Propositions of the thesis

Where I come from and how I got here:
Assessing credibility in asylum cases

1. An effective credibility assessment starts with asking adequate questions: open and free recall questions tailored to the knowledge and experiences of the asylum seeker. (This thesis)

2. Before concluding that statements low in detail, containing inconsistencies, or lacking plausibility are deceptive, explanations related to memory capacities and cultural misunderstandings must be ruled out. (This thesis)

3. People know much about their home country and town, but less than seems to be expected in asylum interviews. (This thesis)

4. The right to asylum and the principle of non-refoulement require an explicit choice about the relative importance of preventing Type I and Type II errors, especially in light of the uncertain and high-stake decision context of asylum procedures. (This thesis)

5. The increasing number of legal proceedings that involve intercultural communication warrants more research on memory processes in people from non-western cultures.

6. Your research question should dictate your methodology, and not vice-versa.

7. Being critical about legal proceedings is easy, finding solutions is much more difficult.

8. In order to successfully interact with practitioners, scientist should learn to speak their language.

9. Ensuring that your research has societal relevance starts with identifying interesting research questions and by interacting with stakeholders; it is not accomplished by merely writing a compulsory valorization addendum after you have finished.

10. The time to relax is when you don’t have time for it. Sydney J. Harris
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