Does the Way We Teach Children Interview Ground Rules Impact the Number of Details They Provide?

By Hannah Kitchin

Victoria University of Wellington

2020

A thesis submitted to Victoria University of Wellington in fulfilment of requirements for a Master of Science in Psychology.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, thank you to my supervisor Deirdre Brown. Your hard work, kindness and positive attitude made all the difference.

Secondly, to my friends (especially my clinical classmates), thank you so much for always being there to listen and provide kind words.

Most importantly, thank you to my family, I am so grateful for your unconditional love. Special thanks to mum, Sarah, and Hamish, you helped me celebrate the milestones and persist through the setbacks, your patient listening and unwavering support has been invaluable.

Abstract

Ground rules are instructions commonly provided to children in investigative interviews. The ultimate aim of ground rules is to help children provide accurate accounts and resist acquiescence. Therefore, it is no surprise that research into ground rule use has so far focused on the impact ground rule training has on the accuracy of children's reports. Yet, the amount of information a child provides is also important when it comes to legal processes ensued when a child reports abuse. This study is unique as it focuses on how ground rule training impacts the amount of information a child provides and whether this varies as a result of more intense training. So far, there is little research available that systematically evaluates multiple training methods within one study. The current study involves a condition with no ground rule training, one with the standard training often suggested in interview protocols, and two more intense training methods informed by relevant learning theories. Children aged between 5 and 12-years-old experienced a live event at their school and were interviewed about this event after a delay of approximately 2-weeks. Results did not support the hypotheses that ground rule training method would impact the number of unique details provided by children and that this relationship would vary across age. Results also showed that children's accuracy responding to questions used to elicit ground rule responses was not related to the number of details provided. A larger sample is necessary to investigate whether the findings of the current study are accurate when the analyses are satisfactorily powered. Currently, this study suggests that more intense ground rule training does not compromise the richness of children's reports. Findings also indicate that children's acquiescence to suggestive, unanswerable or confusing questions is not related to the amount of information they provide when asked answerable questions.

Table of Contents

Title Page……...1

Acknowledgements……2

Abstract……..3

Table of Contents……...…4

List of Tables……..5

List of Appendices…….6

Literature Review…….…….7

I. Introduction…….....7

II. What are Ground Rules and Why are they Important?.....8

III. Why is the Richness of Children's Reports Important?.....13

IV. Ground Rule Training. ……...…….....14

V. Benefits and Risks of Intensifying Ground Rule Instruction……17

VI. Summary……..….20

Study Method……....21

Study Results…….....39

Discussion…….44

Appendices……59

List of Tables

Table 1. *Age and Ethnicity of Participants*……..22

Table 2. *Ground Rule Statements and Examples of Practice Questions*.....29

Table 3. *Examples of Question Types in Narrative Practice Phase*…….……32

Table 4. *Examples of Question Structure Used in Ground Rule Practice Questions*.....33

Table 5. *Examples of Question Structure for Narrative Practice Questions*……35

Table 6. *Examples of Participant's Ground-rule Responses and Points Awarded*……..37

Table 7. *Mean Number of Details Reported in each of the four ground rule training conditions*…….....40

List of Appendices

A: Health and Safety Interview Script……..59

B: Interview Protocols for Each Ground Rule Training Condition……..72

1. Minimal Practice Condition……..72
2. Extended Practice Condition…….....88
3. Extended with Elaborated Practice Narrative Condition……..101
4. No Ground Rule Condition……...116

C: All Additional Statistics……...124

Introduction

Children are interviewed everyday as witnesses or victims of crimes, patients in medical facilities and participants in research. A child being interviewed about their experience of abuse is just one example of the high-stakes contexts where children's account of events can be extremely influential (Oranga Tamariki, 2019). For the experienced interviewer, it may seem like a common or even mundane event to be having these serious conversations with children. However, for the child, it is most likely a unique experience that their everyday conversations with adults are unlikely to have prepared them for. To acknowledge this, "ground rules" were established. Ground rules are guidelines that draw children's attention to the unfamiliar expectations for how they answer questions in an interview setting (Danby, Brubacher, Sharman & Powell, 2015). Most commonly, these rules are statements asking the child to tell the truth, to indicate when they do not know, are confused, or when the interviewer has said something incorrect.

Currently, there is little research focusing on the most effective way to teach children ground rules so that they can apply them appropriately throughout an interview. We know even less about how ground rule training will impact the richness of details children provide. Therefore, the current study will specifically investigate firstly, how does the way we teach children ground rules impact on the amount of information they provide about a past experience? Secondly, does the impact of ground rule teaching method on the amount of information provided vary by age? And finally, is children's ability to accurately apply ground rules associated with the amount of information they provide? To answer these questions, children experienced a live event at their school. After a delay, children were interviewed about their experience following one of the four ground rule training conditions.

What Are Ground Rules and Why Are They Important?

When children are conversing with adults in their daily lives the consequence of inaccuracies in their accounts is often benign. In the classroom or at home, children may be encouraged to provide a guess in response to questions they have already admitted not having the information to answer. Due to social and cultural norms children also have limited experience questioning or correcting what an adult has told them. This is understandable when the conversational dynamic is such that the adult is most often the more knowledgeable individual in the exchange (Zajac & Brown, 2018). As children's vocabulary is still developing, they are quite often confronted with language they do not understand. However, most children do not ask for a definition of every word they do not know. The function of discussion for children is most often social and emphasis on their knowledge, understanding or ability to correct their conversational partner is not usually evaluated harshly. However, in high-stakes contexts, children mustn't guess, infer the meaning of words they do not understand or fail to indicate when an interviewer has made an incorrect statement. In short, children need to be aware that they are the experts of their own experience and the interviewer may ask the wrong questions (Lyon, 2014).

Ground rule interview instructions have been included in many research and forensic interview protocols since the 1990s (Dickinson, Brubacher & Poole, 2015). For example, in the widely used NICHD (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development) protocol, ground rules are included at the beginning of the interview script (Brown et al., 2013). Similarly, in New Zealand today forensic interviewers are also expected to explain these ground rules to children before they start asking about the event in question (New Zealand Police, 2005). Ground rule training is being implemented widely, but what is the

evidence that supports this practice? Three of the most commonly used ground rules involve children being told that “I don’t know” and “I don’t understand” are acceptable responses and also that if the interviewer has misunderstood events, they should correct the interviewer. These rules are the focus of this study. In the following paragraphs research focusing on each of these rules will be discussed briefly.

The “I don’t understand” Ground Rule

When children are in a legal setting, they may be exposed to jargon or complex language they have never heard of or do not comprehend (Cooper, Wallin, Quas, & Lyon, 2010). The “I don’t understand” rule is presumed to encourage children to signal such incomprehension, given studies demonstrating children’s tendency to answer questions that do not make sense or are unanswerable. For example, Hughes and Grieve (1980) asked five- and seven-year-old children questions that did not make sense, such as, “Is red heavier than yellow?” Children attempted to answer these questions by assigning their own meaning or context to the question rather than asking for clarification from the interviewer. Similarly, Pratt (1990) showed that although five and seven-year-old children could judge whether a question made sense or not with reasonable accuracy, they still attempted to answer questions they believed did not make sense. These findings prompted the investigation into whether teaching children that it was acceptable for them to say "I don't understand" would increase their use of this response when asked questions they could not comprehend. Saywitz, Snyder and Nathanson (1999) taught six and eight-year-old children why and when to tell the interviewer they did not understand a question, using explanation, practice, feedback and reinforcement of the rule. They found that children who received this training provided significantly more accurate accounts compared to children who were simply told to let the

interviewer know if a question needed to be rephrased but were not given any other training. Another study by Peters and Nunez (1999) also showed promising results that teaching children what they referred to as "comprehension monitoring" can help children ask for complicated or incomprehensible questions to be rephrased and provide more accurate accounts of their experiences. Overall, the current research indicates that the "I don't understand" ground rule can be beneficial in helping children indicate confusion. However, as it stands, the methods for teaching this rule have varied across studies and it is unclear what methods are most effective. Research in this area has also focused on how children use the ground rule when asked incomprehensible questions. The current study is unique in that it investigates how ground rule training method and children's application of the rule is related to the number of details they provide about an event.

The "I don't know" Ground Rule

When children are being interviewed in a forensic setting they may be the only individual who was present at the event in question. In other words, the child is the expert and the interviewer is naïve (Earhart, La Rooy, Brubacher, & Lamb, 2014). Therefore, the interviewer is also unaware of the extent of the child's knowledge about the event. Consequently, this can lead to the child being asked questions that they do not have the information to answer. Instead of admitting that they do not have an answer, children may feel pressure to guess or "have a go" at answering. In a forensic setting, children's "guesses" can be used as admissible evidence in court. Therefore, it is vital that children only answer questions they are informed enough to answer. In response to this issue, the most well researched of the ground rules, the "I don't know" rule was established (Brubacher, Poole & Dickinson, 2015). This rule has been shown to be successful in reducing inaccuracies in

children's reports and increasing their use of the "I don't know" response to suggestive questioning. In studies by Saywitz and Moan-Hardie (1994), Nesbitt and Markham (1999) and Dickinson, Brubacher and Poole (2015) children were given explanations for why the rule was needed, practice of the rule, and feedback or reinforcement of rule application. All three studies found positive effects of training. In contrast, in a study by Peterson and Grant (2001), children were simply told about the rule, and these researchers did not find significant effects on children's accuracy or application of the rule. In a field study of forensic interviews with children, Earhart, La Rooy, Brubacher and Lamb (2014) analysed transcripts of interviews with children who were suspected victims of abuse. Two groups were formed; children who received the "don't know" ground rule instruction (without practice) and those who did not receive any instruction. These groups were matched according to age, severity and frequency of sexual abuse suffered as well as relationship to perpetrator. The researchers found that in this applied setting, simple "don't know" rule statement compared to no mention of the rule did not lead to children significantly increasing their "I don't know" responses.

Similarly to research of the "I don't understand" rule, the studies we have to date regarding the "I don't know" rules have two key outcome measures. Firstly, how the presence of a rule impacts a child's use of the "I don't know" response to suggestible questions. Secondly, how the presence of the rule explanation impacts children's overall accuracy in reporting. The current study will contribute to the growing research regarding the "don't know" ground rule. However, it will be unique in that the outcome measure of the rule will be the number of details provided by children. The research described above has suggested that differences in presentation of ground rules can lead to differences in how successful children

are at applying these rules. However, there is yet to be a systematic evaluation of ground rule training methods and how these impact the richness of children's reports.

The "That's Wrong" Ground Rule

Interviewers can make incorrect statements. Due to children's developing conversational competencies, they may be more likely to make statements that do not make complete sense or are open to interpretation. When an interviewer has misunderstood a child it is important that the child can then clarify and correct the interviewer's misunderstanding. In addition, when an interviewer makes incorrect assumptions about what has happened, a child needs to indicate that this assumption is wrong. Children's acceptance of inaccurate statements can be used in court as evidence of unreliability or as proof that they agree to the interviewer's incorrect version of events. Roberts and Lamb (1999) found that interviewers often summarise children's answers incorrectly and children do not reliably correct these inaccuracies. In acknowledgement of this issue, the "that's wrong" ground rule is often included in interview protocols. When taught and practiced by children, the "that's wrong" rule has been shown by many studies to increase children's ability to correct interviewers' inaccurate statements (Geddie et al., 2001; Gee, Gregory, & Pipe, 1999; Krackow & Lynn, 2010; Saywitz & Moan-Hardie, 1994). Ellis, Powell, Thomson and Jones (2003) investigated whether ground rule training, including the "that's wrong" (or correct me) ground rule, reduced inaccuracies in children's responses to suggestive questioning. Children in this study were aged between 3 and 5-years old. Ground rule training in the study involved only rule statement and not practice. The researchers did not find any benefit of the ground rules on the accuracy of children's reports. Geddie, Beer, Bartosik and Wuensch (2001) allowed children to practice the "that's wrong" rule. However, the researchers still did not find the rule beneficial to the

accuracy of younger children's reports. A possible explanation for this finding is that a separate research assistant who did not conduct the main interview delivered ground rule training. This may have made it more difficult for children to generalise their ground rule training to the interview.

The research to date concerning the "that's wrong" ground rule suggests that the response can be useful to children in an interview setting. However, as with the previous ground rules discussed, it is still unclear what circumstances make it easier for children to learn to apply the rule and what impacts this has on the number of details they provide.

Why is the Richness of Children's Reports Important?

As it stands, we have research that provides information about how ground rule training impacts children's ability to answer suggestible or nonsensical questions (Geddie et al., 2001; Gee, Gregory, & Pipe, 1999; Nesbitt & Markham, 1999; Hughes and Grieve, 1980). However, we know little about how training impacts children's ability to answer questions that include accurate details and that they have the comprehension and information to answer correctly. We must clarify whether ground rule instructions help or hinder children's efforts to answer these questions in detail. If they help, it may make the case for ground rule instruction even stronger. However, if ground rule instruction significantly impacts the number of unique details that children report than this may lead to the conclusion that the cost is too great. When children are acting as witnesses in forensic interviews the amount of information they report can be instrumental in if and how an individual is prosecuted for serious crimes such as child abuse. Researchers Kyriakidou, Zalaf and Blades (2014) analysed the transcripts from 46 cases of child testimony and found that prosecution rates were highly correlated with the amount of evidence a child provided, and not with the quality of that verbal

evidence given or the quality of questions asked by the interviewer. Therefore, it is imperative we know the effects of ground rule training on the amount of details children provide and also whether this differs across development so practitioners can adjust their interview practice.

Saywitz and Moan-Hardie (1994) conducted research aiming to increase the accuracy of accounts from 7-year old children. In their first study, the researchers found that training in ground rules could unintentionally encourage children to use responses such as “I don’t know” even when they have the information to correctly answer. This raises a suspicion that rule responses can be overgeneralized, reducing the richness of a child's report. This overgeneralisation may be more likely when more intensive ground rule training is implemented. Therefore, it is hypothesised that the type of ground rule training children receive may decrease the amount of information they provide.

Ground Rule Training

There are some benefits of the "don't know", "don't understand" and "correct the interviewer" ground rules in increasing the accuracy of children's accounts. What is not clear, however, is how best to train children in these rules so they can reach their full potential in understanding and correctly applying the responses appropriately. The literature described above suggests that practice and feedback are important for children's learning of the rules. However, we lack evidence to guide practitioners about how much or what kind of practice is needed for children to maximise the benefits of ground rule training and whether this changes across childhood. Currently, the research base on ground rules has been geared towards assessing their effectiveness at increasing the accuracy of children's reports (Geddie et al., 2001; Dickinson, Brubacher and Poole, 2015; Saywitz, Snyder and Nathanson, 1999). The way that ground rules have been delivered in research has included any or all of the following:

a simple statement of the rule; explanations of why it is important; practice with and without feedback; inclusion of reinforcement. However, in most interview protocols and forensic practice, the rules are delivered in a systematic way that involves a statement which is sometimes but not always followed by one or two practice questions (Brown et al., 2013). Brubacher, Poole and Dickinson (2015) completed a study space analysis of ground rule research. A study space analysis summarises methodological approaches to a research question (e.g., characteristics of samples studied, types of stimulus events used, delay intervals used and so forth). The evidence for ground rule use was reviewed and gaps in the research base were identified. Overall, the paper identified that limited age groups have been studied and comparison across age is rare. In addition, the ground rule training methods used across studies was unstandardised and under-emphasised as an important factor in how children applied the ground rule responses.

There is a gap in the literature regarding how competency of ground rule use changes across childhood. In addition, it is unclear what kind of training might be optimal depending on a child's stage of development. In a practical sense, the most efficient training method needs to be identified. That is, the method which is most effective at increasing children's use of the ground rule response *maintains the richness of their reports*, and is not unnecessarily taxing on the child and interviewer's resources (time, energy, money).

Learning Theories Relevant to Ground Rule Training

Applying ground rule responses accurately involves new unpractised skills for many children, such as challenging an adult on what they've said, admitting ignorance and signalling confusion. Therefore, it is important that in developing ground rule training methods we use

research about how best children learn and transfer new skills across contexts. Currently, in practice, ground rule teaching is inconsistent with evidence-based learning theories.

The Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) and the Progressive Alignment Theory (PAT) both suggest extensive practice and a high degree of similarity between practice and test questions to maximise transference of learning across contexts (Sweller, Van Merrienboer, & Paas, 1998; Gentner, Loewenstein, & Hung, 2007). However, in widely used interview guidelines such as the NICHD protocol, the practice questions are fixed, minimal and are likely to differ greatly to the kinds of questions children will need to apply the ground rule responses to when being asked about their own experiences (La Rooy et al., 2015). For example, for the "don't know" rule a common practice question is, "If I said, 'what is my dog's name?' what would you say?" This question focuses on the child's lack of knowledge about the interviewer's private life rather than allowing the child to practice thinking back to a situation they have experienced and having to consider whether their experience provided them with the information needed to answer the question accurately. Currently, it is unclear whether the lack of evidence-based training methods are contributing to children's difficulty applying the rules (Geddie et al., 2001; Ellis et al., 2003; Peterson and Grant, 2001).

In the current study, children were assigned to one of four different ground rule training methods that varied in the amount and kinds of practice questions they received. The data collected for the current study is part of a larger research project aiming to test ground rule instruction methods informed by CLT and PAT to find out what is the best way to train children that is most efficient for practitioners. As previously mentioned, the bulk of research in this area has focused on the effect of ground rule use on the accuracy of children's accounts (Brubacher, Poole, Dickinson, 2015). This study is unique in that it will investigate how the

different ground rule training methods impact the amount of information children provide about a staged event. This will inform us about the extent to which ground rule training and application is associated with broader recall and reporting processes.

In the control condition, children will not receive ground rule training. In the "Minimal Practice" (MP) condition children will hear the rule statement and be asked one or two practice questions as suggested by the NICHD interview protocol (La Rooy et al., 2015). The next two conditions, the "Extended Practice" (EP) and the "Extended with Elaborative Practice Narrative" (EEPN) condition are both informed by PAT and CLT learning theories. Both conditions involve more practice than the MP condition, however, EP has fewer practice opportunities than EEPN. The purpose of having these two conditions is to be able to clarify what is minimally sufficient to see an impact on ground rule application across different age groups. Younger children may need more intense practice than older children and having training methods that vary in intensity will help clarify this issue (which will be explored in another study using this same data).

Benefits and Risks of Intensifying Ground Rule Instruction

It is suggested that there are cognitive and social abilities implicated in how children understand and apply ground rules (Brubacher, Poole & Dickinson, 2015). Therefore, it may be expected that for children of different ages or developmental stages, different training will be required to maximise the beneficial effects of ground rules. In the current study, we will explore whether children's ability to apply ground rules appropriately to "challenge" questions is associated with the number of details they provide.

Otgaar and Candel (2011) investigated whether children's performance on two different tasks used to elicit false memory was associated. The two tasks were the Deese-Roediger-McDermott (DRM) word list and the Bonn Test of Statement Suggestibility. It was found that on average throughout the sample, performance on the two tasks was not significantly related. It was concluded that these tasks may be functionally different and rely on distinct memory processes. It may also be the case that in the current study children's ability to appropriately apply ground rule responses and the number of unique details they report is two tasks that rely on distinctive memory processes and therefore will not be related.

For younger children, cognitive abilities such as language comprehension, inhibitory control and working memory that are potentially involved in using ground rules are not as developed (Gathercole, Pickering, Ambridge, & Wearing, 2004; McArdle, Ferrer-Caja, Hamagami, & Woodcock, 2002; Gagne & Saudino, 2011). Therefore, compared to older children, they may struggle to understand what the rule means and why it's important, keep it in mind throughout the interview and then decide what questions are appropriate to apply it to. This struggle may be lessened with increased practice and so they may do far better at answering challenge questions in the EPN condition than control, MP or EP conditions. It has been shown that the amount of information younger children provide is less than older children on average (O'Donohue & Fanetti, 2016). It is possible that by becoming better at using the ground responses to appropriate questions, younger children may also overgeneralise the rules to questions they can answer, in an attempt to please the interviewer. The power dynamic between younger children and interviewers is even more blatant than for older children, with the interviewer in an authoritative role and the child vulnerable to undermining their own recall through acquiescence (Saywitz & Camparo, 1998). Therefore, the gap between the

number of details provided by younger and older children may be even more significant when ground rule training intensity is increased.

A conflicting hypothesis is that more intense ground rules training helps children of all ages report more details about their experience. By equipping children well with the ground rule responses, it may emphasise to children that they are the experts of their own experience. This may lead to children feeling more confident in their knowledge and therefore becoming more descriptive. Another reason an increase in the intensity of training may lead to children providing more information is the increased time for rapport building between the interviewer and the child. Research has suggested that rapport building is important for children to feel comfortable enough to provide information about their experiences (Teoh & Lamb, 2010). In the EP and EPN conditions, the ground rule training and narrative phases are longer on average and therefore there is more opportunity for the interviewer and child to have built rapport before inquiries about the event of interest begin.

Children in middle childhood are on their way to becoming proficient in the skills required for ground rule use and increased intensity of training may overload them to the point that there is a decrease in the amount of information they provide. As with young children, when questioned suggestively those in middle-childhood are prone to acquiescence (Cassel, Roebers, & Bjorklund, 1996). These children may have a heavy cognitive load, monitoring their knowledge and understanding, questioning whether what they remember is true and trying to please the interviewer.

For each method of ground rule training, the relationship between how children answer challenge questions and the amount of details they provide about an experienced event is important. Defining this relationship will help researchers and practitioners make decisions

about the best ways to implement training that does not come at the cost of richly detailed reports. If using ground rules appropriately and providing detailed accounts of past experiences are both simply reflective of children's ability to search their memory and respond appropriately to the interviewer, then the tasks could be highly correlated.

Summary

As the field of ground rule research grows, we must consider a broader range of variables outside of the impacts on children's ability to answer suggestible questions. The current study is part of a broader systematic evaluation of ground rule training methods. It is unique in that it focuses on how the training will impact the richness of children's responses to answerable questions about a staged event. Whether this impact varies across development will be investigated and will contribute to the small group of studies considering age as a key factor in this field. Finally, this study will also look at how children's ability to accurately apply ground rule responses is related to the overall richness of their reports.

Method

Ethical Approval

This study was part of a larger research project investigating the impact of five different ground rule training methods on children's use of the rules during an interview about a past event. Ethical approval was granted for the larger project by the School of Psychology Human Ethics Committee under delegated authority to the Victoria University of Human Ethics Committee.

Participants

It is noted that due to external circumstances (the COVID-19 pandemic), only approximately ¼ of the sample initially hoped for was included in the current study. Therefore, the results from the current study should be interpreted with caution as each condition had relatively few participants.

For the whole project, a total of 114 children aged between 5-12 years old (*M* = 8.17 years, *SD* = 1.95, see Table 1) were recruited from schools in the wider Wellington region. In this study, we included 93 children, 54 of whom identified as female and 39 as male. Participants predominantly identified as of Pākehā (New Zealand European) ethnicity (see Table 1 for details.) The number of children in each age group (in years) is provided in Table 1 below. The parents of all participants provided written consent first. Verbal assent from children aged 3-8-years old and written assent from those aged 9-12-years old was required before the commencement of the interview. Children were quasi-randomly assigned to one of five conditions. Only four ground rule training conditions were included in the current study. There a mean of 23 children in each condition (NG = 33, MP = 27, EP = 20, EEPN = 13).

Table 1.

Age and Ethnicity of Participants

Age (in years)	Number of Participants
5yrs	9
6yrs	15
7yrs	11
8yrs	18
9yrs	18
10yrs	10
11yrs	7
12yrs	5
Ethnicity	
Pākehā (NZ European)	77
Other (Asian, Pacific Islander, European)	16

Materials

The script followed by research assistants for the health and safety event can be found in Appendix A and the interview protocol for the three ground rule training methods is provided in Appendix B.

Design

The current study had a between-subject design. There were three independent variables including the age of participants, ground rule training method and accuracy of ground rule use. Each participant experienced one of the four ground rule training methods which included no ground rules (NG), minimal practice (MP), extended practice (EP) and Extended with Elaborated Practice Narrative (EEPN), which are described in detail below. The dependent variable was the total number of unique details provided.

The Health and Safety Event

Interactive "health and safety" presentations were staged with groups of children, to act as the focus of the subsequent memory interview. This event was modelled on ones used previously in other studies by Brown and Pipe (2003) and Brown, Lamb, Lewis, Pipe, Orchach and Wolfman (2013). The events involved approximately 25 children (Mean = 25.66) at a time and were run at the participants' schools. The event took approximately 40 minutes each time it was run and a total of 6 events took place in 3 schools.

A research assistant gathered participants from their classrooms and guided them to a school hall or classroom where the health and safety activity stations were already set up. There were four activity stations. Each child experienced two stations, either the heartbeat and hazards station or the temperature and treatment of cuts station (see below for details). The event leader separated the children into four groups that were identified by colour (yellow, orange, green and red).

There was one research assistant at each activity station acting as the "station leader". If this was the first station of the event that participants were visiting the leaders

handed out pre-prepared nametags. As the second activity was beginning, the event was interrupted by a research assistant acting as though they were in a rush and asking for the event leader. Children were instructed by their station leader to listen carefully to what was going on. The research assistant and the event leader argued briefly about needing the health and safety equipment before the matter was resolved by the event leader suggesting that the "interrupter" take the spare equipment from each station (See Appendix A for script). After the interruption, activities at each station resumed.

At the "temperatures" and "heartbeats" stations, children worked in pairs. Children did not work in pairs at the "hazards" and "treatment of cuts" stations but in their groups. Children attended two stations, they were randomly assigned to experience either the "heartbeats" and "hazards" stations or the "temperatures" and "treatment of cuts" stations. When children had completed their second station they were thanked for their participation and given a pencil

Temperatures Station Activities

First, the leader demonstrated how to check the temperature using the back of their hand on their own forehead and participants then checked their partner's temperature using this method.

The station lead then presented the "skinny thermometer" and children were asked to say "thermometer" aloud together. Each pair received a stick thermometer. Each child put the thermometer under their partner's left armpit and counted to 10 before looking at the reading. This was then repeated with the thermometer behind their partner's left knee. The children were asked if the readings from the two areas were the same or different.

Participants then used an antiseptic wipe to clean the thermometer. Children then swapped roles and the process was completed again with partner two in the checking role.

Children were told that to get the best reading temperature is measured in the ear. Participants were given a digital ear thermometer with a probe cover on it. Number one partners were instructed to put the thermometer gently in their partner's ear and press the button. Partner two was told to look at their temperature reading and record it. Each pair was given one piece of paper to record their name and temperature by writing the number down and circling the number on a cartoon thermometer. The station leader provided children to help with writing the names and temperature number when necessary but all children circled their own temperatures.

Treatments of Cuts Station Activities

At the "care of cuts" station children were told to pay careful attention to a video they were going to watch about "Arthur" who was getting a tyre from the dump. They were then shown a short clip and afterwards asked questions that appeared in a slideshow (see Appendix A). The station leader then demonstrated and instructed the children to hold up their left pointer finger. The leader explained that they were going to draw a small line on the top of each child's finger in red pen as a "pretend cut". The children were taught a four-step process to look after their finger. For each step, the leader told the child what to do, demonstrated it on themselves and showed a slideshow with pictures demonstrating the steps. Firstly, participants were told to put pressure on the "cut" to stop the bleeding. Secondly, they were told to raise the cut above their heart. Thirdly, participants were given an antiseptic wipe and told to wipe the cut to stop it from getting infected. Finally, children were given a blue plaster and told to cover their cut.

The children were then shown another slideshow about “big cuts” and were informed that when cuts are “big and bleeding a lot” then an adult should always be told so they can help. The leader then took a photo of all children with their plasters on and children were given the option to keep their plasters on or take them off.

Hazards Station Activities

At the “hazards” station, children were shown large animated pictures, which depicted a scene with at least one and up to three potential ‘hazards’. There was one “example” picture followed by a minimum of four and a maximum of nine different picture cards. Children were told that for each picture they needed to think about firstly, “what is unsafe in the picture?”, secondly, “why it is unsafe?” and finally, “how we can try and fix it?” The leader showed each picture and recorded answers to these three questions on a sheet of paper. In addition, the activity at this station was audio recorded to ensure all answers were accurately documented. The leader encouraged every child to give at least one answer.

Heartbeats Station Activities

At the “heartbeats” station children were shown a stethoscope and asked to repeat the name aloud in unison. Participants worked in their pairs to listen to each other’s heartbeat on their chest and stomach with the stethoscope and also by feeling their partners pulse on their wrist and then ankle. The name of each participant's partner and whether they were number one or number two partner was recorded by the station leader. Each pair received a working stethoscope with a soft-toy animal cover on it. The kind of animal each pair received was recorded. Number one partners were told to put the earbuds into their ears and tap the "round bit at the end" to see whether the end needs to be twisted to make the

stethoscope louder, the leader demonstrated this. Number ones were then told to listen to their partner's heartbeat on the left of their chest and the leader asked if they could hear the heartbeat. Partner one then listened to their partner's stomach and were asked again if they could hear anything, the leader explained that this is not a very good place to listen to someone's heart. Number one was handed an antiseptic wipe and told to wipe the earpieces before partner two took the stethoscope and the steps above were repeated.

Participants were told that another way of listening to their partner's heartbeat is by feeling their pulse. The leader demonstrated feeling for a pulse on their own wrist before asking the number one partner to do the same on partner two's wrist. The children were asked if they could feel anything before number two partner's had their turn. Participants were told that this is how a pulse is normally taken. Partner one was then asked to check partner two's pulse on their ankle which the leader demonstrated on themselves. Children were asked if they could feel anything and then partner two had their turn. The leader explained that the ankle is not a good place to feel the pulse. After all, activities were finished, the leader took a photo of all children with partner two wearing their stethoscopes.

The Interview

Approximately 2.5 weeks after children took part in the health and safety event (Mean = 17.33 days, SD = 3.29, min = 14.00, max = 26.00) they were interviewed individually by one of two research assistants in a quiet room at their school. The interviews lasted approximately 34 minutes (Mean = 34.21, SD = 7.87, minimum = 20, maximum = 55 minutes). Video and audio recordings were taken of the interviews for transcribing and coding. Children were quasi-randomly assigned to conditions, balancing school group, gender, and age where possible. The interview began after children gave verbal (3-8 years

old) or written (9-12-year-olds) assent. All children were interviewed following the National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Investigative Interview Protocol. All interviews apart from the NG condition began with ground rule training, followed by a narrative practice interview about the child's morning, and then questions about the health and safety event. Children were taught about the same three interview ground rules, including, "I don't understand", "I don't know" and "correct me" (see Table 2 for statements and examples of each). The type of ground rule training that children received varied by condition, and is described in detail below (see appendix B).

Table 2.

Ground Rule Statements and Examples of Practice Questions

Ground Rule	Statement of Rule	Practice Question Example

"I Don't know"	"If I ask you a question, and you don't know, or you have forgotten the answer, just tell me "I don't know", you don't have to guess. But if you do know, please tell me."	"So, if I ask you, 'What is my dog's name?' What would you say?"
"I Don't understand"	"If I ask a question that you don't understand or you're not sure what I mean, just say "I don't understand", okay?' [Pause.] and if I don't understand what you say, I'll ask you to explain."	"If I ask you 'where is the querulous cat?' what would you say?"
"Correct me"	"If I say things that are wrong, then you should tell me. You can say 'that's wrong' and let me know what the correct [right] thing is, okay?"	"If I said that you are a 2-year-old girl/boy [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.] what would you say?"

1. Minimal Practice (MP) Condition

Children in the MP ground rule training condition received the least amount of ground rule practice. This condition most closely reflects how ground rules are suggested to

be taught in many interview protocols around the world, including in New Zealand (New Zealand Police, 2005). The ground rule was described, and then a practice question was asked (see Table 2). Depending on whether or not the child answered correctly, by providing the appropriate ground rules response, they would be provided with positive feedback or probed further before the next practice question was asked. After both practice questions had been asked, a summary involving a brief restatement of each of the three rules was given before the regular “practice narrative” begun.

The regular practice narrative involved three "general invitation" questions, as well as a minimum of four "cued invitation", one "'wh- question" and one "option posing" question (see Table 3 for examples of each). All questions focused on what happened during the child's morning before they arrived at school. After the narrative practice, the interviewer transitioned into talking about the health and safety event, the "memory" phase. To begin the "free-recall" section of the memory phase, the interviewer explained that they had heard a health a safety event occurred at the school and would like to know all about it (see appendix B for exact wording).

Children were then asked questions to encourage them to describe the health and safety event. “Challenge” questions were placed throughout the memory phase of the interview. These questions were aimed to elicit the three ground rule responses taught to children at the beginning of the interview. For example, for the “I don’t know” ground rule, a challenge question would be “Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.” The children were not there and were not told about what the leaders did before they arrived therefore they should say they “don’t know.” When the children were asked these challenge questions varied depending on what they recalled of the

event. However, some general principles were followed. Three open-ended questions, asked in the free-recall section of the memory, three “wh” questions and three option-posing questions were asked in follow up questioning. For each question type (open-ended, “wh” and option-posing) there was one question targeted at eliciting each of the three ground rule responses.

The memory phase had four main topics that were common across all children. Firstly, the free-recall phase in which children were asked to describe the health and safety event more generally. The following three topics involved questions that focused on three different parts of there event experience, including the first station and second stations the child visited and finally the interruption. For each topic, the questions varied depending on what the child reported. However, general guidelines were followed about the types of questions asked the order they should be asked and how many of each. For example, all children were asked a minimum of four "cued invitation" questions. These questions were different for each child as they included details provided in children's previous answers that the interviewer was following up on. At the end of the interview children, each received a small koha (gift) of a stationary to thank them for their participation.

Table 3.

Examples of Question Types in Narrative Practice Phase

Question Structure	Example Question from Narrative Phase
Wh- (what, when, where) question	"What was the very next thing that happened?"
Cued Invitation	"You told me [activity mentioned by child – using child's words], tell me everything about that"
General Invitation	"Tell me everything you can remember from the time you woke up until you arrived at school this morning"
Option-posing Question	"Did that happen before you left for school?"

2. Extended Practice (EP) Condition

Children in the EP condition received the same ground rule statements and practice questions as those in the MP condition. However, they also received practice questions that varied in the structure including a "wh-"question, an "option-posing" question, and an "open-ended" question for each ground rule (see Table 4 for examples of question structure). "Back-up" questions were available to interviewers if needed and were asked if the child failed to use the appropriate ground rule response or if there was a problem with the first question. For example, if a child knew the "tricky" word in a "don't understand" practice question that meant they could comprehend and answer the question without using the ground rule response. Therefore, all children in this condition were asked a minimum of

three practice questions and a maximum of six, for each ground rule. Children were given feedback in the same way as in the MP condition, and a summary of the rules at the end of the training. The interview then progressed in the same way as the MP condition.

Table 4.

Examples of Question Structure Used in Ground Rule Practice Questions

Question Structure	Ground Rule Practice Question
Wh- (what, when, where)	1. Don't understand Ground rule: "So, if I ask you 'what are you most adroit at?' What would you say?" 2. Don't know Ground Rule: "So, if I ask you, 'What is my dog's name?' What would you say?" 3. Correct Me Ground Rule: "If I said that you are a 2-year-old girl/boy [e.g. when interviewing a 5-year old boy] what would you say?"
Open-ended	1. Don't understand Ground rule: "If I said, 'tell me all about your curmudgeon teacher', what would you say?"

	2. Don't know Ground Rule: "If I said, 'tell me all about my last birthday party?' What would you say?" 3. Correct Me Ground Rule: "Tell me about the Prime Minister's visit to your school/preschool this morning?"
Option-posing	1. Don't understand Ground rule: "If I ask you 'is my shirt gridelin?' what would you say?" 2. Don't know Ground Rule: "So, if I ask you, 'did I go to the movies last night?' What would you say?" 3. Correct Me Ground Rule: "If I said, 'is your hair pink or is your hair purple [colours their hair is not] today?' What would you say?"

3. Elaborated Practice Narrative (EPN) Condition

Participants in the EPN condition received the most intense ground rule training. They experienced all of the training that children in EP condition did but were also asked ground rule practice questions throughout the narrative practice phase of their interview. There were three versions of the EPN condition. Across each version, children were asked the same number of general invitation, practice narrative and cued questions in the same order. What varied across versions was the question structure and order that the narrative

practice questions were asked in. In all versions, the narrative practice questions were about the children's morning (see Table 5 for examples). All children received nine practice questions that varied in structure, including the same question types as in the ground rule training phase. For each ground rule, one "wh", open-ended and option-posing question was asked to elicit the appropriate response (e.g. I don't know).

The practice narrative questions were dispersed approximately evenly between non-challenge questions. Feedback to children's answers to narrative practice questions varied depending on whether they gave a correct response, used the wrong ground rule, or attempted to answer a question when they should have provided a ground rule response (See appendix B for full feedback guidelines). When the elaborative practice narrative phase was finished children were reminded of the three ground rules again in a summary. Finally, the health and safety phase of the interview began which followed the same structure and questioning technique as MP and EP (See description in MP section above).

Table 5.

Examples of Question Structure for Narrative Practice Questions

Question Structure	Ground Rule	Example of Narrative Practice Question
Wh- (what, when, where)	"I don't know"	"Which one of your friends woke up the earliest this morning?"
Open-ended	"Correct me"	"Tell me about the hot air balloon that was in the sky on your way to school"

Option-posing (yes-no)	"I don't understand"	"Is [detail child has just given e.g. brushed their teeth] a hemerine part of your morning?"

4. No Ground Rules (NG) Condition

Children in the NG condition did not receive any ground rule training at all and after assent were questioned in the regular practice narrative style also present for children in the MP and EP conditions.

Coding

All interviews were transcribed verbatim and relevant non-verbal responses were documented (e.g. a child pointing to where the stethoscope was placed). The author transcribed 50 of the 114 interviews. Amount of information was coded by the author and one other research assistant. Accuracy of ground rule use was coded by two other research assistants.

The accuracy of ground rule use in response to "Challenge questions" was scored either a 0, 1 or 2. Answers that received a score of 2 points were those that included explicit correct use of the target ground rule response. When a child answered using the wrong ground rule they were given a score of 1 point and if they provided an incorrect or irrelevant response they received 0 points (See Table 6 for further detail). A total score (the accuracy of use score) for the challenge questions for each of the ground rules was created. This score was based on the number of questions a child received, as interviewer error meant that not all children received the same number of questions. The number of points awarded for each

question asked was divided by the number of questions asked. For example, if three "I don't know" challenge questions were asked, and the child received a score of 2 points for each question, their accuracy of use score for the "I don't know" rule would be 2 (3 x 2 = 6, 6/3 = 2).

Table 6.

Examples of Participant's Ground-rule Responses and Points Awarded.

Description	Points awarded	Examples of Participant Responses
Correct response to challenge question	2	Correct Me: I: "So earlier you mentioned doing some different activities, tell me what you did at the hazard station" C: "I wasn't at the hazard station." I Don't Know: I: "The women who came in, what colour was her bicycle?" C: "I didn't see that." I Don't Understand: I: "Tell me about measuring febrility." C: "I don't know what febrility means."
Resisted response or use of wrong rule	1	I: "When did the bellicose woman leave the classroom?"

		C: “I don’t know”
Incorrect response	0	I: “Did you like your leader's tiger stethoscope?"
		C: “Yeah”
Abstained response	0	I: “Tell me about measuring arrythmia”
		C: "After the event, we got pencils as a prize"

All transcripts were coded for the amount of unique meaningful details. Both unverifiable and verifiable details were included. Verifiable details about the event were those able to be verified by documentation (e.g. photographs, audio recordings, written descriptions by research assistants, props used at the events). Unverifiable details did not have supporting documentation or were subjective evaluations. Non-meaningful information such as false-starts and empty language was not coded as a unique detail (e.g. "um", "and"). Details that were repeated were provided in the interviewer's question, were unrelated to the event or did not make sense were also not coded. Information that was coded was relevant to the health and safety event, unique, and meaningful (e.g. "hazards", "cards", "point out"). This information could be in the form of references to specific individuals, actions, objects, places, times, and also included subjective descriptions or evaluations. The details provided by children in response to challenge questions were not coded, however, subsequent elaborations of answers provided were counted. Each unique piece of information was awarded 1 point and there was no minimum or maximum number of points a child would receive.

Inter-rater reliability was established between the author and one other research assistant. The author helped develop the coding protocol and then completed a training phase which involved side-by-side coding so discussions about the reasons for assigning each code could take place. Training took approximately 3 months. For the amount of detail, 30% of the 114 transcripts were coded by both the author and one other research assistant. Double-coding continued until the overall kappa value was substantial for the amount of information at $\kappa = .734$ and almost perfect for accuracy of ground rule use at $\kappa = .925$, this process took approximately 4 months to achieve (Sim & Wright, 2005). Intra-rater reliability was measured after 25% of non-reliability transcripts were coded to ensure that coding had not drifted from the established protocol. Intra-rater reliability was established by the author recoding 10 randomly selected earlier transcripts and was found to be almost perfect with an overall at $\kappa = .866$. The second research assistant's intra-rater reliability was almost perfect at $\kappa = .879$ after recoding 20 randomly selected transcripts.

Results

Preliminary Analysis

First, the data for each dependent variable was inspected to ensure that the assumption of a normal distribution was met as necessary for ANOVA (analysis of variance) and regression analyses.

Dependent variable data inspected included accuracy of use for the three ground rules, as well as the total number of details provided across the whole sample and in the four separate conditions. The dependent variable, number of details, included accurate and inaccurate details. The data for all dependent variables met criteria for consideration of a normal distribution. No skewness or kurtosis values fell below -2 or above +2 (Field, 2013).

There was one outlier in the EEPN condition, for the number of details provided. The sample size for this condition was small (13) and all other assumptions of normality were met. Therefore, this outlier was not excluded. There were no other outliers identified in the dependent variable data. Visual observations of the data showed variability in the number of details provided across all children and in separate conditions. Visual observations of the data for accuracy of use for each ground rule showed variability in scores across all children.

Descriptive Statistics

Across all conditions children provided an average of 146 unique details when being asked about the staged event (Mean = 146.90, SD = 64.37, minimum = 29, maximum = 293). Children in each of the four conditions provided a similar mean number of details, as seen in Table 7.

Table 7.

Mean Number of Details Reported in each of the four ground rule training conditions.

Ground Rule Training Condition	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
No Ground Rules (NG)	159.11	63.15	41	271
Minimal Practice (MP)	139.78	65.01	29	293
Extended Practice (EP)	144.89	74.33	34	265
Extended with Elaborative Practice Narrative (EEPN)	133.85	50.13	39	221

Main Analyses

A univariate two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to investigate how ground rule training condition and age group impacted the number of details provided by children. In each ground rule training condition, the full range of ages was not present. Therefore, for this part of the analysis, the independent variable of age group was created. This variable was made up of three levels, including younger, middle and older aged children, including the age ranges of 5-7 (n = 35), 8-10 (n = 46) and 11-12 (n = 12) years old respectively. All other analyses used age group in years. Homogeneity of variance was assessed by Levene's test and was found non-significant (p = .088).

There was no significant main effect of ground rule training condition on the number of details provided $F(3, 82) = .827$, $p = .483$. There was a significant main effect of age on the number of details provided with older children on average reporting more details than younger children $F(2, 82) = 11.133$, $p < .001$. There was no significant interaction effect between age and ground rule training condition on the amount of information children provided $F(5, 63) = .359$, $p = .875$. These results do not support the hypothesis that ground rule training condition has an impact on the number of details children provide. It also does not support the hypothesis that this effect varies by age.

Analyses were performed to investigate whether the accuracy of children's ground rule use predicted the number of details they provided. Pearson correlation analyses were performed first to ensure that there was a significant correlation between the accuracy of ground use (for each of the separate ground rules) and the number of details provided. The number of details reported did not correlate with the accuracy of use for any of the three ground rules (See appendix C for all additional statistics). Therefore, no linear regression

analyses were performed. Additional correlation analyses found that there was a significant, moderate, positive correlation between age group (in years) and the number of details reported by children $r(91) = .53$, $p < .001$.

There were significant weak correlations between accuracy of responses on "that's wrong" ground rule challenge questions and "I don't know" responses $r(91) = .24$, $p = .014$ as well as age $r(91) = .23$, $p = .028$. "I don't understand" response accuracy was significantly moderately correlated with "that's wrong" response accuracy $r(91) = .39$, $p < .001$. There were no other correlations between the accuracy of responses for the three separate ground rules, age group and number of details reported.

A simple linear regression was performed with age as the predictor for the number of details provided. Age significantly predicted number of details ($F(1, 91) = 34.68$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = .28$.) with age (in years) explaining approximately 27.6% of the variance in the number of details children provided. On average, an increase in a child's age of one year predicted an increase in the number of details provided of 17.28.

Exploratory Analyses

To investigate whether the amount of ground rule practice a child received would impact the number of details they provided the EP and EEPN conditions were combined. These two conditions both involved extended ground rule use practice above and beyond what is most commonly provided to children. The three new conditions including NG ($n = 33$), MP ($n = 27$) as well as the EP and EEPN combined condition ($n = 33$) were used in an additional analysis of variance. It was found that there was still no significant effect of ground rule training condition on the number of details provided $F(2, 90) = .919$, $p = .403$.

Summary

The results indicate that ground rule training condition does not impact the number of details children subsequently provide about a staged event. They also suggest that performance on challenge questions does not predict the number of details provided by children. As expected, age significantly predicted the number of details provided.

Discussion

As previously mentioned, the current study was impacted significantly by the COVID-19 pandemic. The sample originally planned for (490 children) was reduced to only 114, as data collection was interrupted for 5 months. Statistically, there were not enough participants to power the analyses completed in the current study. Broad and reliable conclusions are not to be drawn from the evidence provided. However, re-conceptualised as a substantial pilot study, the current thesis can provide interesting suggestions as to what may be found when a full sample is possible.

The current study aimed to answer the following three key research questions. Firstly, does the way we teach ground rules impact the amount of information they provide? Secondly, does the relationship between ground rule training and amount of information provided vary by age? Thirdly, is children's accuracy at applying ground rule responses related to the amount of information they provide? It was hypothesised that the type of ground rule training children received would impact the number of unique details they provided and that this impact would differ across age. The results did not support these hypotheses. There was no main effect of training condition on the amount of information provided. There was also no significant interaction between ground rule training method and age on the amount of details provided. The author suggested earlier that by intensifying ground rule training this may also make it clearer to children that they should not feel obliged to answer questions they found difficult. This, in turn, could have resulted in the children reporting the event in less detail. However, the current findings do not support this idea. A possible explanation for this finding is that due to the interviewer's high-quality

training and adherence to the interview protocol, children may have been unlikely to receive questions they deemed difficult or unanswerable.

The idea that with more intense ground rule training children (especially younger children) may overgeneralise ground rule responses to answerable questions is not supported by the current findings. This suggests that there may be two distinct processes going on for children as they answer interview questions that are not equally or similarly impacted by the intensity of ground rule training. Firstly, the process of how children use or fail to use ground rule responses when being asked a difficult question. Secondly, children's ability to respond in detail to questions that they can answer, which appears not to be affected by ground rule training intensity or presence.

Our results suggest that regardless of a child's developmental stage, more intense ground rule training will not decrease or increase the richness of their reports when interviewed appropriately. This finding has important implications for interviewers in the forensic interview field. The amount of details a child provides is an important factor in prosecution (Kyriakidou, Zalaf, & Blades, 2014). Therefore, interviewers could be reassured that if it is found that more intense ground rule training helps children resist acquiescence, this may not be at the expense of detail. For children, the current finding suggests that ground rule training intensity may not deter them from providing the unique pieces of information they remember about a live event.

There was also no support for the idea that children's performance on challenge questions (aimed to elicit one of the three ground rules) would predict the number of unique details they provided. One explanation for the finding, is that the tasks of applying ground rules and providing detailed accounts are not related, is that there may be different

characteristics of children related to performance on each. Norton and Warnick's (1976) research suggests there is a relationship between assertiveness and talkativeness. Therefore, the findings of the current study suggest two possibilities. Firstly, that children's ability to use ground rule responses does not reflect their level of assertiveness and that the number of details we recorded does not reflect the talkativeness of the child. In contrast, it may be that the converse is true and that our study does not support the link between the two characteristics when measured in this unique way. Regardless, our results suggest that there are at least some distinctly different processes driving children's ability to accurately apply ground rules and the level of detail they provide to answerable questions.

Otgaar and Candel found that there is no significant association between performance on false-memory implantations tasks and suggestibility question tasks. They concluded that these tasks are measuring two different types of memory processes. This conclusion may also be relevant to the current study. The task of applying ground rule responses to difficult questions and the task of reporting details when asked answerable questions, both rely on a child's memory. Both tasks require children to remember details of the events and also what ground rule responses are available to them. Yet, the challenge questions were interviewer directed and contrasted to the rest of the interview questions which were purposefully related to what the child had been recalling previously. In this way, most of the interview questions acted as prompts for the child to continue talking about topics they had already remembered and reported about the event. The challenge questions aimed to elicit the "I don't know" and "that's wrong" responses also relied on children's memories of the event. However, these questions introduced new information about the event that the child had to evaluate to decide whether they had the information to answer the questions and whether the information

suggested by the interviewer was correct. These differences may elicit different memory processes for children and this may explain why the performance on the two tasks are not related.

The finding that children's accuracy of ground rule responses was not related to the number of details they provided has implications for interviewers. In short, whether a child can apply the ground rules correctly or incorrectly will not provide information to the interviewer about how many details the child will provide about the event in question. Knowledge of this may help interviewers and prosecutors question any biases they have about whether a child's acquiescence is related to the richness of their reports about events (Kyriakidou, Zalaf, & Blades, 2014).

As expected, a child's age predicted the number of details they provided, with older children providing richer accounts than younger children. This finding converges with many other past studies (Gordon & Follmer, 1994). For example, a study completed by Lamb, Sternberg and Esplin (2000) who analysed the transcripts of 145 alleged-abuse victims aged between 4 and 12-years old and found that younger children provided less detailed responses than older children regardless of the question type asked. This finding is likely due to developing cognitive and social abilities needed to remember and provide full and detailed accounts of experienced events. Across childhood, vocabulary is still developing and this has an important impact on how children report their experiences (McArdle, Ferrer-Caja, Hamagami, & Woodcock, 2002). As children get older, they are also more likely to provide subjective details about how they thought or felt about an event, which is likely to increase the number of unique details they provide overall (Bauer, 2006). Socially, older children are likely to be more experienced at providing narratives of past events. They may also be better

at understanding conversational processes and subtleties that younger children may be more likely to struggle with. These more developed social abilities may help older children provide more detailed accounts. For interviewers, the current finding suggests that interviewers may need to ask more questions of younger children. This may give younger children a better opportunity to provide a more detailed picture of their experiences.

Although not the focus of the current study, an interesting finding was the significant positive correlations between children's accuracy answering the "that's wrong" and "I don't understand" challenge questions. A positive correlation between accuracy of the "that's wrong" and "I don't know" responses was also present. Interestingly, no significant relationship between the accuracy of "I don't know" and "I don't understand" responses was found.

The relationship between the accuracy of the "that's wrong" and the "I don't know" rule responses were weak but significant. A possible explanation for this relationship may be that both ground rule responses require theory of mind (Brubacher, Poole, & Dickinson, 2015; Premack & Woodruff, 1978). The "don't know" rule required children to acknowledge that the interviewer may have different or less knowledge them. The "that's wrong" response also required this acknowledgement, while also necessitating children to understand that others hold "false-beliefs" (Brubacher, Poole, & Dickinson, 2015). These cognitive skills are all deemed to be part of what makes up theory of mind. Interestingly, there was a significant relationship between the "that's wrong" response and the age of the children. This converges with research that suggests children's ability to acknowledge that others can hold "false-belief" is still developing between the ages of 4 and 6 years old (Peterson, Wellman, & Slaughter, 2012). The lack of relationship between the "I don't

know" rule and age are consistent with research by Wellamn and Liu (2004). These researchers found that children develop their ability to assess knowledge and ignorance in others before developing their ability to identify false-beliefs. The current study involved only children aged 5-years or older. Therefore, it may be that most of the children's ability to identify ignorance or knowledge in others may have already developed and was no longer impacting their ability to enact the "I don't know" response.

Older children on average were more likely to accurately apply the "that's wrong" response. Therefore, another possible explanation is that this is due to the social abilities needed to enact this rule. The power dynamic between interviewer and younger children is more prominent (Saywitz & Camparo, 1998). Therefore, it may be more difficult for younger children to correct the interviewer when they have made an inaccurate statement. A similar explanation could be made for the relationship between the “that’s wrong” and “I don’t understand” responses which both involve commenting on the content of the interviewer’s question. Both involve telling the interviewer they have said something incorrect or something incomprehensible and have the implicit assertion that the interviewer needs to rephrase or change the content of their question. This is a unique assertion compared with the “I don’t know” response which tells the interviewer the child cannot answer that question regardless of how it is asked. In the context of how children are socialised to behave in the western world, questioning adults who are assumed to be more knowledgeable may be more difficult for some children.

A relevant limitation of the current study is the common difficulty with ecological validity. Apart from a conflict that was very quickly resolved, most children appeared to find the activities pleasant and expressed positive emotions throughout the event. Therefore, the

event contrasted to situations involving violence or abuse which are more likely to elicit negative emotions and are more difficult for children to discuss. There was no investigation of how the emotions experienced at the event impacted the number of details children provided. However, previous research by Levine and Burgess (1997) suggests that emotions do play a role in an individual's ability to recall details. Creating negative emotional experiences for children is ethically wrong. Therefore, the effort made in the current study to create an event as similar to that of which a child would be questioned about in a forensic setting may be all that is possible without causing harm.

A second limitation also related to ecological validity is the way the interviews in the current study were conducted. Efforts were made to make the interview process as similar as possible to the conditions in which children would be questioned in if in a forensic setting. For example, the children were interviewed by a stranger, one-on-one, in a quiet environment. However, these interviews were held at the participants' schools. This familiar environment may have influenced the style in which children interacted with the interviewer, answered questioned and recalled the event. For the current study, the practicality of interviewing children at their school outweighed the concern of the impacts on ecological validity this would have. If resources allow, an improved version of the current study could include interviews that are held in a location unfamiliar to the child participants.

The last limitation of note was the difficulty controlling for and/or recording extraneous factors that may have influenced the children's experience. The events run often involved over 20 young children and it was not always possible to stick strictly to the event plans and scripts. When deviations did occur, research assistants sometimes found it difficult to record these as they were playing dual-roles of station leader and note writer. The effects

of this limitation on the data were moderated by the way interviews with each child were coded. Instead of creating a measure of memory for the event that could be applied across all children, the number of details provided did not have a limit and was individualised to the child. This lessened any disadvantaged children might have due to event differences experienced. The current study was somewhat constrained by resources, such as a limited amount of volunteers running the events. In future, an improved version of the study should involve research assistants present at the event who are solely in charge of recording details. When events become optimally standardised a coding system that involves a check-list approach would also likely significantly reduce data processing time.

Future research should focus on the completion of the current study with the necessary sample size for statistical power. This would allow more robust conclusions to be made about the benefits and costs of different ground rule training methods. Finding out what impacts ground rule training can have on the number of unique details children provide is necessary for practitioners in the forensic field to make informed decisions regarding how their interviews should be conducted. Knowing whether age is a relevant factor in how and if the number of details is reduced or increased by different ground rule training is also important as it may strengthen or weaken an argument for different instructional methods for children of differing ages. For example, it could be found that more intense ground rule training lead younger (but not older) children to overgeneralise the ground rules to the extent that they report less information. If this was true, it may have played an important role in how practitioners perceive the usefulness of such training.

The current study is unique in that it focused on the number of details a child provided as the key measure of ground rule training. However, it is acknowledged that the

accuracy of what a child reports is paramount. Therefore, future research investigating the accuracy and richness of children's reports in combination would be beneficial. Knowing the relationship between these variables in the context of ground rule training would be the most useful information in helping interviewers decide what ground rule training is optimal. As discussed earlier, it may be that social or individual factors other than age (e.g. a child's confidence or experience talking to adults) could be more influential in their use of ground rules. Therefore, another possible research project could focus on using the literature to identify the likely specific social and individual characteristics of children that may be implicated in ground rule use. The project could then use reliable and valid measures of this construct and explore whether there is a relationship with children's accuracy of ground rule use and also the richness of their reports.

As a substantial pilot study, the current research has indicated that the presence and type of ground rule training does not impact the number of details children report. It has also suggested that children's ability to accurately apply ground rule responses does not appear to be related to the number of unique details they provide. Yet, it is important to remember that it is entirely possible that these key results may change when analyses are completed with a larger sample size. The lack of power may be disguising group differences across ground rule training condition and age. If the findings do hold, there are three key messages for practitioners and protocol writers. Firstly, that concerns about more intense ground rule training compromising the richness of children's reports are likely unfounded. Secondly, that this may be true regardless of a child's age. Finally, that the amount of information a child provides cannot be used to predict acquiesence to unanswerable questions or vice versa.

References:

Bauer, P. J. (2006). Event memory. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.-in-chief), D. Kuhn & R. Siegler (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 2. Cognition, perception, and language* (6th edn., pp. 373-425). Hoboken: Wiley.

Brown, D. A., Lamb, M. E., Lewis, C., Pipe, M., Orbach, Y., & Wolfman, M. (2013). The NICHD investigative interview protocol: An analogue study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 19*(4), 367-382.

Brubacher, S., Ann Poole, D., & 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.

Cooper, A., Wallin, A. R., Quas, J. A., & Lyon, T. D. (2010). Maltreated and non maltreated children's knowledge of the juvenile dependency court system. *Child Maltreatment, 15*, 255-260.

Danby, M. C., Brubacher, S. P., Sharman, S. J., & Powell, M. B. (2015). The effects of practice on children's ability to apply ground rules in a narrative interview. *Behaviour Sciences and Law, 33*, 446-458.

Dickinson, J. J., Brubacher, S. P., & Poole, D. A. (2015b). Children's performance on ground rules questions: Implications for forensic interviewing. *Law and Human Behaviour, 39*(1), 87-97.

Earhart, B., La Rooy, D. J., Brubacher, S. P., & Lamb, M. E. (2014). An examination of "don't know" responses in forensic interviews with children. *Behavioural Science and the Law, 32*(6), 746-761.

Ellis, L. M., Powell, M. B., Thomson, D. M., & Jones, C. (2003). Do simple "groundrules" reduce preschoolers' suggestibility about experienced and non-experienced events? *Psychiatry, Psychology & Law, 10*, 334-345.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). London, England: SAGE Publications.

Geddie, L. F., Beer, J., Fradin, S., & Wuensch, K. (2001). Relationship between interview characteristics and accuracy of recall in young children: Do individual differences matter? *Child Maltreatment, 6*(1), 59-68.

Gee, S., Gregory, M., & Pipe, M. (1999). "What colour is your pet dinosaur?" The impact of pre-interview training and question type on children's answers. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 4*, 111-128.

Gentner, D., Loewenstein, J., & Hung, B. (2007). Comparison facilitates children's learning of names for parts. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 8*, 285-307.

Gordan, B. N., & Follmer, A. (1994). Developmental issues in judging the credibility of children's testimony. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 23*(3), 283-294.

Hughes, M., & Grieve, R. (1980) On asking children bizarre questions. *First Language, 1*(2), 149-160.

Krackow, E., & Lynn, S. J. (2010). Event report training: An examination of the efficacy of a new intervention to improve children's eyewitness reports. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 24*, 868-884.

Kyriakidou, M., Zalaf, A., & Blades, M. (2014). Prosecution reliance on the quantity rather than the quality of evidence for children's testimonies. *The Cyprus Journal of Sciences, 12*(2014), 3-15.

Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., & Esplin, P. W. (2000). Effects of age and delay on the amount of information provided by alleged sex abuse victims in investigative interviews. *Child Development, 71*(6), 1586-1596.

La Rooy, D., Brubacher, S. P., Aromäki-Stratos, A., Cyr, M., Hershkowitz, I., Korkman, J., Myklebust, T., Naka, M., Peixoto, C. E., Roberts, K. P, Stewart, H., & Lamb, M. E. (2015). The NICHD protocol: A review of an internationally-used evidence-based tool for training child forensic interviewers. *Journal of Criminological Research, Policy and Practice, 1*(2), 76–89.

Levine, L. J., & Burgess, S. L. (1997). Beyond General Arousal: Effects of Specific Emotions on Memory. *Social Cognition, 15*(3), 157-181.

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

McArdle, J. J., Ferrer-Caja, E., Hamagami, F., & Woodcock R. W. (2002). Comparative longitudinal structural analyses of the growth and decline of multiple intellectual abilities over the life span. *Developmental Psychology, 38*(1), 115-142.

Nesbitt, M., Markham, R. (1999). Improving young children's accuracy of recall for an eyewitness event. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*(1), 449-459.

New Zealand Police (2005). *Investigative Interviewing: The Literature* (Review of investigative interviewing. Wellington, New Zealand: Mary Schollum.

Norton, R., & Warnick, B. (1976). Assertiveness as a communication construct. *Human Communication Research, 3*(1), 62-66.

O'Donohue, W. T., & Fanetti, M. (2016). *Forensic interviews regarding child sexual abuse: A guide to evidence-based practice* (1st ed.). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing Switzerland.

Oranga Tamariki. (2019). *Quarterly Report – March 2019.* Retrieved from https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/statistics/quarterly-reporting/quarterly-report-march-2019/care-and-protection-statistics-2/

Otgaar, H., & Candel, I. (2011). Children's false memories: different false memory paradigms reveal different results. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 17*(6), 513-528.

Peterson, C., & Grant, M. (2001). Forced-choice: are forensic interviewers asking the right questions? *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 33*(2),118-127.

Peterson, C. C., Wellman, H. M., & Slaughter, V. (2012). The mind behind the messages: Advancing theory-of-mind scales for typically developing children, and those with deafness, autism, or asperger syndrome. *Child Development, 83*, 469-485.

Peters, W. W., & Nunez, N. (1999). Complex language and comprehension monitoring: Teaching child witnesses to recognize linguistic confusion. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 661.

Pratt, C. (1990). On asking children – and adults – bizarre questions. *First Language, 10*, 167-175.

Premack, D., & Woodruff, G. (1978). Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences, 4*, 515-526.

Roberts, K. P., & Lamb, M. E. (1999). Children's responses when interviewers distort details during investigative interviews. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 4*, 23-31.

Saywitz, K. J., & Comparo, L. (1998). Interviewing child witnesses: A developmental perspective. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 22*(8), 825-843.

Saywitz, K. J., & Moan-hardie, S. (1994). Reducing the potential for distortion of childhood memories. *Consciousness and Cognition, 3*(3-4), 408-425.

Saywitz, K. J., Snyder, L., & Nathanson, R. (1999). Facilitating the communicative competence of the child witness. *Applied Developmental Science, 3*, 58-68.

Sim, J., & Wright, C. C. (2005). The kappa statistic in reliability studies: Use, interpretation, and sample size requirements. *Physical Therapy, 85*(3), 257-268.

Sweller, J., Van Merrienboer, J. J., & Paas, F. G. (1998). Cognitive architecture and instructional design. *Educational Psychology Review, 10*, 251-296.

Teoh, Y. S., Lamb, M. E. (2010). Preparing children for investigative interviews: rapport-building, instruction, and evaluation. *Applied Developmental Science, 14*, 154-163.

Waterman, A. H., Blades, M., & Spencer, C. (2004). Indicating when you do not know the answer: The effect of question format and interviewer knowledge on children's 'don't know' responses. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 22*, 335-348.

Wellman, H. M., & Liu, D. (2004). Scaling of theory-of-mind tasks. *Child Development, 75* (2), 523-541.

Zajac, R., & Brown, D. A. (2018). Conducting successful memory interviews with children. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 35*(3), 297-109.

Appendix A

Health and Safety Event Script:

Health and Safety Event Opening

Event Leader:

'Hi everyone, my name is ..... Welcome to our health and safety event. I'm here today with some of my helpers to talk to you about how to keep healthy and safe.

There are four stations where you will learn how to look after yourselves if you get sick or hurt, and how to stop this from happening. You will all have a turn at two of the stations.'

'At the "Heartbeats" station the leader is _____.'

'At the "Temperatures" station the leader is _____.'

'At the "Care of cuts" station the leader is _____.'

'At the "Hazards" station the leader is _____.'

'At one of the stations you visit you will do activities with a partner.'

'So first we will split up into teams. Stay in your teams as you go around the stations.'

'Alright time to get started. I'll read your names out and tell you which station to go to.'

'The yellow team is …… *[read out list of names]* you are going to the _____ station first'

'The red team is …… *[read out list of names]* you are going to the _____ station first'

'The green team is …... *[read out list of names]* you are going to the _____ station first'

'The orange team is …... *[read out list of names]* you are going to the _____ station first'

[Event leader reads out the teams of children and sends them to stand by their station leader].

2-MINS REMAINING WARNING

[Keep an eye on the longest station (usually temperatures) to judge when is appropriate to give the two-minute warning. Go around and give each group a two-minute warning. Station leaders will begin sending groups back to the centre from this point. Once all groups are finished and the station leaders have reset, the event leader will instruct each group to go to their next station. MAKE SURE YOU RECORD ANYTHING YOU DO WITH THE CHILDREN DURING THIS TIME TO KEEP THEM OCCUPIED. IDEALLY, HAVE THEM WAIT WITHOUT ADDING ANYTHING ADDITIONAL – IF YOU MUST DO SOMETHING KEEP IT AS SIMPLE AS POSSIBLE.]

Interruption

[Interruption occurs after first activity for each team. Wait until the activity has been introduced, but before the children start the activity].

Interrupter:

[The interrupter bursts in and walks around each team looking for the event leader, asking where she is. 'Hey, I need to find [event leader name], do you know where she is?' *The event leader comes out into the middle of the room to talk to the interrupter].*

Station Leaders:

[Say at the start of the interruption and use facial expressions to indicate discomfort with the situation] 'Hey, we'd better just stop for a minute and see what is going on.'

Interrupter:

'Here you are! You *can't* have these things now; I'm supposed to be giving a demonstration in Miramar in an hour.'

Event Leader:

'But I've had this presentation scheduled for weeks.'

Interrupter:

'Well it wasn't in the diary. I must leave now to be in Miramar in time. What are you going to do?'

Event Leader:

'Me? It's not my fault! I had it up on the board.'

Interrupter:

'Yes, well we don't have time to argue about that. I need to leave now to get there in time. How long will you be?'

Event Leader:

'I'll be another 15-20 minutes by the time I pack up. But look, *[gesture toward the box with all the spare equipment]* I have heaps of spare stethoscopes, we don't need all the pictures, and there's an extra copy of the cuts presentation on this USB, and we have some spare thermometers. Why don't you take those and then both of us are okay?'

Interrupter:

'Good idea. Thanks a lot _____. Sorry I burst in, I was in a panic.'

[Leader and interrupter walk around the teams, collecting extra equipment. Interrupter apologises for interrupting].

Event Leader:

'No problem. Good luck in Miramar, travel safe.'

Station Leaders:

[Say to children in their team] 'Phew, glad that all worked out", and then resume the activity.'

Event Closing

Event Leader:

'Great work today everyone, we have learned a lot today about health and safety. We hope you have had fun. To say thank you, we have a small prize for everyone. Please put this in your school bag when you go back to class so that the other children don't ask you questions about it.'

Temperature Station

Station Leader:

INTRODUCE YOURSELF 'Hey guys, my name is _____ and now we are at the "TEMPERATURES" Station'

INTERRUPTION: *Skip if interruption is not happening.*

INTERRUPTER:

[The interrupter bursts in and walks around each team looking for the event leader, asking where she is. The event leader comes out into the middle of the room to talk to the interrupter].

STATION LEADERS:

[Say at the start of the interruption and use facial expressions to indicate discomfort with the situation] 'Hey, we'd better just stop for a minute and see what is going on.'

……. (interruption happens) ……

STATION LEADERS:

[Say to children in their team] 'Phew, glad that all worked out", and then resume the activity.'

INTRODUCE THE ACTIVITY 'At the temperatures station, we are going to learn about how we take our temperature. Our temperature is how hot or cold our body is. It is important to check our temperature when we think we are sick. When we are sick our body often heats up to fight off bugs.'

'First, I need you to get into pairs.'

[Allow a minute for the children to get into pairs and write down who each child's partner is]

'Now in your pairs decide who is the number one partner, you will go first and who is the number two partners, you will go second.'

'Alright, put your hands up number ones' *[note down who are number ones]*

'Now hands up number twos' *[note down who are the number twos]*

'Sometimes your mums and dads might check your temperature on your forehead, like this.' *[Place the back of your hand to your forehead].*

1. 'Now, number ones I want you to check your partner's temperature on their forehead. How does it feel?' *[Make sure they have time to think about how it feels]*

2. ‘Now number twos, you can have a go now. Put the back of your hand to your partner’s forehead. How does it feel?’ *[Make sure they have time to think about it]*

‘Another way we can check our temperature is using a thermometer.

This is a thermometer *[hold up a skinny thermometer]*. Now say it with me just so I know how clever you all are ... what is this called? A THERMOMETER. The temperature the thermometer tells can be different when we measure temperature in different places.’

‘We are going to practice using this skinny thermometer so number ones all take a thermometer’ *[hand out 1 skinny thermometer to each pair]*

1. ‘Now, number ONES, take your partner’s temperature under their left arm. So all number TWOS put your left arm out and number one’s pop the thermometer under their arm and get them to put their arm down. We will leave it there for 10 seconds so everyone count to ten with me 1, 2, 3, 4.....’
2. ‘Ok number ONES, now we are going to check our partner’s temperature behind their left knee. This isn’t usually where we take our temperature and we will see if the temperature is different. So, all number ONES put the thermometer behind your partner’s left knee and get them to close their leg around it. Ok everyone count to ten. Is it the same or different to the other temperature?’

‘Great job! Now everyone take an antiseptic wipe *[hand out 1 antiseptic wipe to each pair]* Wipe the thermometer down *[have a rubbish bag ready for dirty wipes].*

Ok great now number TWOS take the thermometer’.

1. ‘Put the thermometer under your left partner’s arm. Now everyone count to ten. Check the temperature.
2. Now put it behind your partner’s left knee. Everyone count to ten. Great, now check the temperature, is it the same or different.’

‘It’s okay if you get a LOW reading it just means that it is too difficult for the thermometer to get a reading there, so it is much better taking your temp under your arm.’

[The thermometers quite often get LOW readings. This is because we get them to test their temperature with their clothes over the thermometer rather than on bare skin. This reading can distress some children].

- *Don’t let them take their shirt off to get a better reading*

- *Just tell them that sometimes it is difficult for the thermometers to get a reading and these ones haven't been working very well – then MOVE ON.*

'Another place we can check our temperature is in our ear. This gives us the best reading.'
[Hand out one ear thermometer to each pair – make sure they already have probe covers on]

1. Number ONES put the thermometer gently in your partner's left ear and press the button. Number TWOS have a look at the number on the thermometer and circle the number on the sheet that matches, I will come around and have a look and help you do this.

   [Make sure everyone is circling their own temperature and don't round up for decimals].

2. 'Number TWOS you take the thermometer I will come around and put a new cover on it for you *[put new probe cover on each thermometer]*. Okay number TWOS put the thermometer gently in your partner's left ear and press the button. Now number ONES you circle the number the matches the number on the screen.'

'Great work everyone, were you hot or cold. Really? Great!'

IF THIS IS THE FIRST GROUP

[Don't let the children move into the centre until after the event leader has come around and said there is only 2-mins remaining.]

'Great work everyone, we're all finished at this station. While we wait for everyone to finish up I want you to all go and sit in the centre and wait for our event leader ____ to tell you what station you will go to next. Remember some groups may still be working hard, so let's move and wait quietly, okay? Great, you may go now.

IF THIS IS THE LAST ACTIVITY FOR THE GROUP

'Well done we're finished. Thank you so much for coming and talking to us. I hope you had fun and learn a lot. Because you all worked so well the event leader has a thank you prize for you, so everyone go back to the middle and wait quietly for the event leader to tell you what to do now.'

MAKE SURE ALL PARTNER INFORMATION IS RECORDED!

Record any touch between partners:

- *Forehead*
- *Left Ear (digital thermometer)*
- *Under left arm (stick thermometer)*
- *Behind left knee (stick thermometer)*

Care of Cuts Station

Station Leader:

INTRODUCE YOURSELF 'Hey guys, my name is _____ and now we are at the "CARE OF CUTS" Station'

INTERRUPTION: *Skip if interruption is not happening.*

INTERRUPTER:

[The interrupter bursts in and walks around each team looking for the event leader, asking where she is. The event leader comes out into the middle of the room to talk to the interrupter].

STATION LEADERS:

[Say at the start of the interruption and use facial expressions to indicate discomfort with the situation] 'Hey, we'd better just stop for a minute and see what is going on.'

……. (interruption happens) ……

STATION LEADERS:

[Say to children in their team] 'Phew, glad that all worked out", and then resume the activity.'

INTRODUCE THE ACTIVITY 'Now we are going to have a chat about how we can look after ourselves if we get a cut. First, we are going to watch a short video about Arthur who has gone to get a tyre from the dump. Now, I want you all to watch really, really carefully and pay attention to everything that is happening in the video'

[SHOW THE SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION] – READ OUT EVERYTHING ON THE SLIDES

[PLAY VIDEO BY CLICKING ON IT]

AFTER THE VIDEO – HAVE A DISCUSSION WITH THE CHILDREN (the questions are on the slides)

- ***What happened to Arthur?***
- ***How did Arthur cut his knee?***
- ***Was it a small cut or a big cut?***
- ***If we were there, how could we have helped Arthur?***

AFTER THE DISCUSSION – The children will pretend to have a cut on their finger

1. 'Ok now everyone hold out your left pointer finger out.' *[SHOW THEM]*
2. 'I am going to draw a pretend cut on your finger.' *[draw pretend cut on each child's finger]*
3. 'So, when we have a cut, the first thing we need to do is put pressure on the cut to stop the bleeding. Se everyone put pressure on your cut!'
4. 'The second thing we do is raise the cut up above your heart.'
5. 'Now everyone take an antiseptic wipe *[hand out one wipe to each child]* and wipe your cut to stop it from getting infected.'
6. 'Next you cover the cut with a plaster, *[hand out one Plaster to each child]* so I will give you all a plaster and you can do this last step. You all looked after your cuts so well!'

'So, what were the steps for caring for a cut again? *[Go through the points on the slide]*. These are really important steps for looking after a small cut and these could also be used to help Arthur with his cut.'

[MOVE ON TO BIG CUT SLIDE]

'If it's a big cut that is bleeding a lot then you should always get an adult to help you. Sometimes big cuts need to get stitches to make them all better. And always make sure that any blood is cleaned up.'

'Right now, show me all your plasters and I'll take a photo!'

[Don't give out extra plasters as it can cause confusion on the when we code the child's interview]

IF THIS IS THE FIRST GROUP

[Don't let the children move into the centre until after the event leader has come around and said there is only 2-mins remaining.]

'Great work everyone, we're all finished at this station. While we wait for everyone to finish up I want you to all go and sit in the centre and wait for our event leader ____ to tell you what station you will go to next. Remember some groups may still be working hard, so let's move and wait quietly, okay? Great, you may go now.

IF THIS IS THE LAST ACTIVITY FOR THE GROUP

'Well done we're finished. Thank you so much for coming and talking to us. I hope you had fun and learn a lot. Because you all worked so well the event leader has a thank you prize for you, so everyone go back to the middle and wait quietly for the event leader to tell you what to do now.'

Hazards Station

Station Leader:

INTRODUCE YOURSELF 'Hey guys, my name is _____ and now we are at the "HAZARDS" Station.'

INTERRUPTION: *Skip if interruption is not happening.*

INTERRUPTER:

[The interrupter bursts in and walks around each team looking for the event leader, asking where she is. The event leader comes out into the middle of the room to talk to the interrupter].

STATION LEADERS:

[Say at the start of the interruption and use facial expressions to indicate discomfort with the situation] 'Hey, we'd better just stop for a minute and see what is going on.'

……. (interruption happens) ……

STATION LEADERS:

[Say to children in their team] 'Phew, glad that all worked out", and then resume the activity.'

INTRODUCE THE ACTIVITY 'Now we are going to learn about hazards and how to make dangerous, or unsafe things, safer.'

'We are going to look at some pictures that show some hazards that aren't very safe.'

[There is 1 example picture, complete pictures 1-5 with all teams, pictures 6-10 are additional and do not need to be completed if you run out of time]

'When you are looking at the pictures, I want you all to look carefully and think about:

1. What is unsafe in the picture
2. WHY *[emphasise]* it is unsafe and
3. HOW we can try and fix it.'

'Let's practice with the first one together. Please put your hand up when you have an answer.' *[Show example picture (kitchen), restate instructions if necessary].*

'What do you think is unsafe in this picture?' [Choose one child to answer]

'Why is it unsafe?' [Choose a different child to answer]

'How could we make it less dangerous?' [Choose a different child to answer]

[Show each of the pictures, one by one. Wait until lots of the children have their hands up and try and pick someone different each time to answer].

- *If they have a good point, but it's not a required answer still explore why that is unsafe and how to fix it.*
- *If it is a very odd answer, just say* 'Yes, that could be unsafe, can anyone else see anything else that could be unsafe?'

IF THIS IS THE FIRST GROUP

[Don't let the children move into the centre until after the event leader has come around and said there is only 2-mins remaining.]

'Great work everyone, we're all finished at this station. While we wait for everyone to finish up I want you to all go and sit in the centre and wait for our event leader ____ to tell you what station you will go to next. Remember some groups may still be working hard, so let's move and wait quietly, okay? Great, you may go now.

IF THIS IS THE LAST ACTIVITY FOR THE GROUP

'Well done we're finished. Thank you so much for coming and talking to us. I hope you had fun and learn a lot. Because you all worked so well the event leader has a thank you prize for you, so everyone go back to the middle and wait quietly for the event leader to tell you what to do now.'

Checklist before starting a new group:

- *MAKE SURE THAT THE CARDS ARE KEPT IN THE SAME ORDER*
- *WITH EACH NEW TEAM START FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE PILE*
- *RECORD THE NUMBER OF CARDS YOU COMPLETED FOR EACH TEAM*

Heartbeats Station

Station Leader:

INTRODUCE YOURSELF 'Hey guys, my name is _____ and now we are at the "HEARTBEATS" Station.'

INTERRUPTION: *Skip if interruption is not happening.*

INTERRUPTER:

[The interrupter bursts in and walks around each team looking for the event leader, asking where she is. The event leader comes out into the middle of the room to talk to the interrupter].

STATION LEADERS:

[Say at the start of the interruption and use facial expressions to indicate discomfort with the situation] 'Hey, we'd better just stop for a minute and see what is going on.'

……. (interruption happens) ……

STATION LEADERS:

[Say to children in their team] 'Phew, glad that all worked out", and then resume the activity.'

INTRODUCE THE ACTIVITY 'Now at the heartbeats station, we are going to learn about how to measure our heartbeat. Doctors will often check our heartbeat because if our heart is beating too fast or too slow, it can tell the Doctor that we are not feeling well. '

'This is called a stethoscope *[hold it up and make sure everyone knows what this instrument is called]* and Doctors use this to listen to our heart.'

'So, what was this instrument called again? Say it with me... A STETHOSCOPE!'

'We are going to practice using these, so I would like you all to partner up and decide if you are the number one partner or the number two partner.'

'Number ones hands up – you are going first.'

'The number one partner will use the stethoscope first and go first the whole time.'

'Number twos hands up – you will go second.'

'So again, hands up number one's, and hands up number twos.'

[Write down who each child's partner is, and who is number one or number two in the pairs, and the stethoscope cover they have.]

'Ok now hands up number ONES, I want you to take a stethoscope.

All the number ONES put the bits in your ears and tap the round bit at the end. If you don't hear the tap, twist the end around like this and see if the tapping is louder *[SHOW THEM]*. Alright all the number ONES get your stethoscopes ready.'

1. 'I want you to listen to your partner's heartbeat on the left of their chest. Do it all together. Did you hear it? This is where Doctors usually listen to our hearts.'
2. 'They don't usually listen to our stomachs though. So, number ONES I now want you to listen to your partner's stomach. Did any of you hear anything? *[NO?!]* That's because this isn't a very good place to listen to our partner's heartbeat.'

'Okay, now number ONES take an antiseptic wipe and I want you to wipe the ear pieces. *[Hand out wipes]* Alright, number TWOS, you take the stethoscope.'

1. 'First listen to the left of your partner's chest.'
2. 'Now listen to your partner's stomach. Did you guys hear anything there? No? See it's not a very good place to check for a heartbeat is it?'

'Another way of listening to our heartbeat is by feeling our pulse on our wrist – *a pulse is when we feel the heartbeat rather than hearing it.'*

'We do this by pressing our two fingers down on our wrist *[SHOW THEM]*. So, number ONES you go first.' *[Make sure the children don't swap who goes first, the number one partner here needs to be the same as the heartbeat activity].*

1. 'Press two fingers down on your partner's wrist like this *[show them on yourself].* Do you feel anything? Swap over now and let number TWOS have a go. Did you feel it? This is how we normally check a pulse.'
2. 'Okay so now let's see if we can check our partner's pulse on their ankle. Number ONES press 2 fingers on your partner's ankle. *[Show them on yourself, but make sure they stay holding their partners ankle, so they don't do it to themselves]*. Did you feel anything?'

3. ‘Now number TWOS – you have a go. Press 2 fingers on your partner’s ankle. Did you feel anything? It is not a very good place to feel your pulse on your ankle, so this is why you probably didn’t feel anything here and this is why we normally feel our pulse on our wrist.’

‘Right now, standing next to your partner I am going to take a I’ll take a photo!’

IF THIS IS THE FIRST GROUP

[Don’t let the children move into the centre until after the event leader has come around and said there is only 2-mins remaining.]

‘Great work everyone, we’re all finished at this station. While we wait for everyone to finish up I want you to all go and sit in the centre and wait for our event leader ____ to tell you what station you will go to next. Remember some groups may still be working hard, so let’s move and wait quietly, okay? Great, you may go now.

IF THIS IS THE LAST ACTIVITY FOR THE GROUP

‘Well done we’re finished. Thank you so much for coming and talking to us. I hope you had fun and learn a lot. Because you all worked so well the event leader has a thank you prize for you, so everyone go back to the middle and wait quietly for the event leader to tell you what to do now.’

MAKE SURE ALL PARTNER INFORMATION IS RECORDED!

Appendix B

Interview Protocols for Each Ground Rule Training Condition:

1. Minimal Practice (MP) Condition

I. ASSENT

Welcome the child into the interview room and verify the recorder is on.

Record the following information on the tape before you begin.

1. **'I am going to record our talk today, so I can remember everything you tell me later on.'**

   'Hello, my name is [name]**. A letter from home said it was okay for you to talk with me today. We will be talking about some things that have happened to you. But, before we start, I want to make sure that you are happy to. If you don't want to do this, you can go back to class/play and that is okay. If you do want to stay and talk to me, we can stop at any stage, just let me know.'**

   'There is a video camera there [point] **which is on while we are talking. This is so that later on I can remember all the important information you tell me. Also, while we are talking, I'll write some things down to help me work out what questions I need to ask.'**

2. [For children 3-8 years, say:] **'Are you happy to talk with me today?'**
   [If child answers "yes", proceed to question 4]

   2. A *If child answers "no", say:* **'That's okay, thanks for telling me. You can choose a prize/sticker before going back to class/play.'**
   [Stop the interview.]

3. [For children 9-12-years, say:] **'So, if you are happy to talk with me, please write your name on the sheet and tick the box next to the smiley face. If you don't want to talk with me, please write your name on the sheet and tick the box next to the cross box.'**
   [If child answers "yes", proceed to question 4]

3. A *If child answers "no", say*: **'That's okay, thanks for telling me. You can choose a prize before going back to class.'**

[Stop the interview.]

4. '**Thank you, let's get started.** '**Today is** [date, include year] **and it is now** [time] **o'clock. I am interviewing** [participant #]**, condition** [state letter]**, version** [state challenge question letter, followed by elaborative practice version if applicable]**.'**

II. GROUND RULE INSTRUCTION

TRUTH AND LIES

1. **'So, part of my job is to talk to children about things that have happened to them. I meet with lots of children, so they can tell me the truth.**

   'Now, while we are talking today there are four rules for us. The first rule is that you should only tell the truth. So, let's practice that now.'

   'If I say that my shoes are red [or a colour they are not] **is that true or not true?'**

   [Wait for an answer, then say:]

2. **'That would not be true, because my shoes are really** [blue/black/etc.]**.' And if I say that I am sitting down now, would that be true or not true** [right or not right]**?'**

   [Wait for an answer.]

3. **'It would be** [true/right]**, because you can see I am really sitting down.'** [For children who correctly response to the above questions, say: **'I see that you understand what telling the truth means.'**] [Then for all children, say: **'It is *very important* that you *only tell me the truth* today. You should only tell me about things that really happened to you.'**]

   [Pause.]

SAYING 'I DON'T UNDERSTAND'

4. **'So, the second rule is that if I ask a question that you don't understand or you're not sure what I mean, just say "I don't understand", okay?'**

   [Pause.]

5. **'If I don't understand what *you* say, I'll ask you to explain.'**

   [Pause.]

6. '**So, if I ask you "what are you most adroit at?" What would you say?'**

   [Wait for an answer.]

6. A *If they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Right, because you probably don't know what adroit means, huh. Good job for telling me you didn't understand.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 7.]

6. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Do you really know what 'adroit' means?**

[Wait for an answer.]

6. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'adroit' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

6.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **Okay, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know, okay?'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 7.]

6.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Okay, you didn't *really* know what adroit meant. When I ask you a question and you don't understand, I want you to tell me "I don't understand" so I can ask the question in a better way.'**

[Pause.]

7. **'Let's try one more. If I ask you "where is the querulous cat?" what would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

7. A *if they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Great, that's what you need to do today if I say something you don't understand.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 8.]

7. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Let's check that, do you really know what 'querulous' means?**

7. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'querulous' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

7.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **Okay, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know, okay?'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 8.]

7.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Just like before, there was a tricky word that you didn't know. It's important today that you tell me when you don't understand a word.'**

[Pause.]

SAYING 'I DON'T KNOW'

8. **'The next rule is, if I ask you a question, and you don't know, or you have forgotten the answer, just tell me "I don't know", you don't have to guess. But if you do know, please tell me.**

'So, if I ask you, "What is my dog's name?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

8. A *if the child says, "I don't know", say:* **'Right, you don't know, do you?'**

[Wait for an answer – if they say "no" proceed to question 9.]

8. B *if the child offers a GUESS, say:* **'Do you really know my dog's name?** [Pause.] **No, that's right, you don't know because you don't know my dog. When you don't know the answer, don't guess – say that you don't know, or you don't remember.'**

[Pause.]

9. **If I ask you "what were you doing on the 1st June** [use another date if this is their birthday] **two years ago?" what would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

9. A *If the child says, "I don't know/remember", say*: **'Good job for telling me you don't remember/know** [use child's words].

[Pause, then proceed to question 10.]

9.B. *If the child offers a GUESS, say:* **'Do you really remember what happened?**

[Wait for an answer.]

9. B.1 *if the child says "no", say:* **'No, that's right you don't remember/know** [use child's words]**. So, remember, I don't want you to guess when you don't know or don't remember the answer. I want you tell me "I don't know" or "I don't remember".'**

[Pause, then process to question 10.]

9. B.2 *If the child says "yes", say:* **'Well if you didn't remember, you should say "I don't remember" or "I don't know", okay.'**

SAYING 'THAT'S WRONG'

10. **'Now the fourth rule is, if I say things that are wrong, then you should tell me. You can say "that's wrong" and let me know what the correct** [right] **thing is, okay?**

[Pause.]

'If I said that you are a 2-year-old girl/boy [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.] **what would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

10.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right! Now you know you should tell me if I make a mistake or say something that is not right.'**

[Pause, the proceed to question 11.]

10. A.1 *If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:* **'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'** [Pause.] [If needed: **'Are you a [boy / girl]? And how old are you?']**

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 11.]

10.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'What would you say if I made a mistake and called you a 2-year old girl** [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.]**?**

10. B.1 *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right! Now you know you should tell me if I make a mistake or say something that is not right.'**

10.B.1.*If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I think I made a mistake, you are not a 2-year-old girl/boy** [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.]**. Remember, if I make a mistake or say something that is not right you should tell me, "that's wrong and let me know what the correct this is, okay.'**

11. **'Let's practice one more, if I said that you live in Australia what would you say?**

[Wait for an answer.]

11.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right, you don't live in Australia. Great job.**

[Pause, then proceed to question 12.]

11. A.1*If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:* **'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'**

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 12.]

11.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I made a mistake, I can see you don't live in Australia because you go to school/preschool in Wellington. So, I want you to tell me "that's wrong" if I make a mistake and let me know what the correct thing is, okay.**

[Pause.]

SUMMARY OF GROUND RULES

12. **'So, while we are talking today, you should only say stuff that is true and really happened, and you can say "I don't understand", or "I don't know", or "I don't remember", you don't have to guess. It's okay, for you to tell me "that's wrong" if I make a mistake, and you can let me know what the correct thing is, okay?'**

[Pause.]

III. REGULAR PRACTICE NARRATIVE

1. *FIRST GENERAL INVITATION*

'Now, I want to get to know you a little bit better. So, tell me everything you can remember from the time you woke up until arrived at [**school** *or* **preschool**] **this morning.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to 2.]

1.A. *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* **'When did you get up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

2. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me more about this morning.'

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to 3.]

2.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**What was the very first thing you did after getting up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

3. *CUED INVITATION*

'You told me [activity mentioned by the child – use the child's words]**. Tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 4.]

3.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**You've told me lots of things about your morning so far, such as** [summarise the things they have told you]**. Tell me some more about** [same detail as probed above]**'.**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 4.]

3. B *If you need to clarify anything the child has said, say:* **'Explain what you mean by** [use the child's words, do not paraphrase]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

4. *WH- QUESTION, WITH PAIRING*

PAIR ONE QUESTION (4.A *or* 4.B) WITH AN OPEN INVITATION.

4.A. **'What else happened when you were** [same detail as probed above]**?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 4.C (paired invitation)]

4.B. **'What was the very next thing that happened?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 4.C (paired invitation)]

4.C **'Tell me some more about** [same detail probed above]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

5. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Alright, good job. So, describe some other things that happened this morning.'

[Wait for an answer.]

6. *CUED INVITATION*

'Ok so you were telling me about [pick a new detail to probe]**. Tell me all about when that happened'.**

[Wait for an answer]

7. *OPTION POSING QUESTION WITH FOLLOW-UP PAIRING*

PAIR ONE QUESTION (7.A *or* 7.B) WITH AN OPEN INVITATION.

7.A **'Did that happen before you left for** [**school** *or* **preschool**]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 7.C (paired invitation)]

7. B **'was your** [Mum / Dad / Sibling] **there when that happened?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 7.C (paired invitation)]

7.C **'Tell me some more about** [same probed detail].'

[Wait for an answer.]

8. *SUMMARY – INVITIATION*

[Provide a short summary about what the child has said, in their words]. **Tell me any other things you can remember about what you did this morning.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

9. **'Great, thank you for telling me all about what you did this morning.'**

IV. MEMORY INTERVIEW

GR USE DURING MEMORY INTERVIEW
1. Feedback for when a child uses a GR during the memory interview
DK - **'Alright, we can move then.'**
DU - '**Alright, that was a bit tricky, we can move on.'**
CM - '**O, okay, I'll ask a different question.'**

FREE RECALL: TRANSITION TO SUBSTANTIVE TOPIC

1. **'Now that I know you a little bit better, let me tell you why I've come to talk to you today.'** [Pause]**. I heard that a couple of weeks ago, some people came to your school, and you did some health and safety activities. Now, I wasn't there, so I don't know what happened, but I'd like to know all about it.'**

2. GENERAL INVITATION

'**Tell me everything that happened from the beginning to the end.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If the child answers, proceed to question 9.]

[If the child is not forthcoming, proceed to question 3.]

2. A *if the child talks about ANOTHER EVENT, probe until you are sure they are not talking about our health and safety event, say:* **'Tell me more about that time'.**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child is talking about the target event, proceed to question 9.]

2.A.1. *If the child IS TALKING ABOUT ANOTHER EVENT, say:* **'That sounds like it might have been a different time'** [Pause]. **So, I heard that some people came to your school to teach you a number of different things about health and safety** [Pause]. **Tell me all about what happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to question 9.]

[If the child is not forthcoming, proceed to 4.]

3. *If the child is NOT FORTHCOMING, say:* **'So, I heard that some people came to your school to teach you a number of different things about health and safety** [Pause]. **Tell me all about what happened'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to question 9.]

4. *If the child is NOT FORTHCOMING, say:* **'So, I heard that you were in teams to do different health and safety activities** [Pause]. **Tell me everything that you can remember about what happened that time.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to question 9.]

5. *If the child is NOT FORTHCOMING, say:* **'So, I heard that some people came to your school and you got into teams to do the health and safety activities and you were in the** [colour] **team. Tell me everything that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to question 9.]

6. *If the child is NOT FORTHCOMING, say:* **'Have a really big think and tell me anything at all you can remember, even the little things, about that time you had some people come in and teach you are health and safety at school. And, you got to learn about different ways to check if you are sick.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to question 9.]

7. *If the child is NOT FORTHCOMING, say:* **'So, I heard that after you had done the health and safety activities, you got a pencil [**say item child received**]. Tell me all about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, proceed to question 9.]

8. *If the child is STILL NOT FORTHCOMING, say:* **'Alright, that's okay. That's all the questions that I have for you today, thank you for trying so hard.'**

[END INTERVIEW, GO TO THE CLOSING THE INTERVIEW SECTION.]

9. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me some more things that you can remember from the Health and Safety event that was at your school.'

[Wait for an answer.]

10. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me any other things that you can remember about that time.'

[Wait for an answer.]

11. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

12. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me some more things about the when you did the health and safety activities.'

[Wait for an answer.]

[Keep going with these open prompts until the child does not remember anything else. Use pair questioning to clarify and expand their descriptions. Follow each line of enquiry (focused on actions and actors) until the child cannot remember anything else.]

13. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

14. *SUMMARY INVITATION – BRIEF TIMELINE SUMMARY*

[Provide a summary of what the child has said (not too long), and then say:] **'Tell me anything else you can remember about the health and safety event?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

15. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

TARGETED RECALL FOLLOW-UP

EVENT 1: FIRST STATION RECALLED BY THE CHILD

1. *CUED INVITATION*

If the child has already mentioned one of the stations during free recall, use a cued invitation, say: **'Earlier you mentioned** [station mentioned by child, use their words]**. Tell me everything you can remember about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 2.]

1.A *SCRIPTED PROMPT*

If they have NOT MENTIONED ANY OF THE STATIONS during free recall, use a scripted prompt, say: **'So, I heard that you were at the** [first station]. **Tell me everything you can remember about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

2. *INVITATION*

'Tell me any more things you can remember about [station]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

3. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

4. *INVITATION*

'Tell me some more things about the time you were at the [station]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

5. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

6. *INVITATION*

'Tell me anything else you remember about the [station]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

7. *CHALLENGE QUESTION (IF 3 FOR THIS TARGET STATION) – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

EVENT 2: SECOND STATION RECALLED BY THE CHILD

8. *CUED INVITATION*

If the child has already mentioned a second stations, use a cued invitation, say: **'Earlier you mentioned** [station mentioned by child, use their words]**. Tell me everything you can remember about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 9]

8.A *SCRIPTED PROMPT*

If they have NOT MENTIONED ANY OTHER STATIONS, use a scripted prompt, say: **'So, I heard that you were at the** [station] **Tell me everything you can remember about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

9. *INVITATION*

'Tell me any more things you can remember about [station]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

10. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

11. *INVITATION*

'Tell me some more things about the time you were at the [station]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

12. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

13. *INVITATION*

'Tell me anything else you remember about the [station]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

14. *CHALLENGE QUESTION (IF 3 FOR THIS TARGET STATION) – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

EVENT 3: THIRD EVENT RECALLED BY THE CHILD

15. *CUED INVITATION*

If the child HAS ALREADY MENTIONED THE INTERRUPTION, use a cued invitation, say: **'Earlier you mentioned** [use child words to describe the interruption]. **Tell me everything you can remember about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Proceed to question 16]

15.A *SCRIPTED PROMPT*

If they HAVE NOT MENTIONED ANY OF THE INTERRUPTION, use a scripted prompt, say: **'So, I heard that someone came in during the health and safety event. Tell me everything you can remember about when that happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

16. *INVITATION*

'Tell me any more things you can remember about [use child words to describe the interruption]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

17. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

18. *INVITATION*

'Tell me some more things about the time [use child words to describe the interruption] **happened.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

19. *CHALLENGE QUESTION – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

20. *INVITATION*

'Tell me anything else you remember about the [**interruption -** use child's words]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[Follow-up any detail you think is necessary using the pairing principle]

21. *CHALLENGE QUESTION (IF 3 FOR THIS TARGET STATION) – REFER TO QUESTION SHEET AND RECORD THEIR ANSWER.*

[Wait for an answer.]

V. INTERVIEW CLOSURE

1. [If the interview was terminated early due to lack of event recall, say:] **'Thank you for trying your best today to answer my questions** [Pause]**.'**

[Proceed to question 3.]

2. [If the interview was completed, say:] **'You have told me a lot of things today and I really want to thank you for helping me** [Pause]**.'**

3. **'Are there any questions you want to ask me?'**

   [Wait for an answer and respond if appropriate.]

4. [For preschool aged children, say:] **'Now, it is very important that you don't talk to the other children about what we have talked about today, because we want to know what they can tell us on their own, without any help or clues. When the study has finished at your preschool, you can talk about any part of this you like, okay?** [Pause]**. Great, thank you. You can choose a sticker before going back to play. It's** [specify time] **and this interview is now complete.**

   END OF INTERVIEW.

5. [For school-aged children, say:] **'Now, it is very important that you don't talk to the other students about what we have talked about today, because we want to know what they can tell us on their own, without any help or clues. When the study has finished at your school, you can talk about any part of this you like, okay?** [Pause]**. Great, thank you. You can choose a prize now. But, I do ask that you put it in your school bag before going back to class so the other kids don't start asking you questions about it. It's** [specify time] **and this interview is now complete.**

   END OF INTERVIEW.

2. Extended Practice (EP) Condition

I. ASSENT – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

II. EXTENDED GROUND RULE INSTRUCTION

TRUTH AND LIES

1. **'So, part of my job is to talk to children about things that have happened to them. I meet with lots of children, so they can tell me the truth.**

   'Now, while we are talking today there are four rules for us. The first rule is that you should only tell the truth. So, let's practice that now.'

   'If I say that my shoes are red [or a colour they are not] **is that true or not true?'**

   [Wait for an answer, then say:]

2. **'That would not be true, because my shoes are really** [blue/black/etc.]**.' And if I say that I am sitting down now, would that be true or not true** [right or not right]**?'**

   [Wait for an answer.]

3. **'It would be** [**true/right**]**, you can see that I am really sitting down.'**

   [Pause.]

4. **'Let's try another one. If I say that I am wearing a hat, is that true or not true?**

   [Wait for an answer, then say:]

5. **''It would be not true, because as you can see I am not wearing a hat, am I?'** [For children who correctly response to the above questions, say: **'I see that you understand what telling the truth means.'**] [Then for all children, say: **'It is *very important* that you *only tell me the truth* today. You should only tell me about things that really happened to you.'**]

   [Pause.]

SAYING 'I DON'T UNDERSTAND'

4. **'So, the second rule is that if I ask a question that you don't understand or you're not sure what I mean, just say "I don't understand", okay?'**

   [Pause.]

5. **'If I don't understand what *you* say, I'll ask you to explain.'**

   [Pause.]

6. FIRST WH- PRACTICE

'So, if I ask you "what are you most adroit at?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

6. A *If they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Right, because you probably don't know what adroit means, huh. Good job for telling me you didn't understand.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 8.]

6. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Do you really know what 'adroit' means?**

[Wait for an answer.]

6. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'adroit' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

6.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **'Okay, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know, okay?'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 7.]

6.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Okay, you didn't *really* know what adroit meant. When I ask you a question and you don't understand, I want you to tell me "I don't understand" so I can ask the question in a better way.'**

7. BACK UP WH- PRACTICE

'Let's try one more. If I ask you "where is the querulous cat?" what would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

7. A *if they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Great, that's what you need to do today, if I say something you don't understand.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 8.]

7. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Let's check that, do you really know what 'querulous' means?**

7. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'querulous' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

7.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **'Okay, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know, okay?'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 8.]

7.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Just like before, there was a tricky word that you didn't know. It's important today that you tell me when you don't understand a word.'**

[Pause.]

8. *FIRST OPTION POSING PRACTICE*

If I ask you "is my shirt gridelin?" what would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

8. A *if they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Right, there is a tricky word in that question that makes it hard to understand.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 10.]

8. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Do you really know what 'gridelin' means?**

8. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'gridelin' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

8.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **'Okay, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know, okay?'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 9.]

8.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Okay, you didn't really know what gridelin meant, so I want you to tell me "I don't understand" so I can ask the question in a better way, okay?'**

[Pause.]

9. BACK UP OPTION POSING PRACTICE

If I ask you "did you uhtceare [oot-seer] **this morning?" what would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

9. A *if they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Right, there is a tricky word in that question so it's hard to understand.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 10.]

9. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Do you really know what 'uhtceare'** [oot-seer] **means?**

9. B.1 *if the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'uhtceare'** [oot-seer] **mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

9.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **'Okay, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know, okay?'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 10.]

9.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Okay, you didn't really know what uhtceare meant. Remember when there was a tricky word that you didn't know, it's important today that you tell me, say "I don't understand", okay?'**

[Pause.]

10. FIRST OPEN-ENDED PRACTICE

If I said, "tell me all about your curmudgeon teacher", what would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

10.A *If they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Good job, there is a tricky word in that question.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 12.]

10. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Do you really know what 'curmudgeon' means?**

10. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'curmudgeon' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

10.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **'Alright, but if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 11.]

10.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Okay, you didn't really know what curmudgeon meant, so I want you to tell me "I don't understand" so I can ask the question in a better way.'**

[Pause.]

11. BACK UP OPEN-ENDED PRACTICE

Let's try another one, "tell me all about how rats are erinaceous to hedgehogs".'

[Wait for an answer.]

11. A *If they answer, "I don't understand", say:* **'Well done for telling me there that you don't understand my question.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 12.]

11. B *If the child answers the question or uses the wrong ground rule say:* **'Do you really know what 'erinaceous' means?**

11. B.1 *If the child answers "yes", say:* **'What does 'erinaceous' mean?'**

[Record the child's response]

11.B.1.a *If the child provides a correct definition say:* **Well, if I ever say something and you're not totally sure what I meant, just let me know.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 12.]

11.B.1.b *If the child cannot define the tricky word, say:* **'Okay, you didn't really know what erinaceous meant, so remember**

you should say "I don't understand" so I can ask the question in a better way, okay?'

SAYING 'I DON'T KNOW'

12. **'The next rule is, if I ask you a question, and you don't know, or you have forgotten the answer, just tell me "I don't know", you don't have to guess. But if you do know, please tell me.**

13. FIRST WH- PRACTICE

'So, if I ask you, "What is my dog's name?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

13. A *if the child says, "I don't know", say:* **'Right, you don't know, do you?'**

[Wait for an answer – if they say "no" proceed to question 15.]

13. B *if the child offers a GUESS, say:* **'Do you really know my dog's name?** [Pause.] **No, that's right, you don't know because you don't know my dog. When you don't know the answer, don't guess – say that you don't know, or you don't remember.'**

[Pause.]

14. BACK UP WH- PRACTICE

If I ask you "what were you doing on the 1st June [use another date if this is their birthday] **two years ago?" what would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

14. A *If the child says, "I don't know/remember", say*: **'Good job for telling me you don't remember/know** [use child's words].

[Pause, then proceed to question 15.]

14.B. *If the child offers a GUESS, say:* **'Do you really remember what happened?**

[Wait for an answer.]

15. B.1 *if the child says "no", say:* **'No, that's right you don't remember/know** [use child's words]**. So, remember, I don't want you to guess when you don't know or don't remember the. I want you tell me "I don't know" or "I don't remember".'**

[Pause, then process to question 15.]

14. B.2 *If the child says "yes", say:* **'Well if you didn't remember, you should say "I don't remember" or "I don't know", okay.'**

[Pause.]

15. *FIRST OPTION POSING PRACTICE*

'So, if I ask you, "did I go to the movies last night?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

15. A *if the child says, "I don't know", say:* **'Good work, you don't know me, and so you don't know what I did last night.'**

[Wait for an answer – if they say "no" proceed to question 17.]

15. B *If the child offers a GUESS, say:* **'Do you really know if I went to the movies last night?** [Pause.] **No, that's right, you don't know because you don't know me. Remember, when you don't know the answer, don't guess. Say "I don't know, okay?'**

[Pause.]

16. *BACK UP OPTION POSING PRACTICE*

'So, if I ask you, "did I go dancing last night?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

16. A *if the child says, "I don't know", say:* **'Good work, you don't know me, and so you don't know if I went dancing last night.'**

[Wait for an answer – if they say "no" proceed to question 17.]

16. B *If the child offers a GUESS, say:* **'Do you really know if I went to the dancing last night?** [Pause.] **No, that's right, you don't know because you don't know me. Remember, when you don't know the answer, don't guess. Say "I don't know, okay?'**

[Pause.]

17. *FIRST OPEN-ENDED PRACTICE*

Here, is another one. If I said, "tell me all about my last birthday party?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

17. A *if the child says, "I don't know/remember", say*: **'That's right, you don't know.**

[Pause, then proceed to question 19.]

17.B. *If the child offers a GUESS, say*: **'Wait, do you really remember what happened?**

[Wait for an answer.]

17. B.1 *if the child says "no", say:* **'Right, you don't know. So, when you "don't know the answer say, "I don't know" or "I don't remember". Don't guess, okay?'**

[Pause, then process to question 18.]

17. B.2 *If the child says "yes", say:* **'Well if you didn't remember, you should say "I don't remember" or "I don't know", okay.'**

[Pause.]

18. BACK UP OPEN-ENDED PRACTICE

'If I said, "tell me all about the first time you ate with a spoon." What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

18. A *if the child says, "I don't know/remember", say*: **'Great, that's right, you don't remember because you were just a baby.**

[Pause, then proceed to question 19.]

18.B. *If the child offers a GUESS, say*: **'Wait, do you really remember what happened?**

[Wait for an answer.]

18. B.1 *if the child says "no", say:* **'Right, you don't know/remember** [use child's words]**. So, when you "don't know/remember the answer say, "I don't know" or "I don't remember". Don't guess, okay?'**

[Pause, then process to question 19.]

18. B.2 *If the child says "yes", say:* **'Well if you didn't remember, you should say "I don't remember" or "I don't know", okay.'**

[Pause.]

SAYING 'THAT'S WRONG'

19. **'The forth rule is, if I say things that are wrong, then you should tell me. You can say "that's wrong" and let me know what the correct** [right] **thing is, okay?**

[Pause.]

20. FIRST WH- PRACTICE

'If I said that you are a 2-year-old girl/boy [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.] **what would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

20.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right! Now you know you should tell me if I make a mistake or say something that is not right.'**

20. A.1 *If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:* **That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'** [Pause.] [If needed: **'Are you a [boy / girl]? And how old are you?']**

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, then proceed to question 21.]

20.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'What would you say if I made a mistake and called you a 2-year old girl** [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.]**?**

[Wait for an answer, if the child corrects you proceed to 21.]

20. B.1 *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right! Now you know you should tell me if I make a mistake or say something that is not right.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 21.]

20.B.1. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I think I made a mistake, you are not a 2-year-old girl/boy** [when interviewing a 5-year old boy, etc.]**. Remember, if I make a mistake or say something that is not right you should tell me, okay.'**

[Pause.]

21. BACK UP WH- PRACTICE

'Let's practice another. If I asked, "where in Australia do you live?" What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

21.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right, you don't live in Australia. Great job.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 22.]

21. A.1*If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:*
'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 12.]

21.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I made a mistake, I can see you don't live in Australia because you go to school/preschool in Wellington. So, I want you to tell me "that's wrong" if I make a mistake, and let me know what the correct thing is, okay?'**

[Pause.]

22. FIRST OPTION POSING

'If I said, "is your hair pink or is your hair purple [colours their hair is not] **today?" What would you say?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

22.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'Well done, your hair is not pink or purple** [colours used in the above question] **today.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 24.]

22. A.1*If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:*
'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 23.]

22.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I think I made a mistake, because I can see that your hair is not pink or purple. When I make a mistake**

please tell me "that's wrong" and tell me what the correct thing is, okay?'

[Pause.]

23. BACK UP OPTION POSING

'If I asked, "do you live in Christchurch or Dunedin? What would you say?'

[Wait for an answer.]

23.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right, you don't live in Christchurch or Dunedin, do you.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 24.]

23. A.1*If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:* **'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'**

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 24.]

23.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I made a mistake, I can see you don't live in Christchurch or Dunedin because you are here at school/preschool in Wellington. So, I want you to tell me "that's wrong" if I make a mistake and let me know what the correct thing is, okay?'**

[Pause.]

24. FIRST OPEN ENDED

'**Let's practice another one. Tell me about the Prime Minister's visit to your school/preschool this morning?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

24.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'That's right, the Prime Minster didn't visit your school/preschool this morning, good work.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 26.]

24. A.1*If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:* **'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'**

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 25.]

24.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'Hang on, I think I made a mistake because the Prime Minister didn't visit to your school/preschool this morning, did she?** [Pause]. **So, I want you to tell me "that's wrong" if I make a mistake and let me know what the correct thing is, okay?'**

[Pause.]

25. BACK UP OPEN ENDED

'Tell me all about sleeping at school/preschool last night?'

[Wait for an answer.]

25.A. *If the child corrects you, say:* **'Nice, you didn't sleep at school/preschool last night, good job.'**

[Pause, then proceed to question 26.]

25. A.1*If the child corrects you but doesn't say what the right thing is, say:* **'That's right? And what would be the correct thing to say?'**

[Wait for answer.]

'Now you know that you should let me know what the correct thing is, when you tell me I've made a mistake.'

[Pause, the proceed to question 26.]

25.B. *If the child does NOT correct you, say:* **'I think I made a mistake because you didn't really sleep at school/preschool last night, did you?** [Pause]**. Remember, if I make a mistake or say something that is not right, you should tell me "that's wrong" and let me know what the correct thing is, okay?'**

[Pause.]

SUMMARY OF GROUND RULES

26. **'So, while we are talking today, you should only say stuff that is true and really happened, and you can say "I don't understand", or "I don't know", or "I don't remember", you don't have to guess. It's okay, for you to tell me "that's wrong" if I make a mistake, and you can let me know what the correct thing is, okay?'**

[Pause.]

III. REGULAR PRACTICE NARRATIVE – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

IV. MEMORY INTERVIEW – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

V. INTERVIEW CLOSURE – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

3. Extended with Elaborated Practice Narrative (EEPN)

I. ASSENT – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

II. EXTENDED GROUND RULE INSTRUCTION - Same as "EP" Condition, See Above.

III. ELABORTATIVE PRACTICE NARRATIVE

[There are three versions of the elaborative practice narrative script. Use the version assigned in counterbalancing for each participant in this condition.]

ELABORATED PRACTICE NARRATIVE FEEDBACK

CORRECT RESPONSE

FEEDBACK FOR THE FIRST CORRECT RESPONSE TO EACH GROUND RULE:

DK - 'Thank you for not guessing and telling me you don't know the answer to my question'

DU - 'Thank you for telling me you didn't understand what I said.'

CM - 'Thank you for telling me I made a mistake **[if they provide a correction, continue to say:]** and for telling me what the correct thing is.'

FEEDBACK FOR ALL CORRECT RESPONSES AFTER FEEDBACK FOR THE FIRST CORRECT

'Alright, thank you', 'Cool, thank you'

CHILD ASKS THE MEANING OF A DU WORD.

'**[Tricky word]** is a tricky word to understand, it means **[insert tricky word meaning]**. I'll ask a different

WRONG GR USE

CHILD RESPONDS WITH THE WRONG GROUND RULE.

'How come you said **[insert the rule used by the child]**?'

[Wait for response.]

DU – DK: 'Okay, **[use the words the child uses to describe the target GR – e.g. "I don't know what that means"]**. To help me ask a better question I need to know if you don't know the answer, or if the question is too tricky.'

RULE CHALLENGE

CHILD ATTEMPTS TO ANSWER A DK, DU, OR CM QUESTION WITH THE USING A GR

DK - 'Do you really know **[what happened when…]**?'

DU - 'Do you really know what **[tricky word]** means?'

If they say "yes", ask: 'What does **[tricky word]** mean?'

CM - 'Did **[error]** really happen?'

Response "*yes*"

Response "*no*"

DK - 'Well, you don't know **[Insert relevant content]**. So, when I ask a question and you don't know the answer, I want you to tell me "I don't know", okay?

DU – '**[Insert tricky word]** is a tricky word to understand. So, if I use a word you don't understand, or you don't get the question I want you to tell me, so I can ask a better question, okay?'

CM – 'I'm pretty sure **[insert relevant content]**. So, if I ask a question and I make a mistake, I want you to tell me "that's wrong" and let me know what the correct thing is, so I know what really happened, okay?'

DK - 'That's right you don't really know **[insert relevant content]**. So, don't guess, just tell me "I don't know", okay?'

DU – 'That's right you didn't really know what **[insert tricky word]** means. So, I want you to tell me "I don't understand", so I can ask the question in a better way, okay?'

CM – 'That's right **[insert relevant content]** didn't really happen. So, I want you to tell me "that's wrong" and let me know what the correct thing is so I know what really happened, okay?'

CHILD GUESSES MEANING OF A DU WORD, OR *ACTUALLY* CAN ANSWER A DK QUESTION

DU – 'You figured out what meant even though you didn't know what that tricky word was. You guessed, it was a good guess, but I don't want you to do that today. If you hear any word that you don't understand I want you to tell me, okay?'

DK – 'Okay, you did know. But, if I ask you something that you don't know it is important that you let me know. Say "I don't know".

CM - 'Did [error] really happen?'

EXTENDED AND ELABORATIVE PRACTICE NARRATIVE – VERSION 1

EPN VERSION 1

1. *FIRST GENERAL INVITATION*

'Now, I want to get to know you a little bit better. So, tell me everything you can remember from the time you woke up until arrived at [**school** *or* **preschool**] **this morning.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

1.A **'Then what happened?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

2. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me more about this morning.'

[Wait for an answer.]

2.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**What was the very first thing you did after getting up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

3. *DKO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me what was happening on your street before you woke up this morning?'

3.A. *If needed, say:* **'When did you get up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

4. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me about waking up this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

5. *DKW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Which one of your friends woke up the earliest this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

6. *CUED INVITATION*

'What was the very first thing you did after getting up?'

[Wait for an answer.]

7. *CUED INVITATION*

'You told me [activity/detail disclosed by child – use the child's words]**. Tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 7.]

7.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**You've told me lots of things about your morning so far, such as** [summarise the things they have told you]**. Tell me some more about** [same detail as probed above]**'.**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 7.]

7. B *If you need to clarify anything the child has said, say:* **'Explain what you mean by** [use the child's words, do not paraphrase]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

8. *DUY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Is [just disclosed detail] **a hemerine part of your morning?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

9. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me everything that happened from the time [same detail] **until you got to school/preschool.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

10. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'What else happened this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

11. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me (more) about having breakfast this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

12. *DKY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Did your teacher eat yogurt for breakfast this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

13. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me (more) about getting to school/preschool.'

14. *CMW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'How long did it take you to go home and get the school/preschool bag you forgot this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

15. *CUED INVITATION*

'Okay, what else happened on your way to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

16. *CMO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me about the hot air balloon that was in the sky on your way to school/preschool.'

[Wait for an answer.]

17. *CUED INVITATION*

'What happened when you go to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

18. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Okay, then what happened?'

[Wait for an answer.]

19. *CUED INVITATION*

'You told me [any disclosed detail about getting to school/preschool – use the child's words]**, tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

20. *DUO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me about making your bag pendant?'

[Wait for an answer.]

21. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me the first thing that happened when you got into your classroom/at preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

22. *CMY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Did you leave the classroom when the fire engine came to school/preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

23. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'What else happened in your classroom/at preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

24. *CUED INVITATION*

'What's your favourite thing that happened this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

25. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me more about that part?'

[Wait for an answer.]

26. *DUW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'When did you feel the most acrasial this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

27. *SUMMARY INVITATION*

'[Provide a short summary about what the child has said, in their words]. **Tell me any other things you can remember about what you did this morning.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

28. **'Great, thank you for telling me all about what you did this morning. Just like you did when we practiced, when we are talking today it is important that you only say stuff that is true and really happened.**

You should tell me if I ask you a question and you don't know the answer, you don't have to guess.

Or, if I ask you a question and you don't understand something I have said, or you are not sure what I mean.

Or, if I make a mistake, it is important that you tell me, so I know to ask my question in a better way, okay?

EXTENDED AND ELABORATIVE PRACTICE NARRATIVE – VERSION 2

EPN VERSION 2

1. *FIRST GENERAL INVITATION*

'Now, I want to get to know you a little bit better. So, tell me everything you can remember from the time you woke up until arrived at [**school** *or* **preschool**] **this morning.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

1.A **'Then what happened?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

2. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me more about this morning.'

[Wait for an answer.]

2.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**What was the very first thing you did after getting up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

3. *DKY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Were there people walking on your street *before* you woke up this morning?'

3.A. *If needed, say:* **'When did you get up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

4. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me about waking up this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

5. *DKO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Who is your best friend? [wait for an answer] **Tell me everything that happened when they got up this morning?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

6. *CUED INVITATION*

'What was the very first thing you did after getting up?'

[Wait for an answer.]

7. CUED INVITATION

'You told me [activity/detail disclosed by child – use the child's words]**. Tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 7.]

7.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**You've told me lots of things about your morning so far, such as** [summarise the things they have told you]**. Tell me some more about** [same detail as probed above]**'.**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 7.]

7. B *If you need to clarify anything the child has said, say:* **'Explain what you mean by** [use the child's words, do not paraphrase]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

8. *DUW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'What are your hemerine morning activities?'

[Wait for an answer.]

9. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me everything that happened from the time [same detail] **until you got to school/preschool.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

10. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'What else happened this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

11. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me (more) about having breakfast this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

12. *DKW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'What did your teacher eat for breakfast this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

13. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me (more) about getting to school/preschool.'

[Wait for an answer.]

14. *CMW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'What colour was the hot air balloon that was in the sky on your way to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

15. *CUED INVITATION*

'Okay, what else happened on your way to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

16. *CMY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Did you go back home to get the school/preschool bag you forgot this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

17. *CUED INVITATION*

'What happened when you go to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

18. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Okay, then what happened?'

[Wait for an answer.]

19. *CUED INVITATION*

'You told me [any disclosed detail about getting to school/preschool – use the child's words]**, tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

20. *DUY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Did you make your bag pendant?'

[Wait for an answer.]

21. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me the first thing that happened when you got into your classroom/at preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

22. *CMO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me everything that happened when the fire engine came to school/preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

23. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'What else happened in your classroom/at preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

24. *CUED INVITATION*

'What's your favourite thing that happened this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

25. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me more about that part?'

[Wait for an answer.]

26. *DUO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me about feeling acrasial this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

27. *SUMMARY INVITATION*

‘[Provide a short summary about what the child has said, in their words]. **Tell me any other things you can remember about what you did this morning.’**

[Wait for an answer.]

28. **Great, thank you for telling me all about what you did this morning. Just like you did when we practiced, when we are talking today it is important that you only say stuff that is true and really happened.**

You should tell me if I ask you a question and you don’t know the answer, you don’t have to guess.

Or, if I ask you a question and you don’t understand something I have said, or you are not sure what I mean.

Or, if I make a mistake, it is important that you tell me, so I know to ask my question in a better way, okay?

EXTENDED AND ELABORATIVE PRACTICE NARRATIVE – VERSION 3

EEPN VERSION 3

1. *FIRST GENERAL INVITATION*

‘Now, I want to get to know you a little bit better. So, tell me everything you can remember from the time you woke up until arrived at [**school** *or* **preschool**] **this morning.’**

[Wait for an answer.]

1.A **‘Then what happened?’**

[Wait for an answer.]

2. *GENERAL INVITATION*

‘Tell me more about this morning.’

[Wait for an answer.]

2.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* **‘What was the very first thing you did after getting up?’**

[Wait for an answer.]

3. *DKW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'How many people were walking on your street *before* you woke up this morning?'

3.A. *If needed, say:* **'When did you get up?'**

[Wait for an answer.]

4. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me about waking up this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

5. *DKY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Did you wake up earlier than all your friends this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

6. *CUED INVITATION*

'What was the very first thing you did after getting up?'

[Wait for an answer.]

1. CUED INVITATION

'You told me [activity/detail disclosed by child – use the child's words]**. Tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 7.]

7.A *If the child is not forthcoming, say:* '**You've told me lots of things about your morning so far, such as** [summarise the things they have told you]**. Tell me some more about** [same detail as probed above]**'.**

[Wait for an answer.]

[If child answers, and clarification is not needed proceed to 7.]

7. B *If you need to clarify anything the child has said, say:* **'Explain what you mean by** [use the child's words, do not paraphrase]**.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

8. *DUO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me everything about a hemerine part of your morning.'

[Wait for an answer.]

9. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me everything that happened from the time [same detail] **until you got to school/preschool.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

10. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'What else happened this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

11. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me (more) about having breakfast this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

12. *DKO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me everything that happened when your teacher had breakfast this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

13. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me (more) about getting to school/preschool.'

[Wait for an answer.]

14. *CMO CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Tell me about going home to get your school/preschool bag you forgot this morning.'

[Wait for an answer.]

15. *CUED INVITATION*

'Okay, what else happened on your way to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

16. *CMY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Was the hot air balloon in the sky on your way to school/preschool red and white?'

[Wait for an answer.]

17. *CUED INVITATION*

'What happened when you go to school/preschool?'

[Wait for an answer.]

18. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Okay, then what happened?'

[Wait for an answer.]

19. *CUED INVITATION*

'You told me [any disclosed detail about getting to school/preschool – use the child's words]**, tell me everything about that.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

20. *DUW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'How did you make your bag pendant?'

[Wait for an answer.]

21. *CUED INVITATION*

'Tell me the first thing that happened when you got into your classroom/at preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

22. *CMW CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'What did you do when the fire engine came to school/preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

23. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'What else happened in your classroom/at preschool this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

24. *CUED INVITATION*

'What's your favourite thing that happened this morning?'

[Wait for an answer.]

25. *GENERAL INVITATION*

'Tell me more about that part?'

[Wait for an answer.]

26. *DUY CHALLENGE QUESTION*

'Did you feel acrasial when you woke up today?'

[Wait for an answer.]

27. *SUMMARY INVITATION*

'[Provide a short summary about what the child has said, in their words]. **Tell me any other things you can remember about what you did this morning.'**

[Wait for an answer.]

28. **Great, thank you for telling me all about what you did this morning. Just like you did when we practiced, when we are talking today it is important that you only say stuff that is true and really happened.**

You should tell me if I ask you a question and you don't know the answer, you don't have to guess.

Or, if I ask you a question and you don't understand something I have said, or you are not sure what I mean.

Or, if I make a mistake, it is important that you tell me, so I know to ask my question in a better way, okay?

IV. MEMORY INTERVIEW - Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

V. INTERVIEW CLOSURE - Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

4. No Ground Rules (NG) Condition

I. ASSENT – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

II. GROUND RULE INSTRUCTION – NOT PRESENT

III. REGULAR PRACTICE NARRATIVE – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

IV. MEMORY INTERVIEW – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

V. INTERVIEW CLOSURE – Same as "MP" Condition, See Above.

CHALLENGE QUESTIONS

T&T – VERSION A

CQ. TO ASK DURING "FREE RECALL" STAGE

1. [DKO] **Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.**

2. [CMO] **Earlier you said you did different activities, tell me about what you did at the** [*wrong station*] **hazards station.**

3. [DUO] **Tell me about measuring febrility?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "TREATMENT OF CUTS" STAGE

4. [DKW] **What was the name of the girl who cut her finger in the slideshow?**

5. [CMW] **Where did you draw the pretend cut?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "TEMPERATURE" STAGE

6. [CMY] **Was your temperature the same** [use higher or low if temp was really the same] **as your partners or** [higher/lower – use incorrect]**?**

7. [DUY] **Did you put your thermometer next to your tympanum?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "INTERRUPTION PROMPT" STAGE

8. [DUW] **When did the bellicose woman leave the** [**hall/classroom**]**?**

9. [DKY] **The woman who came in, did she arrive by bicycle?**

T&T – VERSION B

CQ. TO ASK DURING "FREE RECALL" STAGE

1. [DKO] **Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.**

2. [CMO] **Earlier you said you did different activities, tell me about what you did at the** [wrong station] **hazard station.**

3. [DUO] **Tell me about measuring febrility?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "TREATMENT OF CUTS" STAGE

4. [DKY] **You know the girl in the slideshow who cut her finger, was her name Sarah?**

5. [CMY] **Did you use a red pen to draw a cut on your knee?** *(don't put emphasis on knee)*

6. [DUY] **Did Arthur hurt his patella?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "TEMPERATURE" STAGE

7. [DUW] **When did you put the thermometer next to your tympanum?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "INTERRUPTION PROMPT" STAGE

8. [DKW] **The woman who came in, what colour is her bicycle?**

9. [CMW] **Where was the man who needed the spare equipment going?**

T&T – VERSION C

CQ. TO ASK DURING "FREE RECALL" STAGE

1. [DKO] **Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.**

2. [CMO] **Earlier you said you did different activities, tell me about what you did at the [wrong station] hazard station.**

3. [DUO] **Tell me about measuring febrility?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "TREATMENT OF CUTS" STAGE

4. [DUW] **Which part of his crus did Arthur hurt?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "TEMPERATURE" STAGE

5. [DKW] **What was the leader's temperature?**

6. [CMW] **When the leader saw the temperature was 42 (wrong temperature), what did she say?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "INTERRUPTION PROMPT" STAGE

7. [DUY] **Did the bellicose woman leave the [hall/classroom] after picking up spare equipment?**

8. [DKY] **The woman who came in, did she arrive by bicycle?**

9. [CMY] **Was the woman who needed the spare equipment going to Karori?**

H&H – VERSION A

CQ. TO ASK DURING "FREE RECALL" STAGE

1. [DKO] **Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.**

2. [CMO] **Earlier you said you did different activities, tell me about what you did at the [wrong station] treatment of cuts station.**

3. [DUO] **Tell me more about measuring arrhythmia?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "HAZARDS PROMPT" STAGE

4. [DKW] **In the picture of the girl with scissors, what happened after she ran with scissors?**

5. [CMW] **In the picture of the garden, who got hurt stepping on the rake?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "HEARTBEAT PROMPT" STAGE

6. [DUY] **Did someone auscultate your pulse?**

7. [CMY] **Did you like your leader's tiger stethoscope?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "INTERRUPTION PROMPT" STAGE

8. [DKY] **The woman who came in, did she arrive by bicycle?**

9. [DUW] **When did the bellicose woman leave the** [**hall/classroom**]**?**

H&H – VERSION B

CQ. TO ASK DURING "FREE RECALL" STAGE

1. [DKO] **Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.**

2. [CMO] **Earlier you said you did different activities, tell me about what you did at the [wrong station] treatment of cuts station.**

3. [DUO] **Tell me more about measuring arrhythmia?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "HAZARDS PROMPT" STAGE

4. [DKY] **Did the girl who ran with scissors fall and cut her brother?**

5. [CMY] **In the picture of the garden, did the boy hurt his foot when he stepped on the rake?**

6. [DUY] **In the picture of the road, was the man on the zebra crossing running with impigrity?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "HEARTBEAT PROMPT" STAGE

7. [DUW] **Who auscultated your pulse?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "INTERRUPTION PROMPT" STAGE

8. [DKW] **The woman who came in, what colour was her bicycle?**

9. [CMW] **Where was the man who needed the spare equipment going?**

H&H – VERSION C

CQ. TO ASK DURING "FREE RECALL" STAGE

1. [DKO] **Tell me everything that happened with the leaders before they came and got you.**

2. [CMO] **Earlier you said you did different activities, tell me about what you did at the [wrong station] treatment of cuts station.**

3. [DUO] **Tell me more about measuring arrhythmia?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "HAZARDS PROMPT" STAGE

4. [DUW] **In the picture of the road, why was the man in the zebra crossing running impigriously?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "HEARTBEAT PROMPT" STAGE

5. [DKW] **How much did the stethoscopes cost the leader at the heartbeat station?**

6. [CMW] **Where was the leader wearing her Bear stethoscope?**

CQ. TO ASK DURING "INTERRUPTION PROMPT" STAGE

7. [DUY] **Did the bellicose woman leave the** [**hall/classroom**] **after picking up spare equipment?**

8. [DKY] **The woman who came to take the spare equipment, did she arrive by bicycle?**

9. [CMY] **Was the woman who came in going to Karori?**

WORD DEFINITION & PRONUNCIATION

WORD	PRONUNCIATION	MEANING
Adroit	əˈdrȯit	Having or showing skill, cleverness, or resourcefulness in handling situations

Querulous	quer·u·lous	Complaining in a rather petulant or whining manner – *'she became querulous and demanding'*
Gridelin	grid·e·lin	A dark purplish red that is bluer and paler than pansy purple
Uhtceare	oot·seer	Lying awake before dawn and worrying
Curmudgeon	cur·mud·geon	A bad- or ill-tempered person, especially an old one.
Erinaceous	er·*uh*·ney·sh*uh* s	Of the hedgehog kind or family
Hemerine	hem·e·rine	Happening or occurring daily
Acrasial	a·cra·sial	Ill-regulated, intemperate, uncontrolled
Febrility	fe·bril·i·ty	The state of being febrile (affected by fever) feverishness
Tympanum	tim·p*uh*·n*uh* m	The drum of an ear
Patella	p*uh*·tel·*uh*	The flat, moveable bone at the front of the knee, kneecap
Crus	kruhs, kroos	The part of the leg or hind between the femur or thigh and the ankle
Arrhythmia	*uh*·ri*th* ·mee·*uh*, ey·ri*th*	Any disturbance in the rhythm of the heartbeat
Auscultate	aw·sk*uh* l-teyt	To examine by auscultation (act of listening either directly or using a stethoscope)
Impigrity	impigritāt·em	Quickness, with speed
Bellicose	bel·li·cose	Favoring or inclined to start quarrels/arguments

Note: Only provide a definition of a tricky word in Condition E when appropriate. Otherwise all enquiries are to be acknowledged before moving onto the next question. For example, "that is a bit tricky, let's move on".

QUESTION BANK & PROMPTS

Question Bank

Open & Cued Invitations

- "Tell me everything that happened from the beginning to the end"
- "You mentioned [an action mentioned by child] tell me what happened [just before/just after] that happened"
- "Tell me everything you remember about…"
- "Tell me more about…"
- "Tell me more about the time…"
- "You mentioned…tell me more about that"
- "Tell me everything about that"
- "Describe more about…"
- "Say some more about that"
- "Tell me some more things about that" (especially for younger children)
- "Explain some more about the …"
- "Tell me another thing you remember"
- "Tell me the next thing you remember"
- "Tell me one thing you remember"
- "Then what happened

Directives	Option Posing	Prompts
• "When did that happen?" • "What happened when…" • "How did you…" • "Why did you do that?" • "Who was there when…"	• "Did you…"/ "Were you…"/"Was the"/"Did they"	• "Sometimes my questions might seem a bit tricky, so just try your best" • "There is no wrong answer" • "You are doing great, not too many more questions" • "Good job", "Well done", "Thank you" • "Sometimes my questions might seem a bit tricky, so just try your best"

Actions – Objects – People – Places – Events

Appendix C

All Additional Statistics:

Table 8.

Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Number of Details

	Kurtosis Value	Skewness Value
Across Participants	-.779	.184
MP Condition	.050	.467
EP Condition	-1.519	.138
EEPN Condition	.325	-.437
NG Condition	-.960	.052

Table 9.

Skewness and Kurtosis Values for Accuracy of Ground Rule Responses

Accuracy of Responses to Challenge Questions.	Kurtosis Value	Skewness Value
"I don't know"	-1.049	-.154
"I don't understand"	-.927	-.381
"That's Wrong"	-.360	-.349

Table 10.

Pearson Corrleations between Number of Details, Age and Accuracy of Ground Rule Responses.

Dependent Variable	Pearson Correlation	*p* value
Number of Details		
Age	.525	<.001
"I don't know"	-.042	.687
"I don't understand"	.014	.897
"That's wrong"	.060	.571
Age		
"I don't know"	.092	.378
"I don't understand"	.108	.303
"That's wrong"	.228	.028
"I don't know"		
"I don't understand"	.110	.294
"That's wrong"	.254	.014
"I don't understand"		
"That's wrong"	.403	<.001