The mock juror participants were 125 first year undergraduate psychology students (102 females, 23 males; mean age = 19.19 years, SD = 3.38) who took part in return for course credits. Full ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee at Royal Holloway, University of London.

Videos of autistic and typically developing (TD) witnesses were taken from a previous experiment (Maras et al., 2013). Here, the experimenter and witness participant each performed several actions on a road traffic accident mannequin and were subsequently interviewed for their memory of the event. Interviews comprised two aspects: free recall and subsequent questioning (as per Achieving Best Evidence guidelines, Home Office, 2011). As is typical in an Achieving Best Evidence interview, the information witnesses provided in their free recall accounts (before questioning) formed the foundation of the interview. To ensure some standardisation, juror participants only viewed the free recall segments of the videos (i.e., without questioning).

The final sample of witness participants comprised 17 autistic witnesses and 17 TD witnesses. The sample did not differ on age (autism M = 41.06 years, SD = 13.52; TD M = 46.12 years, SD = 12.33), t(32) = 1.14, p = .263, d = 0.39, or verbal IQ (autism M = 110.35, SD = 11.21; TD M = 109.76, SD = 12.06), t(32) = 0.15, p = .884, d = 0.05. There were also no differences in the number of correct details they freely recalled in their videos, t(32) = 0.81, p = .422, d = 0.28, thus allowing an examination of credibility perceptions based on the way autistic witnesses provided their testimony, irrespective of the completeness of their memory for the event per se. Autistic and TD witness videos were further individually paired in terms of the number of details reported. Three pairs of videos were randomly selected to be viewed by each juror participant, with the constraint that each video pair was viewed an equal number of times across the experiment. Thus, each juror participant viewed and rated a total of six videos (three autistic and three TD witness pairs). The order in which autism and TD videos were shown was counterbalanced within each pair, and the order of presentation of videos was also rotated so that each video was shown a roughly equal number of times in each position between presentations. Videos lasted an average of 6 mins and 2 seconds (SD = 2 mins 28 seconds) and did not differ in duration between autistic and TD witnesses, t(32) = 0.60, p = .554, d = 0.21. Juror participants were tested in groups of up to eight but seated at individual computers with dividing screens between them. They were randomly allocated to one of two conditions: ‘AUT+info’ (in which juror participants were told that three of the six witnesses in the videos they were to view had an autism diagnoses and were given information about autism) and ‘No info’ (in which juror participants were not given any diagnostic or additional information about the six witness participants’ videos they viewed); with the constraint that all participants were in the same information condition in any one testing session. All juror participants were instructed that they were about to view six video clips of witness interviews taken in a previous experiment whereby witnesses had participated in a first aid event and the videos showed them recalling what had happened. They received written instructions explaining that their task was to view the witness’ testimony as if they were a jury member before completing a questionnaire concerning their impressions of credibility and the quality of the witness’ account. In the AUT+info condition (at the start of the experiment), participants were also provided with a written summary about autism including descriptions of some of the behavioural features often associated with the condition (see attachments). Juror participants were informed at the start that some of the videos would be of autistic witnesses and they were instructed whether or not the witness was autistic prior to viewing each video. After viewing the video, participants completed a pen and paper credibility questionnaire asking them to rate (on 7-point Likert scales) the following indicators of a witness’ credibility: accuracy; convincingness of account; witness confidence in account; confidence in demeanour; competence of account; honesty; credibility; believability; completeness of account; level of cognitive functioning; and capability to testify (adapted from Crane et al., 2018; Henry, Ridley, Perry, & Crane, 2011; Maras et al., 2019; Mueller-Johnson, Toglia, Sweeney, & Ceci, 2007). Two open-ended questions at the end of each questionnaire asked if/how the witness’ testimony and credibility might be improved. At the end of the experiment (before debriefing) participants in the No info condition were also asked whether they had guessed if any of the witnesses were autistic. Finally, all participants were asked to rate on a 7-point Likert scale how much knowledge/experience of autism they had prior to taking part in the study (1= none, 7 = extensive). There was no significant difference in perceived prior knowledge/experience of autism diagnosis between participants in either the AUT+info (M = 3.95, SD = 1.49) or the No info (M = 3.84, SD = 1.52) experimental conditions, t(123) = 0.41, p = .682, d = 0.07.