

# 'Stand by Me': The Effect of Emotional Support on Children's Testimonies

Carmit Katz\*

---

\*Correspondence to Carmit Katz, Ph.D., Bob Shapell School of Social Work, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv 69978, Israel. E-mail: [drckatz@gmail.com](mailto:drckatz@gmail.com)

## Abstract

Many children who come into contact with the legal system following suspected maltreatment have difficulty disclosing the alleged abuse and providing rich and coherent testimonies. This study focuses on three interviews with alleged victims: two girls who were interviewed following reports of possible sexual abuse by their fathers and one boy who was interviewed following a report of possible sexual abuse by his mother. All the interviews were conducted by social workers trained in investigative interviewing techniques. The main aim of these case studies is to explore the effect of emotional, non-suggestive support on children's disclosure patterns and narratives during the forensic interview. These illustrative interviews emphasise the importance of employing emotional non-suggestive support in the forensic context, as this practice balances between the interests of the legal system and the best interests of the children involved. This balancing is a highly complicated task and represents social workers' contributions to the experiences of maltreated children in the legal system. The practical implications for social workers in the forensic context and other contexts are also discussed.

**Keywords:** Investigative interviews with children, child sexual abuse, disclosure, resistance, support

*Accepted: June 2013*

## Introduction

### Child maltreatment and the legal process

In the last several decades, child maltreatment has been recognised as a social problem and has drawn considerable attention (Malloy *et al.*, 2011). Many researchers have dedicated their studies to better understanding this

alarming phenomenon, and serious efforts are being made to facilitate children's recovery processes and well-being (Corwin and Keeshin, 2011; Gupta *et al.*, 2011) and promote the skills of the legal and other professionals who work with them (Malloy *et al.*, 2011). Maltreated children participating in the legal system are a core and very challenging area of interest for researchers.

Accurate identification of child maltreatment and its victims is crucial if we wish to end victimisation, protect children and provide children, families and potentially perpetrators with appropriate services and treatment (Malloy *et al.*, 2011; Lamb *et al.*, 2008). Early identification is often difficult because of the difficulty of investigating child maltreatment. Because corroborative evidence is often absent, especially when sexual abuse is involved, suspected victims are often the sole source of information about their experiences (Lamb *et al.*, 2008). For this reason, investigative interviews are vital in the investigation of child maltreatment. Information from investigative interviews can have a powerful effect on legal and administrative decisions that may profoundly affect the lives of children, families and suspects. Therefore, it is imperative that children's reports are clear, consistent, detailed and accurate. However, many children are reluctant to disclose alleged abuse and, even when they do so, their testimonies are sometimes weak and lacking in the core information demanded by the legal system (Lamb *et al.*, 2008, 2011).

### Emotional difficulties and resistance during the investigative interview

The investigative interview demands a wide range of cognitive and communicative abilities from children in order for their narratives to be heard and understood in the legal context (Lamb *et al.*, 2008, 2011; Poole and Lamb, 1998). However, the emotional state of children may present a significant barrier during the interview (Pipe *et al.*, 2007). When children arrive at a forensic investigation, they are interviewed by a social worker; they do not know about a traumatic experience that they may not have previously disclosed (Pipe *et al.*, 2007). Retrieving and reporting the alleged abuse may be experienced as a stressful event that can generate feelings of shame, guilt, fear and uncertainty (Kuehnle and Connell, 2011).

A substantial proportion of alleged victims do not disclose abuse when they are formally interviewed. Disclosure is affected by a variety of factors and the relationship of the child to the suspect is of central importance (London *et al.*, 2005, 2007, 2008). Research shows that children face particular difficulties reporting abuse by parental figures (e.g. Goodman-Brown *et al.*, 2003; Hershkowitz *et al.*, 2005; Ussher and Dewberry, 1995; Wyatt and Newcomb, 1990); approximately half of alleged victims deny abuse when questioned directly (Hershkowitz *et al.*, 2005). This tendency is stronger in

male victims and younger children and when sexual rather than physical abuse is suspected.

In addition to the factors that pertain to the characteristics of the child or the child's relationship to the suspect, researchers have suggested that the quality of the interaction between a child and a social worker in the course of a forensic investigation may significantly affect whether a child discloses the suspected abuse (Pipe *et al.*, 2007). This notion was developed following a field study that examined the dynamics of forensic interviews in substantiated cases of abuse that resulted in disclosure or non-disclosure (Hershkowitz *et al.*, 2006). This study identified the risks of creating a situation of escalating negative dynamics between a reluctant child and a social worker, which leads to increasing reluctance on the child's part and ends in non-disclosure. The researchers pointed to the challenges reluctant children pose to social workers and emphasised key failures on the part of social workers, including intrusive questioning, unsupportiveness and premature discussion of sensitive topics. Because the non-disclosing children in this study showed reluctance at the beginning of the interviews, the researchers argue that it is possible and important to identify reluctance early in the interview and to adjust for it before negative dynamics develop.

Interestingly, a recent field study clearly showed that non-disclosers expressed reluctance early in the interview by non-verbal means (Katz *et al.*, 2012), which provided social workers with additional cues to detect interviewees' reluctance. This study stresses the importance of an awareness of children's emotional states to allow the forensic social worker to modify an interview according to the interviewees' needs.

### Providing non-suggestive support

The notion that the interviewer's support can have a significant influence on a child's performance during the interview has been explored in several studies (Hershkowitz, 2011). Studies focusing on the value of rapport building have shown that good rapport may facilitate communication with children and encourage them to affirm and describe traumatic experiences in clinical (Morgan and Friedemann, 1988), evaluative (Powell and Lancaster, 2003) or investigative interviews (Ruddock, 2006; Powell and Thomson, 1994; McBride, 1996; Aldridge and Wood, 1998; Hynan, 1999). Effective rapport building seems to decrease anxiety and distress in children, to empower them and to increase their engagement in interviews. Therefore, rapport building is a key factor in motivating children, particularly reluctant disclosers, to talk about their abuse (e.g. Goodman *et al.*, 1991; Hershkowitz *et al.*, 2006; Siegman and Reynolds, 1983).

Similarly, research on the effects of support shows that a supportive interview environment can improve the accuracy of the information reported by a child (Greenstock and Pipe, 1997; Moston, 1992) and reduce suggestibility

(Cornah and Memon, 1996; Greenstock and Pipe, 1996, 1997). A comparison of supportive and non-supportive interviewers in laboratory studies showed that supportive interviewers elicited more accurate free-recall information from pre-schoolers (Goodman *et al.*, 1991), even when abuse-related questions were referred to the children (Davis and Bottoms, 2002). In field settings, a study of child sexual abuse investigations demonstrated the positive association between the social worker's support and the child's production of forensically relevant details (Hershkowitz, 2009).

Providing non-suggestive support is a highly challenging task for interviewers within the legal context due to concerns over suggestion (Malloy and Quas, 2008). Suggestive intervention can adversely affect children's narratives, and numerous studies have shown that suggestive intervention can hamper communication between interviewers and children. Extreme examples documented by researchers show children completely fabricating events. There is a consensus among researchers that putting pressure on children, or even 'just encouraging' them in a specific direction (e.g. 'When Daddy hit you, it hurt you, right?'), is highly dangerous and should be completely avoided, especially in interviews undertaken in the legal context. Given this, providing support can be risky, and the line between suggestive and non-suggestive support is easily blurred. From the few studies that have been conducted on this topic, it is clear that non-suggestive support should not enforce the expectations of any particular information from children being interviewed; rather, it should be addressed in the form of free-recall prompts (Lamb *et al.*, 2008, 2011).

Fuelled by these findings, a field study was designed and conducted in Israel (Katz *et al.*, 2010) to implement and explore the effects of supportive interviews on children's testimonies. The main finding of this study was that the rates of disclosure among children who were interviewed using the support-enriched NICHD (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development) Protocol were higher (55.1 per cent,  $p < 0.029$ ) than the rates of disclosure from children who were interviewed using the Standard NICHD Protocol (49.9 per cent). Moreover, children interviewed with the Revised Protocol produced their disclosures in response to open-ended invitations in more than 30 per cent of cases, compared with less than 17 per cent with the Standard Protocol. These findings are extremely important in the forensic context, given the consensus on the reliability of children's free-recall narratives (Lamb *et al.*, 2011).

The aim of this paper is to explore in depth what it is, exactly, to offer non-suggestive support to children, alleged victims of abuse, within the legal context. Through analysis of three investigations, the interview dynamic will be displayed and the interview elaborations that were employed by the social workers will be elaborated on with the aim of understanding their effects on the children's disclosure patterns and narratives.

## Method

### Sample

The three investigations were drawn from a sample (Katz *et al.*, 2010) of 1,424 Israeli children (728 boys and 696 girls) aged four to thirteen years ( $M = 8.19$ ,  $SD = 2.12$ ) who were referred for investigation following suspicions of physical ( $n = 1,222$ ) or sexual ( $n = 202$ ) abuse by a family member. Most of the suspected perpetrators were biological parents ( $n = 1,117$ ), but some were step-parents ( $n = 113$ ), siblings ( $n = 64$ ) or extended family members ( $n = 70$ ). These interviews were selected because they best followed the Revised Protocol guidelines and displayed accurate and responsible use of the intervention techniques presented in this paper, which were employed in response to children's difficulties in disclosing and elaborating on alleged abuse. Another selection criterion was the existence of evidence external to the children's narratives (such as a suspect's admission to the police or a clear medical examination pointing to a clear conclusion concerning abuse).

Seven experienced social workers trained in investigative interviewing from all regions of Israel conducted a total of 613 interviews using the Standard NICHD Investigative Protocol and 811 interviews using the Revised Protocol. The Standard Protocol has been mandatory in Israel since 1996, and all interviewers were trained in its use prior to the study. It is important to note that, in Israel, social workers are the only professionals that were given the permission of interviewing maltreated children for the legal process. The interviewers conducted interviews using the Standard Protocol for eight months before being introduced to the Revised Protocol in two day-long sessions, during which the rationale for the revisions was explained. Interviews were then conducted using the Revised Protocol for eight months. Throughout the study, supervision was provided to participating interviewers by the author during monthly scheduled sessions. Supervision of Standard Protocol interviews focused on cognitive but not socio-emotional factors, while supervision of Revised Protocol interviews focused exclusively on socio-emotional factors.

### The NICHD Protocol

The NICHD Protocol (Lamb *et al.*, 2008) is fully structured and covers all phases of the investigative interview. In the introductory phase, interviewers introduce themselves, clarify the children's task (the need to describe experienced events truthfully and in detail) and explain the ground rules and expectations (i.e. the child can and should say 'I don't remember', 'I don't know', 'I don't understand' or correct the interviewer when appropriate). The rapport-building phase comprises two sections. The first is a structured, open-ended section designed to encourage children to provide personally

meaningful information. In the second section, children are prompted to describe in detail one recent event to practise the retrieval of episodic memory and to further develop rapport between the child and the interviewer. In addition to its rapport-building function, this phase of the interview is designed to simulate both the open-ended investigative strategies and techniques used in the substantive phase and the related patterns of interaction between interviewers and children while demonstrating to the children the specific level of detail expected of them.

In a transitional phase between the pre-substantive and substantive parts of the interview, open-ended prompts are used to identify the target event/s to be investigated. If the child does not disclose in response to open-ended prompts, the interviewer proceeds to gradually narrow the prompts, referring to available information about previous disclosures, physical marks or other evidence as needed.

### The revised NICHD Protocol

Several changes and additions were made to the NICHD Protocol ([Katz \*et al.\*, 2010](#)). To enhance the child's trust and co-operation with the social worker, the rapport building preceded (rather than followed) the explanation of the ground rules and expectations, and additional guidance was provided to interviewers with respect to building and maintaining rapport. In addition to inviting a narrative about recent experiences during the rapport-building phase, interviewers were encouraged to express interest in the children's experiences, to acknowledge the children's feelings, to echo or explore these feelings and to ask the children to provide more information about personally meaningful topics using free-recall invitations. The revised instructions advised interviewers to encourage children verbally and nonverbally to describe experienced events in both the pre-substantive and substantive portions of the interview. Positive reinforcement of the children's efforts, but not their specific content, was recommended. Similarly, expressions of empathy with the children's expressed feelings regarding the interview experience, but not past experiences, were encouraged.

The list of utterances that interviewers were advised to use when turning the focus to possible abuse was amended to include various supportive comments designed to reduce anxiety and overcome feelings of shame and guilt. Interviewers were advised to explore difficulties the children may have talking about their experiences and to show understanding, acceptance, support and appreciation throughout the interview.

### Ethics statement

The research was approved by the manager of the investigative interview unit in Israel, the head of the youth department of the Israeli police, the vice

president of the Israeli juvenile court and the chairman of the University of Haifa's ethics board.

It is important to note that these interventions were employed by the social workers as part of an improvement of their intervention skills. These interventions were encouraged in the Israeli legal system in Israel, which had been repeatedly asked by the unit handling child abuse to find a better way to address children's emotional difficulties during the investigation.

## Case illustrations

### Investigative interview number 1

A twelve-year-old girl was interviewed about alleged sexual abuse committed by her father. The girl reported spontaneously to her teacher at school: 'I am tired. My dad is keeping me awake all night.' When the teacher asked about this comment in an effort to understand its meaning, the girl replied: 'Now that I am older, I am afraid to get pregnant.' Two days after the disclosure to the teacher, a female investigative interviewer came to the girl's school. The girl looked guarded and did not communicate with the interviewer.

The girl provided non-verbal cues regarding her reluctance (e.g. avoiding eye contact, not answering questions, closed body language) as well as verbal cues (such as answering 'I don't know' and 'I don't remember' to the questions asked by the interviewer). The interviewer responded with supportive rapport-building statements.

The following exchange is an example of the rapport-building phase of the interview:

Interviewer: Tell me about things you love to do at school.

Girl: I do not know.

Interviewer: I really want to get to know you better. Tell me about anything that makes you feel happy.

Girl: I cannot remember.

Interviewer: Thank you for trying to. Can you tell me about things that make you feel sad at school?

Girl: Not really.

Interviewer: I understand that it is hard for you. You don't know me, but I am here for you, and I need your help in getting to know you better.

Girl: I love to dance.

Interviewer: Thank you for sharing this with me. Tell me more about your love of dancing.

Girl: I love to dance ballet with my friends; this is my time out . . .

This example emphasises the importance of basic non-suggestive support in interviews with children. As illustrated, it was difficult for the girl to open up

to the interviewer. The interviewer saw and echoed her difficulties ('I understand that it is hard for you. You don't know me'), empowered her as the sole source of information ('I need your help in getting to know you better') and, when the girl co-operated, acknowledged her efforts and shared her appreciation ('Thank you for sharing this with me').

Following the rapport-building phase, the interviewer discussed the alleged abuse with the girl. The girl disclosed the alleged abuse to the interviewer in response to the following open-ended invitation:

Interviewer: So, [girl's name], I understand that something might have happened to you. Please tell me everything about it from the beginning to the end as best as you can.

Girl: Yes, my dad is touching me and it hurts and I am afraid because I can get pregnant.

From this point on, the girl provided a detailed testimony relating to several incidents of abuse by her father. It was difficult for her and many times she said 'I am afraid to say that', 'I am ashamed' or 'I am embarrassed'. The interviewer did not ignore the emotional difficulties the girl mentioned; instead, she acknowledged and respected them, and she provided the girl with supportive statements.

The interviewer invited the girl to talk more about her feelings: 'You are saying that you are afraid to say that. Tell me more about that.'

The interviewer acknowledged and legitimised the girl's feelings: 'You said "I am ashamed." I understand what you are saying. Many children feel that when talking to me, but you can trust me, and I am the one you can share your story with.'

At the end of the interview, the interviewer asked the girl to respond to the following queries:

Tell me how you felt before our meeting.

Tell me how you felt during our meeting.

Tell me how you are feeling now that our meeting over.

The main aim of these invitations was to obtain mutual acknowledgement and understanding of the significant and unique experience that just occurred.

The girl replied as follows:

Before our meeting, I was angry at myself for disclosing to my teacher. I was afraid. I thought to myself, why the hell did you not continue to shut up? Why did you have to talk?

During our meeting, I understood that you care for me, you respect me and did not push it.

Now that our meeting is over, I am afraid of what will happen next, but for the first time I am feeling like someone really understands me, and for some reason I am not feeling so weird like I did something wrong or something. Now I am feeling like maybe there is hope for me.

## Investigative interview number 2

A five-year-old girl was referred to an investigative interview due to suspicions that her father had sexually abused her. The suspicions were raised due to the girl's inappropriate sexual behaviour in nursery school (touching her genitals obsessively). When the nursery teacher asked 'How are you?', the girl responded: 'Daddy is bothering me.'

The girl was very quiet at the beginning of the interview and did not communicate with the interviewer. After asking some questions, the interviewer recognised that the girl was uncomfortable, so she invited her to draw what was on her mind because she wanted to get to know her better. The girl happily accepted the invitation to draw, and she drew some flowers and a butterfly.

The interviewer said: 'Thank you for this drawing. I am really looking forward to getting to know you.'

Following this exchange, the girl began talking to the interviewer. Although her verbal abilities were limited due to her young age, she revealed some relevant forensic details regarding the abuse ('Daddy touching my privates . . . it hurts me').

When it was difficult for her to continue to talk or when she could not find the words, she asked the interviewer if she could draw. Although there were only scribbles on the page, the act of drawing itself was very reassuring for the girl, and having her hands busy helped her to speak freely with the interviewer.

## Investigative interview number 3

A ten-year-old boy was interviewed due to suspicions that his mother had sexually abused him. Although he co-operated with the interviewer in the preliminary portion of the interview and disclosed information about himself, he completely shut down when the interviewer attempted to talk to him about the reason he came to the interview.

The interviewer reported that, although the boy sounded confident and verbally denied that anything had happened to him, his non-verbal behaviour showed great stress (he pulled his hair and obsessively sucked his finger). The interviewer asked him the following supportive question:

Interviewer: I can see that your body keeps moving. How are you feeling?

Boy: Not good.

Interviewer: I understand what you are saying to me. How can I help you?

Boy: I don't know.

Interviewer: If there is something you wish to share with me, would you like to write it down or to draw it?

Boy: Yes, to write it down.

Interviewer: You are very brave for staying here with me. I am here for you, and here is a paper and a pencil. The boy wrote: 'My mom is touching me and I think it is not ok.'

Interviewer: Would you like to read what you wrote or would you like me to read it aloud?

Boy: You can read it.

After the interviewer read it, the boy was able to disclose some details about the abuse by his mother. Although his narrative was very poor and he had difficulties retrieving events, he provided a coherent narrative about the main abuse ('She forced me to kiss her vagina, and she kissed mine').

This case is another illustration of the importance of support and active listening by the interviewer. The interviewer took note of the boy's verbal and non-verbal signals, verbally demonstrated that she was focused on him, allowed the boy the right to choose his method of disclosure and, through these actions, returned to him some of the control that was taken from him during the abusive incidents (e.g. asking how the interviewer could help, giving the boy the choice to write or draw, giving the boy the choice to read or have the interviewer read). Finally, by listening to the boy's story and not pushing, the interviewer demonstrated understanding that this was the first time the boy had understood and disclosed the events.

The interview was a powerful experience for the boy and helped him not only to remember the events, but, importantly, to overcome his difficulties with disclosing and acknowledging the abuse:

After writing it down, I talked to you; I was able to tell you what happened to me. You understood, and now I hope that I will feel better.

## Discussion and practical implications

Using case studies of complicated sexual abuse accusations by children against their parents, with variations in the children's age (five, ten and twelve) and gender (two girls and a boy) and in the sex of the suspected perpetrators (two fathers and one mother), this study documents interventions that were taken from the clinical context to the legal context, with adaptations to ensure that the legal process would not be contaminated. This study presents a salient practice for social workers across child welfare and legal systems that clearly puts the focus on the best interests of the child.

Because our society provides children with the right to be heard in the legal process, it is our responsibility to provide them with interventions that are not only developmentally appropriate, but also emotionally modified. The interventions presented in this study put the focus not only on the children's testimonies and their place in the legal context, but also on the children's experiences during these investigations and the social worker's obligation to not only obtain clear, accurate testimony rich in forensically relevant details, but also to notice and address the children's well-being. As expected

based on findings from previous studies (Pipe *et al.*, 2007), the children in the current study were reluctant to disclose the suspected abuse. They signalled their resistance to the interviewers with verbal and non-verbal cues. One of the greatest challenges for practitioners working with children is to detect their resistance. In the forensic context, this challenge is even greater given, that the forensic investigation is the first and usually only meeting with the children. For this reason, training social workers and other professionals in resistance and its indicators is highly important and can promote their understanding of children's difficulties and help them to modify their interview methods according to individual children's needs (Pipe *et al.*, 2007; Lamb *et al.*, 2011).

Training social workers in the forensic context is a challenging task (Stewart *et al.*, 2011). The current paper addresses another area with which social workers should become familiar (children's emotional states and indicators of resistance) in addition to gaining practical knowledge of children's development and good practices. It is well documented (Malloy *et al.*, 2011) that theoretical knowledge alone does not make a difference in practitioners' practical interventions. Therefore, practical guidelines are extremely important. In the current study, all interviews followed the practical guidelines of the Revised NICHD Protocol; however, providing non-suggestive emotional support is a complicated task.

Providing children with support in the clinical context is important and relatively harmless, but including this support in the forensic context is difficult due to the risk of contaminating the legal process. The legal system demands reliable testimony from children. This is why social workers' interventions during investigations are being explored in court (Lamb *et al.*, 2011) and why many practitioners are especially careful when approaching children, often choosing to ignore their emotional state during the investigation (Hershkowitz *et al.*, 2006). During the training process in the current study, the social workers expressed their concerns with respect to support. Many of them were reluctant to employ these interventions, and the training process was highly demanding. However, after emotional work and intensive training on suggestive versus non-suggestive support, the interviewers felt more comfortable in employing these interventions.

As this paper discussed only three interviews and their effects on the children's disclosure patterns and narratives, it is important to stress that the effects of non-suggestive support cannot be generalised from this study alone. Future studies should seek to gain a better understanding of how these interventions impact children's testimony, as well as their well-being following an investigation. The potential of these interventions on children's well-being can be explained as giving them the opportunity to play an active role during an investigation (by drawing or writing). Providing them with the right to choose may return some control to these children, whose control was taken from them through the abuse (Dewey, 1963, 1980). Previous qualitative studies (Westcott and Davies, 1996) have demonstrated this result in children's narratives

following investigative interviews. The interviewed children stressed the importance of feeling that the interviewer believed them and the importance of receiving support and active listening from the interviewer.

It is important to note that, although this paper addresses the potential of non-suggestive support on children's disclosure patterns and narratives within the legal context, we should consider the conclusions carefully given the limitations of the study. In addition to the need to further explore the impact of these interventions on children's testimony and well-being, it is also important to assess whether these interventions affect the legal outcomes for these investigations.

The interventions illustrated in this study strongly emphasise the important role that social workers have when interviewing maltreated children within the legal context. Interviewing children within the legal context demands that the professionals carefully strike a balance between producing rich, accurate and clear testimonies and keeping the best interest of the children. Moreover, putting the focus on providing non-suggestive support to maltreated children during the legal process declares that two outcomes are influential: one is promoting justice and the other is generating the children's recovery process.

Providing maltreated children with modified interventions based on their individual developmental and emotional states is relevant not only to social workers within the legal context, but also to social workers in the clinical context and in the child welfare system. The experience presented in this study should be applied in these other contexts, while retaining the use of practical guidelines for social workers and suitable training and, above all, providing children with modified interventions that are focused on their best interests.

## Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the collaborative work with Professor Michael Lamb for Cambridge University and with Professor Irit Hershowitz from Haifa University on this study. The author gratefully acknowledges the great partnership of the Unit of Investigative Interviews in Israel. This research was supported by the Nuffield Foundation.

## References

- Aldridge, M. and Wood, J. (1998) *Interviewing Children: A Guide for Child Care and Forensic Practitioners*, Chichester, John Wiley.
- Cornah, C. E. and Memon, A. (1996) 'Improving children's testimony: The effects of social support', presented at the biennial meeting of the American Psychology–Law Society, Hilton Head, TX.
- Corwin, D. L. and Keeshin, B. R. (2011) 'Estimating present and future damages following child maltreatment', *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, **20**(3), pp. 505–18.

- Davis, S. L. and Bottoms, B. L. (2002) 'Effects of social support on children's eyewitness reports: A test of the underlying mechanism', *Law and Human Behavior*, **26**, pp. 185–215.
- Dewey, J. (1963) *Experience and Education*, New York, Collier.
- Dewey, J. (1980) *Art as Experience*, New York, Perigee.
- Goodman, G. S., Bottoms, B. L., Schwartz-Kenney, B. and Rudy, L. (1991) 'Children's memory for a stressful event: Improving children's reports', *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, **1**, pp. 69–99.
- Goodman-Brown, T. B., Edelstein, R. S., Goodman, G. S., Jones, D. P. H. and Gordon, D. S. (2003) 'Why children tell: A model of children's disclosure of sexual abuse', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **27**, pp. 525–40.
- Greenstock, J. and Pipe, M. E. (1996) 'Interviewing children about past events: The influence of peer support and misleading questions', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **20**, pp. 69–80.
- Greenstock, J. and Pipe, M. E. (1997) 'Are two heads better than one? Peer support and children's eyewitness reports', *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, **11**, pp. 461–83.
- Gupta, S., Bonanno, G. A., Noll, J. G., Putnam, F. W., Keltner, D. and Trickett, P. K. (2011) 'Anger expression and adaptation to childhood sexual abuse: The role of disclosure', *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, **3**(2), pp. 171–80.
- Hershkowitz, I. (2009) 'Socioemotional factors in child sexual abuse investigations', *Child Maltreatment*, **14**, pp. 172–81.
- Hershkowitz, I. (2011) 'Rapport building in investigative interviews of children', in M. E. Lamb, D. La-Rooy, L. C. Malloy and C. Katz. (eds), *Children's Testimonies: A Handbook of Psychological Research and Forensic Practice*, 2nd edn, Chichester, UK, Wiley, pp. 179–98.
- Hershkowitz, I., Horowitz, D. and Lamb, M. E. (2005) 'Trends in children's disclosure of abuse in Israel: A national study', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **29**, pp. 1203–14.
- Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J. and Horowitz, D. (2006) 'Dynamics of forensic interviews with suspected abuse victims who do not disclose', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **30**, pp. 753–69.
- Hynan, D. (1999) 'Interviewing: Forensic psychological interviews with children', *The Forensic Examiner*, **8**(3–4), pp. 25–30.
- Katz, C., Hershkowitz, I., Malloy, L. C., Lamb, M. E., Atabaki, A. and Spindler, S. (2012) 'Non-verbal behavior of children who disclose or do not disclose child abuse in investigative interviews', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, **36**(1), pp. 12–20.
- Katz, C., Lamb, M. E. and Hershkowitz, I. (2010) 'The Revised NICHD Protocol and its effect on the way children disclose the allegation for the first time in investigative interviews', paper presented to the American Psychology–Law Society Conference, Vancouver (BC), 18–20 March 2010.
- Kuehnl, K. and Connell, M. (2011) 'Managing children's emotional and clinical needs', in M. E. Lamb, D. La-Rooy, L. C. Malloy and C. Katz. (eds), *Children's Testimonies: A Handbook of Psychological Research and Forensic Practice*, 2nd edn, Chichester, UK, Wiley, pp. 179–98.
- Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y. and Esplin, P. W. (2008) *Tell Me What Happened: Structured Investigative Interviews of Child Victims and Witness*, Chichester, UK and Hoboken, NJ, Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E., La Rooy, D., Malloy, L. C. and Katz, C. (2011) *Children's Testimony: A Handbook of Psychological Research and Forensic Practice*, 2nd edn, Chichester, UK, Wiley Publications.

- London, K., Bruck, M. and Wright, D. B. (2008) 'Review of the contemporary literature on how children report sexual abuse to others: Findings, methodological issues and implications for forensic interviewers', *Memory*, **16**, pp. 29–47.
- London, K., Bruck, M., Ceci, S. J. and Shuman, D. (2007) 'Disclosure of child sexual abuse: A review of the contemporary empirical literature', in M. E. Pipe, M. E. Lamb, Y. Orbach and A. C. Cederborg. (eds), *Child Sexual Abuse: Disclosure, Delay and Denial*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- London, K., Bruck, M., Ceci, S. J. and Shuman, D. W. (2005) 'Disclosure of child, sexual abuse: What does research tell us about the ways that children tell?', *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, **11**, pp. 194–226.
- Malloy, L. C., Lamb, M. E. and Katz, C. (2011) 'Children and the law: Examples of applied developmental psychology in action', in M. E. Lamb and M. H. Bornstein. (eds), *Social and Personality Development*, New York, NY, Psychology Press, pp. 435–76.
- Malloy, L. C. and Quas, J. A. (2009) 'Children's suggestibility: Areas of consensus and controversy', in K. Kuehnle and M. Connell. (eds), *The evaluation of child sexual abuse allegations: A comprehensive guide to assessment and testimony*, Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley and Sons. pp. 267–97.
- McBride, K. L. (1996) 'Child sexual abuse investigations: A joint investigative approach combining the expertise of mental health and law enforcement professionals', *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, **56**, pp. 51–2.
- Morgan, M. K. and Friedemann, V. M. (1988) 'Abuse and religion: When praying isn't enough', in A. L. Horton and J. A. Williamson. (eds), *Interviewing Children about Sensitive Topics*, Lexington, MA, Lexington Books/D. C. Heath, pp. 145–55.
- Moston, S. (1992) 'Social support and children's eyewitness testimony', in H. Dent and R. Flin. (eds), *Children as Witnesses*, Oxford, UK, John Wiley and Sons, pp. 33–46.
- Pipe, M. E., Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y. and Cederborg, A. C. (2007) *Child Sexual Abuse: Disclosure, Delay and Denial*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Poole, A. D. and Lamb, E. M. (1998) *Investigative Interviews of Children: A Guide for Helping Professionals*, Washington, DC, American Psychological Association.
- Powell, M. B. and Lancaster, S. (2003) 'Guidelines for interviewing children during child custody evaluations', *Australian Psychologist*, **38**, pp. 46–54.
- Powell, M. B. and Thomson, D. M. (1994) 'Children's eyewitness memory research: Implications for practice', *Families in Society*, **75**, pp. 204–16.
- Ruddock, A. C. (2006) 'The relationship of interviewer rapport behaviors to the amount and type of disclosure from children during child abuse investigations', *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, **67**(4-B), p. 2241.
- Siegmán, A. M. and Reynolds, M. A. (1983) 'Effects of mutual invisibility and topical intimacy on verbal fluency in dyadic communication', *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, **12**, pp. 443–55.
- Stewart, H., Katz, C. and La Rooy, D. (2011) 'Training forensic interviewers', in M. E. Lamb, D. La-Rooy, L. C. Malloy and C. Katz. (eds), *Children's Testimonies: A Handbook of Psychological Research and Forensic Practice*, 2nd edn, Chichester, UK, Wiley, pp. 199–216.
- Ussher, J. and Dewberry, C. (1995) 'The nature and long-term effects of childhood sexual abuse: A survey of adult women survivors in Britain', *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, **34**, pp. 177–92.
- Westcott, H. L. and Davies, G. M. (1996) 'Sexually abused children's and young people's perspectives on investigative interviews', *British Journal of Social Work*, **26**, pp. 451–74.
- Wyatt, G. E. and Newcomb, M. (1990) 'Internal and external mediators of women's sexual abuse in childhood', *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, **58**(6), pp. 758–67.