contract and then not working hard) would create dissonance. Proponents of cognitive dissonance theory would argue that, to avoid this created dissonance, participants had to work hard to provide quality information.

There are various reasons as to why the reciprocation and authority conditions did not result in higher levels of provided information than the control and baseline conditions. In terms of reciprocation, it is possible that the participants felt that they were

already doing the interviewer a favour by showing up for the interview itself. Furthermore, they were already receiving an incentive of a bonus point, which may have led to effects of reciprocity across all conditions. In terms of authority, it is possible that the participants did not believe that the interviewer's credentials were real; anecdotally, several participants mentioned they did not believe the certificate was valid. Unfortunately, no measurements about participants' thoughts on existing reciprocal relationships with the interviewer or on the validity of the certificate were taken.

There are at least four potential limitations to the current study that require discussion. First, the primary author conducted all of the interviews, and was therefore not blind to the condition of the participants during the interviews. It is therefore possible that the interviewer somehow influenced participants in the social influence conditions to provide more information than in the standard rapport and baseline conditions. However, this explanation seems unlikely considering there were no differences found between either the standard rapport or baseline conditions, compared to any of the other experimental conditions (i.e., consistency, authority, reciprocation) and there was no pre-determined reason to believe social proof would work any better than any of the other conditions. It is also important to note that all of the transcripts were coded with both the experimenter and the second coder blind to the participant's condition.

A second limitation concerns the manipulations conducted in the study. Although participants were able to correctly identify which condition they took part in and which conditions they did not take part in, (i.e., manipulation saliency), we did not measure the strength of each manipulation. Strength of manipulations could have been conducted if

we had employed a factorial design, but such an endeavour was beyond the scope of this project. In an effort to maintain consistency with the literature, the reciprocity, consistency, and social proof conditions all used adaptations of manipulations that have been shown previously to be successful manipulations. However, the authority condition used a novel approach, which was supported by the aforementioned French and Raven's (1959) bases of power. Anecdotally, several participants in the reciprocity condition mentioned that they did not want to eat the provided candy for a variety of reasons (e.g., not hungry, too early in the morning). Future manipulations could be made stronger by obtaining an idea of whether the participant actually wanted the reciprocated good, or identifying something that would lead to increased compliance.

A third potential limitation is that I did not ask participants on the demographics form if they had ever been in a police interview before. It is therefore unknown whether more participants in the social proof condition, for example, had taken part in police interviews before, and therefore knew the interview process and the level of detail required. However, random assignment should minimize this concern.

A fourth limitation is the possibility of floor effects for incorrect and confabulated information provided. As previously mentioned, on average there was only 1.71 incorrect details provided, and just .43 confabulated details provided. It is therefore a possibility that the information in the video was easy to remember due to the simplicity of the video, the small five minute delay, or the ease of the distractor task. The simplicity of the video may be ruled out as a cause of floor effects considering that even the participant that did the best remembered less than half (48.8%) of all of the details included in the guide. It is

also important to note that participants were explicitly instructed not to provide information that was inaccurate, which may have led to the small numbers of incorrect and confabulated information provided. Although we cannot rule out the ease of the distractor task, anecdotally, none of the participants were able to complete the entire distractor task in the allotted five minutes.

This study lays the framework for future studies on social proof as an information provision tool. Such findings could be extended with future research which concerns the external validity of these results. As with any experimental design, the controlled settings of the laboratory are different than the conditions of actual practice (e.g., police officers present, interview room). The controls were put in place in order to standardize the presentation of the witnessed event and to standardize the interview itself. However, the findings of this study could be incorporated into witness interview procedures such that a field-level analysis of social influence in real practice may be conducted. As such, it would be premature to suggest that witnesses of real-life crimes would provide more details given social proof manipulations in actual practice, but this study does lend support to such an endeavour. Conceptual replications of this study could also help test the boundary limits of the findings. One conceptual replication could be the use of real witnesses to real-time events. By using real witnesses, the phenomenon of social proof could be expanded outside of the direct attention afforded to the video medium used in the current study.

A second replication could be a field study where social proof is embedded in some police interview preambles in comparison with control others. A third replication

could be a factorial design which would show the additive effect of specific aspects of the techniques. For example, the social proof condition could be parsed into just showing the participant the pilot tested interview transcript (level one), or just comparing the participant to the ideal previous participant (level two). Such a design could also be helpful in determining whether social proof is driven by social comparison theory (i.e., similarities fostering cooperation) (level one) or conformity (i.e., societal norms fostering cooperation) (level two). For instance, a future study could involve having participants cooperate on a task with a confederate who admits to being knowledgeable on the task (i.e., social proof) or a confederate who admits they haven't done this task before (i.e. conformity).

It would also be important to see whether these tactics are drawing on some of the same principles of other interviewing methods. For instance, meta-analysis of the cognitive interview has shown large effect sizes of cognitive interviewing techniques on information provision (Köhnken, Milne, Memon, & Bull, 1999). It would be beneficial for future research to consider the potential additive effects of using social proof within the framework of a cognitive interview. It may also be important to note that the cognitive interview has been shown to increase the amount of incorrect information provided, while social proof showed no corresponding increase in inaccurate information.

For many people, witness interviews are novel situations. By explaining the interview process, and creating a fictional (or real) analogue suggesting how somebody ought to act can increase understanding of the interview process, and potentially improve the quality and quantity of provided information. If this study were replicated in a field-

study using actual police or real witnesses, it would support the introduction of social influence as an investigative tool.

Table 1. The Mean (and Standard Deviation) Talking Time, in Seconds

Condition	Talking Time
Social Proof	668.59 (364.28)
Consistency	511.97 (176.91)
Reciprocation	437.79 (181.18)
Authority	463.52 (232.15)
Standard Rapport	451.21 (201.00)
Baseline	408.10 (249.08)
Total	490.20 (254.04)

Table 2. Absolute Values of Cohen's D Values for Differences Between Conditions on Talking Time

Condition	Reciprocation	Consistency	Social Proof	Authority	Standard rapport	Baseline
Reciprocation						
Consistency	0.41					
Social Proof	0.80	0.55				
Authority	0.12	0.23	0.67			
Standard Rapport	0.07	0.32	0.74	0.06		
Baseline	0.14	0.48	0.83	0.23	0.19	

Table 3. The Mean (And Standard Deviation) Number of Correct, Incorrect, and Confabulated Details, and Error Rates by Condition

Condition	Correct Details	Incorrect Details	Confabulated Details	Error Rate
Social Proof	72.45 (20.13)	1.76 (1.57)	0.41 (0.63)	2.81 (2.27)
Consistency	63.69 (20.22)	1.59 (1.66)	0.34 (0.55)	2.90 (2.07)
Reciprocation	52.69 (18.26)	1.24 (1.46)	0.52 (0.99)	3.44 (4.29)
Authority	52.59 (19.34)	1.72 (1.94)	0.55 (1.09)	5.25 (8.39)
Standard Rapport	52.52 (15.16)	1.76 (1.27)	0.55 (0.87)	3.99 (2.80)
Baseline	49.97 (22.48)	2.21 (2.16)	0.41 (0.73)	4.67 (3.27)
Average	57.32 (20.75)	1.71 (1.70)	0.47 (.82)	3.84 (4.44)

Table 4. Absolute Values of Cohen's D values for Differences Between Conditions on Accurate Information Provided

Condition	Reciprocation	Consistency	Social Proof	Authority	Standard rapport	Baseline
Reciprocation						
Consistency	0.57					
Social Proof	1.03	0.43				
Authority	0.01	0.56	1.01			
Standard Rapport	0.01	0.63	1.12	0		
Baseline	0.13	0.64	1.05	0.12	0.13	

Table 5. Absolute Values of Cohen's D values between Conditions on Inaccurate Information Provided

Condition	Reciprocation	Consistency	Social Proof	Authority	Standard rapport	Baseline
Reciprocation						
Consistency	0.22					
Social Proof	0.34	0.11				
Authority	0.28	0.08	0.02			
Standard Rapport	0.38	0.12	0	0.02		
Baseline	0.52	0.32	0.23	0.23	0.25	

Table 6. Absolute Values of Cohen's D values between Conditions on Confabulated Information Provided

Condition	Reciprocation	Consistency	Social Proof	Authority	Standard rapport	Baseline
Reciprocation						
Consistency	0.22					
Social Proof	0.13	0.12				
Authority	0.03	0.24	0.16			
Standard Rapport	0.04	0.28	0.18	0		
Baseline	0.12	0.11	0	0.15	0.17	

Table 7. Absolute Values of Cohen's D values between Conditions on Error Rates

Condition	Reciprocation	Consistency	Social Proof	Authority	Standard rapport	Baseline
Reciprocation						
Consistency	0.16					
Social Proof	0.18	0.04				
Authority	0.27	0.38	0.40			
Standard rapport	0.15	0.44	0.47	0.20		
Baseline	0.32	0.65	0.66	0.09	0.22	

Appendix A

Example Script:

Let's start your interview today with an introduction. [Handshake] My name is and I'll be conducting your interview today. For the purpose of this interview, please call me ___. I have your name as _____. What do you prefer to be called?
For the record, I'm just going to state the date, it's _____, 201_ and we are in room 2057 of the Science Building at Memorial University.

I am not sure if you have participated in experiments before, but I just wanted to check and see if you have any questions or concerns before we begin. Alright then, is there anything you need to do before we get started, like go to the bathroom or something? And just to make sure, do you have enough time to continue with the experiment right now? Alright then. I've turned off my cellphone, and just to make sure we're not interrupted, would you please turn off yours if you have it with you? Or put it on silent.

Now [preferred name], I just want to go over some housekeeping issues and tell you some of my expectations for the interview today.
[THIS IS WHERE THE SOCIAL INFLUENCE TACTIC WAS EMBEDDED WITHIN ALL OF THE TRANSCRIPTS—SEE BELOW FOR EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS]

As you know, this interview is being audio and video taped; this is so that I can review the interview later. Also, you may see me taking some notes today – please don't be distracted by that. I'm just taking notes so I don't miss anything you're saying.

I'd like to ask you not to rush with your answers – I'll be pausing a lot to let you think. And because we will need to transcribe those videos and also just for common courtesy, we're going to do our best to not interrupt each other. So when you're talking I'm not going to interrupt you and I hope you can do the same for me. Also, if I ask you to repeat something, it's not because I think you're lying, I just want to make sure I am as thorough as possible to get all the facts straight.

If throughout the interview you have any questions at all, please don't hesitate to ask me.

If I say some something that you don't understand, let me know so I can clarify what I said for you. If you don't know the answer to something, it is OK to just say you don't know. I am just trying to get as much accurate information as possible. Saying that, I would appreciate it if you don't leave any information out or guess at anything you're not sure of.

Now that I'm done explaining what this interview is all about I'm going to turn it over to you. What I would like you to do is think about everything you witnessed on video; all of the people, the environment, the actions, everything. Now, I would like you to tell me, in as much detail as possible, everything that you can remember about the video you watched a moment ago.

[After the participant has finished speaking]

What else do you remember?

[After the participant has finished speaking]

Thanks. I just have to turn the cameras off, I'll be right back.

Experimental Manipulations

Social Proof:

Before we begin, I'd like to quickly talk about how the best interviews normally go so that you can understand what I'm hoping to achieve today. In ideal interviews, students try really hard to provide as much accurate information as they can. They are able to remember almost every detail, no matter how insignificant it could be to the investigation. They never guess at anything they're not sure of—instead they just let me know that they don't know. They speak slowly and clearly, and think about everything carefully before they say it. For anonymity purposes I've taken all identifying information from these transcribed statements, but you can really tell that these participants give a lot of information [**SHOW PARTICIPANT TRANSCRIBED ACCOUNT OF STORY**]. The best participants have taken as long as fifteen minutes of describing the event in order to make sure they haven't missed a thing. I hope that talking about those interviews will help you understand what I'm hoping today's interview will go like.

Consistency:

Before we begin, I'd like to go over a couple more things. You have come here today to speak with me about an event that you have witnessed. What I'd like you to do, is try your hardest to provide as much accurate information as possible. If you would, I'd like you to sign this "**Promise to work hard agreement**". All I ask is that you sign your name to this form which says that you will work as hard as you can to provide as much accurate information as possible.

[Ask for a verbal promise if they say no]

Thanks, I really appreciate that.

Reciprocation:

Before we begin, I'm just going to step out for a second.

[Leave Room Momentarily]

While I was out I picked up a bottle of water, and I thought that you would like one too.

[give them a bottle of water]

Help yourself to some candy as well.

[give them candy]

Authority:

Before we begin, I'd just like to discuss the interview technique I'll be using today. The model was developed in the United Kingdom in the 1990s, and brought to Canada by my professor in 2008. The model is the gold standard of interviewing worldwide. The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary is the first organization to implement this scientifically-based model in North America. As you can see,

[MOTIONS TO CERTIFICATE OF TRAINING ON WALL]

for the past few years, I have been co-training police officers on how to use this model. So if there's a homicide or some other violent crime that occurs in the city, they would employ the exact same model that I'm going to use with you today.

Appendix B

1) What are five animals with the letter “u” in their name?

2) What are six items you could find in a toolbox?

3) 6 + (8 x 4) = ____ + 11

4) What are eight different majors at Memorial University?

5) Name the provinces of Canada in alphabetical order.

6) 54 – (6 x 3) = 23 + ___

7) Name six types of trees?

8) What are twelve things you would expect to see at the beach?

9) What is the twentieth letter of the alphabet?

10) Name six genres of music

Appendix C

Demographic Information

1) What is your age? _____

2) What is your gender? _____

3) Have you seen the video clip you watched today before? _____

4) What is your Program of Study at Memorial? _____

5) Please indicate your attitude towards the police (Circle one):

Very Negative	Negative	Neutral	Positive	Very Positive
1	2	3	4	5

Appendix D

Manipulation Check

Some of these events may have happened during your participation, and some may not have happened. Please fill this out honestly.

Please circle the answers you feel best describe your experience in this experiment:

1) The Interviewer purposefully showed me the **physical evidence of his credentials** that he was **certified** in interviewing procedures.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

2) Excluding the consent form I signed earlier, the researcher **made me sign a contract** promising to work as hard as I could in the interview.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

3) The researcher showed me **an example transcription** of how a **previous interview** had gone.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

4) The researcher **gave me a drink and a snack**.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neither Agree nor Disagree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

Appendix E

Royal Newfoundland Constabulary

This is to certify that

Zak Keeping

has successfully completed the

Advanced Witness Interviewing Course

Course Date: September 8 - 12, 2013

Dated: September 12, 2013

Sergeant Todd Barron
Instructor
Royal Newfoundland Constabulary

Dr. Brent Snook
Instructor
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Appendix F

Promise to Work Hard Agreement

I, _____, acknowledge that the purpose of this interview is to provide as much information as possible to the interviewer.

As part of this process, I agree to work as hard as possible to provide the interviewer with a lot of information. I agree to try my hardest to provide as accurate information as I possibly can. I also agree to not confabulate any of my account.

Interviewee Signature: _____

Investigator Signature: _____

Appendix G

(Fake Pilot Transcript which was flashed to participants)

Kanye Omari West was born on June 8, 1977 in Atlanta, Georgia.[7][8] His parents divorced when he was three years old. After the divorce, he and his mother moved to Chicago, Illinois.[9][10] His father, Ray West, is a former Black Panther and was one of the first black photojournalists at The Atlanta Journal-Constitution. Ray West was later a Christian counselor,[10] and in 2006, opened the Good Water Store and Café in Lexington Park, Maryland with startup capital from his son.[11][12] West's mother, Dr. Donda C. (Williams) West,[13][14] was a professor of English at Clark Atlanta University, and the Chair of the English Department atChicago State University before retiring to serve as his manager. West was raised in a middle-class background, attending Polaris High School[15] in suburban Oak Lawn, Illinois after living in Chicago.[16]

At the age of 10, West moved with his mother to Nanjing, China, where she was teaching at Nanjing University as part of an exchange program. According to his mother, West was the only foreigner in his class, but settled in well and quickly picked up the language, although he has since forgotten most of it.[17] When asked about his grades in high school, West replied, "I got A's and B's. And I'm not even frontin'."[18]

West demonstrated an affinity for the arts at an early age; he began writing poetry when he was five years old.[19] His mother recalled that she first took notice of West's passion for drawing and music when he was in the third grade.[20] Growing up in Chicago, West became deeply involved in its hip hop scene. He started rapping in the third grade and began making musical compositions in the seventh grade, eventually selling them to other artists.[21] At age thirteen, West wrote a rap song called "Green Eggs and Ham" and began to persuade his mother to pay $25 an hour for time in a recording studio. It was a small, crude basement studio where a microphone hung from the ceiling by a wire clothes hanger. Although this wasn't what West's mother wanted, she nonetheless supported him.[19] West crossed paths with producer/DJ No I.D., with whom he quickly formed a close friendship. No I.D. soon became West's mentor, and it was from him that West learned how to sample and program beats after he received his first sampler at age 15.[22]

After graduating from high school, West received a scholarship to attend Chicago's American Academy of Art in 1997 and began taking painting classes, but shortly after transferred to Chicago State University to study English. He soon realized that his busy class schedule was detrimental to his musical work, and at 20 he dropped

out of college to pursue his musical dreams.[23] This action greatly displeased his mother, who was also a professor at the university. She later commented, "It was drummed into my head that college is the ticket to a good life... but some career goals don't require college. For Kanye to make an album called College Dropout it was more about having the guts to embrace who you are, rather

Kanye West began his early production career in the mid-1990s, making beats primarily for burgeoning local artists, eventually developing a style that involved speeding up vocal samples from classic soul records. His first official production credits came at the age of nineteen when he produced eight tracks on Down to Earth, the 1996 debut album of a Chicago rapper named Grav.[25] For a time, West acted as a ghost producer for Deric "D-Dot" Angelettie. Because of his association with D-Dot, West wasn't able to release a solo album, so he formed and became a member and producer of the Go-Getters, a late-1990s Chicago rap group composed of him, GLC, Timmy G, Really Doe, and Arrowstar.[26][27] His group was managed by John "Monopoly" Johnson, Don Crowley, and Happy Lewis under the management firm Hustle Period. After attending a series of promotional photo shoots and making some radio appearances, The Go-Getters released their first and only studio album World Record Holders in 1999. The album featured other Chicago-based rappers such as Rhymefest, Mikkey Halsted, Miss Criss, and Shayla G. Meanwhile, the production was handled by West, Arrowstar, Boogz, and Brian "All Day" Miller.[26]

West spent much of the late-1990s producing records for a number of well-known artists and music groups.[28] The third song on Foxy Brown's second studio albumChyna Doll was produced by West. Her second effort subsequently became the very first hip-hop album by a female rapper to debut at the top of the U.S. Billboard200 chart in its first week of release.[28] West produced three of the tracks on Harlem World's first and only album The Movement alongside Jermaine Dupri and the production duo Trackmasters. His songs featured rappers Nas, Drag-On, and R&B singer Carl Thomas.[28] The ninth track from World Party, the last Goodie Mobalbum to feature the rap group's four founding members prior to their break-up, was co-produced by West with his manager Deric "D-Dot" Angelettie.[28] At the close of the millennium, West ended up producing six songs for Tell 'Em Why U Madd, an album that was released by D-Dot under the alias of The Madd Rapper; a fictional character he created for a skit on The Notorious B.I.G.'s second and final studio album Life After Death. West's songs featured guest appearances from rappers such as Ma$e, Raekwon, and Eminem.[28]

Appendix H

Content Dictionary

People

Korean Man Physical Description

Watch: The Korean man has a watch, wristwatch, time piece, analog watch, time keeper, etc.

Shirt: that the Korean man was wearing a shirt.

Untucked: that the Korean man's shirt was untucked.

Patterned: that the Korean man's shirt had a pattern on it.

shapes: that the pattern of the shirt involved either squares, geometric shapes, lines that slanted backwards or forwards, mismatched lines, vertical etc.

colours: that the Korean man's shirt was multicoloured

kinds of colours: one point is awarded for the mentioning of the presence of any of the following colours on the Korean Man's shirt: Red, Blue, Black, Grey, White

Collar: that the Korean Man's shirt had a collar, top collar, buttoned collar, etc.

Button Up: that the top portion, collar, shirt, neck, v-line, etc., portion of the shirt was button up

Buttons undone: that the top buttons on the shirt were undone

Pants: that the Korean Man was wearing pants

pants type: that the Korean Man's pants were khaki, Cotton Dockers, Dockers,

Dickies, etc.

pants colour: that the pants were **EITHER** red or brown or Khaki, they receive the point.

Socks: that the Korean man was wearing socks

Sock Colour: that the socks were white

* It is impossible to tell from the video how long the Korean Man's socks were. It is clear that he is not wearing ankle socks. Any mentioning of ankle socks will be coded as incorrect.

Ethnicity: the Korean Man was Asian

Korean: the Korean Man was Korean

Facial Hair: the Korean Man had facial hair.

Facial Hair Colour: the Korean Man's facial hair was grey, greying, blackish, black, black and grey, pepper, etc.

Facial Hair Thickness: that the Korean Man's facial hair was scrappy, patchy, partially missing, balding, peach fuzzy, thinning etc.

Facial Hair Type: that the Korean Man had a beard, full beard, beard and moustache, moustache, moustache missing connectors, beard missing connectors, etc.

Hair: that the Korean Man had hair

Hair Type: the Korean man was balding, showed signs of balding, had male pattern baldness, friar hair, horseshoe hair, etc.

Hair Length: the Korean Man's hair was Longer in the Back, Lengthy where hair was, Longer on the sides, etc.

Hair Colour: The Korean man's hair was black, dark, etc.

Build: that the Korean Man was of average build, medium build, not fat, not thin, normal-sized, etc.

Ring: that the Korean Man was wearing a ring

Sweaty: the Korean man was sweaty, perspiring, clammy, sweating, wet-looking, etc.

Age: the Korean man was middle aged, mid life, adult, older, forties, fifties, mid forties, mid fifties, etc.

Gender: the Korean man was male, a dude, a guy, a man, etc.

Skin Colour: the Korean had tan, darker, yellow-hued, etc. coloured skin.

Michael Douglass Physical Description

Business Attire: Michael Douglass was wearing business attire

Watch: a watch, wristwatch, time piece, analog watch, time keeper, etc.

Left Wrist: that the watch was worn on Michael Douglass' Left Wrist.

Shirt: that Michael Douglass was wearing a shirt

Tucked: Michael Douglass' shirt was tucked into his pants

Shirt Type (Formerly Buttons): Michael Douglass' shirt was a button-up shirt, AND/OR dress shirt, collared shirt, etc.

Buttons Done up: all of the buttons were done up

Shirt Colour: Michael Douglass'

Pocket: Michael Douglass' shirt has a pocket

Side of Pocket: the pocket was on the left hand side of the shirt

Pens: Michael Douglass had a pen in his pocket. *Note: Pencils is inaccurate.

Pen Quantity: there were multiple pens in his pocket

Pocket Protector: Michael Douglass' pocket featured a pocket protector.

Short Sleeve: Michael Douglass' shirt had short sleeves.

Tie: Michael Douglass was wearing a tie

Tie Colour: the tie was black in colour

Tie Stripes: the tie featured stripes.

Stripe Direction: the tie's stripes were diagonal

Tie Clip: the tie had a clip

Glasses: Michael Douglass was wearing glasses

Glasses Colour: the glasses were black-rimmed, black, dark, etc.

Glasses Type: the glasses were horn-rimmed, Rayban-style, top-only, etc.

Pants: Michael Douglass was wearing pants

Pants type: Michael Douglass' pants were dress pants, business pants, formal pants, etc.

Pants Colour: the colour of the pants are black

Belt: Michael Douglass was wearing a belt

Belt Colour: the belt was black, dark, etc.

Belt Buckle: the belt had a belt buckle

Shoes: Michael Douglass was wearing shoes

Shoe Colour: Michael Douglass' shoes were black

Shoe type: the shoes were dress shoes, formal shoes, etc.

Briefcase: Michael Douglass brought a briefcase

Briefcase Colour: the briefcase was dark, black, brown, chestnut, etc. in colour

Build: Michael Douglass was of average build, medium build, not fat, not thin, normal-sized, etc.

Nationality: Michael Douglass was an American, from the States, etc.

Ethnicity: Michael Douglass was white, Caucasian, pale, pale-skinned, etc.

Hair: Michael Douglass had hair

Hair Colour: Michael Douglass' hair was brown, blonde, strawberry blonde, grey, greying, light coloured, etc. * Note: Responses suggesting Michael Douglass' hair was white should be coded incorrect

Hair Style: Michael Douglass had an army-style cut, short hair, buzzed sides, buzzed sides with longer hair on top, military hair, hair that was spiked naturally (i.e., hair that was not spiked up with gel) etc.

Facial Hair: Michael Douglass was clean-shaven, had no facial hair, had no stubble, etc.

Sweating: Michael Douglass was sweating, perspiring, clammy, etc.

Age: Michael Douglass was middle aged, thirties, forties, mid-life, etc. *Responses classifying Michael Douglass as elderly, old, geriatric etc., should be coded as incorrect

Gender: Michael Douglass is a man, guy, dude, gentleman, male, etc.

Location

Store: the events took place in a store

Store type: the store was a convenience store, ma-and-pa store, general store, small store, corner store, etc.

Store Brand: the store was generic, without branding, not corporate, etc.

Dim Lighting: there were no lights on in the store, the store was dimly lit, dark, etc.

Sunlight: the only light was provided by the sun, sunlight, etc.

Door light: light entered in through the door

Door Open: the door to the store was ajar, open, etc.

Blinds: there were blinds on the windows

Blind Orientation: the blinds were drawn, closed, etc.

Aisles: the store featured aisles

Shelves: the store featured shelves or cabinets

Ceiling Fan: the store featured a ceiling fan

Fan Working: the fan was spinning, on, working, etc.

Signs: there were any kind of signs in the store

Sign Type 1: there were street signs in the store

Street Sign Writing: the street signs said "Corona"

Street sign Quantity: there were two street signs, plural street signs, multiple street signs, etc.

Sign Type 2: there was a neon sign in the store

Store Location: the store was in the United States, in America, in the US, in North America, etc.

*Note: Any mention of where within the states the store was located (e.g., middle America, lower America, southern states, etc.) should be coded as confabulated

Nobody Else: No other customers or workers were in the store during the altercation.

Actions / Objects

Coin Roll: the roll of Coins, or coins at the onset of the transcript

Opening: the Korean Man breaking open, opening, cracking open, etc. the roll of coins into the cash register

Cigarette: the Korean Man smoking a cigarette when the customer walks in

Change Request: Michael Douglass asking for change

Change Purpose: the change is for a phone call

Change Response: the shopkeeper rejects him, or says no

Change if: the shopkeeper will give change if Michael Douglass buys something

Shuts Cash: The Korean Man shuts the cash register after refusing to give change

Dollar: Michael Douglass has a dollar

Bill: the money is paper, bill, Washington, etc.

Currency: the money is American

Cash Register: there is a cash register in the store

Register Age: the cash register is an antique, an older-model, etc.

Register Buttons: the cash register has push-buttons

Register Sale: the register has a red sign, red flag, sale indicator, or any variation.

Briefcase Location: Michael Douglass puts the briefcase down on the counter, slams the briefcase down on the counter, etc.

Cooler: a fridge, refrigerator, cooler, freezer, etc.

Grabs Coke: the fridge contained coke, a drink, coke and diet coke, colas, sodas, pop, etc. or any mentioning of the man having selected any

of the abovementioned products

Cooler Contents Specific: the fridge contained only coke and diet coke, 7 cans of coke in total, or any specific details about the contents of the fridge

Cola Brand: the selected pop was a Coca Cola.

Cola Brand Specific: the selected pop was a "classic" coke.

Cola Colour: the can is red.

Cola Size: the can has 12 ounces OR 355 ml.

Cola Can: the cola is in can form

Walk to Drink: Michael Douglass walked over to the cooler, walked around to get a drink, walked over, etc.

Cooler Open: Michael Douglass opened the cooler

Watching Cooler: the Korean man watched, surveyed, eyed, or looked at Michael Douglass while he was at the cooler

Watching Watching: Michael Douglass notices the Korean man watching him at the cooler

Cool Down: Michael Douglass cools down or presses his forehead with the coke *Note* if they say he cooled down his face give them the point here

Cool Down Cheek: Michael Douglass cools down his cheek with the coke.

Both Cheeks: Michael Douglass cools down both cheeks with the coke.

Cooler Shut: Michael Douglass shuts the cooler, closes the cooler, etc.

Counter Return: Michael Douglass walked back to the counter after being at the cooler,

or walks back after getting the drink, etc.

Coke on counter: Michael Douglass puts the can of coke on the cash register or counter when he returns to the counter

Coke Cost: the shopkeeper tells Michael Douglass the cost of the coke

Coke Cost Actual: the coke costs eighty five cents, or any value that captures eighty five cents

Coke Mishear: Michael Douglass doesn't understand what the cashier tells him is the cost

Coke Too much: Michael Douglass says 85 cents is too much, or wouldn't give him enough cash to make the phone call

Coke Negotiation: Michael Douglass offers fifty cents for the coke, offers less for the coke, tries to haggle for the coke

Rejected Negotiation: the Korean refuses the offer, refuses to haggle, etc.

Ultimatum: the Korean gives Michael Douglass a pay or leave ultimatum

Mispronounce: Michael Douglass complains about, points out, or notes the Korean Man's mispronouncing of words

Mispronounce Actual: the mispronunciation is forgetting "v" in five.

Briefcase Leave: Michael Douglass picking up his briefcase before preparing to leave

Turn to Leave: Michael Douglass turning, leaving, preparing to leave, or beginning to walk out

Return to Counter: Michael Douglass returning from leaving, not leaving, refusing to leave, or deciding not to leave

Briefcase Slam: Michael Douglass slamming, throwing, or any synonym for harshly placing his briefcase back down on the counter

Racism: Michael Douglass insinuates the Korean is from China or is Chinese, makes racist comments, etc.

Racist correct: the Korean corrects him, says he is Korean, etc.

Country: Michael Douglass complains the man is in his country

Money: Michael Douglass complains the man takes his money, his people take his money, etc.

Language: Michael Douglass complains the man doesn't speak English, know his language, etc.

Foreign Aid: Michael Douglass asks the Korean if he knows how much money his country gives to Korea, etc.

Korean unsure: the Korean doesn't know how much

Douglass unsure: Michael Douglass is also unsure

Douglass qualifier: Michael Douglass says it's a lot

Asks to Leave: the Korean asks Michael Douglass to leave

No Trouble: the Korean doesn't want any trouble

Staying: Michael Douglass decides to stay, refuses to leave, etc.

Bat: the presence of a bat, bat-like object, etc.

Bat Size: that the bat was smaller than an average baseball bat

Bat Material: the bat was made of wood

Bat Handle: the bat's handle was black in colour

Bat Colour: the bat is brown

Bat Reach: the Korean was the first to reach for the bat, the Korean got the bat, the Korean had a bat, etc.

Bat Location: the bat was under the counter, behind the counter, etc.

Bat Retaliation: Michael Douglass grabs the bat as well

Over the Counter: the altercation occurs over, on top of, or any variation of the counter

Bat Hands: both or either man has both hands placed on the bat

Bat Struggle: the men fight, tussle, wrestle, get physical, or any variation, struggle to get it, etc.

Bat Victor: Michael Douglass gains control of the bat

Knocked Glass: the men knock over a glass jar while struggling for the bat

Glass Shatter: the glass shatters on the ground, breaks on the ground etc.

Flags in Glass (Glass Contents): the glass contained flags

Flag Type: the flags were American flags

Flag Size: the flags were small

Flag Quantity: multiple flags, thirteen flags, several flags etc.

Knocked Display: the men knock over a display while struggling for the bat

Fall to Floor: both parties fall to the floor, they get pushed to the floor, they end up on the floor

Kick: Michael Douglass kicks the Korean man to get the bat

Kick Location: the kick occurred on the Korean Man's chest or stomach

Stomach Hurt: the Korean man, holding, aching, wincing, or any variation in regards to his injured stomach

Bat Destruction: Michael Douglass swinging the bat to destroy a shelf, to destroy items above the cash, items to the side of the cash, or things around the store

No Bat on Korean: that Michael Douglass never hits the Korean with the bat

Korean Position: the Korean assumes the fetal position, curls up, cuddles up, balls up, or any variation

Korean hands-cover: the Korean covering his mouth with his hands

Korean hands-remove: the Korean removes his hands from his face

Take the Money: the Korean telling Michael Douglass to take his money

Take the money multiple: the Korean telling Michael Douglass multiple times to take the money

Can't Understand: Michael Douglass can't understand what the Korean is saying

Ask to Remove: Michael Douglass requesting the Korean move his hands away from his face

Ask Slow: Michael Douglass request the man speak slow

Ask Distinct: Michael Douglass request the man speak clearly, distinctly, etc.

I'm a thief: Michael Douglass saying the Korean man thinks he's a thief

Not a thief: Michael Douglass saying he's not a thief

You're a thief: Michael Douglass insinuates the Korean man is the thief

Thief Justification: Michael Douglass justifies the Korean man as the thief by saying he's asking too much for soda, or prices in general

Consumer Rights: Michael Douglass is standing up for consumer rights

Rollbacks: Michael Douglass is rolling back prices

Rollback era: Michael Douglass is rolling back prices to the 1960s, 1965, etc.

Asks Prices: Michael Douglass goes around asking the prices of various items

Too much: Michael Douglass thinks various goods are overpriced, is outraged at prices, etc.

Smashes if too much: Michael Douglass smashes the overpriced goods

Pasta Pasta was present in the store

Potato Chips Potato chips were present in the store

Vanilla Wafer vanilla wafers were present in the store

Box of Something At least one of the items smashed by MD was in a box

*** IMPORTANT—**If the person mentions that MD goes around asking prices, thinking they're too much and then smashing them with the bat, and then later says, "some of the items were X, Y, and Z", make sure you code ALL of the items separately (e.g., donut, asked cost, smashed, etc.)

Donuts: the presence of donuts, baked goods, etc.

Donut Cost: Michael Douglass asking how much the donuts will cost

Donut Cost Actual: the donuts cost One Dollar Twelve cents, about a dollar, more than a dollar, or any monetary value that captures one

dollar and twelve cents

Donut Type: the donuts were powdered, sugared, plain, or any variation

Pre-Package: the donuts were pre-packaged

Donut Quantity: the donuts were in a package of six

Cost too much 1: the donuts cost too much, according to Michael Douglass

Donut Crush: Michael Douglass crushes the donuts, flattens the donuts, or any variation

Donut Crush w Bat: Michael Douglass crushes the donuts with the bat

Aspirin: the presence of aspirin, pills, medication, etc.

Aspirin Cost: Michael Douglass asking how much the Aspirin costs

Aspirin Cost Actual: the aspirin cost more than the donuts, three forty, more than three dollars, less than four dollars, or any monetary value that captures three forty

Cost too much 2: the donuts cost too much according to Michael Douglass

Aspirin Crush: Michael Douglass crushing the Aspirin or any variation

Aspirin Crush w Bat: Michael Douglass crushed the Aspirin with his bat

Miscellaneous Crush: Michael Douglass hit collateral or extraneous items while crushing the Aspirin

Batteries: the presence of batteries

Battery Quantity: there were four packs of batteries

Battery Type: the batteries were double A batteries

Battery Cost: Michael Douglass asked how much the batteries cost

Battery Cost Fake: the shopkeeper started to say one price, but then switched the price

Battery Cost Fake 2: the shopkeeper first said five dollars

Battery Lie Price: the Korean changed the price to 4 29, more than the aspirin, or any variation the captures 4 29

Crush Anyway: Michael Douglass begins hitting the shelf, and/or batteries

Crush w Bat: Michael Douglass hits these items using the baseball bat**Asks**

Coke Again: Michael Douglass asks again for the price of the cola

New Cost: the Korean tells him the cost is now fifty cents

Sold: Michael Douglass accepts the new price, says sold, etc.

Coke Payment: Michael Douglass pays for the coke

Payment Type: Michael Douglass pays for the coke using a dollar bill

Bill Location: the bill was on the counter, Michael Douglass took the bill off the counter

Douglass Cashier: Michael Douglass does the transaction himself

Button Press: Michael Douglass presses the buttons on the cashier, opens the cash, etc.

Dollar Placed: Michael Douglass puts his dollar in the cash

Change: Michael Douglass removes his change from the cash

Change type: the change is two quarters

Pleasure: Michael Douglass thanks the Korean man for his sale, thanks him for his service, thanks him for the establishment, or any variation

Takes Briefcase: Michael Douglass takes his briefcase with him

Takes Bat: Michael Douglass takes the bat with him

Leaves with Coke: Michael Douglass takes the coke with him

Leaves Building: Michael Douglass leaves

Cashier Floor: the Cashier is still on the floor when Michael Douglass leaves

Pig Bank: there is a piggy bank in the store

Things to Remember When Coding:

-If they aren't specific, that's fine (e.g., if they say it was eighty something cents, and it was eighty five cents, they are marked as correct. If, however, they say it was eighty seven cents, they are wrong) anything that captures the true value of the item is marked correctly

-Somebody can be right and wrong (e.g., if they say the guy had a white shirt, and then later say he had a black shirt, the correct answer is marked as correct and the incorrect answer is marked as incorrect).

-Verbal actions are marked correct if the gist information (e.g., what they're getting at) is reasonably close. (e.g., if the man said, "Sold" in the script, and the account states, "I'll take it", that would still be correct). However, "you come into our country and take our money" is different from "get out of our country you foreigner".

-If the account provides information that wasn't possible to take from the video, they are marked as confabulated (e.g., it was a summer's day… there is no way to tell that information)

Appendix I

Incorrect Information Coding Guide

Characteristics of MD

MDCanadian	MD is a Canadian
MDAccent	MD has a thick Southern Accent
MDHeight	MD was tall, anything other than average height
PenPocketSide	Pens were in the right side or pants pockets
Bifocals	MD's glasses were bifocals
MDBlouse	MD is wearing a blouse
MdBuild	MD has a build other than average
MDBald	MD is bald
MDJeans	MD is wearing jeans
MDPencils	MD has pencils in his pocket
MD Suit	MD was wearing a suit, blazer, etc.
MD Sleeves	MD wore long sleeves
Tie Colour	The tie colour was anything other than black (or black w/ stripe)
MDTshirt	MD was wearing a T shirt
MDWantstoRob	MD wanted to rob KM
NotePad	MD had a note pad in his pocket
Briefcase Colour	The briefcase was any colour except black or brown
Pen Quantity	Pen Quantity is not 3, or any number that encompasses 3 (e.g., 2-5)

GelHair	MD used gel in his hair
Bowtie	MD was wearing a bowtie
MDRolledSleeves	MD had his sleeves rolled up
GlassesColour	The glasses were anything except rayban style horn-rimmed black glasses.
TrenchCoat	MD wore a trench coat
MDHairColour	MD has white hair or black hair
Characteristics of KM	
KMShortSleeve	KM was wearing a short sleeve shirt
KMLongHair	KM has long hair
Khakis	MD was wearing khaki pants
KM wearing black	KM was wearing black clothing
KMPonyTail	KM has a pony tail
KMShirt	KM`s shirt is described as shimmery, a golf shirt, plaid, or flowery
VestKM	KM wore a vest
Store Characteristics	
FlagsNocup	The flags were in anything except a cup or jar or glass (e.g., bowl)
FlagQty	Flag quantity is not 13 or any number that encompasses 13
StoreDirty	The store was dirty, unclean etc.
Spices	Spices were evident in the video
Corona Place	The Corona sign said anything other than Street
MiniFridge	There is a mini fridge
BlindsOpen	The blinds are open

RegisterColour	The Register is any colour other than black or grey
SlidingDoor	The fridge has a sliding door
Not Convenience	The store is described as anything except a convenience store, ma and pa, etc.
Donuts/Aspirin/Batteries and Destroyed Items	
Cost of Products	states the prices of products (non-specific i.e., not donuts, batteries, aspirin or coke) that are not stated within the clip's dialogue
Price Donuts	Price of Donuts was anything except 1.12, or something that encompasses 1.12
Price Aspirin	Price of Aspirin was anything except 3.40, or something that encompasses 3.40
MistookDonuts	Any grain product (e.g., muffin, bread, brownie, cookie, biscuit, bun) that is not donuts
2ndPriceReduction	A price was reduced two times
Donut Quantity	Any number of donuts that is not 6 or something that does not encompass 6
DoesntHitBattery	MD elects not to hit the batteries
BatteriesCost	The cost of the batteries was anything but 5 dollars or 4.29, or something that doesn't encompass one of those numbers
Battery Type	The batteries were any type other than double A
MDFlipObject	MD flips objects around
TwoPack	A two pack of anything is mentioned
BatteryQty	Battery quantity is anything other than 4

BoxBatteries	The batteries were in box form
Not Aspirin	The drug is referred to as anything except Aspirin (e.g., advil, Tylenol, etc.)
AlcoholSale	Liquor or beer was for sale in the store
Verbal Actions	
MDWantedBuy	MD wanted to buy something originally
Requested Call	MD originally wanted to make a phone call, not to get change for a phone call
Mumbled Something	KM instigated the fight by mumbling something to MD
KMFrom	KM is described as being from anywhere except Korea (Note he never mentions if he`s from North or South Korea
ChangePurpose	Why MD needed the change was not for the phone (e.g., bus, etc.)
CameforCoke	MD came in for the coke originally
Rollback	The era for rollbacks was anything except 1965 or some age that does not include 1965
Asked Where From	MD asked KM where he's from
CostofCall	The cost of the phone call was anything different from 50 cents
CokeOrNot	KM asks MD whether he wants the coke or not
SarcasticApology	MD apologized sarcastically for his actions
RuleChange	MD wants to change the rules of the store
KMPronounce	KM mispronounces something that isn't the v in five
MDThreatensKM	MD threatens KM
KMDontHitMe	KM said don't hit me

MDLikedPrice	MD liked the price of any item in the store
TakeMyWallet	KM asked MD to take his wallet
Don`tBelongHere	KM is told he doesn`t belong or shouldn`t be in America
KMDontHurt	KM says don’t hurt me to MD
Physical Actions	
KMRegTamper	KM tampers with the register
KMTakeMoney	KM takes money from the cash register
MDBurglar	MD broke into the convenience store or was a burglar
KMSitCash	KM was sitting at the cash
CokeNeck	MD cools his neck off with the coke
TimeatFridge	MD spends any length of time at the fridge that seems excessive (e.g., minutes, forever, etc.)
CokeCost	The coke costs anything except 50cents or a figure that encompasses that value
ColaSize	The cola was anything other than 355mL or 12 ounces
Pepsi	The soda was a Pepsi
Bottle of Coke	states a bottle rather than a can
OpenedCoke	MD opened the coke
Bill Increment	The bill was anything other than a one dollar bill
Original50cents	MD originally had 50 cents
What Bat Was	The baseball bat was something aside from a bat or small club
BatSize	Bat is long, normal sized
KM Attack	KM started the fight by attacking or provoking MD

MDPulledOutBat	MD pulled the bat out from somewhere other than KM's hands
WhereMDgotBat	MD took the bat from anywhere other than the hands of KM
MDgrabbedKM	MD grabbed the Korean Man
MDhitsKorean	MD hits KM
KMForceout	KM tries to force MD out of the store
MDJumpsonKM	MD jumps on KM
MDGrabHands	MD grabs KM's hands
Rollback	Rollbacks are described as going back to any time other than 1965 or some figure that encompasses 1965
MDusesWallet	MD takes money from his wallet
ChangeAmount	MD got anything other than 50 cents back
PaidFromPocket	MD paid the dollar from his pocket
Leaves Bat	MD leaves the bat in the store
AmountPaidforcoke	MD paid anything other than 50 cents (from a dollar) for the Coke
MDClosedCash	MD Closed the cash register
KMGotup	KM got up after being knocked down
LeavesCoke	MD left the coke there

Appendix J

Confabulated Information Coding Guide

Characteristics of MD

Age MD	states a specific age for MD, or that he was young
MDSick	MD was feeling ill, felt sick, etc.
MDAspergers	MD has Aspergers Syndrome
MDhighClass	MD was high class
MDConservative	MD has conservative ideologies
MDEducation	MD is well educated, had a higher education, etc.
MDWantstoRob	MD wanted to rob KM
MDRage	MD has a rage problem
MDWife	MD was in fights with his wife, or had a wife, etc.
MDPsychBreak	MD was undergoing a psychological breakdown
MDonDrugs	MD was on drugs during the incident
MDAddict	MD has a drug addiction
MDPointProve	MD is trying to prove a point
MDWarVeteran	MD is a war veteran
MDLostFriend	MD lost a friend in a war
MDEmployment	The location or purpose of MD`s occupation is listed
WeirdedOut	MD is weirded out by things in the store
MDLunch	MD is on Lunch Break
LeftMeeting	MD left to go to a meeting or was coming from a meeting

Characteristics of KM

KMimmigrant KM is an immigrant

Characteristics of the Setting

Time of Day	states a specific time of day when the events took place.
Family run	The store was family run
DoorBreeze	A breeze was coming in through the door
GasStation	The business was a gas station
HeatWave	the setting was during a heat wave
MDDoorDinger	The door dinged as people entered and left
Air Conditioning	The store had air conditioning, or an air conditioner was present
Warm Country	The setting is in a warm country
Season	Any mention of what season it is
Slowday	This was a slow day at work
EconomyBad	The Economy is Bad
PayPhoneLocation	The location of the payphone is mentioned
VendingMachine	Presence of a vending machine
Verbal Actions	
Don’t Know Law	MD accuses KM of not understanding the law
Stealing Jobs	Koreans or immigrants were stealing American jobs
Don`t Belong Here	MD told KM he shouldn’t be here, in America, etc.
Mumbled Something	KM instigated the fight by mumbling something to MD
Asks KM name	MD asks KM for his name

KMsaidnotmuch	KM said the coke wasn't that much
CokeOrNot	KM asks MD whether he wants the coke or not
ComparesKM	MD compares KM to the quotidian American citizen
HadtoBuyTwo	MD had to buy two cokes
YouHaveNoIdea	KM gives MD a "you have no idea" look
KoreanWar	The Korean War was mentioned
Physical Actions	
KM Attack	KM started the fight by attacking or provoking MD
MakesCall	MD makes his phone call
MDhitsKoreanBat	MD hits KM with the bat
WasGoingBat	MD was going to do something (e.g., hit) with the bat
SmashesWindow	MD smashes a window
MDHadPapers	MD had papers in his briefcase
IntentToHitMD	KM intends to hit MD
KMExtortion	KM tries to extort somebody
KMOvercharge	KM is purposefully overcharging
TearsDownCabinet	MD tore down a cabinet
4thItem	A fourth item was smashed

References

Anker, A. E., & Feeley, T. H. (2011). Asking the difficult questions: message strategies used by organ procurement coordinators in requesting familiar consent to organ donation. *Journal of Health Communication, 16*, 643-659. doi:10.1080/10810730.2011.551999

Antrobus, E., Bradford, B., Murphy, K., & Sargeant, E. (2015). Community norms, procedural justice, and the public's perceptions of police legitimacy. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, doi: 10.1177/1043986 10.1177/1043986214568840214568840

Baldwin, J. (1993) POLICE INTERVIEW TECHNIQUES: Establishing Truth or Proof? *British Journal of Criminology, 33*(3), 325-352.

Bartsch, R. A., & Cheyrprakobkit, S. (2004) The effects of amount of contact, contact expectation, and contact experience with police on attitudes toward police. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology 19(1),* 58-70. doi: 10.1007/BF02802575

Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping and altruism. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *6*, 63-108. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60025-8

Blass, T. (1991). Understanding behavior in the Milgram obedience experiment: The role of personality, situations, and their interactions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(3), 398. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.398

Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: Would people still obey today? *American Psychologist*, *64*, 1-11. doi:10.1037/a0010932

Burger, J. M. (1999). The foot-in-the-door cooperation procedure: A multiple-process analysis and review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*, 303-325. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0304_2

Burger, J. M., & Caldwell, D. F. (2003). The effects of monetary incentives and labeling on the foot-in-the-door effect: Evidence for a self-perception process. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *25*, 235-241. doi:10.1207/S15324834BASP2503_06

Burger, J. M., Ehrlichman, A. M., Raymond, N. C., Ishikawa, J. M., & Sandoval, J. (2006). Reciprocal favor exchange and cooperation. *Social Influence*, *1*(3), 169-184. Doi:10.1080/15534510600819693

Burger, J. M., Horita, M., Kinoshita, L., Roberts, K., & Vera, C. (1997). Effects on time on the norm of reciprocity. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *19*, 91-100. doi:10.1207/15324839751037165

Burger, J. M., Messian, N., Patel, S., del Prado, A., & Anderson, C. (2004). What a coincidence! The effects of incidental similarity on cooperation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 35-43. doi: 10.1177/0146167203258838

Carducci, B. J., Deuser, P. S., Bauer, A., Large, M., & Ramaekers, M. (1989). An application of the foot in the door technique to organ donation. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 4*, 245-249. doi:10.1007/BF01016444

Carron, A. V. (2002). Cohesion and performance in sport. *Journal of sport & exercise psychology*, *24*, 168-188.

Cialdini, R. B. (2007). *Influence: The psychology of persuasion*. New York: Harper Collins.

Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Cooperation and conformity.

Annual Review of Psychology, *55*, 591-621. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015

Cialdini, R. B., & Trost, M. R. (1998). Social influence: Social norms, conformity, and cooperation. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 151-192). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cialdini, R. B., Wosinska, W., Barrett, D. W., Butner, J., & Gornik-Durose, M. (1999). Cooperation with a request in two cultures: The differential influence of social proof and commitment/consistency on collectivists and individualists. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 1242-1253. doi:10.1177/0146167299258006

Cohen, L.S. (1988). Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of management*, *31*(6), 874-900. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279602

Fehr, E., & Fischbacher, U. (2004). Social norms and human cooperation.*Trends in cognitive sciences*, *8*(4), 185-190. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2004.02.007

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, *7*, 117-140. doi:10.1177/001872675400700202

Fisher, R. P., & Geiselman, R. E. (1992). *Memory-enhancing techniques for investigative interviewing: The cognitive interview*. Charles C Thomas, Publisher.

Freedman, J. L., & Fraser, S. (1966). Cooperation without pressure: The foot-in-the-door technique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4*, 195-202.

doi:10.1037/h0023552

French, J., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Gawronski, B., & Strack, F. (2004). On the propositional nature of cognitive consistency: Dissonance changes explicit, but not implicit attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 40(4), 535-542. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2003.10.005

Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. *Annual review of psychology*, 62, 451-482. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145346

Goei, R., Lindsey, L. L. M., Boster, F. J., Skalski, P. D., & Bowman, J. M. (2003). The mediating roles of liking and obligation on the relationship between favors and cooperation. *Communication Research*, *30*, 178-197. doi:10.1177/0093650202250877

Goldstein, N. J., Griskevicius, V., & Cialdini, R. B. (2012). Reciprocity by proxy: A novel influence strategy for stimulating cooperation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, INFO doi: 0001839211435904.

Gopinath, M., & Nyer, P. U. (2009). The effect of public commitment on resistance to persuasion: The influence of attitude certainty, issue importance, susceptibility to normative influence, preference for consistency and source proximity. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *26*(1), 60-68. doi: doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2008.08.003

Guadagno, R. E., & Cialdini, R. B. (2010). Preference for consistency and social influence: A review of current research findings. *Social Influence*, *5*, 152-163.

doi:10.1080/15534510903332378

Gudjonsson, G. H., Sigurdsson, J. F., Bragason, O. O., Einarsson, E., & Valdimarsdottir, E. B. (2004). Confessions and denials and the relationship with personality. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *9*(1), 121-133. doi: 10.1348/135532504322776898

Guéguen, N., & Jacob, C. (2001). Fund-raising on the web: The effect of an electronic foot-in-the-door on donation. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 4*, 705-709. doi:10.1089/109493101753376650

Haworth, K. (2006). The dynamics of power and resistance in police interview discourse. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(6), 739-759. doi: 10.1177/0957926506068430

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: John Wiley.

Köhnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999). The cognitive interview: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, *5*(1-2), 3-27. doi: 10.1080/10683169908414991

Leal, S., Vrij, A., Warmelink, L., Vernham, Z., & Fisher, R. P. (2015). You cannot hide your telephone lies: Providing a model statement as an aid to detect deception in insurance telephone calls. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, *20*(1), 129-146. doi: 10.1111/lcrp.12017

MacCoun, R. J. (2012). The burden of social proof: Shared thresholds and social influence. *Psychological review*, *119*(2), 345. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027121

McGuire, K., London, K., & Wright, D. B. (2011). Peer influence on event reports among adolescents and young adults. *Memory*, *19*(6), 674-683. doi:

10.1080/09658211.2011.602086

Memon, A., Holley, A., Milne, R., Koehnken, G., & Bull, R. (1994). Towards understanding the effects of interviewer training in evaluating the cognitive interview. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *8*(7), 641-659. doi: 10.1002/acp.2350080704

Memon, A., Bull, R., & Smith, M. (1995). Improving the quality of the police interview: Can training in the use of cognitive techniques help?. *Policing and Society: An International Journal*, *5*(1), 53-68. doi: 10.1080/10439463.1995.9964710

Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority: An experimental view.* New York: Harper & Row.

Morris, L. S., & Schulz, R. M. (1992). Patient compliance—an overview. *Journal of clinical pharmacy and therapeutics*, *17*(5), 283-295. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2710.1992.tb01306.x

Parashos, A., Xiromeritis, K., Zoumbou, V., Stamouli, S., & Theodotou, R. (2000) The problem of non-cooperation in schizophrenia: opinions of patients and their relatives. A pilot study. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice, 4 (2),* 147-150. doi: 10.1080/13651500050518334

Pascual, A., & Guéguen, N. (2005). Foot-in-the-door and door-in-the-face: A comparative meta-analytic study. *Psychological Reports*, *96*, 122-128. doi: 10.2466/pr0.96.1.122-128

Petrova, P. K., Cialdini, R. B., & Sills, S. J. (2007). Consistency-based cooperation across cultures. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*(1), 104-111. doi: doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2005.04.002

Platow, M. J., Haslam, S. A., Both, A., Chew, I., Cuddon, M., Goharpey, N.,Grace, D. M. (2005). "It's not funny if *they're* laughing": Self-categorization, social influence, and responses to canned laughter. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 542-550. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2004.09.005

Postmes, T., Haslam, S. A., & Swaab, R. I. (2005). Social influence in small groups: An interactive model of social identity formation. *European review of social psychology*, *16*(1), 1-42. doi: 10.1080/10463280440000062

Regan, D. T. (1971). Effects of a favor and liking on cooperation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *7*, 627-639. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(71)90025-4

Rodin, J., & Janis, I. L. (1982). The social influence of physicians and other health care practitioners as agents of change. In H. S. Friedman & R. M. DiMatteo (Eds.), *Interpersonal issues in health care* (pp. 33-50). New York: Academic Press.

Roter, D. L., Hall, J. A., Merisca, R., Nordstrom, B., Cretin, D., & Svarstad, B. (1998). Effectiveness of interventions to improve patient cooperation: A meta-analysis. *Medical Care, 36,* 1138-1161. doi:10.1097/00005650-199808000-00004

Schultz, W. P., Khazian, A. M., & Zaleski, A. C. (2008). Using normative social influence to promote conservation among hotel guests. *Social influence*, *3*(1), 4-23. doi: 10.1080/15534510701755614

Sim, J., & Wright, C. C. (2005). The kappa statistic in reliability studies: use, interpretation, and sample size requirements. *Physical therapy*, *85*(3), 257-268.

Spangenberg, E. R., & Greenwald, A. G. (1999). Social influence by requesting self-prophecy. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *8*(1), 61-89. doi: doi:10.1207/s15327663jcp0801_03

Steiner, B., Hester, R., Makarios, M. D., & Travis, L. F. (2012). Examining the link between parole officers' bases of power and their exercise of power. *The Prison Journal, 92*, 435-459. doi:10.1177/0032885512457546

Stichman, A., J. (2003). The sources and impact of inmate perceptions of correctional officers' bases of power. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati).

Tsai, C. C., Yang, Y. K., & Cheng, C. H. (2014). The effect of social comparison with peers on self-evaluation. *Psychological reports*, *115*(2), 526-536. doi: 10.2466/07.PR0.115c20z7

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, *185*(4157), 1124-1131. doi: 10.1126/science.185.4157.1124

Uehara, E. S. (1995). Reciprocity reconsidered: Gouldner's 'Moral Norm of Reciprocity' and social support. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12*, 483-502. doi:10.1177/0265407595124001

Vogel, E. A., Rose, J. P., Roberts, L. R., & Eckles, K. (2014). Social comparison, social media, and self-esteem. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, *3*(4), 206. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000047

Whatley, M. A., Webster, J. M., Smith, R. H., & Rhodes, A. (1999). The effect of a favor on public and private cooperation: How internalized is the norm of reciprocity? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *21*, 251-259. doi:10.1207/S15324834BASP2103_8

Zhao, J. S., & Ren, L. (2015). Exploring the Dimensions of Public Attitudes Toward the Police. *Police Quarterly*, doi:1098611114561304.