NATIONAL CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER'S CHILD FORENSIC INTERVIEW STRUCTURE

Copyright © National Children's Advocacy Center, 2019. All Rights Reserved.

Written permission must be obtained from the National Children's Advocacy Center for duplication, distribution or dissemination by any means including mechanically, electronically, or otherwise. Use of this material without above copyright statement is prohibited.

Preferred citation: National Children's Advocacy Center. (2019). National Children's Advocacy Center's Child Forensic Interview Structure. Huntsville, AL: Author.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY CENTER
HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA
CHILD FORENSIC INTERVIEW STRUCTURE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The National Children's Advocacy Center (NCAC) provides a model for the forensic interview of a child or adolescent which has a semi-structured format that can be adapted to children of different ages and cultural backgrounds, and is useful for interviewing children who may have experienced sexual or physical abuse or who may be a witness to violence against another person. The NCAC Child Forensic Interview Structure (NCAC CFIS) emphasizes a flexible, thoughtful, decision-making approach throughout the interview and does not recommend a scripted format.

2.0 PURPOSE OF A FORENSIC INTERVIEW

A forensic interview is a structured conversation with a child intended to elicit detailed information about a possible event or events that the child has experienced or witnessed. The purposes of a forensic interview are multiple: obtaining information from a child which may be instructive in a criminal investigation, assessing the safety of the child's living arrangements, and obtaining information that will contribute to either corroborating or refuting allegations or suspicions of maltreatment (American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children [APSAC], 2012; Cronch, Viljoen, & Hansen, 2006; Faller, 2007; Lamb & Brown, 2006; Newlin et al., 2015; Perona, Bottoms, & Sorenson, 2005). Such an interview is conducted when there are concerns that the child may have been a victim of physical or sexual abuse or when a child has been a witness to a violent or abusive act perpetrated on another victim. The interviewer should adopt an open-minded and fact-finding approach and maintain objectivity throughout the conversation. (Cordisco Steele & National Children's Advocacy Center, 2016; Newlin et al., 2015; Poole, 2016; Powell & Snow, 2007; Saywitz, Lyon, & Goodman, 2011, 2017).

3.0 CONTEXT OF THE INTERVIEW

3.1 Timing

The interview should follow as closely in time to the targeted event as feasible. However, the interview should also be timed to maximize the child's capacity to provide accurate and complete information; this may involve consideration of the child's physical and mental state, immediate safety concerns, and the possible impact of delays in the interview process on the child's ability to recall and report his/her experience (APSAC, 2012; Faller, 2007; Lamb, Hershkowitz, Orbach, & Esplin, 2008; Newlin et al., 2015; Pipe & Salmon, 2002; Smith & Milne, 2011).

3.2 Location

It is recommended that a forensic interview be conducted at a Child Advocacy Center or other child-friendly facility. When a designated facility is not accessible, the interview should occur in a safe, neutral environment which should be private, informal, and free from unnecessary distractions (APSAC, 2012; Jones et al., 2010; Jones, Cross, Walsh, & Simone, 2005; National Children's Alliance (NCA), 2016; Saywitz & Camparo, 2014; Sorenson, Bottoms, & Perona, 2002).

When it is necessary to conduct the forensic interview at the child's school, arrangements should be made with school officials concerning the child's availability and the need for privacy. Every attempt should be made to avoid conducting an interview at the location where abuse is thought to have occurred (APSAC, 2012; State of Michigan, 2011).

4.0 DOCUMENTATION

Forensic interviews must be accurately and thoroughly documented (Faller, 2007; Lamb et al., 2008; Myers, 1992, 1998). Electronic documentation (DVD, video, or audio taping) provides the most accurate and complete form of documentation (Cauchi & Powell, 2009; Jones et al., 2005; Myers, 1992, 1998; NCA, 2016; Smith & Milne, 2011; Sorenson et al., 2002) as it captures a thorough depiction of all behaviors and statements from the child and the interviewer. Such documentation can ensure and validate appropriate interview techniques (Cronch et al., 2006; Faller, 2007).

Any written documentation should be as close to verbatim as possible (Lamb, Orbach, Sternberg, Hershkowitz, & Horovitz, 2000). Every attempt should be made to maintain the accuracy and integrity of all recordings of the forensic interview.

4.1 Number of Interviews

Prevailing practice during an investigation of child is for one official interview of the child to be conducted (APSAC, 2012; Merchant & Toth, 2006; NCA, 2016; Saywitz & Comparo, 2009). Multiple duplicative interviews by different interviewers can result from a lack of coordination among investigating agencies and are discouraged as this practice may increase the child's distress and perception of the investigation as harmful, as well as increase the number of inconsistencies (APSAC, 2012; Cross, Jones, Walsh, Simone, & Kolko, 2007; Malloy, Lyon, & Quas, 2007; NCA, 2015).

The decision about the number of interview sessions should be based upon the minimum number of sessions needed to elicit complete and accurate accounts of events and to insure the well-being of the child (APSAC, 2012; Davies & Westcott, 1999; Goodman-Brown, Edelstein, Goodman, Jones, & Gordon, 2003; Hershkowitz & Terner, 2007; La Rooy, Lamb, & Pipe, 2009; Waterhouse, Ridley, Bull, & La Rooy, 2016). Multiple sessions of an interview, conducted by a single interviewer who is implementing good questioning practices and avoiding the use of leading or suggestive questions, is appropriate for an extremely reluctant or severely traumatized child, or a child with intellectual or communicative disabilities (Lamb, Hershkowitz, Orbach, & Esplin, 2008; La Rooy et al., 2009; La Rooy, Katz, Malloy, & Lamb, 2010). Additionally, new information or evidence which arises during an investigation may necessitate a need for a limited follow-up interview of a child (Waterhouse et al., 2016). At times a structured extended forensic interview approach may be recommended for a child identified as fitting one of the previously mentioned categories (Cronch et al., 2006; Faller, 2007; Faller, Cordisco Steele, & Nelson-Gardell, 2010).

4.2 Participants

A trained forensic interviewer designated by the investigative team should conduct the interview while other investigators observe by closed circuit television, one-way mirror, or some other unobtrusive means. Provision for communication between the interviewer and investigators is essential, so that questions from all members of the investigating team are considered (APSAC, 2012; Cronch et al., 2006; Jones et al, 2005; NCA, 2016; Sorenson et al., 2002; Van Eys & Benneke, 2011). Communication with observing team members can be achieved through breaks during the interview, transmission of questions via electronic devices worn by the interviewer, or the passage of hand written notes; but the method selected should not be disruptive for the child. If more than one investigative interviewer is present in the room, a lead interviewer should be designated and a plan for questioning should be developed

before beginning the interview. The observing interviewer should hold questions until the lead interviewer reaches a logical stopping point (State of Michigan, 2011).

4.3 Pace and Duration

The child's age, physical needs, emotional state, and culture should determine the pace of the interview, with the interviewer providing structure and focus in a developmentally and culturally sensitive manner (Bottoms, Quas, & Davis, 2007; Fontes, 2008a; Faller & Hewitt, 2007; Lamb et al., 2008; Saywitz & Camparo, 2009; Saywitz et al., 2017). The interviewer should proceed carefully without a display of frustration or annoyance if the child is reluctant to talk or has difficulty attending to the topic. A child should not be pressured to respond to questions (APSAC, 2012; Davis & Bottoms, 2002; Hershkowitz, 2009; Hershkowitz et al., 2006; Lamb et al., 2008). The interviewer must stay alert to signals from the child indicating fatigue, distress, or loss of concentration. Breaks can be taken as needed. If the interview is being electronically recorded, recording equipment should continue to run during any break.

5.0 QUESTIONING STRATEGIES

The goal of forensic questioning is to elicit a complete and accurate account of the child's experience(s), while minimizing the introduction of specific information or influence from the interviewer (APSAC, 2012; Lamb et al., 2008; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Saywitz, Esplin, & Romanoff, 2007). Empirical research and practice consensus concur that information obtained through use of recall or open-ended prompts is more likely to be accurate and to include greater contextual detail (Lamb et al., 2008; Lyon, 2005; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Orbach & Lamb, 2007; Poole & Lindsey, 2002; Powell & Snow, 2007; Saywitz, Goodman, & Lyon, 2002; Saywitz & Geiselman, 1998; Sternberg, Lamb, Esplin, Orbach, & Hershkowitz, 2002). However, practice experience and research also acknowledge that children at times require more direct probes and scaffolding of their responses to assist in organizing their accounts into a "story model" format and to enable them to talk about embarrassing topics (Faller & Hewitt, 2007; Saywitz et al., 2002; Walker, 2013). The interviewer must consider both the structure (i.e. narrative prompt, 'wh' question, option-posing question) and the purpose of the questions (substantive intent) when posing questions (Faller, 2007; Powell & Snow, 2007; Saywitz, et al., 2002).

The interviewer should implement the continuum of questions discussed below throughout the interview, even when discussing non-abuse topics (Brown & Lamb, 2009; Lamb et al., 2008; Lamb & Brown, 2006; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011, 2017; Sternberg et al., 1997).

5.1 Narrative Invitation

Narrative invitations, also known as open-ended questions, open-ended prompts, or free recall questions, encourage the child to talk at length about a topic with minimal input from the interviewer. Non-verbal attention, facilitative responses, and additional invitational questions provide acknowledgement of the child's narrative and encourage elaboration in the child's own words. Some children can provide substantial amounts of information in response to narrative invitations and before the first option-posing utterances (Lamb et al., 2008; Lyon, 2005; Poole, 2016; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Sternberg et al., 2002).

Narrative invitations include statements such as "Start at the beginning and tell me everything about…" and "Tell me more about…." Narrative invitations can incorporate different structural formats such as "describe" or "explain how that happened" or "what happened next?" The use of narrative invitations is recommended throughout the interview with a child who is able to respond to such prompts, as they best elicit the child's idiosyncratic description of events and the use of their own words (Lamb et al., 2008, 2011; Lyon, 2005; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011, 2017; Sternberg et al., 2002).

As children benefit from permission and practice in narrative exchanges with adults, this style of conversation should begin early in the interview and should not be reserved for the abuse-specific portion of the interview (Orbach & Lamb, 2007; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Sternberg et al., 2002).

5.2 Focused Narrative Request

A focused narrative request employs the same invitational format while cueing the child to a specific topic (person, location, activity, object, or time). The intent of the focused narrative question format is to gather as much information as possible from the child in their own words while providing structure and direction to the conversation (Cronch et al., 2006; Faller, 2007; Lamb et al., 2003). This questioning format is the preferred method when seeking clarification or elaboration of a detail or action previously mentioned by the child as opposed to the use of focused and specific

questions (Lamb et al., 2008, 2011; Poole, 2016; Powell & Snow, 2007; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011). The form of the focused narrative question can vary. "Tell me more about [child's words]" is often used. However, a request for the child to "explain," "describe" or "help me understand" can also be implemented. Certain 'wh' questions serve as a focused narrative request (i.e. "What do you do for fun?" or "what happened?"). Open-ended 'wh' questions often work well with a preschool child who may be confused by the broader request to "tell me all about …." (Faller, 2007; Fivush, Peterson, & Schwarzmueller, 2002; Hershkowitz, Lamb, Orbach, Katz, & Horowitz, 2012).

Focused narrative requests are an effective way both to introduce a new topic, as well as to ask for additional information about a person, place, or activity previously mentioned by the child. It may be helpful for the interviewer to reflect or repeat back a portion of the child's earlier statement and follow with the question focusing on the topic of interest (i.e. "You said that the man had messy hair. Tell me about his messy hair" or "Describe his messy hair.") (Evans & Roberts, 2009; Kadushin & Kadushin, 1997; Powell & Snow, 2007).

5.3 Detail/"wh" Question

Children are not raised to be witnesses and may not relate all stored information about a remembered event without the direction of a specific question. Additionally, a child may be reluctant to reveal certain information for a variety of reasons, including lack of understanding of the task, embarrassment, fear, shame, or minimization of the event (Alaggia, 2004; McElvaney, 2013; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Orbach, Shiloach, & Lamb, 2007; Saywitz et al., 2002; Walker, 2013).

The purpose of a "wh" questions is to invite the "who", "what", "where," "when" and "how" information which were not included in the child's narrative description, about a topic already under discussion. Such information, while highly relevant in a forensic interview, may not be typically included in everyday conversation. The interviewer should maintain the "funnel" approach and not resort to "wh" questions before implementing a thorough use of narrative prompts. The interviewer should avoid barraging the child with a series of "wh" questions (Ahern, Andrews, Stolzenberg, & Lyon, 2015; APSAC, 2012; Bruck, Ceci, & Hembrooke, 2001; Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lyon, 2015; Saywitz et al., 2002). Also, interviewers are cautioned to remember that a child will not have encoded all descriptive information and peripheral details about even well-remembered salient events. Detail questions should always be framed in such a way as to give the child permission to say that they do not know the answer to a detail question.

5.4 Multiple-Choice Questions

Multiple-choice questions are sometimes described as option-posing questions. The use of option-posing questions should only be considered after other questioning alternatives have been unsuccessful (Fivush et al., Herskhowitz et al., 2012; Lyon, 2014; Mehrani & Peterson, 2015). A multiple-choice question may clarify the intent of a detail question when the child seems confused by the question. The recommendation is to provide the child a couple of specific choices and to follow with an open prompt requesting elaboration. Young children may not be able to make use of multiple-choice prompts and this type of question should be avoided or used cautiously with young children (Imhoff & Baker, 1999; Mehrani & Peterson, 2015; Peterson, Dowden, & Tobin, 1999; Rocha, Marche, & Briere, 2013).

5.5 Yes/No Question

Yes/no questions serve different purposes in a forensic interview. Yes/no questions can be used to ask the child about specific information not included in the child's narrative in a manner that respects that the child may or may not have information to share (i.e. "Did he say anything to you?") as opposed to ("What did he say to you?"). The initial yes/no question reminds the child that they should only answer questions where they know the information (Ceci & Bruck, 1995). To be of benefit, these questions should be followed by an invitation to elaborate, (i.e. "Tell me more about that") (Faller, 2007; Orbach & Pipe, 2011; Saywitz & Camparo, 2009; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011, 2017).

Interviewers should be cautious about using yes/no questions to address salient elements of abuse (i.e. specific acts or people) and should always be employed as a last resort (Ceci & Bruck, 1995; Peterson et al., 1999; Rocha et al., 2013). Without additional narrative description or clarification, a singular response to a yes/no question is inconclusive. Interviewers should be particularly cautious about employing yes/no questions with a preschool child (Faller & Hewitt, 2007; Peterson et al., 1999).

5.6 Leading Question

The terms "leading" and "suggestive" are often used interchangeably and fall into the category of a least preferred question, especially when the focus is on essential elements of a crime. However, leading questions are sometimes unavoidable if the interviewer wishes to learn the full scope of the child's experience (APSAC, 2012; Everson, 1999; Faller, 2007; Saywitz et al., 2002).

A leading question introduces information not previously provided by the child, sometimes referred to as externally-derived information (Lamb et al., 2008; Orbach & Pipe, 2011; Saywitz et al., 2011). This information may have been gained from another source as part of the investigation or may be a follow-up question to information implied, but not stated by the child. The introduction of a leading question is less risky with a child who has already demonstrated the ability provide narrative description and is not prone to suggestion (i.e. can say "No" or "I don't know" or can correct the interviewer.)

The interviewer should pose the least information possible in a question and follow up on the child's response with the request to "tell me all about [child's words]". Questions that direct the child to respond in a specific way or merely ask for affirmation or denial should be avoided (APSAC, 2012; Bruck et al., 2001; Faller, 2007; Home Office, 2002; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Poole & Lamb, 1998).

6.0 USE OF MEDIA AND INTERVIEW AIDS

Research on the use of media in forensic settings provides mixed findings. Professionals also hold differing opinions about the influence of simple media on a child's participation in a forensic interview with some voicing concern that media may be a distraction, influence the child's responses, or encourage play and fantasy (Cordisco Steele, 2011; Gross & Hayne, 1998; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Pipe & Salmon, 2002; Poole & Lamb, 1998; State of Michigan, 2011). The decision to allow or disallow access to simple media (paper, markers, play-doh) is most often a decision made jointly by the forensic interviewer and multidisciplinary team (MDT) members.

6.1 Free Drawing

Paper and markers or crayons are a flexible media which allows for different kinds of drawing during a forensic interview. Free drawing during the pre-substantive potion of the interview may serve to increase rapport and diminish anxiety, while providing useful developmental information (Faller, 2007; Katz, Barnetz, & Hershkowitz, 2014; Pipe & Salmon, 2002; Poole & Dickinson, 2014). The interviewer is able observe the impact of drawing on the child's conversational motivation and attention span, assessing whether the drawing facilitates narrative, substitutes for narrative, focuses the child, or serves as a distraction.

During the allegation-focused portion of the interview, drawing can serve multiple purposes. Drawing may provide a form of context reinstatement (Saywitz et al., 2017) that can facilitate the recall of details through the production of drawing of the location, a specific person, the event, or elements of the event (Katz & Hamama, 2013; Katz & Hershkowitz, 2010; MacLeod, Gross, & Hayne, 2013; Patterson & Hayne, 2011; Salmon, Roncolato, & Gleitzman, 2003; Wesson & Salmon, 2001). The interviewer must skillfully facilitate the use of drawing during a child's disclosure by keeping the focus on the child's verbal descriptions with the drawing in an assisting role. Children's drawings should always be used as a tool that supports communication rather than as a medium to be interpreted by the interviewer (Brown, 2011; Katz & Hamama, 2013; Katz & Hershkowitz, 2010).

6.2 Human Figure Drawings

Body drawings vary in the amount of "anatomical" detail included, ranging from "gingerbread" drawings to human figure outlines with minimal details to diagrams of human figures with facial and age-appropriate body features. Research on the incorporation of human figure drawings in the forensic interview is limited and inconclusive; but indicates that the safest use of a human figure drawing is for purposes of clarification of details about an event already under discussion when all other attempts at clarification have been exhausted (Aldridge et al., 2004; Brown, Pipe, Lewis, Lamb, & Orbach, 2007; Pipe & Salmon, 2002; Poole & Bruck, 2012; Poole & Dickinson, 2011; Teoh, Yang, Lamb, & Larrson, 2010).

7.0 PRE-INTERVIEW PREPARATION

It is customary for the interviewer to have limited background information about the child and the allegations prior to the interview. Relevant information about the child can include age, developmental functioning, school status, cultural background, family make-up, health status, and special needs (i.e. disabilities, compromised language, medication, mental health concerns, recent or monumental losses) which may affect the child's ability to participate in the interview (Alaggia, Collins-Vezina, & Lateef, 2017; Myers, 1992, 1998; Pipe et al., 2007; Poole, 2016; Rivard & Compo, 2017; Smith & Milne, 2011; Sorenson et al., 2002).

With preschool children or children with disabilities, the interviewer may wish to gather additional information about the child's language, environment and routines, as well as recommendations for successful communication (Cederborg & Lamb, 2008;

Cordisco Steele, 2011; Hewitt, 1999; Koenig & Harris, 2005; Poole & Lamb, 1998). Consultation and additional preparation may be needed for children with special issues (Cederborg, La Rooy, & Lamb, 2008; Davies & Faller, 2007; Lamb et al., 2008).

A minimal amount of case-specific information can assist the interviewer in structuring the interview, anticipating complicating factors (multiple events, jurisdictions, perpetrators, traumagenic concerns) and considering alternative hypotheses to be explored (Rivard & Compo, 2017). Reluctant children may require a tailored approach to substantive topics; and such information can assist the interviewer in developing a funneled approach without resorting to overly direct or leading questions. The interviewer must be mindful not to introduce information or topics to the child in a manner designed to confirm or disconfirm prior information from others or interviewer's suspicions (APSAC, 2012; Cronch et al., 2006; Faller, 2007; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Myers, 1998; Orbach & Pipe, 2011; Poole & Lamb, 1998).

8.0 CHILD FORENSIC INTERVIEW STRUCTURE

8.1 Introduction

The interviewer should provide a brief, neutral explanation of both the interviewer's and the child's roles, using language and terminology that is appropriate to the child's developmental level and culture. The interviewer should be attentive and responsive to any verbal and non-verbal cues indicating anxiety, embarrassment, anger, or fear, which may affect the child's ability or willingness to participate in the interview. Additionally, the interviewer should inform the child about the means of documentation and observation, and respond to any questions or concerns. In some CACs the information about roles, recording, and observation may have already been provided by a victim advocate or other CAC personnel prior to the beginning of the forensic interview (NCA, 2016) and is only repeated briefly during the interview. The introductory stage of the interview is generally not lengthy, but may be adapted to the needs of the child and family (APSAC, 2012; Fontes, 2008a, 2008b; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Sorenson et al., 2002; State of Michigan, 2011).

8.2 Developmental & Cultural Perspective

Developmentally and culturally sensitive interviewing does not refer to a discreet stage of an interview; but a principle and approach that is evident throughout the interview. A working knowledge of the basics of child development (motor, cognitive, language, emotional), cultural differences (linguistic style and family normative

behaviors) and the potential impact of traumatic experiences on development will assist the interviewer in accomplishing this goal (Fivush, Haden, & Reese, 2006; Fontes, 2008a, 2008b; Gaskill & Perry, 2012; Price, Roberts, & Jackson, 2006; Rogoff, 2003; Stein & Kendall, 2004; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001; Tang, 2006). Developmental and cultural adaptations begin in conjunction with introductions, early engagement, interview instructions, and narrative practice as the interviewer closely observes the child and adapts topics, follow-up questions, and any use of media to the child's temperament and demonstrated level of functioning. Developmental accommodations continue throughout the interview process as the interviewer attempts to stay within the child's developmental capacity when requesting information or clarification (Cederborg, Danielsson, LaRooy, & Lamb, 2009; Cronch et al., 2006; Imhoff & Baker-Ward, 1999; Sorenson et al., 2002; Tang, 2006; Wood & Garven, 2000).

8.3 Early Engagement

Establishing rapport, an essential component of the forensic interview, is also not a discreet stage of the interview, but rather a style of interaction that continues throughout the conversation (Cordisco Steele, 2011; Davis & Bottoms, 2002; Hershkowitz, Lamb, Katz, & Malloy, 2013; Katz, 2013; Saywitz et al., 2017; Teoh & Lamb, 2013). Children will vary in their openness to a conversation with an unfamiliar adult. Initially, the interviewer should engage the child in conversation about neutral or positive topics. A request to "tell me some things about yourself" or "tell me what kind of things you like to do" invites the child to talk about comfortable and familiar topics and begins to establish the child as the informant/expert and the interviewer as the listener. The interviewer can observe the child's linguistic patterns, interaction with the environment, and comfort in talking with an unfamiliar adult. The interviewer should demonstrate good verbal and non-verbal attending behaviors, which may serve to increase the child's confidence in the interviewer's ability and willingness to listen (Bottoms, Quas, & Davis, 2007; Cordisco Steele, 2011; Cronch et al., 2006; Davies & Westcott, 1999; Faller, 2007; Hershkowitz, 2009; Kadushin & Kadushin, 1997; Koenig & Harris, 2005; Saywitz, Larson, Hobbs, & Wells, 2015; Sorenson et al., 2002; Wood, McClure, & Birch, 1996). As the interview progresses and topics of conversation become more stressful, good listening, paraphrasing, and non-coercive support may assist the interviewer in maintaining rapport with a child (Bottoms, Quas, & Davis, 2007; Faller, 2007; Katz, 2013).

8.4 Interview Instructions

Expectations and dynamics governing a forensic interview differ from the implicit rules of most adult/child conversations. An explanation of the rules of the interview can enhance the child's understanding of the requirements and their role in the interview (APSAC, 2012; Brubacher, Poole, & Dickinson, 2015; Cronch et al., 2006; Davies & Westcott, 1999; Mulder & Vrij, 1996; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011, 2017). The rules for the interview may be provided immediately following introductions or may follow a period of early engagement. Younger children may benefit from an opportunity to practice the rules (Lamb & Sternberg, 1999; Lyon, 2005; Merchant & Toth, 2006, Poole & Lamb, 1998; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011, 2017).

Rules that may be included in this portion of the interview are as follows:

- The purpose of the interview is to talk about "true things" and about things that really happened. It is important to "tell the truth."
- The child knows more about what happened than the interviewer, since the interviewer was not present during any events. The child should be encouraged to correct the interviewer if the interviewer makes a mistake.
- The interviewer will be asking a lot of questions. It is okay if the child does not know or remember the answers. It is okay to say, "I don't know" or "I don't remember."
- The interviewer may ask a question that is hard to understand or doesn't make sense. If this happens the child should say, "I don't understand."

The process of providing rules may be confusing or overwhelming to a young preschooler or developmentally delayed child. In such cases, this step may be eliminated or adapted to the perceived needs of the child. Interviewers may use knowledge gained about the child during the earlier phase of the interview when deciding how or if the guidelines should be presented (APSAC, 2012; Hewitt, 1999; Walker, 2013).

8.5 Narrative Practice

Research demonstrates that the inclusion of narrative practice (also known as episodic memory training/practice) in the pre-substantive phase of the interview improves the quantity and quality of information provided by the child during the substantive portion of the interview (Davies & Westcott, 1999; Lamb & Brown, 2006; Lamb et al., 2003, 2008; Poole, 2016; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011, 2017). Narrative practice helps to inform and prepare the child for the differences of this unique conversation (informed child and uninformed adult) by providing the child an

opportunity to describe a non-abuse event in detail from the beginning until the end of the event. The interviewer employs facilitative responses and narrative invitations to prompt the child for information, thus modeling the forensic conversation. This "training session" allows the child an opportunity to practice providing detailed narratives; while providing the interviewer an opportunity to become familiar with the child's language and narrative style, as well as the effectiveness and limitations of questioning approaches with this child (Cordisco Steele, 2010; Hershkowitz, 2009; Lamb & Brown, 2006; Lyon, 2005; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Orbach & Lamb, 2007; Poole & Lamb, 1998; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011; Sorenson et al., 2002; State of Michigan, 2011).

8.6 Family

It can be helpful to have a brief discussion about members of the child's family, as well as people who live with or interact frequently with the household, in preparation for understanding a child's description of personal life events. Particularly when interviewing a child where the allegations are about a family member or friend, this brief conversation may give some indication of the child's comfort and willingness to talk about people and household events. Indications of reluctance from a child may indicate that they are not ready to transition into more difficult topics (Hershkowitz et al., 2006; Malloy, Lyon, & Quas, 2007; Orbach et al., 2007; Lamb, 2007).

8.7 Transitioning to the Allegation Phase of the Interview

Referrals of children for a forensic interview occur in a variety of ways. Many children will have made concerning and sometimes descriptive statements (an outcry) to an adult, (London, Bruck, Ceci, & Shuman, 2005; Lyon & Ahern, 2011) who then made a report to the appropriate authorities. For other children the referral for a forensic interview results from other kinds of information, such as confusing and unclear behavior and statements by the child, physical evidence, a confession, or witness statements which lead to a report to authorities (Alaggia, 2004; Bottoms, Rudnicki, & Epstein, 2007; Bruck et al., 2001; Cederborg, Lamb, & Laurell, 2007; DeVoe & Faller, 1999; Goodman-Brown et al., 2003; Hershkowitz et al., 2006; Hershkowitz, Horowitz, & Lamb, 2007; Jensen, Gulbrandsen, Mossige, Reichelt, & Tjersland, 2005; Lawson & Chaffin, 1992; London et al., 2005; Lyon, 2007; Lyon & Ahern, 2011; Malloy et al., 2007; Olafson & Lederman, 2006; Orbach et al., 2007; Pipe et al., 2007; Staller & Nelson-Gardell, 2005; Wyatt, 1999). In some cases, the child may never have made any statements or allegations to an adult (Easton, Saltz, & Willis, 2014; McElvaney, 2013; Munzer et al., 2014; Priebe & Svedin, 2008).

Children who are participating in a forensic interview may fall into a variety of categories.

(1) No maltreatment – no allegations from child
(2) No maltreatment – child making allegations
(3) Maltreatment – child made allegations and willing to talk (active disclosure)
(4) Maltreatment -child made allegations and reluctant to talk (tentative disclosure)
(5) Maltreatment -child made allegations and denies

Interviewers must be prepared to use a range of strategies for transitioning to the allegation portion of the interview, adapting their approach to the history and demonstrated needs of the child being interviewed as well as information contained in the allegation report. Such strategies allow for a "funneled" approach, as the interviewer moves incrementally from open-ended prompts to more focused prompts to possibly direct prompts (APSAC, 2012; Davies & Westcott, 1999; Faller, 2007; Hershkowitz et al., 2006; Lamb et al., 2008; Poole, 2016; Lippert, Cross, Jones, & Walsh, 2009; Saywitz et al., 2017; Sorenson et al., 2002).

A child in "active disclosure," may initiate discussion of the allegation topic during the pre-substantive phase of the interview. If this happens, the interviewer should follow the child's lead. When the interviewer must provide the transition to substantive topics, they should begin with the most open-ended prompts such as "Now that I know you a little better, I want to talk about why you are here today" (Lamb et al., 2008) or "Tell me what you came here to talk to me about today" (Powell, 2003). An open invitation allows the child to initiate discussion about concerning events in their own way. If the child does not respond to the most open invitation, the interviewer can try a sequence of slightly more focused prompts such as, "Has someone/your mother been worried about you?" or "Have you been worried about something?" or "Has something happened to you?" Again, the interviewer should be prepared to follow the child's lead (Lamb et al., 2008, 2011; Lyon, 2005; Saywitz et al., 2011; Sorenson et al., 2002; State of Michigan, 2011).

When the interviewer has confidence in information contained within the report, that information may be introduced to the child in a structured and funneled manner. The interviewer can reference the child back to an earlier conversation or contact with a social worker, doctor, police officer, etc. and inquire about the reason for and content of that conversation (APSAC, 2012; Faller, 2007; Lamb et al., 2008, 2011; Newlin et al., 2015; Poole, 2016; Saywitz et al., 2017). Focused transitions should be planned during the pre-

interview preparation meeting. A funneled approach should be implemented, as the interviewer attempts to introduce the minimal amount of information needed to focus the child on the topic of the allegations. Any response or acknowledgement by the child should be followed up with an open invitation to gather details from the child (APSAC, 2012; Lamb et al., 2008, 2011; Poole, 2016).

When there is a high degree of certainty that abuse has occurred (electronic media, photographic evidence, medical evidence, suspect confession, etc.) serious concerns about a child's safety can exist. In such cases it may be appropriate to introduce evidence to the child in a carefully planned and thoughtful manner. Attention should be given to introducing the minimal amount of evidence needed to focus the child on the topic of concern (APSAC, 2012).

Some referrals may be vague or confusing. In such cases the interviewer likely does not have information they consider reliable enough to introduce to the child. In such cases, the interviewer may choose to engage the child in a series of conversations on topics such as care routines, family members, activities and hobbies, recent events, or other topics that may form the contextual background of the allegations; providing the child an opportunity to recall information in response to open-ended, focused prompts. This indirect approach allows the interviewer to engage in conversations about the child's experiences without making assumptions about maltreatment or resorting to leading questions. The focused topics approach is also appropriate when the allegations are unspecific (behavioral or medical concern with no outcry) and there has been no direct outcry from the child (APSAC, 2012; Faller, 2007; Poole, 2016).

Preschoolers often require a more direct prompt tailored to specific elements of the allegations or context, such as inquiring about a person, location, activity, an element of the outcry scenario, or follow-up responses (doctor, law enforcement or social services response) while the interviewer is especially mindful of avoiding leading questions about substantive issues (Faller & Hewitt, 2007; Hewitt, 1999).

8.8 Allegation-Specific Questioning

Once the transition to the allegation topic has occurred, the interviewer should invite the child to describe in detail the event(s) (Lamb & Brown, 2006; Lamb, Orbach, Hershkowitz, Esplin, & Horowitz, 2007; Poole & Lamb, 1998). Observations of the child's language and narrative ability during the pre-substantive phase of the interview can assist the interviewer in selecting the optimal open questions for eliciting narrative description from the child. Prompts that ask the child to "Start at the beginning and

tell me everything that you can about what happened" along with attentive listening, pausing, reflection, and the use of facilitative prompts allow the interviewer to encourage full description from the child without interruption. Open-ended breadth questions invite the child to provide more information without offering direction or focus (e.g. "What happened then?" or "What else happened?"). Open-depth questions ask the child to provide more elaborate detail, description, or clarification about a previously mentioned detail (e.g. "Tell me more about the part where [activity or detail already mentioned by the child]" (Poole, 2016; Powell & Snow, 2007).

"Wh" questions may be useful in eliciting still missing elements in the child's description of events, as they ask for more specific information without providing options. Responses to "wh" questions may be brief, but will be in the child's own words (Ahern et al., 2016; Hershkowitz et al., 2012). Option-posing questions should only be used as a last resort and with caution (Katz & Hershkowitz, 2012; Poole, 2016; Saywitz et al., 2002, 2011). The interviewer's challenge is to adapt the free recall phase to the child's linguistic style (APSAC, 2012; Lamb et al., 2003, 2008; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Myers, Saywitz, & Goodman, 1996; Orbach et al., 2007; Poole, 2016; Poole & Lamb, 1998; State of Michigan, 2011; Walker, 2013).

With a reluctant child or a child with limited narrative abilities, the interviewer should provide appropriate scaffolding through use of the full continuum of questions and consideration of the incorporation of media such as free drawing or writing (Katz & Hershkowitz, 2012; Lamb, LaRooy, & Malloy, 2011; Lippert, Cross, Jones, & Walsh, 2009). Interviewers should still gather as much detail (who, what, where, when, & how) about the allegation topic as the child can provide, being mindful of limitations demonstrated in the earlier phase of the interview. Specific closed questions, including yes/no questions and multiple-choice questions, must be used judiciously, and paired with an open invitation to gain clarification in the child's words. Interviewers should avoid barraging the child with a series of direct "wh" questions to gather details about an event under discussion; rather approaching those questions with focused narrative request questions, moving to "wh" questions only as needed, and returning to open prompts (APSAC, 2012; Cronch et al., 2006; Davies & Westcott, 1999; Faller, 2007; Newlin et al., 2015; Poole, 2016; Quas, Davis, Goodman, & Myers, 2007; Walker, 2013).

Many children experience multiple episodes of abuse. When the child alleges multiple incidents, the interviewer can first obtain a description of what usually happens (the script memory) before moving to particularization of specific incidents. When unique episodes of abuse are referenced by the child in their free narrative description, the

interviewer should explore each of those episodes, using the child's label for each event (Brubacher, Malloy, Lamb, & Roberts, 2013; Brubacher, Powell, & Roberts, 2014; Brubacher, Roberts, & Powell, 2012; Chamberlin & NCAC, 2016). Additional prompts for particular events can include requests to talk about the "first time," "last time, "a time that you remember well," "a time that something different happened," "a time it happened in a different place," etc. The interviewer should keep in mind the child's developmental and language abilities to distinguish unique episodes (Brubacher et al., 2012, 2013, 2014; Chamberlin & NCAC, 2016). With each event, the interviewer should attempt to clarify descriptions of acts, terminology, or ambiguous statements (APSAC, 2012; Poole & Lamb, 1998).

8.9 Closure

Once the substantive portion of the interview is complete, the interviewer should turn the conversation back to neutral topics. If the conversation has been upsetting to the child, the interviewer may decide to spend more time with the child in the closure phase or may connect the child to the caregiver or a victim advocate or therapist. Any questions from the child should be answered as directly and honestly as possible. The interviewer should not make promises about events that are beyond the interviewer's control. The interviewer should acknowledge the child's participation in the interview, regardless of the outcome of the interview (Davies & Westcott, 1999; Merchant & Toth, 2006; Newlin et al., 2015; Poole & Lamb, 1998; State of Michigan, 2011).

9.0 SUMMARY

The NCAC recognizes that the work of a child abuse investigation is done in a way that accommodates state laws and community practices. Many factors influence the investigation, including demographics, specialization within professions, cultural concerns, resources, and standard of practice within courts with authority over criminal and child protection decisions. The presence or absence of multidisciplinary teams and child advocacy centers also affects the practice of interviewing child witnesses and conducting investigations (APSAC, 2012; Jones et al., 2005; NCA, 2016; Pence, 2011). The NCAC Child Forensic Interview Structure provides guidelines for best practice as influenced by research and standards of practice in the field. The NCAC model provides a semi-structured, flexible structure that allows for discretion in matters decided by state statutes and community practices.

10.0 REFERENCES

Ahern, E. C., Andrews, S. J., Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2015). The productivity of wh-prompts in child forensic interviews. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *33*(13), 2007-2015.

Alaggia, R. (2004). Many ways of telling: Expanding conceptualizations of child sexual abuse disclosure. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *28*(11), 1213-1227.

Alaggia, R., Collin-Vezina, D., & Lateef, R. (2017). Facilitators and barriers to child sexual abuse (CSA) disclosures: A research update (2000-2016). *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 1-24. Online ahead of print. DOI: 10.1177/1524838017697312

Aldridge, J., Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P. W., & Bowler, L. (2004). Using a human figure drawing to elicit information from alleged victims of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychiatry*, *72*(2), 304-316.

American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC) (2012). *Practice guidelines: Forensic interviewing in cases of suspected child abuse*. Chicago, IL: Author.

Bottoms, B. L., Quas, J. A., & Davis, S. L. (2007). The influence of interviewer-provided social support on children's suggestibility, memory and disclosures. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 135-157). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bottoms, B. L., Rudnicki, A. G., & Epstein, M. A. (2007). A retrospective study of factors affecting the disclosure of childhood sexual and physical abuse. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 175-194). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, D. A. (2011). The use of supplementary techniques in forensic interviews with children. In M. E. Lamb, D. J. La Rooy, L. C. Malloy, & C. Katz (Eds.), *Children's testimony: A handbook of psychological research and forensic practice* (2nd ed, pp. 217-250). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brown, D. A., & Lamb, M. E. (2009). Forensic interviews with children: A two-way street: Supporting interviewers in adhering to best practice recommendations and enhancing children's capabilities in forensic interviews. In K. Kuehnle & M. Connell (Eds.), *The evaluation of child sexual abuse allegations: A comprehensive guide to assessment and testimony* (pp. 299-325). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Brown, D. A., Pipe, M.-E., Lewis, C., Lamb, M. E., & Orbach, Y. (2007). Supportive or suggestive: Do human figure drawings help 5-7 year old children to report touch? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *75*(1), 33-42.

Brubacher, S. P., & La Rooy, D. (2014). Witness recall across repeated interviews in a case of repeated abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(2), 202-211.

Brubacher, S. P., Malloy, L. C., Lamb, M. E., & Roberts, K. P. (2013). How do interviewers and children discuss individual occurrences of alleged repeated abuse in forensic interviews. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 27*(4), 443-450.

Brubacher, S. P., Poole, D. A., & Dickinson, J. J. (2015). The use of ground rules in investigative interviews with children: A synthesis and call for research. *Developmental Review*, *36*, 15-33.

Brubacher, S. P., Powell, M. B., & Roberts, K. P. (2014). Recommendations for interviewing children about repeated experiences. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 20*(3), 325-335.

Brubacher, S. P., Roberts, K. P., & Powell, M. (2012). Retrieval of episodic versus generic information: Does the order of recall affect the amount and accuracy of details reported by children about repeated events?. *Developmental Psychology*, *48*(1), 111-122.

Bruck, M., Ceci, S., & Hembrooke, H. (2001). Reliability and credibility of young children's reports: From research to policy and practice. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Children and the law: The essential readings* (pp. 87-123). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.

Bussey, K., Lee, K., & Grimbeek, E. (1993). Lies and secrets: Implications for children's reporting of sexual abuse. In G. S. Goodman, & B. L. Bottoms (Eds.), *Child victims, child witnesses: Understanding and improving testimony* (pp. 147-168). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Ceci, S., & Bruck, M. (1995). *Jeopardy in the courtroom: A scientific analysis of children's testimony.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cauchi, R., & Powell, M. B. (2009). An examination of police officers' notes of interviews with alleged child abuse victims. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *11*(4), 505-515.

Cederborg, A. C., Danielsson, H., LaRooy, D., & Lamb, M. E. (2009). Repetition of contaminating question types when children and youths with intellectual disabilities are interviewed. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 53(5),* 440-449.

Cederborg, A. C., & Lamb, M. E. (2008). Interviewing alleged victims with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, *52*(1), 49-58.

Cederborg, A.-C., Lamb, M. E., & Laurell, O. (2007). Delay of disclosure, minimization, and denial of abuse when the evidence is unambiguous: A multivictim case. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb., Y. Orbach, & A. C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 159-173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cederborg, A. C., La Rooy, D., & Lamb, M. (2008). Repeated interviews with children who have disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 21*, 103-113.

Chamberlin, A. K., & National Children's Advocacy Center (2016). Getting the details: Gathering episodic information in cases of repeated abuse-A Research-to-Practice Summary. Huntsville, AL: Author. http://calio.org/images/getting-the-details-gathering-episodic-information.pdf

Cordisco Steele, L. (2011). The forensic interview: A challenging conversation. In P. Goodyear-Brown (Ed.), *Handbook of child sexual abuse: Identification, assessment and treatment* (pp. 99-119). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Cordisco Steele, L., & National Children's Advocacy Center. (2010). Narrative practice: What is it and why is it important? A research-to-practice summary. Huntsville, AL: National Children's Advocacy Center. http://calio.org/images/narrative-practice-rev.2015.pdf

Cordisco Steele, L., & National Children's Advocacy Center. (2015). Rapport in child forensic interviews. A research-to-practice summary. Huntsville, AL: National Children's Advocacy Center. http://calio.org/images/rapport-forensic-interviews.pdf

Cordisco Steele, L., & National Children's Advocacy Center. (2016). Alternative Hypotheses in the Child Forensic Interview: What Are We Talking About?: A Research-to-Practice Summary. Huntsville, AL: National Children's Advocacy Center. https://calio.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/alternative-hypotheses-in-child-forensic-interview.pdf

Cronch, L. E., Viljoen, J. L., & Hansen, D. J. (2006). Forensic interviewing in child sexual abuse cases: Current techniques and future directions. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*, *11*(3), 195-207.

Cross, T. P., Jones, L. M., Walsh, W. A., Simone, M., & Kolko, D. (2007). Child forensic interviewing in Children's Advocacy Centers: Empirical data on a practice model. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 31*(10), 1031-1052.

Davies, D., & Faller, K. C. (2007). Interviewing children with special needs. In K. C. Faller (Ed.), *Interviewing children about sexual abuse: Controversies and best practices* (pp. 152-163). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Davies, G. M., & Westcott, H. (1999). In B. Webb (Ed.), *Interviewing children under the Memorandum of Good Practice: A research review.* Police Research Series, Paper 115. http://library.npia.police.uk/docs/hopolicers/fprs115.pdf

Davis, S. L., & Bottoms, B. L. (2002). The effects of social support on the accuracy of children's reports: Implications for the forensic interview. In M. L. Eisen, J. A. Quas, & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Memory and suggestibility in the forensic interview* (pp. 437-457.) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

DeVoe, E. R., & Faller, K. C. (1999). The characteristics of disclosure among children who may have been sexually abused. *Child Maltreatment*, *4*(3), 217-227.

Easton, S. D., Saltzman, L. Y., & Willis, D. G. (2014). "Would you tell under circumstances like that?": Barriers to disclosure of child sexual abuse for men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(4), 460-469.

Evans, A. D., & Roberts, K. (2009). The effects of different paraphrasing styles on the quality of reports from young child witnesses. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *15*(6), 531-546.

Everson, M. D. (1999). Leading and suggestive questions in the child forensic interview. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from Mark Everson, Program on Child Trauma and Maltreatment CB #7160, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7160).

Faller, K. C. (2007). *Interviewing children about sexual abuse: Controversies and best practice.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Faller, K. C., Cordisco Steele, L., & Nelson-Gardell, D. (2010). Allegations of sexual abuse of a child: What to do when a single forensic interview isn't enough. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 19*(5), 572-589.

Faller, K. C., & Hewitt, S. K. (2007). Special considerations for cases involving young children. In K. C. Faller (Ed.), *Interviewing children about sexual abuse: Controversies and best practice* (pp. 142-151). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Fivush, R. R., Haden, C. A., & Reese, E. (2006). Elaborating on elaborations: Role of maternal reminiscing style in cognitive and socioemotional development. *Child Development*, *77*(6), 1568-1588.

Fivush, R. R., Peterson, C., & Schwarzmueller, A. (2002). Questions and answers: The credibility of child witnesses. In M. L. Eisen, J. A. Quas, & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Memory and suggestibility in the forensic interview* (pp. 331-354). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fontes, L. A. (2008a). *Child abuse and culture: Working with diverse families*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Fontes, L. A. (2008b). *Interviewing clients across cultures: A practitioner's guide*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Friedman, W. (2007). The development of temporal metamemory. *Child Development*, *78*(5), 1472-1491.

Friedman, W., & Lyon, T. D. (2005). Development of temporal-reconstructive abilities. *Child Development*, *76*(6), 1202-1216.

Gaskill, R. L., & Perry, B. D. (2012). Child sexual abuse, traumatic experiences, and their impact on the developing brain. In P. Goodyear-Brown (Ed.), *Handbook of child sexual abuse: Identification, assessment and treatment* (pp. 29-47). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Goodman-Brown, T. B., Edelstein, R. S., Goodman, G. S., Jones, D. P., & Gordon, D. S. (2003). Why children tell: A model of children's disclosure of sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *27*(5), 525-540.

Gross, J., & Hayne, H. (1998). Drawing facilitates children's verbal reports of emotionally laden events. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *4*(2), 163-179.

Hershkowitz, I. (2009). Socioemotional factors in child sexual abuse investigations. *Child Maltreatment, 14*(2), 172-181.

Hershowitz, I., Lamb, M. E., Katz, C., & Malloy, L. C. (2013). Does enhanced rapport-building alter the dynamics of investigative interviews with suspected victims of intra-familial abuse? *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 30*(1), 6-14.

Hershkowitz, R., Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Katz, C., & Horowitz, D. (2012). The development of communicative skills among preschoolers: Lessons from forensic interviews about child abuse. *Child Development, 83*(2), 611-622.

Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., Pipe, M.-E., & Horowitz, D. (2006). Dynamics of forensic interviews with suspected abuse victims who do not disclose. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *30*(7), 753-770.

Hershkowitz, I., Horowitz, D., & Lamb, M. E. (2007). Individual and family variables associated with disclosure and nondisclosure of child abuse in Israel. In M.-E. Pipe., M. E. Lamb., Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 65-75). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hershkowitz, I., & Terner, A. (2007). The effects of repeated interviewing on children's forensic statements of sexual abuse. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *21*(9), 1131-1143.

Hewitt, S. K. (1999). *Assessing allegations of sexual abuse in preschool children: Understanding small voices.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Home Office (2002). *Achieving the best evidence in criminal proceedings: Guidance for vulnerable and intimidated witnesses, including children*. London, UK: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Imhoff, M. C., & Baker-Ward, L. (1999). Preschoolers' suggestibility: Effects of developmentally appropriate language and interviewer supportiveness. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *20*(3), 407-429.

Jensen, T. K., Gulbrandsen, W., Mossige, S., Reichelt, S., & Tjersland, O. A. (2005). Reporting possible sexual abuse: A qualitative study on children's perspectives and the context for disclosure. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, *29*(12), 1395-1413.

Jones, L., Cross, T., Walsh, W., & Simone, M. (2005). Criminal investigations of child abuse: The research behind "Best Practices." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, *6*(10), 254-268.

Jones, L. M., Atoro, K., Walsh, W., Cross, T., Shadoin, A., & Magnuson, S. (2010). Nonoffending caregiver and youth experiences with child sexual abuse investigations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*(2), 291-314.

Kadushin, A., & Kadushin, G. (1997). *The social work interview: A guide for human service professionals.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Katz, C. (2013). 'Stand by me': The effect of emotional support on children's testimonies. *British Journal of Social Work*, *45*(1), 349-362.

Katz, C., Barnetz, Z., & Hershkowitz, I. (2014). The effect of drawing on children's experiences of investigations following alleged child abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(5), 858-867.

Katz, C., & Hamama, L. (2013). "Draw me everything that happened to you.": Exploring children's drawings of sexual abuse. *Children and Youth Services Review, 35*(5), 877-882.

Katz, C., & Hershkowitz, I. (2010). The effects of drawing on children's accounts of sexual abuse. *Child Maltreatment*, *15*(2), 171-179.

Katz, C., & Hershkowitz, I. (2012). The effect of multipart prompts on children's testimonies in sexual abuse investigations. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*(11-12), 753-759.

Katz, C., Hershkowitz, I., Malloy, L. C., Lamb, M. E., Atabaki, A., & Spindler, S. (2012). Non-verbal behavior of children who disclose or do not disclose child abuse in investigative interviews. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 36*(1), 12-20.

Koenig, M., & Harris, P. (2005). Preschoolers mistrust ignorant and inaccurate speakers. *Child Development*, *76*(6), 1261-1277.

Lamb, M. E., & Brown, D. A. (2006). Conversational apprentices: Helping children become more competent informants about their own experiences. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24*(1), 215-234.

Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. W. (2008). *Tell me what happened: Structured investigative interviews of child victims and witnesses.* West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lamb, M. E., Malloy, L. C., & La Rooy, D. J. (2011). Setting realistic expectations: Developmental characteristics, capacities and limitations. In M. E. Lamb, D. J. La Rooy, L. C. Malloy, & C. Katz (Eds.), *Children's testimony: A handbook of psychological research and forensic practice,* (2nd ed. pp.15-48). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. (2008). *Tell me what happened: Structured investigative interviews of child victims and witnesses*. West Sussex, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lamb, M. E., Malloy, L. C., & La Rooy, D. J. (2011). Setting realistic expectations: Developmental characteristics, capacities and limitations. In M. E. Lamb, D. J. La Rooy, L. C. Malloy, & C. Katz (Eds.), *Children's Testimony: A handbook of psychological research and forensic practice* (pp. 15-48). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Hershkowitz, I., Esplin P., & Horowitz, D. (2007). A structured 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.

Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Sternberg, K., Hershkowitz, I., & Horowitz, D. (2000). Accuracy of investigator's verbatim notes of their forensic interviews with alleged abuse victims. *Law and Human Behavior*, *24*(6), 699-708.

Lamb, M. E., Sternberg K. J., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P. W., Stewart, H., & Mitchell, S. (2003). Age differences in young children's responses to open-ended invitations in the course of forensic interviews. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *71*(5), 926-934.

La Rooy, D., Katz, C., Malloy, L. C., & Lamb, M. E. (2010). Do we need to rethink guidance on repeated interviews? *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 16*(4), 373-392.

La Rooy, D., Lamb, M. E., & Pipe, M. E. (2009). Repeated interviewing: A critical evaluation of the risks and potential benefits. In K. Kuehnle, & M. Connell (Eds.) *The evaluation of child sexual abuse allegations: A comprehensive guide to assessment and testimony* (pp. 153-180). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lawson, L., & Chaffin, M. (1992). False negatives in sexual abuse disclosure interviews. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *7*(4), 532-542.

Lippert, T., Cross, T., Jones, L., & Walsh, W. (2009). Telling interviewers about sexual abuse. *Child Maltreatment, 14*(1), 100-113.

London, K., Bruck, M., Ceci, S. J., & Shuman, D. W. (2005). Disclosure of child sexual abuse: what does the research tell us about the ways that children tell? *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 11*(1), 194-226.

Lyon, T. D. (2005). *Ten Step Investigative Interview.* http://tinyurl.com/6w4hzar

Lyon, T. D. (2007). False denials: Overcoming methodological biases in abuse disclosure research. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 41-62). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lyon, T. D. (2014). Interviewing children. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 10*, 73-89.

Lyon, T. D., & Ahern, E. C. (2011). Disclosure of child sexual abuse: Implications for interviewing. In J. E. B. Myers (Ed.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (3rd ed., pp. 233-252). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lytle, N., London, K., & Bruck, M. (2015). Young children's ability to use two-dimensional and three-dimensional symbols to show placements of body touches and hidden objects. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *134*, 30-42.

Malloy, L. C., Lyon, T. D., & Quas, J. A. (2007). Filial dependency and recantation of child sexual abuse allegations. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 46*(2), 162-170.

Macleod, E., Gross, J., & Hayne, H. (2013). The clinical and forensic value of information that children report while drawing. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *27*(5), 564-573.

McElvaney, R. (2013). Disclosure of child sexual abuse: Delays, non-disclosure and partial disclosure: What the research tells us and implications for practice. *Child Abuse Review, 24*(3), 159-169.

McElvaney, R., Greene, S., & Hogan, D. (2012). Containing the secret of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(6), 1155-1175.

Mehrani, M. B., & Peterson, C. (2015). Recency tendency: Responses to forced-choice questions. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 29*(3), 418-424.

Merchant, L., & Toth, P. (2006). Child interview guide. Seattle, WA: Harborview Center for Sexual Assault and Traumatic Stress and Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission.

Mulder, M., & Vrij, A. (1996). Explaining conversation rules to children: An intervention study to facilitate children's accurate responses. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, *20*(7), 623-631.

Münzer, A., Fegert, J. M., Ganser, H. G., Loos, S., Witt, A., & Goldbeck, L. (2014). Please tell! Barriers to disclosing sexual victimization and subsequent social support perceived by children and adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *31*(2), 355-377.

Myers, J. E. B. (1992). *Legal issues in child abuse and neglect practice.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Myers, J. E. B. (1998). *Legal issues in child abuse and neglect practice* (2nd ed.) Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Myers, J. E. B., Saywitz, K., & Goodman, G. (1996). Psychological research on children as witnesses: Practical implications for forensic interviews and courtroom testimony. *Pacific Law Journal, 28*(1), 3-92.

National Children's Alliance. (2016). Standards for Accredited Members, 2017 ed. Washington, DC: Author. http://calio.org.calio.idm.oclc.org/images/nca-standards-for-accredited-members-2017.pdf

Newlin, C. Steele, L. C., Chamberlin, A., Anderson, J., Kenniston, J., Russell, A., Stewart, H., & Vaughan-Eden, V. (2015). Child forensic interviewing: Best practices. *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, US Department of Justice*. http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/248749.pdf

Olafson, E., & Lederman, C. S. (2006). The state of the debate about children's disclosure patterns in child sexual abuse cases. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *57*(1), 27-40.

Orbach, Y., & Lamb, M. E. (2007). Young children's references to temporal attributes of allegedly experienced events in the course of forensic interviews. *Child Development*, *78*(4), 1100-1120.

Orbach, Y., & Pipe, M-E. (2011). Investigating substantive issues. In M. E. Lamb, D. J. La Rooy, L. C. Malloy, & C. Katz (Eds.), *Children's testimony: A handbook of psychological research and forensic practice* (2nd ed, pp. 147-164). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Orbach, Y., Shiloach, H., & Lamb. M. E. (2007). Reluctant disclosers of child sexual abuse. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 115-134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Patterson, T., & Hayne, H. (2011). Does drawing facilitate older children's reports of emotionally laden events? *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 25*(1), 119-126.

Pence, D. M. (2011). Child abuse and neglect investigation. Interviewing children. In J. E. B. Myers (Ed.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (3rd ed., pp. 325-335). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Perona, A. R., Bottoms, B. L., & Sorenson, E. (2005). Research-based guidelines for child forensic interviews. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, 12*(3-4), 81-130.

.

Peterson, C., Dowden, C., & Tobin, J. (1999). Interviewing preschoolers: Comparison of yes/no and wh questions. *Law and Human Behavior*, *23*(5), 539-555.

Pipe, M.-E., Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Stewart, H., Sternberg, K. J., & Esplin, P. (2007). Factors associated with nondisclosure of suspected abuse during forensic interviews. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 77-96). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pipe, M.-E., & Salmon, K. (2002). What children bring to the interview context: Individual differences in children's event reports. In M. L. Eisen, J. A. Quas, & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Memory and suggestibility in the forensic interview* (pp. 235-261). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Poole, D. A. (2016). *Interviewing children: The science of conversation in forensic contexts.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Poole, D. A., & Bruck, M. (2012). Divining testimony: The impact of interviewing props on children's reports of touching. *Developmental Review*, *32*(3), 165-180.

Poole, D. A., & Dickinson, J. J. (2014). Comfort drawing during investigative interviews: Evidence of the safety of a popular practice. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *38*(2), 192-201.

Poole, D. A., & Dickinson, J. J. (2011). Evidence supporting restrictions on uses of body diagrams in forensic interviews. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 35*(9), 659-669.

Poole, D. A., & Lamb, M. E. (1998). *Investigative interviews of children: A guide for helping professionals.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Powell, M. (2003). A guide to introducing the topic of an interview about abuse with a child. *Australian Police Journal*, *57*(4), 259-263.

Powell, M. B., & Snow, P. C. (2007). Guide to questioning children during the free-narrative phase of an investigative interview. *Australian Psychologist*, *42*(1), 57-65.

Price, J. R., Roberts, J. E., & Jackson, S. C. (2006). Structural development of the fictional narratives of African American preschoolers. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *37*(3), 178-190.

Priebe, G., & Svedin, C. G. (2008). Child sexual abuse is largely hidden from the adult society: An epidemiological analysis of adolescents' disclosures. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 32*(12), 1095-1108.

Quas, J., A., Davis, E. L., Goodman, G. S., & Myers, J. E. B. (2007). Repeated questions, deceptions, and children's true and false reports of body touch. *Child Maltreatment*, *12*(1), 60-67.

Rivard, J. R., & Compo, N. S. (2017). Self-reported current practices in child forensic interviewing: Training, tools and pre-interview preparation. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 35,* 253-268.

Rocha, E. M., Marche, T. A., & Briere, J. L. (2013). The effect of forced-choice questions on children's suggestibility: A comparison of multiple-choice and yes/no questions. *Canadian Psychological Association, 45*(1), 1-11.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Salmon, K., Roncolato, W., & Gleitzman, M. (2003). Children's reports of emotionally laden events: Adapting the interview to the child. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *17*(1), 65-79.

Saywitz, K. J., & Camparo, L. B. (2009). Contemporary child forensic interviewing: Evolving consensus and innovation over 25 years. In B. L. Bottoms, C. J. Najdowski, & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Children as victims, witnesses, and offenders: Psychological science and the law* (pp. 102-127). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Saywitz, K. J., Esplin, P., & Romanoff, S. (2007) A holistic approach to interviewing and treating children in the legal system. In M.-E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach, & A.-C. Cederborg (Eds.), *Child sexual abuse: Disclosure, delay, and denial* (pp. 221-249). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Saywitz, K. J., & Geiselman, R. (1998). Interviewing the child witness: Maximizing completeness and minimizing error. In S. J. Lynn, & K. M. McConkey (Eds.), *Truth in memory* (pp. 190-223). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Saywitz, K. J., Larson, R. P., Hobbs, S. D., & Wells, C. R. (2015). Developing rapport with children in forensic interviews: Systematic review of experimental research. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 33*(4), 372-389.

Saywitz, K. J., Lyon. T. D., & Goodman, G. S. (2011). Interviewing children. In J. E. B. Myers (Ed.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (3rd ed., pp. 337-360). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Saywitz, K. J., Lyon, T. D., & Goodman, G. S. (2017). When interviewing children: A review and update. USC Law Legal Studies Paper No. 17-2, 32 p. Forthcoming in J. Conte & B. Klika (Eds.), *APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (4th ed). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Saywitz, K. J., Goodman, G. S., & Lyon, T. D. (2002). Interviewing children in and out of court: Current research and practice implications. In J. E. B. Myers, L. Berliner, J. Briere, C. T. Hendrix, C. Jenny, & T. Reid (Eds.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (2nd ed., pp. 349-377). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, K., & Milne, R. (2011). Planning the interview. In M. E. Lamb, D. J. La Rooy, L. C. Malloy, & C. Katz (Eds.), *Children's testimony: A handbook of psychological research and forensic practice* (2nd ed., pp. 87-107). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sorenson, E., Bottoms, B. L., & Perona, A. (2002). *Handbook on intake and forensic interviewing in the children's advocacy center*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention. http://filecache.drivetheweb.com/np2cr_nca-online/393/download/intakeandfihandbook.pdf

Staller, K. M., & Nelson-Gardell, D. (2005). "A burden in your heart": Lessons of disclosure from female preadolescent and adolescent survivors of sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *29*(12), 1415-1432.

State of Michigan Governor's Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect and Department of Human Services. (2011). *Forensic interview protocol* (3rd ed). Lansing, MI: Author. https://www.michigan.gov/documents/dhs/DHS-PUB-0779_211637_7.pdf

Stein, P. T., & Kendall, J. C. (2004). *Psychological trauma and the developing brain*: *neurologically based interventions for troubled children*. New York, NY: Haworth Maltreatment and Trauma Press.

Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E, Hershkovitz, I., Yudilevitch, L., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P., & Hovav, M. (1997). Effects of introductory style on children's abilities to describe experiences of sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *21*(11), 1133-1146.

Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Esplin, P., Orbach, Y., & Hershkowitz, I. (2002). Using a structured interview protocol to improve the quality of investigative interviews. In M. L. Eisen, J. A. Quas, & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Memory and suggestibility in the forensic interview* (pp. 409-436). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tang, C. (2006). Developmentally sensitive forensic interviewing of preschool children: Some guidelines drawn from basic psychological research. *Criminal Justice Review*, *21*(2), 132-145.

Teoh, Y. S., & Lamb, M. (2013). Interviewer demeanor in forensic interviews of children. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 19*(2), 145-159.

Teoh, Y. S., Yang, P. J., Lamb, M. E., & Larrson, A. S. (2010). Do human figure diagrams help alleged victims of sexual abuse provide elaborate and clear accounts of physical contact with alleged perpetrators? *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *24*(2), 287-300.

Van Eys, P., & Benneke, B. (2011). Navigating the system: The complexities of the multidisciplinary team in cases of child sexual abuse. In P. Goodyear-Brown (Ed.), *Handbook of child sexual abuse: Identification, assessment and treatment* (pp. 71-97). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Walker, A. G., Kenniston, J., & Inada, S. S. (2013). *Handbook on questioning children: A linguistic perspective* (3rd ed). Washington, DC: American Bar Association Center on Children and the Law.

Waterhouse, G. F., Ridley, A., Bull, R., La Rooy, D., & Wilcock, R. (2016). Dynamics of repeated interviews with children. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 30*, 713-721.

Wesson, M., & Salmon, K. (2001). Drawing and showing: Helping children to report emotionally laden events. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *15*(3), 301-319.

Wood, J., & Garven, S. (2000). How sexual abuse interviews go astray: Implications for prosecutors, police, and child protection services. *Child Maltreatment*, *5*(2), 109-118.

Wood, J. M., McClure, K. A., & Birch, R. (1996). Suggestions for improving interviews in child protection agencies. *Child Maltreatment*, *1*(3), 223-230.

Wyatt, G. E., Burns, T., Solis, B., Carmona, J. V., & Romero, G. (1999). The prevalence and circumstances of child sexual abuse: Changes across a decade. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*(1), 45-60.