

This is a Supplemental Disclosure Statement to the following published article:

Willén, R.M., & Strömwall, L.A. (2012). [Offenders' uncoerced false confessions: A new application of statement analysis?](#) *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 17, 346-359.

The information below was undisclosed in the above published article:

A rough sample size of about 30 participants was decided in advance. No formal power calculation was conducted and the participation rate was expected to be low. Initially, 36 offenders participated in the experiment. The narratives from six participants were excluded for different reasons. Three respondents were excluded because – on the respondents' initiative – the narratives were not focused on the purpose of the interview (i.e., the experiment). One was excluded because the false confession was so lengthy that the interviewer had to end the interview prematurely. One respondent was excluded because the narratives were severely incoherent to the extent that they were not possible to understand. One respondent was excluded because the interviewer had reason to believe that the event behind the supposedly true confession actually had taken place. All six respondents were excluded prior to the statistical analyses being made. Some of the excluded narratives were used by the research assistants/coders for training purposes.

In line with findings from Willén and Strömwall (2012), it was initially predicted that gender and interview experience would influence the outcome on CBCA and RM scores. These analyses were not statistically significant ( $p > .05$ ). In line with common publication practice (John et al., 2012), these predictions were therefore deleted from the report and the two variables instead included as covariates.

Finally, for the purpose of any future research aiming to replicate the study, it should be noted that the interviewer also had criminal experience and that all respondents were briefly informed about this (albeit not the nature of the experience) during the recruitment process. Before granting access, the prisons' heads of security did a thorough check-up to ensure that the interviewer was not familiar with any of the current prisoners (i.e., not only potential respondents).

All manipulations and measures are reported in the paper.