Abstract

1

2   The consistency of young asylum-seeker's verbal testimony is often critical in

3   determining the outcome of their claims. It is well established that an interviewee may change

4   their answers to appease an interviewer or in response to suggestions. Experiencing adversity

5   during childhood may increase vulnerability in such interview situations. Here, the

6   vulnerability to interview pressure of asylum-seeking youth separated from their caregivers

7   as minors was compared with age-matched peers. Thirty participants (16-23 years) completed

8   the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale (GSS2 , measures of negative life events (NLEs) and non-

9   verbal cognitive functioning measures. Vulnerability to interrogative suggestibility, non-

10   verbal cognitive functioning and number of NLEs was compared between two groups. This

11   preliminary data showed asylum-seeking youth as significantly more vulnerable to Shift;

12   changes in response to interviewer feedback. NLEs and lower non-verbal cognitive

13   functioning were significantly more common among the separated youth increasing

14   vulnerability to Shift. The implications are discussed.

15

16   **Keywords:** interview; interrogative suggestibility; negative life events;

17   unaccompanied asylum-seeking minor; separated youth; interrogation; negative feedback.

18
19

20

21

22

1

Introduction

Those seeking asylum as unaccompanied minors (henceforth 'separated youth') are required to provide verbal testimony via an interview to apply for state protection. When arriving in the United Kingdom (UK) they are usually in mid-to-late adolescence (Refugee Council, 2020). They will be asked to provide an initial testimony and are interviewed again in a substantive interview where a decision is made, although this decision may be appealed in court. The legal process can take from 6 months to 20 or more years with multiple interviews spanning from adolescence to adulthood (Lyons, 2018).

Decision-making in asylum claims often rely heavily on how credible someone's testimony is judged to be (Home Office, 2015; UNHCR, 2014; Veldhuizen, Horselenberg, Landstrom, Granhag, & van Koppen, 2017). Decision makers will look to separated youth to provide a clear and coherent story, which is consistent with their previous responses to questions and fits with other facts gathered from external sources (Byrne, 2007; Herlihy, Jobson, & Turner, 2012; Veldhuizen, Maas, Horselenberg, & van Koppen, 2018). However consistency cannot be relied upon as a heuristic of credibility (Granhag & Stromwall, 2000; Memon, 2012). The nature of memory means we may forget details (omission errors) over time and/or fill in gaps in our memory as a result of some form of influence such as misleading questioning (commission errors). Spinhoven, Bean, and Eurelings-Bontekoe (2006) interviewed asylum-seeking minors (12-18 years) about a traumatic experience twice, approximately 6 months apart. Despite the reports being based in fact with no reason for deception, the researchers found 86.4% of participants had at least one omission or commission and 58.9% had two or more. This highlights how common inconsistencies are

1 even when events are grounded in fact. Such discrepancies in testimonies can be cited as a

2 reason for rejecting someone's asylum claim on the grounds of credibility in the United

3 Kingdom and Europe (Herlihy et al., 2012; UNHCR, 2014).

4   The asylum interview like a police interview can put pressure upon an interviewee to

5 respond in a formal manner, Gudjonsson & Joyce, 2011; Milne & Bull, 1999; Veldhuizen et al.,

6 2018). A culture where submission and obedience towards authority is the norm may also

7 influence behaviour in an interview (Pinter, 2012, p.13) increasing vulnerability to

8 manipulation and suggestion (Given-Wilson et al., 2016; UNHCR, 2014).

9   Experimental research suggests the degree of non-contingent interviewer support

10 may be associated with accuracy (Saywitz, Wells, Larson & Hobbs, 2019) while a non-

11 supportive context can increase susceptibility to suggestion (Amerigogna, Ost, Bull, &

12 Akehurst, 2007). A study that examined the style and content of questions in Dutch asylum

13 interviews found questions asked are predominantly closed questions that restrict responses

14 to one answer, typically 'yes' or 'no' (Veldhuizen et al., 2018). This goes against best practice

15 and research showing greater accuracy when open ended questions are employed (Milne &

16 Bull, 1999).   When an interviewee is uncertain as to how to respond or receives negative

17 feedback, the interrogative pressure to respond to a closed question may lead them to doubt

18 their memory and change their answers (Drake & Bull, 2011; Gudjonsson, 1992, 2003, 2018;

19 Gudjonsson & Pearse, 2011; Milne, Clare, & Bull, 2002).

20   The concept of interrogative suggestibility – when an interviewee changes their own

21 internal beliefs following an interviewer's suggestion is used to explain this behaviour in

22 interviews. Gudjonsson and Clark's (1986) model of interrogative suggestibility illustrates the

23 extent to which individuals may willingly go along with suggestive questions and occasionally

be persuaded to change their responses. The model distinguishes between two types of suggestibility: a susceptibility to accept leading questions (*Yield*), and a susceptibility to critical feedback from the interrogator leading to a change in answer (*Shift*). Low cognitive functioning contributes to interrogative suggestibility in both children (Curci, Bianco, & Gudjonsson, 2017; Klemfuss & Olaguez, 2018) and adults (Gudjonsson, 1988, 2003). Moreover, age and the strength of the source memory trace (i.e., immediate and delayed verbal recall) in children (aged 7-16 years) has been found to be associated with lower Yield and Shift responses on the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale (Gudjonsson, Vagni, Maiorano, & Pajardi, 2016).

Life adversity in childhood appears to increase vulnerability to changing answers under pressure in interrogative interviews (Gudjonsson, 2018, pp. 132-134). Increased vulnerability to interrogative suggestibility has been found in those who have experienced early life adversity including victims of child sexual abuse (Vagni, Maiorano, Pajardi, & Gudjonsson, 2015), child maltreatment (Benedan, Powell, Zajac, Lum, & Snow, 2018) and adults who self-reported a higher number of negative life events (NLEs) throughout their lifetime (Norbeck, 1984, cited in Drake, Bull, & Boon, 2008). A series of studies by Drake and colleagues (Drake et al., 2008; Drake 2010a & 2010b) found that individuals who have experienced more NLEs are more likely to comply with negative feedback and are more suggestible both in terms of Yield and Shift (Drake 2010a, 2010b). The researchers propose that those with negative experiences feel more uncertain and look to external cues such as interviewer feedback, making them more sensitive to interviewer pressure and more likely to alter their answers. In addition, trauma symptoms can reduce the resilience of children to give 'no' answers to misleading questions both before and after negative feedback (Gudjonsson, Vagni, Maiorano, et al., 2020a).

4

1   Exposure to adversity and multiple negative and traumatic life events may increase

2   vulnerability in an asylum interview. For example, many separated youth have fled armed

3   conflict, torture, abuse, persecution, exploitation, and poverty and undertaken long and

4   dangerous journeys to seek safety, and may continue to experience adversity in host

5   countries (Reed, Fazel, Jones, Panter-Brick, & Stein, 2012).

6   Given the evidence indicating an association between NLEs, cognitive functioning and

7   interrogative suggestibility, this study tested two hypothesises. First, that there would be a

8   difference in experiences of NLEs, cognitive functioning and suggestibility between young

9   people who had been separated from their caregivers as minors and were seeking asylum in

10   the UK (Separated Youth) and their non-asylum-seeking peers (Comparison Group). Second,

11   that there would be a significant relationship between suggestibility and NLEs.

12

13   **Method**

14   **1.1. Participants**

15   Thirty participants, aged 16 to 23 years, formed two groups: 'Separated youth' (n=13)

16   and age-matched peers ('Comparison Group'; n=17).

17   Eight males (62%) and five females (38%), with a mean age of 18.15 years (*SD*=2.14),

18   formed the Separated youth group. All Separated youth participating had been separated

19   from their caregivers during childhood, arrived unaccompanied in the UK and applied for

20   asylum before turning 18. They had been in the UK for an average of 30 months when they

21   participated in the study (*M*=29.58, *SD*=18.05). They were from 8 countries; Sudan (n=3; 23%),

22   Afghanistan (n=2; 15%), Ethiopia (n=2; 15%), Eritrea (n=2; 15%), Albania (n=1; 8%), Cameroon

1   (n=1; 8%), Somalia (n=1; 8%) and Vietnam (n=1; 8%). None of the Separated youth reported

2   English as their primary language, however all were assessed as being proficient in English by

3   the therapist who referred them to the study, the researcher who conducted the interviews

4   (SC) and by the participant themselves. No difficulties arose assessing these participants in

5   English.

6   Seven males (41%) and ten females (59%), with a mean age of 17.53 years (SD = 1.66),

7   formed the Comparison Group, recruited through an organisation supporting disadvantaged

8   youth and consequently participants from low socioeconomic backgrounds were

9   overrepresented. All were born in the UK and reported English as their primary language.

10   Exclusion criteria included a pre-existing diagnosis of psychosis, severe learning

11   difficulties and/or developmental disorders due to challenges in assessing suggestibility

12   among individuals with such difficulties (Gudjonsson, 1997; Gudjonsson & Young, 2020).

13   **1.2. Sample Size**

14   Sensitivity analysis was calculated using G*Power 3 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner,

15   2007) to estimate the number of participants required to ensure sufficient statistical power.

16   Specifying alpha at .05 and desired power at .80, with three predictors (group, non-verbal

17   cognitive functioning, and NLEs), a sample size of 34 individuals was needed to ensure

18   sufficient statistical power to detect moderate effects. The total number of participants fell

19   short by 4 due to significant challenges contacting separated youth including instability in

their living arrangements, engagement with services, and in the outcome of their asylum claims. [1]

1.3. Ethical Considerations

The study obtained ethical approval from the University's Research Ethics Committee and was carried out according to their guidance. Independent Ethics Review Boards attached to recruitment sites also granted ethical approval (full details are omitted to protect confidentially).

1.4. Recruitment

Participants were recruited through opportunity sampling sites across London (n=6) and Kent (n=21), England and Glasgow (n=3), Scotland. The Separated youth were recruited from social care (n=2; 15%), youth charities (n=3; 23%), community (n=4; 31%) and therapeutic settings (n=4; 31%). The Comparison Group were recruited through youth charities (n=17; 100%). Professionals working in these contexts were contacted and asked to identify young people who met the inclusion criteria. Written information explained the study explored memory and life experiences (positive and negative). Confidentiality was assured and it was explicitly stated that participation in the research would not affect immigration proceedings. Informed consent was sought and participants received an honorarium of GBP£10 to cover participation costs. Consenting participants took part in a one-off interview in a confidential space in a community setting with the researcher (SC).

1.5. Measures

---

[1] Separated youth are an extremely hard-to-reach group and due to our exclusion criteria we were limited in how many separated youth we could include. This small sample size meant that there was reduced statistical power in detecting smaller effects sizes.

1   *Interrogative suggestibility* was measured using the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale

2   (GSS 2; Gudjonsson, 1987, 1997), a structured, manualised interview developed to objectively

3   measure vulnerability and susceptibility to give in to leading questions ('Yield') and

4   interrogative pressures ('Shift') when interviewed. It is presented as a memory assessment. A

5   story containing 40 ideas is narrated and has to be recalled with a point for each correct

6   answer giving an immediate recall score. There is a delayed test after 50 minutes followed by

7   20 questions related to the story, of which 15 are misleading. Answers to these questions

8   produce the Yield 1 score (score range 0-15). The participant then gets feedback that their

9   answers were incorrect and has the same 15 questions producing the score for Yield 2 (score

10   range 0-15). Any change in answers between immediate recall and delayed recall is the Shift

11   (score range 0-20). Total Suggestibility scores range from 0 to 35 and are calculated by

12   combining Yield 1 and Shift scores.

13   The measure has been validated and standardised with both adult and child

14   populations for use in research and clinical settings in multiple languages. The GSS2 has good

15   internal consistency and construct validity with alpha coefficients of .87 for Yield 1, .90 for

16   Yield 2 and .79 for Shift (Gudjonsson, 1992), and demonstrates high inter-rater reliability,

17   ranging from .989 to .996 (Clare, Gudjonsson, Rutter, & Cross, 1994).

18   *Negative life events (NLEs)* were measured using a combination of the Trauma History

19   Questionnaire (THQ; Green, 1996) to capture exposure to traumatic NLEs, and the

20   Coddington Life Events Scale - Adolescent Version (CLES-A; Coddington, 1999) to capture

21   more normative NLEs. The THQ consists of 24 yes/no items covering crime events, general

22   disaster and traumatic experiences and physical and sexual experiences, as well as one catch-

23   all question. If participants respond 'yes' they are asked to indicate their age(s) when the

1 event(s) occurred and how many times it occurred. The THQ has been found to be reliable

2 and valid in a large variety of clinical and non-clinical samples (Hooper, Stockton, Krupnick, &

3 Green, 2011). The CLES-A measures recent positive and NLEs. Response options include

4 yes/no items as well as an identification of frequency within the last year (0 - 8+ times). The

5 CLES-A has good test-retest and inter-rater reliability, as well as good validity (Coddington,

6 1999; Sandler & Block, 1979). THQ and CLES-A were pooled to calculate total NLEs (see

7 Appendix 1). Following guidance from Sandler and Block (1979), a separate count of NLEs

8 scores was used; with higher scores indicating more negative events. A score of one was given

9 if an event occurred once and so on. If the participants were unable to give an exact number

10 and reported an event occurring 'more than 10 times', 'countless' or 'many times', a score of

11 10 was ascribed as the maximum score. In these cases, participants were not pushed to give

12 an exact number due to the difficulty involved in bringing such memories to mind and the

13 associated distress of doing so (Given-Wilson et al., 2016).

14 *Non-verbal cognitive functioning* was measured using the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale

15 of Intelligence (WASI; Wechsler, 1999). To reduce bias based on language aptitude, only Block

16 Design and Matrix Reasoning subtests were used due to their non-verbal format. These scores

17 produce a Performance Intelligence Quotient (PIQ). Reliability coefficients range from .92 to

18 .95 for PIQ. The PIQ has evidenced strong correlations with full-scale IQ scores (r=.90;

19 Wechsler, 1999). All participants completed a demographic questionnaire, capturing age,

20 gender, country of origin, language, and date of arrival in the UK.

21 **1.6. Procedure**

22 The GSS 2 was administered by a clinical psychologist trained in administering the GSS

23 2. The GSS 2 narrative was presented first, followed by assessment of immediate recall.

1   During the required 50-minute interval, all additional measures were administered. Control

2   for order effects were addressed by random assignment of measures, organised in advance

3   using a random number generator in SPSS statistical analysis software IBM.

4   **1.7. Analytical Strategy**

5   Means and standard deviations were calculated for all continuous variables for the

6   two groups.[2] Group comparisons were made with independent t-tests with Cohen's d for

7   effect sizes. Pearson's correlations and regression were used examined the association

8   between interrogative suggestibility and NLEs.

9   **Results**

10   The Separated youth (n=13, *M* age = 18.15, *SD*=2.14) and Comparison Group (n=16, *M*

11   age = 17.25, *SD*=1.20)[3] were age matched. Descriptive statistics and comparisons between

12   groups on elements of the GSS 2, NLEs and non-verbal cognitive functioning are presented in

13   Table 1.

14   **Table 1:** Descriptive statistics of outcome measures and two-tailed t-tests comparing Separated

15   youth and Comparison Group.

	Separated youth Mean (*SD*)	Comparison Mean (*SD*)	*t*	*d*
Total Suggestibility (Yield 1 + Shift)	12.31 (3.84)	8.69 (4.80)	2.205*	.833
Yield 1	5.77 (3.37)	5.19 (3.06)	.487	.180
Yield 2	7.54 (4.12)	6.06 (3.36)	1.065	.394
Shift	6.54 (3.67)	3.50 (2.71)	2.567*	.942

---

[2] The distribution of data was assessed visually using histograms and scatter plots, and by calculating the skewness and kurtosis of distributions, as well as linearity, normality, multicollinearity, auto-correlation and homoscedasticity. The assumptions for *t*-tests, correlations, and regression analyses were satisfied.
[3] An outlier was detected across multiple scales. To prevent error the Comparison Group participant's data was excluded from the analysis which did not significantly affect outcomes.

Immediate Recall	10.69 (6.28)	13.00 (5.23)	-1.081	.398
Delayed Recall	9.46 (6.83)	11.41 (4.55)	-.918	.336
NLEs	46.85(28.97)	15.69 (12.66)	3.608**	1.39
Cognitive Functioning (Performance IQ)	80.46 (15.05)	94.69 (14.32)	-2.600*	.969

Note. *p<.05, **p<.01

2.1 Interrogative Suggestibility

Total Suggestibility scores were significantly higher among Separated youth, with a large effect size. The individual elements of interrogative suggestibility were also compared. Of these, Shift was the only score to show significant differences between the two groups; Shift scores were significantly higher among Separated Youth than the Comparison Group, with a large effect size. As Shift was the only significant measure of interrogative suggestibility, Shift scores were used in further analyses.

2.2 Negative Life Events

Total NLEs were found to be significantly higher among Separated Youth than the Comparison Group, with a large effect size.

2.3 Non-verbal Cognitive Functioning

Separated Youth were found to have significantly lower performance IQ scores than the Comparison Group, with a large effect size.

2.4 Associations between variables

A significant positive correlation was found between exposure to NLEs and Shift (r (27) = .511, p = .005), with a large effect size.

Table 2: Correlations between key variables.

	1	2	3	4
1. Total Suggestibility (Yield 1 + Shift)	-			
2. Shift	.740**	-		
3. NLEs	.256	.511**	-	
4. Cognitive Functioning (Performance IQ)	-.342	-.357	-.262	-

Note.   *p<.05,   **p<.01

2.5 Regression Analysis

A prediction model including Shift as the outcome variable and Group, non-verbal cognitive functioning and NLEs as or variables was significant and showed a large effect size ($F(3,25) = 3.965$, $p = .019$, $f^2 = .475$). This model explained 24.1% of the variance in Shift scores (adjusted $R^2 = .241$).

Group ($\beta = -.123$, $t = -.555$, $p = .584$), non-verbal cognitive functioning ($\beta = -.201$, $t = 1.092$, $p = .285$) and NLEs ($\beta = .384$, $t = 1.870$, $p = .073$) shared the variance in Shift scores, with none making significant independent contributions due to the correlation between the three predictor variables.

Discussion

This research presents new findings on separated youth's responses to interview pressure suggesting that individuals who have been asylum-seeking minors and are separated from caregivers may be more vulnerable to interrogative pressure compared with non-asylum-seeking peers. These findings are discussed below, taking into considering limitations of differences in the groups' culture, language and education and the limited statistical power.

Separated youth were significantly more likely to *Shift* (an aspect of interrogative suggestibility) their answers upon receiving negative feedback from an interviewer. Separated youth did not internalise suggested answers more than the comparison group (which is associated with *Yield* scores), nor did they demonstrate differences in their ability to remember or recall details of the presented story (as indicated by immediate and delayed recall scores). The results point to a vulnerability in shifting or changing their answers under some conditions in the youth sampled . The strong correlation between NLEs and *Shift* corroborates recent findings from an Italian sample with children with a reported history of sexual abuse (Gudjonsson et al., 2020a).

Separated youth in the current study were also found to have significantly lower non-verbal cognitive functioning and reported significantly higher numbers of NLEs than their British peers. Together, these factors contribute to explaining the variance in *Shift* scores. The findings suggest that separated youth, those with lower non-verbal cognitive ability and a high number of NLEs may be prone to a heightened vulnerability to negative feedback and this could lead them to change their answers to questions in response to interrogative pressures.

A non-verbal measure was used to reduce effects due to language and there is good evidence to suggest non-verbal cognitive functioning is similarly associated with interrogative suggestibility as is verbal cognitive functioning (Gudjonsson, 1983; Gudjonsson, 1990). Despite the differences found in non-verbal cognitive functioning between separated youth and the comparison group, no verbal memory differences were observed in outcomes of the GSS 2 (no differences in immediate and delayed recall scores). These findings add to the

explanation that separated youth were particularly vulnerable to interrogative pressure, rather than a recall failure leading to changes in their responses.

There are several ways in which the differences in non-verbal cognitive functioning between the two groups could be understood. Previous researchers have documented lower intellectual functioning and verbal ability among young people with experiences of adverse and traumatic life events (e.g. Bengwasan, 2018; Bengwasan & Bancual, 2020). Additionally, educational, language and cultural differences between the two groups contributed to challenges in accurately assessing non-verbal cognitive functioning. It would be interesting in future research to have a culturally linguistically similar comparison group[4].

The NLEs experienced by separated youth were more extensive, varied and often of a traumatic nature. This finding is consistent with the high levels of adversity potentially encountered in someone's home country, during their journey and in the country in which they seek safety (e.g. Reed et al., 2012). While it is well-established that these NLEs can have a range of deleterious effects on the young person's well-being and mental health (Reed et al., 2012), the data from the small select sample studied here suggests they may also contribute to their vulnerability in the interview setting.

The large effect size associated with NLEs, vulnerability to interrogative pressure and tendency to shift answers across all participants is noteworthy. It contributes to the growing body of research which has found significant relationships between exposure to childhood adversity and suggestibility, with adversity most strongly associated with Shift scores (Drake, 2010a; 2010b; Drake & Bull, 2011; Drake et al., 2008; Gudjonsson, Vagni, Maiorano, et al., 2020a; Gudjonsson, Vagni, Maiorano, et al., 2020b). It is proposed that of the two

---

[4] We would like to thank one of our reviewers for this suggestion.

1 interrogative suggestibility subscales, *Shift* is more related to social relationships and anxiety

2 than *Yield* (Gudjonsson, 2018). Together these findings suggest that a person's capacity to

3 cope with interrogative pressures may be impacted by the number or severity of NLEs they

4 have been exposed to.

5   Drake et al. (2008) speculate on the mechanisms that account for the association

6 between life adversity and interview performance. They suggest that exposure to NLEs

7 intensify feelings of uncertainty and negative self and performance-expectations can increase

8 feelings of inadequacy. This leads to individuals employing strategies such as relying on an

9 interviewer's verbal and non-verbal responses for guidance, which in turn could increase their

10 sensitivity to leading questions and interrogative pressures in an attempt to avoid additional

11 negative feedback and alleviate feelings of distress. The results reported here are in line with

12 Drake et al.'s (2008) proposed mechanism that NLEs increase shifting answers under

13 interrogative pressure.

14   Discrepancies are often judged as indicators that a young person's account in asylum

15 application is lacking credibility (Given-Wilson, Herlihy, & Hodes, 2016; Herlihy, Scragg, &

16 Turner, 2002; Spinhoven et al., 2006). Importantly, the results reported here suggest that if a

17 young person perceives their answer to be unsatisfactory due to negative response from an

18 interviewer they may decide to alter their answer(s). To our knowledge this is the first study

19 that has drawn attention to the potential for this specific vulnerability in unaccompanied

20 youth seeking asylum. What is less clear is the extent to which the effects seen here reflect

21 differences in language, culture and education. In order to answer these questions further

22 research is needed.

While the current study will need to be replicated with a more substantial sample, there is an indication that separated youth are vulnerable; and suggestive questioning by asylum officials, decision makers, lawyers, and social services may adversely impact the reliability and credibility of the information they provide. Separated youth who have been interviewed for a UK asylum application describe questions being asked repeatedly during interviews, and report feeling untrusted or disbelieved, which undermined their ability to communicate core details of their case (Pinter, 2012; UNHCR, 2014). If these findings are replicated there are clear implications for policy and practice. For example some simple steps can be taken to effectively reduce power differentials such as fostering a supportive interviewing style to make interviewees feel safe and cared for (see Bottoms, Quas, & Davis, 2007 for a review) and explaining that interviewees can say when they do not know an answer (Milne & Bull, 1999). Furthermore, following existing UK governmental guidance on achieving best evidence by allowing the young person to provide an uninterrupted free narrative account of events (Ministry of Justice, 2011) may help reduce their vulnerability to interrogative suggestibility.

References

Amerigogna, J., Ost, J., Bull, R., & Akehurst, L. (2007). A state of high anxiety: How non-supportive interviewers can increase the suggestibility of child witnesses. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 21,* 963-974.

Benedan, L., Powell, M.B., Zajac, R., Lum, J.A., Snow, P. (2018). Suggestibility in neglected children: The influence of intelligence, language, and social skills. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 79, 51-60.

Bengwasan, P. (2018). The intellectual profile of abused and neglected children in the Philippines: An analysis of SB5 IQ scores of sexually abused, physically abused and neglected children. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 81, 389-395.

Bengwasan, P., & Bancual, M.E.J.F. (2020). The developmental status of abused and neglected children in the Philippines. *Children and Youth Services Review 110, 104756.*

Bottoms, B., Quas, J., & Davis, S. (2007). The influence of interviewer-provided social support on children's suggestibility, memory, and disclosures. In M. Pipe, M. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 135–158). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Byrne, R. (2007). Assessing testimonial evidence in asylum proceedings: Guiding standards from the international criminal tribunals. International Journal of Refugee Law, 19, 609–638.

Clare, I.C.H., Gudjonsson, G.H., Rutter, S.C., & Cross, P. (1994). The inter-rater reliability of the Gudjonsson suggestibility scale (form 2). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33*, 357-365.

Coddington, R.D. (1999). *Coddington life events scales (CLES) technical manual*. Toronto: Multi Health Systems.

1   Curci, A., Bianco, A & Gudjonsson, G. (2017). Verbal ability, depression and anxiety as

2   correlates of interrogative suggestibility in children exposed to life adversities.

3   Psychology, Crime & Law, 23(5), 445-458.

4   Drake, K. (2010a). Interrogative suggestibility: Life adversity, neuroticism & compliance.

5   *Personality & Individual Differences, 48*, 493-498.

6   Drake, K. (2010b). The psychology of interrogative suggestibility: A vulnerability during

7   interview. *Personality & Individual Differences, 49*, 683-688.

8   Drake, K., & Bull, R. (2011). Individual differences in interrogative suggestibility: Life adversity

9   & field dependence. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 17*, 677-687.

10   Drake, K., Bull, R., & Boon, J. (2008). Interrogative suggestibility, self-esteem, & the influence

11   of negative life-events. *Legal & Criminological Psychology, 13, 299-307.*

12   Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power

13   analysis for the social, behavioural, & biomedical sciences. *Behaviour Research*

14   *Methods, 39, 175-191.*

15   Given-Wilson, Z., Herlihy, J., & Hodes, M. (2016). Telling the story: A psychological review on

16   assessing adolescents' asylum claims. *Canadian Psychology Special Edition: Refugee*,

17   1-18.

18   Granhag, P.A. & Strömwall, L.A. (2000). Deception detection: examining the consistency

19   heuristic. In C.M. Breur, M.M. Kommer, J.F. Nijboer & J.M. Reijntjes (Eds.), *New trends*

20   *in criminal investigation and evidence* (pp.309-321).

21   Green, B.L. (1996). Trauma history questionnaire. In B.H. Stamm (Ed.), *Measurement of stress,*

22   *trauma, & adaptation* (pp. 366-369). Lutherville: Sidran Press.

Gudjonsson, G.H. (1983). Suggestibility, Intelligence, Memory Recall and Personality: An Experimental Study. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 142,* 35-37.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1990). The relationship of intellectual skills to suggestibility, compliance and acquiescence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 11*, 227-231.

TheGudjonsson, G.H. (1987). A parallel form of the Gudjonsson suggestibility scales. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *26*, 215–221.

Gudjonsson, G. H. (1988). The relationship of intelligence and memory to interrogative suggestibility: The importance of range effects. *British Journal Clinical Psychology, 27*, 185-187.

Gudjonsson, G.H. (1992). Interrogative suggestibility; factor analysis of the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale (GSS2). *Personality & Individual Differences, 13*, 479-481.

Gudjonsson, G.H. (1997). *The Gudjonsson suggestibility scales manual*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Gudjonsson, G.H. (2018). Interrogative Suggestibility. In G.H. Gudjonsson (Ed.) The psychology of false confessions. Forty years of science and practice (pp. 51-62). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

Gudjonsson, G.H., & Clark, N. (1986). Suggestibility in police interrogation: A social psychological model. *Social Behaviour, 1, 83-104.*

Gudjonsson, G.H., & Joyce, T. (2011). Interviewing adults with intellectual disabilities. *Advances in Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities, 5(2), 16-21.*

1 Gudjonsson, G.H., & Pearse, J. (2011). Suspect interviews & false confessions. *Current*

2   *Directions in Psychological Science, 20*, 33-37.

3 Gudjonsson, G., Vagni, M., Maiorano, T., & Pajardi, D. (2016). Age and memory related

4   changes in children's immediate and delayed suggestibility using the Gudjonsson

5   Suggestibility Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *102*, 25-29.

6 Gudjonsson, G., Vagni, M., Maiorano, T., Giostra, V., & Pajardi, D. (2020a). Trauma symptoms

7   of sexual abuse reduce resilience in children to give 'no' answers to misleading

8   questions.   *Personality   and   Individual   Differences*,

9   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110378.

10   Gudjonsson, G., Vagni, M., Maiorano, T., Pajardi, D. (2020b). The relationship between

11   trauma symptoms and immediate and delayed suggestibility in children who have

12   been sexually abused. Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling,

13   https://doi.org/10.1002/jip.1554

14 Gudjonsson, G., & Young, S, (2020). An investigation of 'don't know' and 'direct explanation'

15   response styles on the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale: A comparison of three

16   different   vulnerable   adult   groups.   P*ersonality   and   Individual   Differences*,

17   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110385.

18 Herlihy, J., Scragg, P., & Turner, S. (2002). Discrepancies in autobiographical memories –

19   implications for the assessment of asylum seekers: repeated interviews study. *British*

20   *Medical Journal*, *9,* 324-327.

21 Herlihy, J., Jobson, L., & Turner, S. (2012). Just tell us what happened to you: Autobiographical

22   memory & seeking asylum. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 26,* 661-676.

1   Home Office. (2015). *Asylum Policy Instruction. Assessing credibility and refugee status.*

2   *Version 9.* Retrieved from

3   https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attac

4   hment_data/file/397778/ASSESSING_CREDIBILITY_AND_REFUGEE_STATUS_V9_0.pd

5   f.

6   Hooper, L., Stockton, P., Krupnick, J., & Green, B. (2011). Development, use, & psychometric

7   properties of the Trauma History Questionnaire. *Journal of Loss & Trauma, 16*, 258-

8   283.

9   IBM Corp. (2017). *IBM SPSS statistics for windows, version 25.0*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

10   Klemfuss, J. & Olaguez, A. (2018). Individual differences in children's suggestibility: An

11   updated review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 24, 1-25.

12   Lyons, K. (2018, August 17). Revealed: Asylum seekers' 20 year wait for Home Office ruling.

13   *The Guardian,* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/uk-

14   news/2018/aug/17/revealed-asylum-seekers-20-year-wait-for-home-office-ruling

15   Memon, A. (2012). Credibility of asylum claims: Consistency and accuracy of autobiographical

16   memory reports following trauma. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 26, 677-679.*

17   Milne, B. & Bull, R. (1999). Investigative Interviewing: psychology and practice. Chichester:

18   Wiley.

19   Milne, B., Clare, I., & Bull, R. (2002). Interrogative suggestibility among witnesses with mild

20   intellectual disabilities: the use of an adaptation of the GSS. *Journal of Applied*

21   *Research in Intellectual Disability*, *15*(1), 8-17.

1   Ministry of Justice (2011) Achieving best evidence in criminal proceedings: Guidance on

2   interviewing victims and witnesses, and guidance on using special measures. London:

3   Ministry of Justice.

4   Pinter, I. (2012). *Into the unknown, children's journey through the asylum process: A better*

5   *childhood.   For   every   child*.   Retrieved   from   https://www.childrens

6   society.org.uk/sites/default/files/tcs/into-the-unknown--childrens-journeys-through-

7   the-asylum-process--the-childrens-society.pdf.

8   Reed, R.V., Fazel, M., Jones, L., Panter-Brick, C., & Stein, A. (2012). Mental health of displaced

9   & refugee children resettled in low-income & middle-income countries: Risk &

10   protective factors. *The Lancet, 21*, 250-265.

11   Refugee Council (2020, August 27) Facts about separated children, Refugee Council.

12   https://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/information/refugee-asylum-facts/separated-

13   children-facts/

14   Sandler, I.N., & Block, M. (*1979*). Life stress & maladaptation of children. *American Journal of*

15   *Community Psychology, 7*, 425-440.

16   Saywitz, K., Wells, C., Larson, R. & Hobbs, S.(2019).   Effects of interviewer support on

17   children's memory and suggestibility: Systematic review and meta-anaylses of

18   experimental research. *Trauma Violence and Abuse, Vol.20, 1-18*

19   Spinhoven, P., Bean, T., & Eurelings-Bontekoe, L. (2006). Inconsistences in the self-report of

20   traumatic experiences by unaccompanied refugee minors. *Journal of Traumatic Stress,*

21   *19, 663-673.*

UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). (2014). *Gathering the facts. The Heart of the Matter: Assessing credibility when children apply for asylum in the European Union*. Brussels: UNHCR.

Vagni, M., Maiorano, T., Pajardi, D., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (2015). Immediate & delayed suggestibility among suspected child victims of sexual abuse. *Personality & Individual Differences, 79*, 129–133.

Veldhuizen, T., Horselenberg, R., Landstrom, S., Granhag, P., & van Koppen, P. (2017). Interviewing asylum seekers: A vignette study on questions asked to assess credibility of claims about origin and persecution. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 14, 3-22.*

Veldhuizen, T., Maas, R., Horselenberg, R., & van Koppen, P. (2018). Establishing origin: Analysing the questions asked in asylum interviews. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 25*(2), 283–302.

Wechsler, D. (1999). *Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence.* New York: The Psychological Corporation, Harcourt Brace & Company.