

Peer influence on event reports among adolescents and young adults

Katherine McGuire¹, Kamala London¹, and Daniel B. Wright²

¹Department of Psychology, University of Toledo, Toledo, OH, USA

²Department of Psychology, Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA

When two or more people witness an event together, the event report from one person can influence others' reports. In the current study we examined the role of age and motivational factors on peer influence regarding event reports in adolescents and young adults. Participants ($N = 249$) watched a short video of a robbery then answered questions with no co-witness information or with information believed to be from a co-witness. Public and private response conditions were included to explore motivations for peer influence. Co-witness information influenced participants' responses, although the effect was equally strong in the private and the public co-witness conditions. Peer influence on event reports was steady across a large age range (11- to 25-year-olds).

Keywords: Memory; Co-witness; Social influence; Eyewitness testimony; Forensic interviewing.

A number of high-profile childcare cases in the late 1980s and early 1990s (e.g., *People v. Buckey*, 1990; *State of New Jersey v. Michaels*, 1988) spawned a flood of research on memory and suggestibility in child witnesses (e.g., Ceci, Loftus, Leichtman, & Bruck, 1994; for a review see Goodman & Melinder, 2007). Most of this work focused on young children, and the general finding was that preschoolers are much more suggestible than school-aged children (e.g., Goodman & Reed, 1986; Robinson & Briggs, 1997). More recently, Bruck and Ceci (2004) have pointed out that the emphasis on suggestibility in preschoolers has led to a misconception that suggestibility ends after kindergarten. However, a growing body of research has documented that suggestibility continues into older childhood (Bruck & Ceci, 2004; Bruck, London, Landa, & Goodman, 2007; Ceci, Papierno, & Kulkofsky, 2007; Finnälä, Mahlberg, Santtila, Sandnabba, & Niemi, 2003; London, Bruck, & Melnyk, 2009; Robinson & Briggs, 1997), and there are certain

conditions under which older children are *more* suggestible than younger children (see Brainerd, Reyna, & Ceci, 2008, for a review; Connolly & Price, 2006; Dewhurst & Robinson, 2004; Principe, Guiliano, & Root, 2008). While the literature addressing suggestibility in older children is sparse, the topic of suggestibility in adolescence is virtually non-existent. The goal of the present study was to examine the effects of one particular mechanism of suggestibility, peer influence, on event reports among adolescents and young adults.

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH EXAMINING PEER INFLUENCE ON EVENT REPORTS AMONG ADOLESCENCE

Peer influence on adolescents' event reports is an important topic to examine for a number of reasons. First there are practical reasons to

Address correspondence to: Kathy McGuire, University of Toledo, 2801 West Bancroft Street, MS 948, Toledo, Ohio 43606, USA. E-mail: kathy.mcguire@rockets.utoledo.edu

examine this population. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2007), adolescents and young adults consistently maintain the highest arrest and victimisation rates for violent crimes. Adolescent witnesses, therefore, are a key part of the criminal justice process, and they are often called upon to serve as eyewitnesses in both forensic interviews and courtroom testimony. Second, there are theoretical reasons that suggest adolescence is a developmental period where peers exert particularly strong influence upon one another. Specifically, adolescence is an important time for identity development (Meeus, 1996), and navigating social relationships outside one's immediate family gains increasing importance (Blakemore, 2008). For example, Sebastian, Viding, Williams, and Blakemore (2010) conducted an ostracism experiment with adolescents (11- to 15-year-olds) and adults (22- to 47-year-olds). They found that, compared with adults, adolescents had stronger negative emotional reactions to social exclusion and that adolescents were "hypersensitive" to social rejection.

Another line of research has demonstrated that adolescents show a particularly high rate of susceptibility to peer influence compared to younger and older age groups in the classic Asch-type (Asch, 1956) tasks (e.g., Costanzo & Shaw, 1966; Hamm & Hoving, 1969, 1971; Hoving, Hamm, & Galvin, 1969; Iscoe, Williams, & Harvey, 1963; Klein, 1972; Sistrunk, Clement, & Guenther, 1971). Since adolescents are particularly susceptible to peer influence (Prinstein & Dodge, 2008), and social influence is a driving force behind suggestibility effects (e.g., Ceci & Bruck, 1993; Ceci, Ross, & Togliola, 1987), peer influence and suggestibility is especially interesting to examine in this population.

SUGGESTIBILITY OF EVENT REPORTS AMONG ADOLESCENTS

There are two main research areas that are relevant to the present study. In the first section, below, we review suggestibility studies that have included adolescents in their sample. However, these studies do not use the peer as the source of misinformation. In the second section we review studies that have examined peer influence on memory reports, though few of these studies have included adolescents.

Traditional suggestibility studies

Some studies have examined developmental trends in suggestibility including or spanning across near-adolescent or adolescent-aged youth. The general paradigm employed in these studies is to present or stage an event for children. Some of the studies interview children immediately after the event with misleading questions (Coxon & Valentine, 1997; Richardson, Gudjonsson, & Kelly, 1995). Other researchers have interviewed children with misleading questions then interviewed them again after a delay (Cohen & Harnick, 1980; Eisen, Qin, Goodman, & Davis, 2002; Lee, 2004; Roos af Hjelmsäter, Granhag, Strömwall, & Memon, 2008). The findings from these studies are equivocal. Some studies indicate that suggestibility may reduce from childhood to adolescence and that adolescents may not differ from adults (Cohen & Harnick, 1980; Coxon & Valentine, 1997; Eisen et al., 2002). However, other studies suggest that adolescents may be more similar to children than adults in suggestibility (Lee, 2004; Roos af Hjelmsäter et al., 2008).

Based on extant research, then, are adolescents more like adults or are they similar to older children regarding their suggestibility? The studies examining developmental differences have used different paradigms and methodologies as well as ages and comparison groups, which has led to some confusion in determining developmental trends. Importantly, none of these studies used peers as the source of the misinformation. Rather, the mode of delivering the misinformation in these studies is from the adult interviewer (or an adult confederate in the case of Roos af Hjelmsäter et al., 2008). Therefore the results from this literature are mixed and developmental patterns in suggestibility across adolescence, particularly when introduced through peer influence, still requires exploration.

Peer influence on adolescents' event reports

Although both theory and research show that social influence plays a large role in suggestibility, surprisingly few suggestibility studies have examined the role of peer influence on children's event reports (for exceptions involving young children, see Ceci et al., 1987; Garven, Wood, & Malpass, 2000; Lampinen & Smith, 1995; Principe et al.,

2008; Principe, Kanaya, Ceci, & Singh, 2006). Rather, the developmental literature has examined the role of misinformation given from adults.

The results from a recently published study indicate that, in a pre-adolescent sample, peers may exert more influence on reports compared with adults. Roos af Hjelmsäter, Granhag, and Strömwall (2009) investigated the effects of social influence from peers versus adults on 11- to 12-year-olds' reports of a personally experienced interaction with a stranger. Before being interviewed about the event, participants watched a videotaped statement either from an adult woman or from a 10-year-old girl suggesting either that a person who was present actually was not, or else that a person who was not present really was present. They found that more influence was exerted on 11- and 12-year-olds' event reports by peers versus adults. Roos af Hjelmsäter et al.'s (2009) findings provide additional evidence indicating the importance of examining peer influence as a source of suggestibility among adolescents.

In the adult memory field, over the past decade, an area of study known as memory conformity (Gabbert, Memon, & Allan, 2003; Gabbert, Memon, Allan, & Wright, 2004; Wright, Self, & Justice, 2000) or social contagion of memory (Roediger, Meade, & Bergman, 2001) has materialised. These studies have a well-established experimental protocol to manipulate co-witness information (for a review, see Wright, Memon, Skagerberg, & Gabbert, 2009). Memory conformity research examines the effect of post-event information on event reports when peers, rather than interviewers, are the source of post-event information. Peer influence is typically established through a co-witness, either another participant or a confederate, who witnesses the same event and engages in the same memory task as the participant. The general finding from this literature is that, even when memories originate from another source such as a co-witness, people often maintain that these memories are their own and have originated from their own experiences (e.g., Candel, Memon, & Al-Harazi, 2007; Skagerberg & Wright, 2008a; Wright & Schwartz, 2010).

To our knowledge, only two studies have been conducted using a memory conformity paradigm with youth. Candel et al. (2007) compared levels of memory conformity in young children (6- to 7-year-olds) versus pre-adolescents (11- to 12-year-olds). They found that the older group showed

more memory conformity on a free recall measure although the two groups did not differ on a cued recall measure. One study examined memory conformity in a facial recognition task among 11- to 18-year-old adolescents (Wright, London, & Waechter, 2010). They found steady levels of memory conformity across age, although their study was limited to a facial recognition task versus reports regarding an event. While there is evidence that pre-adolescents may be more suggestible than older children in some contexts, it is difficult to determine whether this trend continues into adulthood. Since evidence discussed above suggests that adolescents may have heightened sensitivity to peer influence further research is needed to examine peer influence regarding event reports across adolescence.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The goal of this study was to examine peer influence on event reports among adolescents and young adults. Additionally, we sought to explore whether factors known to affect conformity would affect peer influence regarding event based reports, and if so whether these effects would be unevenly distributed developmentally. A broad age range, from 11 to 21 years, was included to allow us to explore these questions.

An additional goal of the present study was to provide some preliminary evidence regarding factors that predict or explain conformity to event reports. Therefore a potential mediator variable (normative versus informational social influence) was examined. Deutsch and Gerard (1955) differentiated informational and normative influences as motivations for conformity. Informational influence occurs when people conform because they desire to be accurate. Normative influence, on the other hand, occurs when conforming responses are the result of an individual's desire to appear in agreement with others in order to fit in with the group.

The extent to which peer influence on event reports is driven by normative versus informational motivation is unclear. Gabbert et al. (2003) suggested that informational influence was most likely responsible for the memory conformity effects found in their study because responses were made in an individual and private setting where pressures to "fit in" were absent. However, Wright, Gabbert, Memon, and London (2008) found inconsistent effects of private versus public

judgements during a memory conformity task with adults. They had participants either make their responses so the other person could see their responses, or so the other person could not see the responses. They found more conformity in the public condition, but only when participants were told to be really careful not to make any false alarms. They found when participants were told false alarms were all right, but not to miss any previously presented item, the private condition actually produced greater suggestibility. The processes involved with private and public responding appear complex, and therefore warrant further investigation.

Most likely a combination of motivations produce conformity, as individuals are motivated to report both the most accurate and socially acceptable responses (Nolan, Schultz, Cialdini, Goldstein, & Griskevicius, 2008). However, adolescents and adults may display conformity for different motivational reasons. Further exploration of conformity motivations is necessary in order to determine whether there are developmental differences in peer influence on event reporting behaviour or the underlying explanations.

Design overview

The independent variables in this study included age of the participant and the between-participants factor of co-witness information type. There were three co-witness information conditions. In one condition participants received no co-witness information (No-CWI). In two conditions, participants received co-witness information (CWI); approximately half of these were told they would need to report their answers publicly (CWI-Public) and the other half was not (CWI-Private). The dependent variable was the amount of correct information reported.

Based on the work reviewed above, we hypothesised that (1) all participants (11 to 21 years of age) would be influenced by peers' event reports, (2) pre-adolescents' and adolescents' reports would be less influenced by their peers as they got older, (3) both CWI conditions would produce conforming responses as a result of peer influence, and (4) CWI presented with increased normative pressures (i.e., perceived public response) may elicit more conforming responses than CWI presented without this increased pressure.

METHOD

Participants

Participants included 252 11- to 21-year-olds ($M = 16.69$ years; $SD = 2.71$). Three participants were excluded from analyses, bringing the final sample size to 249 participants (145 female). One participant (age 14) was excluded from the analyses because he indicated a lack of understanding or willingness to comply with the instructions of the experiment. Two others (both 18-year-olds) were excluded because they indicated at debriefing that they were suspicious about the intent of this study.

Participants under the age of 18 years were recruited from local summer camps and received either a \$5 restaurant certificate or a 4-hour time slot for their entire camp at the local university recreation centre. Participants 18 years old and over were recruited from introductory psychology courses at a Midwestern university and received partial course credit for participation.

Materials

Materials included a short 40-second video clip with no sound that depicted the theft of a mobile phone (cell phone) in a busy shopping district. The video was played on a 15-inch portable DVD player or notebook computer. In the video a male is shown walking beside another male who is talking on his mobile phone. The man suddenly grabs the victim's phone and runs away. Through the remainder of the video the thief continues to run and passes several landmarks, vehicles, and potential witnesses. This video was developed by Skagerberg and colleagues in conjunction with the London Metropolitan Police and the London Science Museum and has been used in other research (e.g., Skagerberg, 2007).

The video questionnaire consisted of 14 questions with two forced-choice alternatives, one of which was the correct response. In the CWI conditions participants could see a co-witness's responses to these questions. Nine of these responses were true and five were false (for clarity, we refer to these responses as "true" or "false" in order to distinguish them from "correct" and "incorrect" responses from participants). An example of a false question is: "What colour is the van that the victim is walking

by before his phone is stolen?" For participants in the CWI conditions this question would be followed by the answer choice "red" already circled, while the correct response is "white". An example of a true question is: "When the thief turned the corner, a bus went by. What did the bus look like?" This question would have the correct response "a red tourist bus" circled, while the incorrect answer choice is "a silver Greyhound bus". Random coin tosses were used for each question to determine whether (1) true or false CWI would be provided for that question and (2) the CWI would appear as the first or second answer choice. Participants who were in the No-CWI condition received the same questionnaire with the same forced-choice alternatives but with no responses given.

Procedure

Before testing, parental and adult consent, as well as assent from adolescents, was obtained. Participants watched the video clip in age- and gender-matched pairs. If no age or gender match was available participants were tested alone in the No-CWI condition. Participants were asked to pay as much attention to the details and the events in the video as possible, since they would only see it once and would later be asked questions regarding the video clip.

After the video, participants were taken to separate areas for the remainder of the experiment. Participants were told they would go into separate rooms and that one of them would complete the video questionnaire first and one would complete a list-learning task first; then they would switch tasks. They were separated, and in reality each participant was told to complete the list-learning task while under the assumption that their partner was working on the video questionnaire. The list-learning task lasted about 10 minutes and required participants to listen to word lists using a tape recorder and a headset. After this task participants were asked to wait until the experimenter (fictitiously) took the tape recorder and headset to their peer and retrieved a video questionnaire for them to fill out. Upon returning, the experimenter told those in the public and private CWI conditions that we had run out of copies; they were told there were no blank questionnaires available but we were able to "retrieve one from their partner" who had already finished this part of the experiment. They

were then asked if they would mind using the filled-out questionnaire. All participants agreed and were asked to put a star by their answer choices, since their partner already had circled their answer. The researcher explained to participants that we needed them to do this so that we could keep their answers separate.

In the CWI conditions both participants received the same pre-written questionnaire and each assumed their partner had filled in the responses. This manipulation was intended to provide true and false CWI that participants would assume was given by a peer. Participants in the CWI-Public condition followed the same procedure except that they were additionally told they would meet with their partner at the end of the experiment, and each would read their answers aloud as an extra precaution to ensure answers for each participant were recorded properly. Participants in the No-CWI condition simply filled out the blank questionnaire when the experimenter returned. All participants were instructed to fill out all questions about the video and not to leave any blank.

When participants had completed all tasks they were debriefed and asked whether they suspected anything unusual about the study. They were thanked for their time, asked not to discuss the study with anyone else, and released after being given the opportunity to ask questions. A full debriefing revealing the intent of the study was not included because adolescent participants were drawn from very small sample pools, and any discussion about the intent of the study would prohibit further data collection from the same sample pool.

RESULTS

There are several ways in which our age variable can be coded (e.g., placing the values into bins, treating age as a continuous variable, transforming, etc.), but all the methods that we examined led to the same conclusions: main effects for condition (with No-CWI being different from the CWI groups, which did not differ from each other) and older children accurately responding slightly more often than younger children, but no significant interaction between age and CWI condition. The lack of interaction suggests that younger individuals were not more prone to conformity effects but rather more prone to being inaccurate. Here we report the results using age in

months as a continuous linear predictor, and compare the fit of that model to some non-linear models where the relationship between age and response is allowed to be more flexible.

For the items on which participants received false CWI there were main effects of condition, $F(2, 245) = 3.46, p = .03, \eta_p = .17$. Scores for the No-CWI ($M = 2.69, SD = 1.04$), CWI-Public ($M = 2.34, SD = 1.28$), and CWI-Private ($M = 2.29, SD = 1.08$) reflect the average number of correct responses when false information was given. However, while the No-CWI group differed from the others, $t(245) = 2.56, p = .01$, the two CWI groups did not differ from each other, $t(245) = 0.26, p = .80$. For each month increase in age, the score went down by .0045 (or .054 per year). This decrease was statistically significant, $F(1, 245) = 4.22, p = .04, \eta_p = .13$. Because of the importance of age in the current study we examined whether non-linear relationships could improve the fit. First we tested if using two straight lines joined at the median improved the fit. It did not, $F(1, 244) = 0.70, p = .40, \eta_p = .05$. In case the relationship was more complex, we then tried two quadratic curves joined with a straight line at the median, and two cubic curves joined with a quadratic curve at the median. These are called splines, and this is a fairly standard progression for exploring possible non-linearity in a model (Wright & London, 2009). Neither of these more complex splines improved the fit of the model significantly, $F(1, 243) = 0.42, p = .52, \eta_p = .04$ and $F(1, 242) = 1.25, p = .27, \eta_p = .07$. Thus it appears that the linear relationship is a good fit. See Table 1 for the percentage of false items scored correctly by condition and question type.

The pattern was similar for items with true CWI. There were statistically significant main effects for condition, $F(2, 245) = 8.89, p < .001, \eta_p = .26$, and for age, $F(1, 245) = 6.55, p = .01, \eta_p = .16$. For conditions, No-CWI ($M = 5.29, SD = 1.41$) differed from CWI-Public ($M = 6.24, SD = 1.70$) and CWI-Private ($M = 5.90,$

$SD = 1.72$), $t(245) = 4.03, p < .001$, but the two CWI groups did not differ significantly from each other, $t(245) = 1.25, p = .21$. Using age in months as a linear predictor was statistically significant, $F(1, 245) = 6.52, p = .01, \eta_p = .16$, with a slope of .0078 increase in correct responses per month (.094 per year). The interaction between age and condition was non-significant, $F(2, 243) = 0.33, p = .72, \eta_p = .05$. We tried allowing more flexible relationships between age and response and none improved the fit: using two lines joined at the median, $F(1, 244) = 0.49, p = .49, \eta_p = .04$; using two quadratic curves joined at the median with a straight line, $F(1, 243) = 1.44, p = .23, \eta_p = .05$; using two cubic curves joined at the median with a quadratic, $F(1, 242) = 0.06, p = .81, \eta_p = .02$. Thus, again, we can say that a CWI effect occurred, but that it was about the same in the two CWI conditions, and that while accuracy increased with age, it did not interact with CWI. See Table 1 for the percentage of true items scored correctly by condition and question type.

DISCUSSION

We examined the influence of peers on event reports among adolescents and young adults. The results revealed an effect of co-witness information among the 11- to 21-year-old participants, and levels of conformity did not vary with age. Conformity rates did not differ based on private versus public response conditions. When participants were given true information purportedly from a peer they generally showed better performance than No-CWI participants on those questions, indicating their use of the peer information. Likewise, when given false information purportedly from a peer they generally used this information, as evidenced by their worse performance on these questions compared with the No-CWI group. This suggests that both adolescents' and young adults' reports were

TABLE 1
Percentage of questions correct for true and false items by condition

Question type	Condition					
	CWI-Public, N = 74		CWI-Private, N = 63		No-CWI, N = 112	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
True	69.4%	18.9%	65.6%	19.1%	58.7%	15.7%
False	46.6%	25.6%	45.7%	21.7%	53.8%	20.8%

susceptible to conformity effects to a similar extent.

Age

Our findings extend current developmental research on event reporting and suggestibility. Adolescents, largely ignored in previous suggestibility research, were found to be suggestible to both true and false co-witness information. Candel et al. (2007) found that pre-adolescents conformed their event reports more than older children. If adolescents were in fact particularly susceptible to conforming pressures we would expect adolescents also to display more conforming behaviour than our young adult sample. Contrary to our hypothesis, but consistent with Wright et al. (2010), adolescents' reports were no more prone to peer influence than young adults. In addition, age was explored with several methods and none revealed age effects.

There are a number of possible explanations for the absence of age effects in this study. First, perhaps there really are no differences in peer influence on event reports between adolescence and young adulthood, and peer influence on event reports remains stable at least from the ages of 11 to 21 years. Another possibility is that developmental trends have changed since the late 1960s and early 1970s when the original perceptual conformity studies were conducted for which our age hypotheses were based. According to Arnett and Tanner (2006), a period similar to adolescence, referred to as "emerging adulthood", is extending further into what previously was considered early adulthood. Compared with the 1960s and 1970s, young adults in Western cultures are waiting longer to make important life decisions like career and family. This group of individuals, approximately 18 to 25 years of age, can be identified as neither adolescents nor adults but are described as having characteristics of both. Therefore, perhaps older individuals would need to be included in order to detect developmental differences in peer influence. Perhaps differences between "emerging adults" and adolescents are more subtle than hypothesised and are, therefore, more difficult to detect.

The absence of age effects mimicked the work of some suggestibility research (e.g., Cohen & Harnick, 1980; Coxon & Valentine, 1997) but contradicted the work of others (e.g., Richardson

et al., 1995). Most notably, these null age findings are contrary to expectation according to the trends reported in the developmental conformity literature discussed previously (i.e., Hamm & Hoving, 1969, 1971; Hoving et al., 1969; Iscoe et al., 1963; Klein, 1972; Sistrunk et al., 1971; Strassberg & Wiggen, 1973). In addition to possible cohort changes in conformity it should also be considered that this past literature deals with individuals' tendency to conform their responses regarding perceptual judgement, not regarding an event. Events, by their very nature, are rich in detail. Unlike perceptual stimuli that are still in front of the individual, events have already taken place. Thus issues like source monitoring come into play, whereby individuals may actually think the suggested information was something they witnessed. As such, the dynamic and rich nature of event memory often may lead to conformity via an information route.

Finally, methodological limitations may explain null age findings. Participants aged 17 years and younger were recruited from summer camps, which were usually small groups of around 40 individuals or fewer. These individuals were much more likely to know each other compared with the college students who were recruited from a large subject pool and most likely had never met. Therefore it is possible that younger individuals were more or less likely to conform than they would have been otherwise if they, like the adults, had not known each other. For example, it is possible that adolescents are more conforming than adults. However when with individuals they know, they conform less. If this were true it would mask any differences between the groups. The reverse is also possible. That is, adolescents may be less conforming than adults, but when with others they know, they conform more (also masking any differences).

Motivations

An additional goal of our study was to examine the role of motivations in peer influence regarding event reports. The co-witness groups did incorporate co-witness information into their reports, but the public and private co-witness groups did not differ in their conformity rates. The CWI-Public and -Private conditions were differentiated by only one additional statement in the instructions. Perhaps the pressure applied to participants in the CWI-Public condition was

not adequate social pressure to produce a normative response.¹

Past research in the adult memory conformity literature has yielded mixed results when testing participants under private versus public response conditions. Gabbert et al. (2004) found higher rates of memory conformity when misinformation was delivered via discussion versus in a written format, providing some evidence for normative influence on memory. Conversely, Bodner, Musch, and Azad (2009) also included discussion versus written information routes and found no difference in conformity between the two routes. Gabbert et al. (2003) did not include a public response condition but also found that private responding was sufficient to elicit a conformity effect. In the study reported here we compared private versus public response conditions. Wright et al. (2010) provide a theoretical model of memory conformity whereby individuals weigh the cost of disagreeing with the cost of being correct in order to formulate their response. We assumed our public response condition would increase the cost of disagreeing, leading to higher conformity. However perhaps the informational route to persuasion, being present in both conditions, was enough to elicit maximum conformity regardless of the added public pressure. Perhaps a measure that assesses individuals' desire to appear favourably would be helpful in the future to distinguish routes of persuasion specific to individuals.

Conclusion

According to surveys of actual witnesses, if more than one witness is present during a crime they tend to discuss the crime with each other (Paterson & Kemp, 2006; Skagerberg & Wright, 2008b). Extant research shows that peer influence can be a powerful source of influence on event memory. An important implication of these findings includes assessing the structure of the forensic interview process for the adolescent population. Interviewers should attempt to separate witnesses before questioning so that

opportunities for peer influence are reduced. In addition, witnesses should be interviewed as quickly as possible to lessen the opportunities for co-witness discussions. If the co-witness happened to be accurate then the person's statements likely would be bolstered; but if the co-witness gave inaccurate information then the person's statement would likely be adversely affected. The interviewer of course does not know the accuracy of the co-witness account. Investigators should be cautious when corroborating reports are formed after opportunities for co-witness influence have occurred.

Manuscript received 1 August 2010

Manuscript accepted 20 June 2011

REFERENCES

- Arnett, J. J., & Tanner, J. L. (2006). *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 1st century*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Asch, S. (1956). Studies of independence and conformity. A minority of one against a unanimous majority. *Psychological Monographs*, *70* (9, Whole No. 416).
- Blakemore, S. (2008). Development of the social brain during adolescence. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *61*, 40–49.
- Bodner, G. E., Musch, E., & Azad, T. (2009). Reevaluating the potency of the memory conformity effect. *Memory & Cognition*, *37*, 1069–1076.
- Brainerd, C. J., Reyna, V. F., & Ceci, S. J. (2008). Developmental reversals in false memory: A review of data and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*, 343–382.
- Bruck, M., & Ceci, S. J. (2004). Forensic developmental psychology: Unveiling four misconceptions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *13*, 229–232.
- Bruck, M., London, K., Landa, R., & Goodman, J. (2007). Autobiographical memory and suggestibility in children with autism spectrum disorder. *Development and Psychopathology*, *19*, 73–95.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007). *Crime and victims report*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojp/usdoj.gov/bjs/>
- Candel, I., Memon, A., & Al-Harazi, F. (2007). Peer discussion affects children's memory reports. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *21*, 1191–1199.
- Ceci, S. J., & Bruck, M. (1993). Suggestibility of the child witness: A historical review and synthesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*, 403–439.
- Ceci, S. J., Loftus, E. F., Leichtman, M. D., & Bruck, M. (1994). The possible role of source misattributions in the creation of false beliefs among preschoolers. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Hypnosis*, *42*, 304–420.
- Ceci, S. J., Papierno, P., & Kulkofsky, S. (2007). Representational constraints on children's suggestibility. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 503–509.

¹A second study was conducted to increase public conformity pressure by testing participants in the same room with a confederate who provided the CWI. However, the increased normative pressure did not increase conformity beyond that demonstrated in the private condition. Thus, when participants were provided with someone else's account of an event, this account alone was sufficient to produce conformity effects.

- Ceci, S. J., Ross, D. F., & Toglia, M. P. (1987). Suggestibility of children's memory: Psycholegal implications. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *116*, 38–49.
- Cohen, R. L., & Harnick, M.A. (1980). The susceptibility of child witnesses to suggestion. *Law and Human Behavior*, *4*, 201–210.
- Connolly, D. A., & Price, H. L. (2006). Children's suggestibility for an instance of a repeated event versus a unique event: The effect of degree of association between variable details. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *93*, 207–223.
- Costanzo, P., & Shaw, M. (1966). Conformity as a function of age level. *Child Development*, *37*, 967–975.
- Coxon, P., & Valentine, T. (1997). The effects of the age of eyewitnesses on the accuracy and suggestibility of their testimony. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *11*, 415–430.
- Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. G. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influence upon individual judgment. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, *59*, 204–209.
- Dewhurst, S. A., & Robinson, C. A. (2004). False memories in children: Evidence for a shift from phonological to semantic associations. *Psychological Science*, *15*, 782–786.
- Eisen, M. L., Qin, J., Goodman, G. S., & Davis, S. (2002). Memory and suggestibility in maltreated children: Age, stress arousal, dissociation, and psychopathology. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *83*, 167–212.
- Finnilä, K., Mahlberg, N., Santtila, P., Sandnabba, K., & Niemi, P. (2003). Validity of children's suggestibility for predicting responses to two interview situations differing in their degree of suggestiveness. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *85*, 32–49.
- Gabbert, F., Memon, A., & Allan, K. (2003). Memory conformity: Can eyewitnesses influence each other's memory for an event? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *17*, 533–543.
- Gabbert, F., Memon, A., Allan, K., & Wright, D. B. (2004). Say it to my face: Examining the effects of socially encountered misinformation. *Legal and Criminal Psychology*, *9*, 215–227.
- Garven, S., Wood, J. M., & Malpass, R. S. (2000). Allegations of wrongdoing: The effects of reinforcement on children's mundane and fantastic claims. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *85*, 38–49.
- Goodman, G. S., & Melinder, A. (2007). Child witness research and forensic interviews of young children: A review. *Legal and Criminal Psychology*, *12*, 1–19.
- Goodman, G. S., & Reed, R. S. (1986). Age differences in eyewitness testimony. *Law and Human Behavior*, *10*, 317–332.
- Hamm, N., & Hoving, K. L. (1969). Conformity of children in an ambiguous perceptual situation. *Child Development*, *40*, 773–784.
- Hamm, N., & Hoving, K. L. (1971). Conformity in children as a function of grade level, and real versus hypothetical adult peer models. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *118*, 253–263.
- Hoving, K. L., Hamm, N., & Galvin, P. (1969). Social influence as a function of stimulus ambiguity at three age levels. *Developmental Psychology*, *1*, 631–636.
- Iscoe, I., Williams, M., & Harvey, J. (1963). Modification of children's judgments by a simulated group technique: A normative developmental study. *Child Development*, *34*, 963–978.
- Klein, R. L. (1972). Age, sex, and task difficulty as predictors of social conformity. *Journal of Gerontology*, *27*, 229–236.
- Lampinen, J. M., & Smith, V. L. (1995). The incredible (and sometimes incredulous) child witness: Child eyewitnesses' sensitivity to source credibility cues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *80*, 621–627.
- Lee, K. (2004). Age, neuropsychological, and social cognitive measures as predictors of individual differences in susceptibility to the misinformation effect. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *18*, 997–1019.
- London, K., Bruck, M., & Melnyk, L. (2009). Post-event information affects children's autobiographical memory after one year. *Law & Human Behavior*, *3*, 344–355.
- Meeus, W. (1996). Studies on identity development in adolescence: An overview of research and some new data. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *25*, 569–598.
- Nolan, J. M., Schultz, W. P., Cialdini, R. B., Goldstein, N. J., & Griskevicius, V. (2008). Normative social influence is underdetected. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 913–923.
- Paterson, H. M., & Kemp, R. L. (2006). Co-witnesses talk: A survey of eyewitness discussion. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *12*, 181–191.
- People v. Buckey, No. A-75-0900 (Cal. Crim. Dist. Ct. 1984).
- Principe, G. F., Guiliano, S., & Root, C. (2008). Rumor mongering and remembering: How rumors originating in children's inferences can affect memory. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *99*, 135–155.
- Principe, G. F., Kanaya, T., Ceci, S. J., & Singh, M. (2006). Believing is seeing. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 243–248.
- Prinstein, M. J., & Dodge, K. A. (2008). Current issues in peer influence research. In M. J. Prinstein & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescence* (pp. 3–13). New York: Guilford Press.
- Richardson, G., Gudjonsson, G. H., & Kelly, T. P. (1995). Interrogative suggestibility in an adolescent forensic population. *Journal of Adolescence*, *18*, 211–216.
- Robinson, J., & Briggs, P. (1997). Age trends and eyewitness suggestibility and compliance. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, *3*, 187–202.
- Roediger, H. L., Meade, M. L., & Bergman, E. T. (2001). Social contagion of memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *8*, 365–371.
- Roos af Hjelmsäter, E., Granhag, P. A., & Strömwall, L. A. (2009). Was the stranger alone? On how different sources of social influence affect children's memory reports. *Social Influence*, *4*, 155–169.
- Roos af Hjelmsäter, E., Granhag, P. A., Strömwall, L. A., & Memon, A. (2008). The effects of social influence on children's memory reports: The omission and commission error asymmetry. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *49*, 507–513.
- Sebastian, C., Viding, E., Williams, K. D., & Blakemore, S. (2010). Social brain development and the affective

- consequences of ostracism in adolescence. *Brain and Cognition*, 72, 134–145.
- Sistrunk, D., Clement, D. E., & Guenther, Z. (1971). Developmental comparisons of conformity across two cultures. *Child Development*, 42, 1175–1185.
- Skagerberg, E. M. (2007). Co-witness feedback in line-ups. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 22, 207–216.
- Skagerberg, E. M., & Wright, D. B. (2008a). The co-witness misinformation effect: Memory blends or memory compliance? *Memory*, 16, 436–442.
- Skagerberg, E. M., & Wright, D. B. (2008b). The prevalence of co-witnesses and co-witness discussions in real eyewitnesses. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 14, 513–521.
- State of New Jersey v. Michaels, NJ Supr. Ct. 136 N.J. 299, 642 A.2d 1372 (1994).
- Strassberg, D. S., & Wiggen, E. (1973). Conformity as a function of age in preadolescents. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 91, 61–66.
- Wright, D. B., Gabbert, F., Memon, A., & London, K. (2008). Changing the criterion for memory conformity in free recall and recognition. *Memory*, 16, 137–148.
- Wright, D. B., & London, K. (2009). Multilevel modeling: Beyond the basic applications. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 62, 439–456.
- Wright, D. B., London, K., & Waechter, M. (2010). Social anxiety moderates memory conformity in adolescents. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 24, 1034–1045.
- Wright, D. B., Memon, A., Skagerberg, E. M., & Gabbert, F. (2009). When eyewitnesses talk. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 174–178.
- Wright, D. B., & Schwartz, S. L. (2010). Conformity effects in memory for actions. *Memory & Cognition*, 38, 1077–1086.
- Wright, D. B., Self, G., & Justice, C. (2000). Memory conformity: Exploring misinformation effects when presented by another person. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91, 189–202.

Copyright of Memory is the property of Psychology Press (UK) and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.