



## Expert Summary Brief

---

### Support S.6: prohibit threats and deception when questioning young people

#### Deception in interrogations:

- Increases the risk of false confessions, especially among youth
- Exploits youths' vulnerabilities that stem from incomplete brain development
- Undermines citizens' faith in the justice system
- Invites costly legal challenges about confession reliability and voluntariness
- Exposes police departments and municipalities to staggering civil liability, if deception contributes to a wrongful conviction

#### DR. HAYLEY CLEARY

is Associate Professor of Criminal Justice and Public Policy at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, VA.

Her research expertise is in developmental psychology, police interrogation, false confessions, juvenile justice, and public policy.

hmcleary@vcu.edu  
804-827-0475

## WHY DECEPTION IS DANGEROUS

---

- **Deception increases the occurrence of false confessions.** Abundant research confirms that police deception—especially lying or bluffing about evidence—increases the likelihood of a false confession. False confession is a leading cause of wrongful conviction, which causes extraordinary harm to wrongfully convicted persons, their families, and the justice system.
- **Most people don't know police can lie to suspects.** Studies show even adults don't realize that police are legally allowed use deception during interrogations. Common examples include bluffing about evidence (e.g., telling suspects DNA samples were found at the scene); presenting false evidence (e.g., telling the suspect their DNA matches the evidence), or—commonly used with groups of juveniles—telling the suspect their friends have already “given them up.” At best, deception unfairly exploits youths' inability to make competent decisions under stress. At worst, it can lead an innocent youth to falsely confess to a crime.
- **Virtually all youth are interrogated without support.** Most youth misunderstand at least one Miranda warning, and the vast majority waive their right to counsel. Thus, youth facing accusatory questioning are making serious legal decisions without the capacity to fully understand the long-term consequences. Parents are poor substitutes for attorneys—they're often just as misinformed about interrogation practices and may have legal, moral, or financial conflicts of interest with the young suspect.

## YOUTH ARE ESPECIALLY VULNERABLE TO DECEPTION

---

- **Youths' incomplete brain development hinders their decision making under stress.** Developmental science shows the human brain isn't fully functional until the mid-20s. The limbic regions of the brain that control reward sensitivity develop faster than the prefrontal regions that control planning, judgment, and self-regulation. These “emotional” and “executive functioning” brain systems don't fully until emerging adulthood. Youth are literally less able to think about future consequences of their actions than adults because the planning and abstract thinking areas of the brain are still developing. Youth are likely to misunderstand or underestimate the legal implications of confessing to a crime, especially without the assistance of counsel.

- **Youth are more suggestible than adults.** Interrogations are a social interaction in which authority figures (police) attempt to persuade suspects to admit wrongdoing. Police are trained to use leading questions, interrupt suspects' attempts to resist, and offer excuses or justifications that make the crime seem less serious. Adolescents are more susceptible to interrogative pressure and more likely to change their statements when authority figures implicitly or explicitly communicate dissatisfaction with their answers. Youth with intellectual limitations, who are overrepresented in the justice system, are especially vulnerable.
- **Youth are more likely to comply with authority figures.** Compliance is different from suggestibility. Compliance involves agreeing to propositions or following instructions to please someone or avoid confrontation). Youth are socialized to obey adult authority figures every day—teachers at school, parents at home, and adult leaders in the community. When an adult police officer—particularly a uniformed, armed officer or even multiple officers—uses deception to obtain cooperation or confession, youth are less likely to advocate for themselves and more likely to acquiesce to police pressure.
- **Youth know less about the legal system than adults.** Many youth don't understand their Miranda rights, and they're also uninformed about justice system actors (such as lawyers and judges) and police interrogation practices (such as deception). Police, by contrast, are well versed in strategies to not only elicit incriminating information but to obtain information that will stand up in court. Allowing police to use deception—especially when youth don't know it's allowed—further perpetuates the imbalance of knowledge and power.
- **Youths' developing brains prime them toward rewards.** Adolescent brains are hardwired to respond to rewards and devalue long-term outcomes of their actions. The idea of escaping a stressful, confusing, or scary situation has a stronger neurobiological pull on youth than adults. This makes certain forms of deception, such as implied leniency, particularly dangerous. A youth suspect who hears an interrogator imply "this will all be over" if the youth confesses is especially sensitive to the short-term reward of relief from interrogative pressure.

## BENEFITS OF PROHIBITING DECEPTION IN JUVENILE INTERROGATIONS

- **Increases cost savings through reduced avenues for wrongful convictions.** Wrongful convictions can be extraordinarily costly to jurisdictions, with rippling effects in the community. A group of wrongfully convicted Nebraskans known as the Beatrice Six received a \$28.1 million jury award in 2016. Saddled with debt, Gage County passed the financial burden to residents by raising property taxes to a maximum. Prohibiting deception with juveniles would reduce opportunities for false confessions and, by extension, the financial repercussions of wrongful convictions for police departments, cities, and counties.
- **Promotes due process by "leveling the playing field."** Interrogators are experienced authority figures who control the entire interrogation interaction—timing, location, duration, and tenor. Adolescent suspects are typically uninformed about their rights, unaided by counsel, and developmentally ill-equipped to withstand interrogative pressures. Permitting deception with adolescent suspects further exploits the legal, social, and informational disadvantages they already face.
- **Promotes transparency, which builds public trust in law enforcement.** Prohibiting deception in juvenile interrogations would better align police practices with the public's expectation about which tactics are permissible.
- **Does not undermine police investigations.** The United Kingdom prohibited deception decades ago. This policy change did not handcuff investigators; on the contrary, it encouraged rigorous, transparent police work. Rigor and transparency ultimately serve the state's dual responsibilities of both public safety and due process.