Suggestibility of Children's Memory

Children can be reliable witnesses, and many of their reports are accurate. But a century of research shows that what a child remembers and reports can be shaped — sometimes profoundly — by how that child is questioned. Suggestibility refers to the degree to which a child's account comes to include false information that was supplied by, or implied through, an interview or conversation. This paper explains what suggestibility is, traces the research from its origins to the daycare-abuse prosecutions that revived the field, and surveys the two broad sources of risk: the techniques an interviewer uses and the characteristics a child brings. The aim is neither to assume that children's allegations are false nor to treat them as beyond question, but to give the trier of fact an accurate picture of when a child's report is most trustworthy and when it is most at risk. It assumes no background in psychology.

Extended resource: Attorneys seeking a fuller, practitioner-oriented treatment of these issues — including forensic child interviews, child memory and suggestibility, and the use of counterintuitive expert testimony in child sexual abuse cases — may consult the author's companion web resource, Child Abuse Allegations: What Every Attorney Should Know (Arizona Forensics, LLC, https://arizonaforensics.com/child-cert/). That resource explores the topics below in greater depth and with additional case-specific material.

What Suggestibility Means

Suggestibility is not a single thing. From the earliest research, investigators distinguished two sources. One is cognitive: a child may genuinely come to misremember, because the original event was poorly encoded or because misleading information has altered the underlying memory trace. The other is social: a child may report something false not because memory has changed but because of the pressures of the interview — a wish to please an adult, to comply with a perceived expectation, or to end an uncomfortable line of questioning (Melnyk, Crossman, & Scullin, 2007). The two can operate together, and a report that begins as mere compliance can, with repetition, harden into something the child appears to believe.

This distinction matters in court because it bears on how a false report should be understood and how it might be detected. A socially driven false answer may be reversible and may leave signs in the interview record; a genuinely altered memory may be reported with the same confidence and detail as a true one. Either way, the central lesson of the research is that suggestibility is substantially a product of the conditions of questioning, not simply a fixed trait of the child.

A Century of Study, and Its Revival

Interest in children's suggestibility is more than a hundred years old. In France, Alfred Binet (1900) conducted pioneering experiments whose findings have been replicated repeatedly ever since. Binet showed children a series of lines, each longer than the last, then asked them to reproduce target lines that were in fact all the same length; children, influenced by the preceding pattern, drew the targets as progressively longer — and many knew they were wrong yet were swayed by the situation. He went on to show that children were most accurate under free recall and most error-prone when misinformation was embedded in questions, and he drew the cognitive-versus-social distinction that still organizes the field. In Belgium, Julian Varendonck (1911, as cited in Ceci & Bruck, 1995) demonstrated that children would readily assent to false suggestions — a beard on a beardless man, a nonexistent stranger — and argued that suggestive interviewing had compromised the child testimony in a murder trial. In Germany, Clara and William Stern documented their own children's memories and found, as later researchers would, that free narratives were more accurate than answers to direct questions.

After this early flowering, the mid-twentieth century was a lean period: children were rarely central witnesses, and the topic drew little attention. That changed in the 1980s. Legal reforms eased the rules that had limited children's testimony, and a wave of mass-allegation daycare prosecutions brought child witnesses to the center of public attention. Cases such as the McMartin Preschool case in California, the Wee Care Nursery case in New Jersey (State v. Michaels), and the Little Rascals case in North Carolina featured numerous young children describing bizarre abuse, often with little or no corroborating physical evidence, and several convictions were ultimately overturned. Researchers who reviewed the interview tapes and transcripts raised serious concerns about how the children had been questioned (Ceci & Bruck, 1995), and that scrutiny revived the scientific study of suggestibility in earnest.

The Architecture of a Suggestive Interview

The central concept to emerge from the modern research is interviewer bias: an interviewer's preexisting belief about what happened, which then shapes the entire interview (Ceci & Bruck, 1995). A biased interviewer tends to seek confirmation of that belief — choosing which questions to ask, how often to ask them, how to characterize the suspect, and what emotional tone to set. Because the bias steers the whole encounter, its effects are not limited to a single bad question; they accumulate across an interview and across interviews. The sections that follow describe the specific techniques through which interviewer bias operates, each of which has been studied under controlled conditions.

Question Type and Repetition

Open-ended invitations — "Tell me what happened" — tend to yield accurate, if incomplete, accounts from children. To fill the gaps, interviewers often turn to direct questions calling for a yes/no or one-word answer, which elicit more information but at a cost: accuracy declines, and a biased interviewer's direct questions may import the interviewer's own assumptions into the child's report (Melnyk et al., 2007). Repetition compounds the risk. When a question is asked again, a child may infer that the first answer was wrong and change it. Poole and White (1991) found that repeating open-ended questions had little effect, but repeating direct yes/no questions undermined the accuracy of four-year-olds, who also gave confident-sounding answers to questions that called for pure speculation.

Repeated interviews carry related dangers. A single exposure to misinformation is enough to produce suggestibility in children, and because children in real cases may be interviewed many times over an investigation, the cumulative effect matters. Purely neutral repeated interviews can actually help memory, but truly neutral interviews are rare, and Melnyk and Bruck (2004) found that repeated suggestive interviewing could increase children's adoption of false suggestions, with the timing of the interviews an important moderator. The practical point is that even one suggestive interview poses a real risk to accuracy, and repetition can magnify it.

Stereotype Induction and Interview Atmosphere

Interviewer bias can be conveyed without a single misleading question. In stereotype induction, the child is led to view the accused negatively over time. The classic demonstration is the "Sam Stone" study (Leichtman & Ceci, 1995): preschoolers were told for weeks that a man named Sam Stone was clumsy; after a brief, uneventful visit, and following several suggestive interviews, large numbers of children — 72% of the youngest — later told a new interviewer that Sam Stone had ripped a book or soiled a teddy bear he had never touched, often adding unsolicited detail and maintaining the claims when gently challenged. Combining a negative stereotype with suggestive questioning produced more false reports than either alone. Studies modeling the actual McMartin interview techniques found them strikingly powerful: a package of suggestive questions, peer

pressure, selective reinforcement, and repetition produced false allegations at far higher rates than simple suggestion (Garven, Wood, Malpass, & Shaw, 1998).

The emotional tone of an interview matters as well. An accusatory atmosphere — communicating that something bad happened and pressing the child to disclose it — can produce false reports that match the interviewer's tone, even for events the child barely remembers. A supportive, non-leading atmosphere can have the opposite effect: young children interviewed warmly and without pressure have answered abuse-related questions more accurately and offered fewer false details than children questioned by a cold interviewer (Goodman, Rudy, Bottoms, & Aman, 1990). Atmosphere is therefore not a neutral backdrop but part of the interview's suggestive force.

Props, Drawings, and Anatomical Dolls

Because young children say little in response to open questions, interviewers have tried nonverbal aids to draw out more. Most fare poorly under scrutiny. Props tend to increase both accurate and inaccurate details, and asking a child to draw specific details of an event can raise suggestibility beyond merely hearing the suggestion (Melnyk et al., 2007). Anatomically detailed dolls, once widely endorsed for asking about sexual touching, have proven especially problematic with three- and four-year-olds, in whom they can produce false reports of genital contact — likely because using a doll to stand for one's own body requires a symbolic ability that is still developing before about age five.

The weight of evidence is that anatomical dolls are problematic with children under five and may add little for children of any age. In at least one study, children interviewed without dolls gave longer and more detailed reports than those interviewed with them. None of this means children cannot communicate about abuse; it means the tools intended to help can introduce error, and their use is itself a factor bearing on a report's reliability.

Child-Based Characteristics

Suggestibility also depends, to a degree, on the individual child. In the most comprehensive review, Bruck and Melnyk (2004) synthesized 69 studies and more than 500 analyses and concluded that there is at present no profile that reliably identifies which children will be highly suggestible, and that most individual-difference factors explain relatively little of the variation. A few factors are consistently related to suggestibility: children with intellectual disability tend to be more suggestible than typically developing peers of the same age (though among typically developing children, intelligence is not a reliable predictor); stronger language ability is associated with lower suggestibility; greater imagination and creativity with higher suggestibility; and higher self-concept with lower suggestibility.

The practical implication is one of caution in both directions. A child's age, articulateness, or apparent confidence cannot be used to certify a report as accurate, nor can the absence of an obvious vulnerability. Because individual characteristics account for only part of the picture, the conditions of questioning remain the most important and most controllable determinant of whether a child's account can be trusted.

Better Practice in Interviewing

The same research that catalogs what goes wrong also points to what works. Structured, evidence-based interview protocols — most prominently the NICHD Investigative Interview Protocol — operationalize the core findings by front-loading open-ended invitations, minimizing option-posing and suggestive prompts, and disciplining interviewer bias. Reviews of field and laboratory studies show that interviewers trained in such protocols ask more open-ended questions and fewer

suggestive ones, and that children interviewed this way provide more forensically useful detail without the inflation of error that suggestive techniques produce (Lamb, Orbach, Hershkowitz, Esplin, & Horowitz, 2007). For courts, the existence of validated protocols supplies a yardstick: the closer an interview hews to open-ended, non-leading, well-documented questioning, the more weight its product can bear; the further it departs, the more caution is warranted.

Children's Suggestibility and the Law

Courts have engaged directly with this research, especially in the wake of the daycare cases. The leading decision is State v. Michaels (1994), in which the New Jersey Supreme Court found that the child interviews had employed most of the techniques the research condemns — interviewer bias, repeated and leading questions, vilification of the defendant, peer pressure, and the like — and held that where a defendant shows that interviews were so suggestive as to raise a substantial likelihood of unreliable testimony, the court must hold a pretrial "taint" hearing, at which the State bears the burden of proving the reliability of the resulting statements by clear and convincing evidence. The decision treats suggestive interviewing as a threat to reliability that the court must screen, much as it screens suggestive identification procedures.

Federal constitutional law approaches the problem largely through the rules of hearsay and confrontation. In Idaho v. Wright (1990), the Supreme Court held that a young child's statements to an examining adult lacked the "particularized guarantees of trustworthiness" needed for admission, faulting the interview for leading questions, a preconceived agenda, and the absence of safeguards such as recording — the very features the suggestibility research identifies as dangerous. Maryland v. Craig (1990) addressed the related question of how a child may testify, permitting closed-circuit testimony on a case-specific showing of necessity, while Crawford v. Washington (2004) later reframed the confrontation analysis for testimonial hearsay. Whether an expert may explain suggestibility research to the jury is governed by the general standards for expert evidence — Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals (1993), as extended by Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael (1999), or the Frye general-acceptance test still followed in some jurisdictions (Frye v. United States, 1923). The body of suggestibility research is large, replicated, and widely accepted, though its application to any particular case turns on that case's specific facts.

Special Issues in Legal Practice

The principles described above apply with equal force to every party in a legal proceeding. Memory operates the same way regardless of who is asking the questions, and the science summarized here favors no side. What differs between the parties is not the science but the vantage point — the particular places where memory issues tend to surface, and the particular errors each party is best positioned to guard against. The two summaries below identify those recurring issues. They are offered for orientation, not as litigation strategy; in every case the controlling question is what the evidence in that case will, and will not, support, and the expert's role is to inform the trier of fact rather than to advocate for either side.

Special Issues for Prosecutors

For the State, the goal is to present a child's account in a form whose reliability can withstand scrutiny, and the issue most likely to surface is how the child was interviewed before trial. Genuine disclosures can be undermined by poor interviewing as surely as false ones can be created by it, so the error best guarded against is allowing a credible allegation to be compromised by avoidable suggestiveness — leading or repeated questioning, stereotype induction, an accusatory tone, or undocumented early interviews. Preserving and recording the first interview, favoring open-ended questions and validated protocols, and documenting the conditions of each contact all help the

State offer testimony that reflects the child's own memory rather than the interviewer's expectations.

Understood this way, the science supports rather than threatens well-founded prosecutions. An allegation developed through careful, well-documented, non-leading interviewing is far more resistant to challenge than one developed through the techniques the research condemns, and attention to interview quality protects the strength of the State's case as much as it protects the accused.

Special Issues for Defense

For the defense, the recurring task is to examine how a child's statements were elicited before accepting them at face value. The issue most likely to surface is suggestive interviewing — interviewer bias, repeated or leading questions, stereotype induction, selective reinforcement, an accusatory atmosphere, or the use of props and anatomical dolls — particularly where there were many interviews, long delays, or a lack of recordings of the earliest contacts. The error best guarded against is treating a confident, detailed, or consistent child account as necessarily accurate, when the research shows such qualities can be products of suggestion rather than memory. Obtaining and analyzing the complete interview record is central to that task.

The corresponding safeguard is to ensure the trier of fact understands what the research establishes and what it does not: that children's reports are most reliable when elicited through open-ended, non-leading questioning, and most at risk under the conditions documented above; that a single suggestive interview can introduce error and repeated ones can compound it; and that detail and confidence are not guarantees of accuracy. Where the facts warrant, a taint hearing and, where admissible, expert explanation of the suggestibility research can help the court weigh a child's testimony — neither dismissing genuine accounts nor accepting compromised ones uncritically.

References

Binet, A. (1900). La suggestibilité. Schleicher Frères.

Bruck, M., & Melnyk, L. (2004). Individual differences in children’s suggestibility: A review and synthesis. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18(8), 947–996. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1070

Ceci, S. J., & Bruck, M. (1995). Jeopardy in the courtroom: A scientific analysis of children’s testimony. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/10180-000

Garven, S., Wood, J. M., Malpass, R. S., & Shaw, J. S., III. (1998). More than suggestion: The effect of interviewing techniques from the McMartin Preschool case. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(3), 347–359. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.3.347

Goodman, G. S., Rudy, L., Bottoms, B. L., & Aman, C. (1990). Children’s concerns and memory: Issues of ecological validity in the study of children’s eyewitness testimony. In R. Fivush & J. A. Hudson (Eds.), Knowing and remembering in young children (pp. 249–284). Cambridge University Press.

Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Hershkowitz, I., Esplin, P. W., & Horowitz, D. (2007). A structured forensic interview protocol improves the quality and informativeness of investigative interviews with children: A review of research using the NICHD Investigative Interview Protocol. Child Abuse & Neglect, 31(11–12), 1201–1231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.03.021

Leichtman, M. D., & Ceci, S. J. (1995). The effects of stereotypes and suggestions on preschoolers’ reports. Developmental Psychology, 31(4), 568–578. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.31.4.568

Melnyk, L., & Bruck, M. (2004). Timing moderates the effects of repeated suggestive interviewing on children's eyewitness memory. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 18(5), 613–631. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1012

Melnyk, L., Crossman, A. M., & Scullin, M. H. (2007). The suggestibility of children's memory. In M. P. Toglia, J. D. Read, D. F. Ross, & R. C. L. Lindsay (Eds.), The handbook of eyewitness psychology: Vol. 1. Memory for events (pp. 401–427). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Poole, D. A., & White, L. T. (1991). Effects of question repetition on the eyewitness testimony of children and adults. Developmental Psychology, 27(6), 975–986. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.27.6.975

Legal Authorities

Crawford v. Washington, 541 U.S. 36 (2004).

Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).

Frye v. United States, 293 F. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923).

Idaho v. Wright, 497 U.S. 805 (1990).

Kumho Tire Co. v. Carmichael, 526 U.S. 137 (1999).

Maryland v. Craig, 497 U.S. 836 (1990).

State v. Michaels, 136 N.J. 299, 642 A.2d 1372 (1994).

Further reading: Child Abuse Allegations: What Every Attorney Should Know (Arizona Forensics, LLC)

Related topic papers: Child Witness Memory · Forensic Interviewing Protocols · Misinformation Effect · Suggestion and False Memory · Interrogation and Suggestibility · Reconstruction and Recall