

Université de Montréal

Les enfants de trois à cinq ans présumés victimes d'agression sexuelle : un portrait de leur témoignage en fonction du type de questions de l'enquêteur.

**Par
Karine Gagnon**

**Département de psychologie
Faculté des Arts et des Sciences**

Essai doctoral
présenté en vue de l'obtention du grade doctorat en psychologie (D.Psy.)

Juin 2018

© Karine Gagnon, 2018

Résumé

Cette recherche a étudié les relations entre le type de questions employé par les interviewers et la quantité de détails obtenue à l'âge préscolaire, lors de l'enquête policière. Un aspect novateur a résidé dans l'analyse des sous-types de questions (p. ex. : directives ouvertes et fermées). Des analyses de variance ont été effectuées sur 55 protocoles d'entrevue NICHHD concernant des enfants âgés de trois à cinq ans, ayant dévoilé au moins une agression sexuelle. Les résultats révèlent que le style de questionnement des enquêteurs est en phase avec les recommandations actuelles concernant les bonnes pratiques d'entrevue auprès des enfants VAS. Tel qu'attendu, il y a davantage de détails dans les réponses : 1) des plus vieux enfants comparativement aux plus jeunes; 2) à la suite d'invitations comparativement aux autres types de question. Toutefois, l'analyse des sous-types de question révèle que les réponses à un questionnement ouvert utilisant un indice (invitation avec indices et directive ouverte) sont plus informatives qu'en l'absence d'indice (invitation générale). Ces résultats supportent la littérature indiquant que, dès l'âge de trois ans, les enfants sont en mesure de produire des réponses informatives lorsqu'ils sont questionnés de façon appropriée concernant l'agression sexuelle et proposent de reconsidérer les types de question à favoriser lors de l'entrevue. Les résultats suggèrent que l'utilisation de questions ouvertes, comportant un indice mentionné précédemment dans le témoignage de l'enfant, soutient l'obtention de détails lors de l'entrevue d'enquête auprès des présumées victimes d'agression sexuelle d'âge préscolaire.

Mots-clés : enfant, préscolaire, types de question, entrevue d'enquête, agression sexuelle, témoignage, psychologie clinique

Abstract

The present study looks into the association between the types of questions used by interviewers and the number of details obtained among preschoolers during an investigative interview. An innovative aspect of this study concerns the analysis of question subtypes (eg. open-ended directive and closed-ended). Analysis of variance were carried out on 55 NICHD interview protocols conducted among children aged three to five years old who disclosed an episode of sexual abuse. Findings reveal that interviewers' style is in accordance with best practices in conducting investigative interviews with children allegedly victims of sexual abuse. As expected, there are more details in answers: 1) provided by older children compared to younger counterparts; 2) following invitations compared to all other question types. However, the analysis of question subtypes has shown that answers given to an open-ended question using cues (cued invitations or directive open-ended) obtained more details concerning the incident compared to the absence of cues (general invitations). These findings support the fact that children as young as three years old are able to produce informative responses when questioned appropriately about the CSA incident and propose reconsidering the types of question that should mainly be used with them. Findings suggest that the use of open-ended questions, using a cue previously mentioned in the testimony of the child, helps provide a detailed account during an investigative interview conducted among preschoolers allegedly victims of sexual abuse.

Keywords : child, preschoolers, question types, forensic interview, sexual abuse, testimony, clinical psychology

Table des matières

Résumé	i
Abstract.....	ii
Liste des tableaux	v
Liste des sigles	vi
Liste des abréviations.....	vii
Remerciements.....	ix
Apports spécifiques des coauteurs	x
Introduction.....	1
The Challenge of Interviewing Young Children	1
Preschoolers' Ability to Testify	2
Types of Questions and Details Provided	3
Objective of the Present Study	6
Participants and Recruitment.....	7
Procedure	8
Measures	9
Results	10
Control Variables and Data Transformation	10
Interviewers' Behaviour During an Investigation	11
Total Number of Details by Age Group.....	12
Number of Details in Relation to the Type and Subtype of Questions and Age.....	12
Discussion.....	13
Interviewers' Behaviors.....	14
Age Group and Total Number of Details	15
Types of Questions and Number of Details.....	16
Question Subtypes and Number of Details	17
Limitations.....	20
Implications and Directions for Future Studies.....	21
References	23

Annexe 1 : Tableau des corrélations – Covariables.....	32
Annexe 2 : Protocole d’entrevue NICHD.....	33

Liste des tableaux

Table 1	28
Table 2	30
Table 3	31

Liste des sigles

ANOVA : Analysis of variance

CSA : Child sexual abuse

NICHHD : National institute of child health and human development

n : Sample size

p : Probability value

SD : Standard deviation

R^2 : Effect size

SAC : Sexually abused children

SPVM : Service de police de la Ville de Montréal (Police Department of the City of Montreal)

Liste des abréviations

E. g. : For exemple

Et al. : And collaborators

Etc. : Et cætera


I. e. : That is to say

Je dédie cette recherche à ceux et celles qui se dévouent pour un monde meilleur

Remerciements

Mon éternelle gratitude à ma directrice Mireille Cyr qui a joué un rôle majeur dans la qualité de mon parcours doctoral, autant sur le plan scientifique que sur le plan humain. Je remercie la profondeur de sa compréhension intellectuelle et empathique. L'ampleur de ses accomplissements professionnels m'impressionne et ont inspiré mon travail, je lui souhaite un avenir prolifique sur tous les plans. Ma gratitude exponentielle à Pierre McDuff pour son aide inestimable lors de mes analyses statistiques (et pour la beauté de ses orchidées) ainsi qu'à Mélanie Corneau pour la traduction anglaise de mon article. Ma colossale gratitude au Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines (CRSH) et aux Fonds de recherche du Québec – Société et culture (FRQSC) qui ont rendu possible l'accomplissement de cette recherche (et grandement facilité mes études) grâce à leur financement.

Mon infinie gratitude à ma précieuse mère, Pauline Pelletier, pour son amour, sa confiance et son soutien inconditionnel, grâce auxquels j'ai renouvelé ma persévérance et appris à prendre soin de moi. Un grand merci à Léon Parent, mon beau-père pour sa constante empathie. Ma profonde gratitude à mon amoureux, Lévy Bourbonnais, qui enjolive ma vie quotidiennement depuis le début de mon doctorat, grâce à sa présence joyeuse, compréhensive, détendue, aimante, talentueuse et attentionnée. Mon inépuisable gratitude à mes ami.e.s intimes qui, de façons variées et répétées, ont été des complices dans la traversée de ce parcours fastidieux. Leur écoute, disponibilité, humour et sensibilité ont été des coussins moelleux sur lesquels j'ai pu me déposer et me ressourcer. Leur présence dans ma vie m'est indispensable et je les aime profondément (en ordre alphabétique) : Ariane Maurice, André Sauvé, Caroline Martin, David Portelance, Dominique Houdard, Frédéric Lebrasseur, Julie McCabe, Lina Bergeron, Marie-Hélène Hamel, Mélissa Flynn, Pascale Vézina-Gagnon, Stéphanie Abran, ainsi que du laboratoire de recherche avec qui j'ai de mémorables souvenirs, Agnès Alonzo-Proulx, Jonathan Lafontaine ainsi que, les dernières mais non les moindres, Valérie Guertin et Valérie Mercier.

À vous tous et à chacun.e, je vous dis un MERCI tout plein d'amour ! 

Apports spécifiques des coauteurs

1. Référence de l'article publié

Gagnon, K., & Cyr, M. (2017). Sexual abuse and preschoolers: forensic details in regard of question types. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 67, 109-118.

2. Apports spécifiques des coauteurs

Karine Gagnon est l'auteure principale de l'article : recension de la littérature, cotation des protocoles d'entrevue (ex. : sous-types de questions), gestion de la base de données, analyses statistiques, rédaction.

Mireille Cyr a joué un rôle d'encadrement et de supervision en tant que directrice de recherche, pour l'ensemble des étapes du projet et pour la rédaction de l'article.

3. Modifications depuis la publication de l'article

Cet essai doctoral comporte des modifications ayant été apportées après la publication de l'article.

Introduction

The Challenge of Interviewing Young Children

Since the child is generally the only witness during an episode of sexual abuse, the investigative interview carried out with the child is often the only reliable way to collect information in order to determine if the allegations are deemed well-founded. In this context, the accuracy and the number of details obtained from the child's recollection of events are crucial. Many controlled and field studies have examined these variables (Brown et al., 2013; Goodman & Melinder, 2007; Saywitz, Lyon, & Goodman, 2011) and there is an existing consensus in the literature concerning the best practices in investigative interviews designed for alleged victims of child sexual abuse (CSA) (Lamb, Hershkowitz, Orbach, & Esplin, 2008; Lyon, 2010; Saywitz & Camparo, 2009; Thakkar, Jaffe, & Vander Linden, 2015). Namely, open-ended questions have shown to yield more detailed, accurate and coherent reports compared to close-ended and suggestive questions among preschool and school-aged children, even though young children's performance on these three variables is generally poorer than older counterparts (Feltis, Powell, Snow, & Hughes-Scholes, 2010; Hershkowitz, Lamb, Orbach, Katz, & Horowitz, 2012; Lamb et al., 2003; Orbach et al., 2000; Lyon, 2014; Snow, Powell, & Murfett, 2009). However, it seems difficult for the interviewers to maintain best practices especially with young children, as observed in two recent Canadian studies who reported the overuse of closed-ended questions and underuse of open-ended questions (Luther, Snook, Barron, & Lamb, 2014; Roberts & Cameron, 2015). Other studies also observed that the use of directive questions is clearly superior to more open invitations (Andrews, Lamb, & Lyon, 2015; Yi, Lamb, & Jo, 2014). Closed-ended questions limit the spontaneous recollection of events from the child, as well as decrease the quantity of information reported

(Lyon, 2014; Snow et al., 2009). In addition, this type of question increases children's suggestibility, making them more likely to provide an answer even when they do not know the answer or understand the question (Peterson, Dowden, & Tobin, 1999; Walker, 2013; Waterman, Blades, & Spencer, 2000). Furthermore, interviewers may present difficulties in adapting to the child's developmental state (Marchant, 2013; Olafson & Kenniston, 2008; Walker, 2013). They often use multiple choice or suggestive questions when interviewing preschoolers and they do not use simple language as recommended (i.e. questions may be too long and complicated, ambiguous references are made about people, etc.) (Korkman, Santtila, Drzewiecki, & Sandnabba, 2008; Powell & Snow, 2007). The present study aims to verify the types of questions that are mainly used by interviewers when they are conducting investigative interviews in the context of sexual abuse among preschoolers, and identify the questions that are most likely to produce a quality answer, as measured by a higher number of details obtained.

Preschoolers' Ability to Testify

Many studies have revealed that preschoolers are less likely to disclose an episode of abuse and when they do, the number of details obtained from the child is lower and the overall report is less coherent and complex than the report provided by older counterparts (Hershkowitz, Horowitz, & Lamb, 2005; Lamb et al., 2003, 2008; Orbach & Lamb, 2007). Yet, when preschoolers disclose an episode during an investigative interview, more than 80% of them do so through open-ended questions (Lamb et al., 2008). Research has shown that sexually abused children (SAC) as young as three years old are able to provide a short and accurate testimony of the abuse they have experienced (Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2003 and 2008; Marchant, 2013; Walker, 2013). Among children aged three to five years old,

open-ended and directive questions (particularly: who, what, where) should be favoured over "yes/no" questions, since they yield more accurate answers (Peterson et al. 1999; Walker, 2013; Waterman et al., 2000). However, in response to open-ended questions, very young children generally provide a shorter report, thereby increasing the challenges associated with the investigation (Marchant, 2013).

Types of Questions and Details Provided

Researchers have created different categories of questions used by interviewers to look at the associations between the number of details provided, the type of questions used and the age of children. Consequently, definitions of question types vary among authors. However, the following broad definitions encompass the differences between articles cited in this section. Open-ended questions (e.g., invitations and open directive questions) allow the child to provide an elaborate and spontaneous response using free recall memory, while closed-ended questions (e.g., closed directive and option-posing questions) aim to find specific information provided with a few words only and using recognition memory. Suggestive questions are classified separately because they undermine the accuracy of the response, so they need to be avoided. See further definitions and examples in Table 1.

Open-ended questions: invitations. A few studies conducted among SAC with samples of school and preschool aged children indicate that the production of details increases with age for all types of questions, but open-ended questions, such as invitations, generally help provide better reports of events (Feltis et al., 2010; Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2003; Snow et al., 2009). This type of questions generated almost half of details in a sample of SAC aged four to eight years old (Lamb et al., 2003). At four years old, the use of invitations seems preferable to other types of questions, since they provide a greater amount of

information (Lamb et al., 2003). This result was replicated by Hershkowitz and her colleagues (2012) among a sample of SAC closer to the preschool age (three to six-year-old). The effectiveness of invitations was however age differentiated: invitations were superior to any other type of questions only for children aged five and six. Authors suggest that there may be a developmental threshold starting at five years old in order to obtain a detailed description of events following invitations, which contradicts in part Lamb et al.'s (2003) findings that pointed to this association in children as young as four years old.

Differences between types of invitations. There are three subtypes of open-ended invitation questions: general invitations, cued invitations and time segmentation invitations (see Table 1). Lamb et al. (2003) have looked at the associations between the subtypes of invitations and the number of details obtained, namely as it concerns the testimony of preschoolers who have been victims of sexual abuse. Results indicate that children aged four years old provided fewer details than older counterparts following general invitations, and the number of details obtained through cued invitations increased with age. As for time segmentation invitations, while they help to better organize the sequence of events for children as young as four years old, they are clearly more efficient at eight years old (Lamb et al., 2003).

Invitation or directive question? Directive questions guide the child's answers by asking him/her to clarify information through questions such as "who, what, when, where, how, which one, what is" (Lamb et al., 2003). Since the structure of directive questions may vary between closed-ended questions or open-ended questions (see Table 1), its classification in one of these categories remains ambiguous (Lyon, 2014). Recent findings from Andrews, Ahern, Stolzenberg and, Lyon (2016) propose a similar analysis about the classification of

invitations and directive questions. The productivity of different types of directive questions (“Wh” prompts) has been compared. The most open-ended directive questions yielded the greatest number of details from school-aged children in contrast with all other kinds of directive questions. This finding can be attributed to the similarity between the requested information through the most open-ended directive question (e.g., what happened?) and the general invitation (e.g., tell me everything that happened from the beginning until the end). Hence, these findings highlight the fluctuation in the number of details produced in relation with directive question subtypes, as well as a similarity between directive questions that are very open and invitations. From a different perspective, when the number of details provided is looked at as a function of question type, directive questions come in second. While they produce fewer overall details than invitations, they still get more details than closed-ended yes/no or multiple-choice questions (Andrews et al., 2016; Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2008).

In contrast, other studies reveal that directive questions are more effective in producing more details from young victims. Korkman et al.’s (2008) study, conducted among children aged three to eight years old, reported that facilitators and directive or suggestive questions produced more details than invitations or option-posing questions. The developmental hypothesis concerning the increase in the number of details provided as a function of age (pre-school or school age) has also been contradicted. Hershkowitz et al. (2012) observed an interaction whereby children aged three and four gave the same number of details following directive questions and invitations, while those aged five and six provided more details following invitations compared to all other types of questions, including directive questions. Since directive questions are more precise than invitations in terms of the specific information

being sought, authors believe that this can explain why children aged three and four years old perform better, considering their level of cognitive development (Hershkowitz et al., 2012).

In sum, studies conducted up until now have examined the associations between the types of questions used by interviewers and the number of details provided by children, but none has looked into this association only among preschoolers (i.e. children aged three to five years old). Moreover, there seems to be a confusion regarding the type of question that produces more details among preschoolers. While invitations and directive questions may provide more details than closed-ended questions, their respective effectiveness has yet to be demonstrated. At last, cued invitations and directive questions may act similarly in helping young children to better answer questions. It is also possible that cued invitations may be more similar to open-ended directive questions, but to date, no study has discriminated subtypes of open-ended and closed-ended directive questions among preschoolers who have been victims of sexual abuse.

Objective of the Present Study

The present study aims to analyze interviewers' behaviors in a real investigative context with alleged victims of CSA aged three to five years old, and to examine the relations between the types of questions used and the number of details provided during the interviews. In order to achieve this, the number of details provided will be analyzed in terms of four types of questions used by interviewers (i.e. invitations, directive, option-posing and suggestive), three subtypes of invitations (general, cued, time segmentation) and two subtypes of directive questions (open-ended and closed-ended). Regarding types of questions, it is expected that 1) there will be a greater number of details provided following invitations and directive questions compared to option-posing and suggestive questions; 2) children aged five will provide more

details following every type and subtype of questions compared to younger counterparts; 3) an interaction effect will be obtained between age and question type: children aged three will provide more details following directive questions in contrast with invitations, while invitations will help children aged five to provide more details than directive questions. As for subtypes of questions, it is expected that the number of details provided, regardless of age: 1) will be inferior following closed-ended directive questions compared to open-ended questions; 2) will be the same following open-ended directive questions compared to general invitations or cued invitations.

Methodology

Participants and Recruitment

The interviews were conducted by police officers in the context of their regular work following complaints filed with the Montreal Police Service (SPVM) or reports to the Youth Protection Director. Interviews were selected from a database of three research projects (from 2000 to 2015). Access to police interviews was made possible through an authorization of the Commission d'accès à l'information or by the consent of the parent to participate depending of the study. A total of 93 police interviews with suspected SAC aged between three and five years old has been listed (22 between 2000 and 2006, 71 between 2012 and 2015). Of these, 55 interviews (18 between 2000 and 2006, 37 between 2012 and 2015) were selected to constitute the sample, based on the following criteria: children were aged three to five years old, be an alleged victim of CSA and disclose at least one episode of sexual abuse in a police interview using the NICHD protocol (notwithstanding whether or not the complaint turned out to be well-founded as a result of the police investigation). The sample is made up of 65% girls and 35% boys, and the mean age is 4.2 years old ($SD = 0.8$). The 55 interviews were divided

into three age groups: 13 interviews in the three years old group, 18 interviews in the four years old group and 24 in the five years old group. Fifty-three percent of alleged victims reported one episode, 43% reported more than one, and 4% did not provide enough details to conclude whether there were one or more episodes. The proportion of intrafamilial abuse (immediate family) was 44%, and the proportion of extrafamilial abuse (extended family, acquaintance or other) was 56%. The type of abuse behavior reported varied from exhibitionism ($n = 1$), touching on top of clothes ($n = 15$), touching under clothes ($n = 19$), oral sex or penetration ($n = 20$). Overall, 11% of children reported the presence of violence (were held, sequestered, or hit). The majority of perpetrators were males (89%), 9 % were females, and one was not specified in the interview. The mean age for perpetrators was 32.5 years old ($SD = 15.4$). Following the police investigation, 37.3% of the files were substantiated, 39.2% were classified as unfounded and for 23.5% no conclusion were drawn.

Procedure

The NICHD investigative interviews were all conducted by trained police officers at the Centre d'expertise Marie-Vincent, in Montreal City, in the province of Quebec. This was a one-time interview, which varied in duration for each child (usually less than 45 minutes). At the time of recruitment, the alleged victims' parents signed a consent form authorizing the research team to have access to the interview recording. These interviews were transcribed and all the personal information was removed in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Data analysis focused on the declarative part of the interview, i.e. the part where the investigator attempts to obtain information on the alleged CSA, thus excluding the first part of the interview that aims to establish ground rules and alliances. Coding was performed by graduate students who completed training on NICHD interview coding so they could: 1)

identify the type of question used by interviewers; 2) identify the number of details reported by children. Inter-rater coding was carried out on 20% of interviews to ensure reliability. Intra-class correlations varied from .81 to .98 for the number of details and from .88 to .99 for types of questions.

Measures

Interview coding. The coding grids used in the present study come from the French version of the NICHD scoring manual (Original version by Lamb et al., 1996; Orbach et al., 2000; French version by Cyr, Dion, Perreault, & Richard, 2002). These grids allowed the categorization of the types of questions asked by interviewers, as well as the number of details provided by children. Among the six categories combining interviewers' statements, two were excluded (facilitators and summaries), since their objectives were mainly to encourage the child to keep talking rather than to uncover specific information. The four remaining categories were (see Table 1): 1) invitations that aim to provide the free recall of the incident by the child (composed of three subtypes); 2) directive questions that seek more closely additional information on content that has been previously mentioned by the child (composed of two subtypes); 3) option-posing that center the child's attention on content he/she did not mention using multiple choice or yes/no questions, but without expecting a specific answer and 4) suggestive questions that guide the child's answers towards an expected answer or introduce information not already provided by children. The subtypes of invitations (general, cued, time segmentation) and the directive questions (open-ended and closed-ended) were also categorized (see Table 1). While each invitation subtype allows the child to come up with an answer using his/her free recall memory, they all operate differently. General invitations, the most open subtype, encourage the child to further elaborate without guiding the answer; cued

invitations aim to provide further information by using a clue previously mentioned by the child and time segmentation invitations aim to get more information from a specific portion of the event reported by the child. Directive questions also use cues previously mentioned by the child, but in a narrower way than cued invitations: closed-ended directive questions aim to provide short answers on a topic or a specific clue, while open-ended directive questions allow the child to elaborate freely on what is being sought. The number of details obtained through the child's answers was calculated in accordance to the guidelines provided in the coding grid. A detail was defined as a word or a group of words that identifies or describes people, objects, actions or events associated with a sexual abuse episode. It was counted only if it was new and if it allowed a better understanding of the event.

Information sheet. Finally, during the investigation process, the police completed a sheet providing information on characteristics related to sexual abuse. Different variables were thus collected. For child's variables gender, age, and particular difficulties (e.g., intellectual disability, hyperactivity) were included. For the sexual abuse, the type (e.g., exhibitionism, touch on or under the clothes, penetration), number of incident, and presence of violence (e.g., tied, hit) were documented. For the perpetrator, variables included age, gender, relationship with the victim (e.g., family, unknown). In addition, information regarding a medical examination and if the parents believe the child were also collected.

Results

Control Variables and Data Transformation

Prior to conducting statistical analyses on the amount of details, the dependent variable was transformed to obtain the proportion of reported details for each type of questions, in order to control for the varying length and number of questions asked in every interview. The

presence of covariables potentially associated with the amplitude of the association between independent and dependent variables was verified using correlational analyses (see appendix 1). There were no significant correlations between any of the child variables (gender, particular difficulties, type of sexual abuse, number of sexual abuse, presence of violence), the perpetrator variables (age, gender, relationship with the victim), or any other variables (medical examination, if parents believe the child). The age of children was not taken into account in the analyses since the objective was to obtain specific data concerning the number of details provided by children in each of the three age groups. In statistical analyses, logarithmic transformations were performed on the dependent variables in order to normalize their distributions. For each repeated measure ANOVA, results of the Greenhouse-Geisser are reported as a correction for violation of sphericity as indicated by the Mauchly's test.

Interviewers' Behaviour During an Investigation

A first repeated measure ANOVA (Age x Questions) was conducted as a means to assess the types of questions (invitations, directive, option-posing, suggestive) that were more frequently used by interviewer depending on preschoolers' age (see Table 2). The age of children was not significantly related to a variation in the types of questions used $F(4.68, 121.56) = 0.44, p = .852$. Findings however reveal that the use of different types of questions significantly varies $F(2.34, 121.56) = 81.49, p = .001$ and that it is a large effect ($R^2 = .61$). Results from post-hoc analyses reveal that interviewers tend to use suggestive questions less frequently compared to invitations, directive and option-posing questions (all at: $p < .001$). In addition, they also use fewer option-posing than directive questions ($p = .008$). A second repeated measure ANOVA (Age x Questions) was conducted in order to measure the difference in the use of the five subtypes of questions (general invitations, cued invitations,

time segmentation invitations, directive open-ended and closed-ended) based on children's age (see Table 2). Again, no main effect of age is noted $F(6.41, 166.58) = 0.91, p = .494$. Results however reveal a significant difference in the use of the five subtypes of questions: $F(3.20, 166.58) = 48.18, p = .001$ and it is a large effect ($R^2 = .48$). Post-hoc analyses have shown that interviewers use significantly less time segmentation invitations compared to all the other types of questions. Moreover, cued invitations are used less often than general invitations and open-ended and closed ended directive questions (respectively: $p = .003; p = .008; p = .012$). Finally, a univariate ANOVA was conducted to test whether there was a difference in the total number of questions asked by interviewers in relation with age groups and yielded a non-signification result $F(2, 52) = 1.11, p = .337$.

Total Number of Details by Age Group

A univariate ANOVA was conducted to verify the variations in the total number of details obtained in regard to age groups. Results were significant $F(2, 52) = 11.03, p = .001$ and revealed a large effect ($R^2 = .55$). As expected, Tukey's post-hoc revealed significant mean differences where children aged five years old gave more details than those aged three and four years old (respectively: $p < .001, p = .001$). However, there is no significant difference between three and four years old ($p = .763$).

Number of Details in Relation to the Type and Subtype of Questions and Age

In order to examine the association between the types of questions (invitations, directive, option-posing and suggestive) and the number of details obtained, a repeated measure ANOVA (Age x Question) was conducted (see Table 3). Findings reveal that the number of details obtained varies as a function of questions asked $F(2.04, 106.25) = 20.60, p$

< .001 and this is a large effect ($R^2 = .28$). Invitations yielded significantly more details compared to all other types of question (respectively: $p = .001$, $p < .001$, $p < .001$), followed by directive questions which lead to more details than option-posing and suggestive questions (both $p < .001$). There is no significant difference between the number of details provided using option-posing and suggestive questions ($p = .163$). The age of children was not associated with the number of details provided based on the types of questions used by interviewers, $F(4.09, 106.25) = 2.13$, $p = .081$. However, with regard to the total number of details, children aged five years old gave overall more details (in response of all types of questions) compared to those aged three and four years old (respectively: $p = .003$, $p = .004$).

As for the five subtypes of questions (see Table 3), results from the repeated measure ANOVA indicated that the number of details provided differed based on the subtypes of questions $F(3.2, 166.15) = 3.22$, $p = .022$ and it is a moderate effect size ($R^2 = .06$). Post-hoc analyses revealed that general invitations and time segmentation invitations generally yielded fewer details than open-ended directive questions (respectively: $p = .02$, $p = .003$), while time segmentation invitations provided more details than closed-ended directive questions ($p = .045$). There was no significant association between the age of children and the number of details provided based on the subtypes of questions used by interviewers $F(6.39, 166.15) = 0.85$, $p = .542$. Here too, children aged five years old gave more overall total details in response to all subtypes of questions than those aged three and four years old (respectively: $p = .006$, $p = .008$).

Discussion

The main objectives of the present study were to better understand the behaviors of interviewers in a real investigative context with preschoolers, and to determine whether there

was a relation between the types of questions used and the number of details provided by children. An innovative aspect of the study was to differentiate between subtypes of directive questions (open-ended and closed-ended) and compare them to subtypes of invitations (general, cued, time segmentation). Results have shown that interviewers generally adhere to best practices when conducting an investigative interview with alleged victims of CSA and this tendency does not vary as a function of children's age. Nevertheless, the age of children and the types or subtypes of questions used are associated with the total production of information during the interview. These findings support the fact that children as young as three years old are able to produce short but informative responses when questioned appropriately about the CSA incident (Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Walker, 2013) and suggest reconsidering the types of question that should mainly be used with them.

Interviewers' Behaviors

On one side, and since the accuracy of the information obtained is crucial in the context of an investigative interview, findings from the present study are encouraging. By using significantly fewer suggestive questions than all other types of questions (invitations, directive or option-posing), as well as significantly more directive questions than option-posing questions, investigators have demonstrated a style of questioning that is associated with obtaining more accurate (Peterson et al., 1999; Waterman et al., 2000) and productive (Lamb et al. 2008) reports of events among preschoolers. Moreover, this questioning style is in line with the recommendations made by authors concerning interview best practices (Lamb et al., 2008; Lyon, 2010, 2014; Orbach et al., 2000; Walker, 2013). In addition, these findings contradict results from recent studies that revealed that Canadian interviewers use more closed-ended questions, of which more option-posing questions than directive questions, when

interviewing children (Luther et al., 2014; Roberts & Cameron, 2015). This difference between Canadian and Quebecer interviewers can potentially be explained by the differential training process, since interviewers from Quebec are trained using the NICHD protocol. This standardized protocol promotes the minimization of closed-ended questions, the avoidance of suggestive questions and the increase up to three times more open-ended questions (Benia, Dillenburg, & Milnitsky, 2015; Cyr et Lamb, 2009; Lamb et al., 2008; La Rooy et al., 2015; Orbach et al., 2000). However, the age of children does not affect the number nor the types or subtypes of questions used by interviewers. Hence, interview practices are similar for all preschoolers.

On the other side, interviewers use general invitations with children aged three to five years old as recommended, but they also use as many open-ended or closed-ended directive questions in order to obtain details compared to cued invitations and time segmentation invitations. Hence, it seems difficult for interviewers to adhere to best practices when they are trying to get more information using a subtype of question that specifically uses cues. These findings contradict Lamb et al.'s (2003) who found that interviewers used cued invitations more frequently than general invitations, among four, five and eight-year-olds (compared to six and seven-year-olds). Thus, in our study, interviewers from Quebec who were trained to follow the NICHD interview protocol use more invitations and directive questions to obtain information, which contrasts with other studies that revealed a clear preference for directive questions compared to invitations (Andrews et al. 2015; Yi et al., 2014).

Age Group and Total Number of Details

Firstly, there was no significant interaction effect between age and the types of questions used with regard to the number of details provided, which contradicts the hypothesis

concerning the developmental threshold. It was initially expected that children aged three years old would provide more details following directive questions compared to invitations, while invitations would allow five-year-olds to provide more details in contrast with directive questions. The presence or absence of interaction between these variables can potentially be explained by the variation in age span. In fact, in the studies that did find significant interaction effects, children were older (three to six years old in Hershkowitz et al., 2012; four to eight years old in Lamb et al., 2003) compared to the present study.

Secondly, and as expected, the five-year-olds gave more details in total, as well as overall in response to all types and subtypes of questions than younger counterparts (three and four-year-olds). This finding is in accordance with those reported in other studies in the field, where authors generally observe an increase in the number of details provided in relation with children's developmental abilities (Feltis, Powell, & Roberts, 2011; Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2003, 2008; Snow et al., 2009). Further research is needed, however, in order to better understand the associations between these variables among three and four year old children considering the absence of significant difference between these two groups.

In sum, the variation in the production of details following different types and subtypes of question cannot be explained in terms of age. Hence, findings discussed in the following sections concern preschoolers in general, without discrimination based on specific age group.

Types of Questions and Number of Details

Results reveal that the types of question are associated with a variation in the number of details obtained from preschoolers. Invitations yielded significantly more details than all other types of question, which is in line with the consensus in the literature indicating that invitations contribute to more detailed and productive descriptions of the event among young

children (Feltis et al., 2010; Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2003; Snow et al., 2009). Contrary to the findings reported by Korkman et al. (2008), directive questions come second after invitations, but before option-posing and suggestive questions in terms of the number of details obtained, which incidentally supports findings from other studies with similar results (Andrews et al., 2016; Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2008). Findings thus confirm the present study's hypothesis, namely that invitations and directive questions would lead to a greater number of details than option-posing or suggestive questions.

It seems preferable to prioritize invitations and directive questions to obtain information among preschoolers as young as three years old, but what about their ambiguity concerning their respective effectiveness? Results have shown that invitations are more informative than directive questions, which supports the recommendations on interview best practices (Lamb et al., 2008; Lyon, 2010; Olafson & Kenniston, 2008; Orbach et al., 2000; Walker, 2013). Lamb et al. (2003) proposed to replace directive questions such as "who, what, when" by invitations, since the latter result in the same type of information among young children. While the NICHD interview protocol's structure fits these recommendations and is considered to be adapted for preschoolers, the analysis of question subtypes reveals that few clarifications are warranted.

Question Subtypes and Number of Details

An innovative aspect of the present study is to explore the relationship between the number of details obtained in preschoolers' answers and the subtypes of invitations (general, cued, time segmenting) or directive questions (open-ended, closed-ended) used by interviewers.

A first hypothesis based on Hershkowitz et al. (2012), stated that open-ended directive questions would produce a similar number of details as compared to general or cued invitations. This hypothesis was only partially supported in the present study. Contrary to our initial expectations, open-ended directive questions yielded more information than general invitations, but, as expected, did not differ from cued invitations. In other words, preschoolers who have been victims of sexual abuse tend to provide more information following open-ended questions using cues that was previously mentioned by the child (cued invitations and open-ended directive) compared to open-ended questions without cues (general invitations). First, this finding is in accordance with Hershkowitz et al.'s (2012) hypothesis concerning the similarity of the role of directive questions and cued invitations among young children whose cognitive development is less mature. A more structured formulation of questions (such as in open-ended directive questions or cued invitations) seems to help them better identify the information that is requested and thus provide more productive answers (compared to general invitations). Findings suggest that interviewers should formulate more specific questions that contain a clue previously mentioned by the preschooler. For example: "Tell me more about your clothes (cued invitation)" or "What happened to your clothes? (open-ended directive)" should be use instead of "Then what happened? (general invitation)". If the child never mentioned the clue, then these questions are suggestive which should be avoided ("Your pants were open, right?"). To illustrate otherwise, here is an example of a child's response to an interviewer: "I was in Mama's room when he touched my belly". These are now the cues available to formulate next questions. According to current interview best practices guidelines, it would be recommended to continue with a general invitation ("Tell me everything about that"). Yet, findings showed that there are few chances that preschool-aged children will give a

specific answers to that type of questions. Interviewers should rather prioritise cued invitations ("You mentioned that he was touching your belly, tell me everything about that") or open-ended directive questions ("How did he touch your belly?"), but currently the research does not know yet which of those two options would be preferable to obtain a greater amount of information. Nevertheless, from a practical standpoint, considering the importance of giving interviewers coherent interview practices which can be generalized from preschool-aged to school-aged children, it might be beneficial to prioritize cued invitations, since research showed that they allow the production of details in these two age groups, as well as more accurate details (Brown et al., 2013; Lamb et al., 2003). Second, the absence of a significant difference between open-ended directive questions and cued invitations may reveal a problem of categorization between some subtypes of questions, as previously mentioned by others. Indeed, some authors indicate that there is an oscillation of directive questions between an open-ended and closed-ended formulation (Lyon, 2014), as well as a similarity between directive questions that are "very" open and general invitations in their relative ability to provide details (Andrews et al., 2016). Accordingly, further research is needed in order to better understand the confusion about the role or the categorisation of invitations and directive subtypes in relation to the amount of information collected among preschoolers.

At last, the analysis of question subtypes indicates that the production of details associated with invitations is lower (general or time segmentation invitations) or the same (cued invitations) compared to open-ended directive questions. While Lamb et al.'s (2003) findings indicate that cued invitations are associated with a greater production of information compared to other types of invitations among preschool-aged SAC, the present study reveals a similar relation with open-ended directive questions. Considering these two studies, it is

difficult to determine which of these two question subtypes provides more information among preschoolers. Hence, further research is needed in order to shed some light on the underlying mechanisms associated with detail production in relation with cued invitations and open-ended directive questions.

A second hypothesis put forth in the present study stated that the number of details provided would be inferior following closed-ended directive questions compared to all other subtypes of open-ended questions. This hypothesis was only partially confirmed since only time segmentation invitations yielded more details than closed-ended directive questions. Moreover, there was no significant difference between open-ended and closed-ended directive questions. These findings can potentially be explained by the very young age of children in the present study. Hence, their ability to elaborate and provide detailed and complex answers during the interview are limited compared to older counterparts (Lamb et al., 2003, 2008; Orbach et al., 2000), which may also explain why analyses failed to uncover a statistical mean difference for these different subtypes of questions.

Limitations

One limitation of the present study is inherent to all field studies and it concerns the inability to verify the accuracy of the information provided by alleged victims of CSA during the investigative interview. Also, the results in this study were generated by the analysis of interviews produced by a single police force in a large city in Quebec, which limits the generalization of the data obtained to all Quebec cities. Another limitation concerns the absence of a measure to assess children's cognitive and verbal development. Indeed, there are potential individual variations in children's abilities that can remain undetected when looked at in terms of age groups. This type of measure could have helped us assess the relations

between the production of details and children's developmental levels more precisely. Finally, the analyses conducted do not allow us to establish a causal relationship between the variables.

Implications and Directions for Future Studies

The present study uncovered new and unpublished evidence concerning the types and subtypes of questions used by police officers in a large city in Quebec when conducting an NICHD investigative interview with alleged victims of CSA who are five years old and younger. In addition, the analysis of questions reinforces the importance of using open questioning among preschoolers in order to obtain more detailed information (Hershkowitz et al., 2012; Lamb et al., 2003; 2008), but also reveals that there is some confusion regarding the subtypes of open-ended questions to be used (general invitations, cued invitations or open-ended directive questions), which correspond to the preoccupations noted in other studies in the field (Andrews, et al. 2016; Hershkowitz et al., 2012). Given that the best practices in investigative interviews are currently based on samples including school aged children, it is necessary to reconsider the recommendation to use general invitations as a priority when investigating with preschool-aged SAC. At this age, results indicate that it is rather the open-ended directives questions and cued invitations that are associated with more details about the incident. Accordingly, this study should be replicated in order to better document and understand how to adapt these recommendations to the particular needs of preschoolers. Further research is also needed in order to better understand: 1) what is the difference between cued invitations and open-ended directive questions among preschoolers?; 2) does their similitude suggest a categorization problem of question subtypes or a developmental difference between preschoolers and school-aged children? Future studies should also look into the quality of disclosure, as usually measured by the number of details provided. Yet, this

way of measuring quality is limited since it does not allow us to know if the child answered the questions correctly, i.e. if he/she provided the information expected by the interviewer. In other words, the fact that some children have a difficult time answering questions could be due to the type of content sought by the question (e.g., description of the person, location, clothes) or to the combination between the type of content and the type of question. Measuring the concordance between question content and answers content may help us better understand children's ability to answer specific questions in relation with their age (e.g., what type of question should be used to obtain information on a specific location with three-year-olds?). Future research may also replicate the analogue study conducted by Browns et al. (2013) to assess the ability of five to seven-year-old children to disclose accurate information in a NICHD interview about an event staged four to six weeks ago. Indeed, it would be interesting to repeat this experimental design, but using specifically a preschool-aged sample and adding the evaluation of questions' subtype (including the distinction between open and closed questions). Thus, it would be possible to examine which types of questions can both promote the quantity as well as the accuracy of the details disclosed by the preschool-aged SAC during the NICHD investigation. Ultimately, the objective is that these really young victims can have the best conditions to produce a credible and convincing testimony, in order to facilitate the application of the principles of justice in the case of a judicial process.

References

- Andrews, S. J., Ahern, E. C., Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2016). The Productivity of Wh-Prompts when Children Testify. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. doi:10.1002/acp.3204
- Andrews, S. J., Lamb, M. E., & Lyon, T. D. (2015). Question Types, Responsiveness and Self-contradictions when Prosecutors and Defense Attorneys Question Alleged Victims of Child Sexual Abuse. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 29(2), 253-261. doi:10.1002/acp.3103
- Benia, L. R., Hauck-Filho, N., Dillenburg, M., & Stein, L. M. (2015). The NICHD Investigative Interview Protocol: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 24(3), 259-279. doi:10.1080/10538712.2015.1006749
- Brown, D. A., Lamb, M. E., Lewis, C., Pipe, M. E., Orbach, Y., & Wolfman, M. (2013). The NICHD Investigative Interview Protocol: An analogue study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 19(4), 367-382. doi:10.1037/a0035143
- Cyr, M., Dion, J., Perreault, R., & Richard, N. (2002). *Guide d'entrevue d'enquête en matière d'agression sexuelle auprès des enfants : Guide du NICHD*. Montréal: Centre de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur les Problèmes Conjugaux et les Agressions Sexuelles (CRIPCAS).
- Feltis, B. B., Powell, M. B., & Roberts, K. P. (2011). The effect of event repetition on the production of story grammar in children's event narratives. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 35(3), 180-187. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.11.004
- Feltis, B. B., Powell, M. B., Snow, P. C., & Hughes-Scholes, C. H. (2010). An examination of the association between interviewer question type and story-grammar detail in child witness interviews about abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34(6), 407-413. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.09.019

- Goodman, G. S., & Melinder, A. (2007). Child witness research and forensic interviews of young children: A review. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 12*(1), 1-19.
doi:10.1348/135532506x156620
- Hershkowitz, I., Horowitz, D., & Lamb, M. E. (2005). Trends in children's disclosure of abuse in Israel: a national study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29*(11), 1203-1214.
doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.04.008
- Hershkowitz, I., Lamb, M. E., Orbach, Y., Katz, C., & Horowitz, D. (2012). The development of communicative and narrative skills among preschoolers: lessons from forensic interviews about child abuse. *Child Development, 83*(2), 611-622. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01704.x
- Korkman, J., Santtila, P., Drzewiecki, T., & Kenneth Sandnabba, N. (2008). Failing to keep it simple: Language use in child sexual abuse interviews with 3–8-year-old children. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 14*(1), 41-60. doi:10.1080/10683160701368438
- La Rooy, D., Brubacher, S. P., Aromäki-Stratos, A., Cyr, M., Hershkowitz, I., Korkman, J., . . . 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. doi:10.1108/jcrpp-01-2015-0001
- Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. W. (2008). *Tell me what happened: Structured investigative interviews of child victims and witnesses*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc; US.
- Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Sternberg, K. J., Esplin, P. W., Hovav, M., Manor, T., & Yudilevitch, L. (1996). Effects of Investigative Utterance Types on Israeli Children's Responses. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 19*(3), 627-637.
doi:10.1177/016502549601900310

- Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P. W., Stewart, H., & Mitchell, S. (2003). Age differences in young children's responses to open-ended invitations in the course of forensic interviews. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(5), 926-934. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.71.5.926
- Luther, K., Snook, B., Barron, T., & Lamb, M. E. (2014). Child Interviewing Practices in Canada: A Box Score from Field Observations. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 30*(3), 204-212. doi:10.1007/s11896-014-9149-y
- Lyon, T. D. (2010). Investigative interviewing of the child. In D.N. Duquette & A.M. Haralambie (Eds.) *Child Welfare Law and Practice* (2d ed., pp.87-109). Denver, CO: Bradford
- Lyon, T. D. (2014). Interviewing Children. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 10*(1), 73-89. doi:10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110413-030913
- Marchant, R. (2013). How Young Is Too Young? The Evidence of Children Under Five in the English Criminal Justice System. *Child Abuse Review, 22*(6), 432-445. doi:10.1002/car.2273
- Olafson, E., & Kenniston, J. (2008). Obtaining Information from Children in the Justice System. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 59*(4), 71-89.
- Orbach, Y., Hershkowitz, I., Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., Esplin, P. W., & Horowitz, D. (2000). Assessing the value of structured protocols for forensic interviews of alleged child abuse victims. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 24*(6), 733-752.
- Orbach, Y., & Lamb, M. E. (2007). Young children's references to temporal attributes of allegedly experienced events in the course of forensic interviews. *Child Development, 78*(4), 1100-1120. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01055.x
- Peterson, C., Dowden, C., & Tobin, J. (1999). Interviewing preschoolers: Comparisons of yes/no and wh-questions. *Law and Human Behavior, 23*(5), 539-555.

- Powell, M., & Snow, P. (2007). Guide to questioning children during the free-narrative phase of an investigative interview. *Australian Psychologist*, 42(1), 57-65.
doi:10.1080/00050060600976032
- Roberts, K. P., & Cameron, S. C. (2015). Observations From Canadian Practitioners About the Investigation and Prosecution of Crimes Involving Child and Adult Witnesses. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 15(1), 33-57. doi:10.1080/15228932.2015.997611
- Saywitz, K. J., & Camparo, L. B. (2009). Contemporary child forensic interviewing: Evolving consensus and innovation over 25 years. In B. L. Bottoms, C. J. Najdowski, & G. S. Goodman (Eds.), *Children as victims, witnesses, and offenders: Psychological science and the law* (pp. 102-127). New York, NY: Guilford Press; US.
- Saywitz, K. J., Lyon, T. D., & Goodman, G.S. (2011). Interviewing Children. In J.E.B. Myers (Eds.), *The APSAC handbook on child maltreatment* (3d ed., pp. 337-360). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Snow, P. C., Powell, M. B., & Murfett, R. (2009). Getting the story from child witnesses: exploring the application of a story grammar framework. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(6), 555-568.
doi:10.1080/10683160802409347
- Thakkar, M. J., Jaffe, A. M., & Vander Linden, R. S. (2015). Guidelines for Conducting a Victim-Sensitive Interview. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 24(7), 717-730.
doi:10.1080/10538712.2015.1077365
- Walker, A. G. (2013). *Handbook on questioning children: A Linguistic Perspective* (3rd Ed.). Washington, DC: ABA Center on Children and the Law.
- Waterman, A. H., Blades, M., & Spencer, C. (2000). Do children try to answer nonsensical questions? *The British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 18(2), 211-225.

Yi, M., Lamb, M. E., & Jo, E. (2014). The Quality of Korean Police Officers' Investigative Interviews with Alleged Sexual Abuse Victims as Revealed by Self-Report and Observation. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 30(4), 274-281. doi:10.1007/s11896-014-9157-y

Table 1

Definitions and Examples of Types and Subtypes of Questions

Questions Types Subtypes	Definitions	Examples
Invitations	Focus on the free recall of the event	“Tell me everything that happened from the beginning until the end”
General invitation	The most open question, do not guide the report of events	“Tell me more about that” “Then what happened?”
Cued invitation	Aim to provide further information previously mentioned by the child by using a clue	“You mentioned his hand on your belly, tell me more about that”
Time segmentation invitation	Isolate a specific time frame as reported by the child in order to further explore that moment	“Tell me everything that happens from the time he enters your room until he touches you”
Directive	Try to find more precise information on content previously mentioned by the child	“Who, what, when, where, how, which one, what is (and using a clue from the child)”
Closed-ended directive	Aim to provide short answers on a topic or a specific clue, by using “Wh/how” questions	“You mentioned you were at home. Where exactly were you?”

		“What was the color of your pyjamas?”
Open-ended directive	Allow the child to elaborate freely, by using “Wh/how” questions	“How did he touch you?” “What are you doing with your hands?”
Option-posing	These are multiple choice or yes/no questions that seek information not mentioned, without waiting for a specific answer from the child	“Did it happen during the morning, afternoon, evening or night?” “Was he tall?”
Suggestive	These questions force the response in a specific direction, use false or unknown information, repeat more than twice the same question	“He forced you, isn’t he?” “Tell me everything that happens when you're on the bed” (the child never said he/she was there before in the interview)

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) of the Use of Types and Subtypes of Questions by the Interviewers Based on Children's Age Groups

Questions	Age groups			
	3	4	5	Total
	(<i>n</i> = 13)	(<i>n</i> = 18)	(<i>n</i> = 24)	(<i>N</i> = 55)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Invitations	16.6 (7.0)	18.2 (7.2)	20.3 (14.5)	18.8 (10.9)
General	8.9 (3.0)	9.1 (3.7)	9.2 (6.8)	9.1 (5.1)
Cued	6.9 (4.5)	6.8 (4.1)	8.0 (6.4)	7.4 (5.5)
Time segmentation	0.8 (1.0)	2.3 (3.1)	3.1 (3.6)	2.3 (3.1)
Directive	19.9 (9.9)	22.5 (19.5)	22.9 (13.2)	22.0 (14.9)
Closed-ended	10.5 (7.8)	11.5 (13.6)	10.3 (7.0)	10.7 (9.7)
Open-ended	9.5 (5.9)	11.0 (8.2)	12.5 (9.2)	11.3 (8.1)
Option-posing	12.4 (7.2)	13.6 (8.3)	17.5 (9.3)	15.0 (8.7)
Suggestive	3.0 (2.5)	3.5 (3.4)	3.5 (3.1)	3.4 (3.0)
In total	61.9 (22.2)	65.3 (31.5)	75.7 (32.3)	69.0 (30.0)

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations (in Parentheses) of the Amount of Proportional Details Provided by Children Based on the Type of Questions used and Children's Age Groups

Questions	Age groups			
	3 (<i>n</i> = 13)	4 (<i>n</i> = 18)	5 (<i>n</i> = 24)	Total (<i>N</i> = 55)
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
Invitations	2.2 (2.5)	2.0 (2.2)	5.8 (4.0)	3.7 (3.6)
General	0.8 (0.8)	1.0 (1.1)	2.5 (2.7)	1.6 (2.0)
Cued	1.0 (1.0)	1.0 (1.2)	3.2 (2.8)	2.0 (2.3)
Time segmentation	1.0 (2.2)	1.5 (2.4)	2.2 (2.7)	1.7 (2.5)
Directive	1.3 (1.0)	1.3 (0.7)	2.1 (1.2)	1.6 (1.1)
Closed-ended	1.1 (0.6)	1.0 (0.6)	1.6 (1.1)	1.3 (0.9)
Open-ended	1.6 (2.1)	1.5 (1.0)	2.5 (1.9)	2.0 (1.8)
Option-posing	0.7 (0.5)	0.8 (0.7)	1.2 (0.6)	1.0 (0.6)
Suggestive	0.7 (1.3)	1.1 (1.7)	1.6 (2.2)	1.2 (1.9)
In total	6.2 (3.9)	7.7 (6.1)	14.7 (6.8)	10.4 (7.0)

Annexe 1 : Tableau des corrélations – Covariables

		Invitations - Détails proportionnels	Directives - Détails proportionnels	Proposant un choix - Détails proportionnels	Suggestive - Détails proportionnels
Sexe de l'enfant	Corrélation de Pearson	-,246	-,116	,098	-,039
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,070	,400	,479	,780
Difficultés particulières	Corrélation de Pearson	-,086	-,206	-,047	-,172
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,550	,146	,743	,227
Type d'agression sexuelle	Corrélation de Pearson	,007	,012	-,042	-,100
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,962	,928	,762	,469
Nombre d'agression sexuelle	Corrélation de Pearson	,186	,136	,218	,162
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,177	,326	,114	,241
Âge de l'agresseur	Corrélation de Pearson	,059	-,174	-,108	,105
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,683	,222	,452	,462
Sexe de l'agresseur	Corrélation de Pearson	-,005	,122	-,052	-,074
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,972	,379	,709	,593
Relation entre la victime et l'agresseur	Corrélation de Pearson	,067	,112	,079	-,116
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,626	,418	,565	,398
Présence de violence	Corrélation de Pearson	-,183	-,146	,102	,101
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,198	,307	,477	,482
Si les parents croient l'enfant	Corrélation de Pearson	-,146	-,130	-,037	-,145
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,321	,377	,802	,326
Examen médical	Corrélation de Pearson	,203	,185	,046	,151
	Sig. (bilatérale)	,158	,199	,749	,296

Protocole du NICHD pour les auditions d'enfants

I. Introduction

1. **“Bonjour, je m’appelle _____ et je suis un(e) policier(ière). (Présentez toute autre personne présente dans la pièce; idéalement, personne d’autre ne sera présent). Aujourd’hui, nous sommes _____ et il est _____ heures. Je rencontre en entretien _____ à _____.”**

“Comme tu peux le voir, nous avons une caméra-vidéo (un magnétophone) et des microphones ici. Ils vont enregistrer notre conversation, pour que je me rappelle de tout ce que tu m’as dit. Quelquefois, j’oublie des choses et l’enregistrement me permet de t’écouter sans avoir à tout écrire ce que tu me dis. ”

“Une partie de mon travail est de parler aux enfants [adolescents] sur les choses qui leur sont arrivées. Je rencontre beaucoup d’enfants [adolescents] pour qu’ils me disent la vérité sur des choses qui leur sont arrivées. Alors avant que nous commencions, je veux m’assurer que tu comprends combien c’est important de dire la vérité. (Pour les plus jeunes enfants, expliquez : “Ce qui est vrai ou ce qui n’est pas vrai”).

“Si je dis que mes souliers sont rouges (ou verts) est-ce que c’est vrai ou ce n’est pas vrai?”

[Attendez une réponse, puis dites :]

2. **“Ça ne serait pas vrai parce qu’en réalité mes souliers sont [noirs/bleus/etc.]. Et si je disais que je suis assis(e) en ce moment, est-ce que ça serait vrai ou pas vrai [correct ou pas correct]?”**

[Attendez une réponse.]

3. **“Ça serait vrai [correct], parce que tu peux voir que je suis assis(e) pour vrai.” “Je vois que tu comprends ce que veut dire : dire la vérité. C’est très important que tu me dises seulement la vérité aujourd’hui. Tu dois seulement me parler des choses qui te sont réellement arrivées.”**

[Pause]

4. **“Si je te pose une question que tu ne comprends pas, dis-moi “Je ne comprends**

pas.” Ok ? ” [Pause] “Si je ne comprends pas ce que tu dis, je vais te poser des questions.”

[Pause]

5. “Si je te pose une question et que tu ne connais pas la réponse, dis-moi “Je ne sais pas.” Alors si je te demande “ Quel est le nom de mon chien ? ” [Ou le nom de mon fils] qu’est-ce que tu dirais ?”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant dit, “Je ne sais pas”, dites :]

6. “C’est exact. Tu ne le sais pas, n’est-ce pas ?” [Si l’enfant tente de deviner, dites :]

6a. “Non, tu ne sais pas parce que tu ne me connais pas. Quand tu ne sais pas la réponse, ne devine pas – dis que tu ne le sais pas.”

[Pause]

7. “Et si je te dis des choses qui sont fausses [pas correctes], tu dois me corriger. Ok ?”

[Attendez une réponse.]

8. “Donc si je te dis que tu es une fille de 2 ans [lorsqu’on interroge un garçon de 5 ans, etc.] qu’est-ce que tu dirais ?”

[Si l’enfant nie et ne vous corrige pas, dites :]

“Qu’est-ce que tu dirais si je faisais une erreur et que je disais que tu es une fille de 2 ans [lorsqu’on interroge un garçon de 5 ans, etc.]?”

[Attendez une réponse.]

9. “C’est exact. Maintenant tu sais que tu dois me le dire si je fais une erreur ou si je dis quelque chose qui n’est pas vrai.”

[Pause]

10. “Alors si je disais : tu es debout, qu’est-ce que tu dirais ?”

[Attendez une réponse.]

“OK ou C’est bien ou C’est exact.”

II. Développement de l’alliance

“Maintenant, j’aimerais mieux te connaître.”

1. “Parle-moi des choses que tu aimes faire.”

[Attendez que l’enfant réponde] [Si l’enfant donne une réponse bien détaillée, passez à la question 3] [Si l’enfant ne répond pas, donne une courte réponse ou reste figé, vous pouvez demander:]

2. “Je veux vraiment mieux te connaître. J’ai besoin que tu me parles des choses que tu aimes faire.”

[Attendez une réponse.]

3. “Parle-moi plus de [une activité que l’enfant a mentionné dans son récit. ÉVITEZ DE VOUS CENTRER SUR LA TV, LES VIDÉOS ET LA FANTAISIE.]”

[Attendez une réponse.]

III. Entraînement à la mémoire épisodique

Événement spécial

[NOTE : CETTE SECTION CHANGE SELON L’ÉVÉNEMENT].

[AVANT L’ENTRETIEN, IDENTIFIEZ UN ÉVÉNEMENT RÉCENT QUE L’ENFANT A VÉCU – PREMIÈRE JOURNÉE D’ÉCOLE, FÊTE D’ANNIVERSAIRE, CONGÉ FÉRIÉ, ETC. – PUIS POSEZ LES QUESTIONS CI-DESSOUS À PROPOS DE CET ÉVÉNEMENT. SI POSSIBLE, CHOISISSEZ UN ÉVÉNEMENT AYANT EU LIEU SENSIBLEMENT DANS LA MÊME PÉRIODE QUE LA SITUATION PRÉSUMÉE D’AGRESSION. SI L’AGRESSION PRÉSUMÉE A EU LIEU LORS D’UN ÉVÉNEMENT OU D’UNE JOURNÉE PARTICULIÈRE, CHOISISSEZ UNE FÊTE OU UN ÉVÉNEMENT DIFFÉRENT.]

“Je veux en savoir plus sur toi et sur les choses que tu fais.”

1. “Il y a quelques [jours/semaines] c’était [Jour de fête (Noël)/ ton anniversaire/ la première journée d’école/ autre événement]. Dis-moi tout ce qui s’est passé [à ta fête/ dans la journée de Noël, etc].”

[Attendez une réponse.]

1a. “Pense très fort à [activité ou événement] et dis-moi ce qui s’est passé ce jour-là du

moment où tu t'es levé(e) le matin, jusqu'à [une partie de l'événement mentionné par l'enfant en réponse à la question précédente].”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

1b. “Et après qu'est-ce qui s'est passé ? ”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

1c. “Dis-moi tout ce qui s'est passé après [une partie de l'événement mentionné par l'enfant], **jusqu'à ce que tu ailles te coucher ce soir-là.”**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

1d. “Parle-moi plus de [activité mentionnée par l'enfant].” [Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

1e. “Tout à l'heure, tu as parlé de [activité mentionnée par l'enfant]. **Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.] [Si l'enfant donne une description peu détaillée de l'événement, continuez avec les questions 2 à 2e.] [Note: Si l'enfant donne une description détaillée de l'événement, dites:] **“C'est très important que tu me dises tout ce dont tu te souviens sur les choses qui te sont arrivées. Tu peux me dire les bonnes choses et les mauvaises choses.”**

Hier

2. “Je veux vraiment en savoir plus sur les choses qui t'arrivent. Dis-moi tout ce qui s'est passé hier, du moment où tu t'es réveillé(e) jusqu'à ce que tu ailles te coucher.”

[Attendez une réponse.]

. **2a. “Je ne veux pas que tu oublies rien. Dis-moi tout ce qui s'est passé du moment où tu t'es réveillé(e) jusqu'à** [une activité ou une partie de l'événement mentionné par l'enfant en réponse à la question précédente].” [Attendez une réponse.]

. **2b. “Après qu'est-ce qui s'est passé ?”** [Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

. **2c. “Dis-moi tout ce qui s'est passé après** [une activité ou une partie de l'événement mentionné par l'enfant] **jusqu'à ce que tu ailles te coucher.”** [Attendez une réponse.]

- . **2d. “Parle-moi plus de [activité mentionnée par l’enfant].”** [Attendez une réponse. Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]
- . **2e. “Tout à l’heure tu as parlé de [activité mentionnée par l’enfant]. Dis-moi tout sur ça.”** [Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

Aujourd’hui

SI L’ENFANT NE FOURNIT PAS UN RÉCIT DÉTAILLÉ ADÉQUAT À PROPOS D’HIER, RÉPÉTEZ LES QUESTIONS 2 À 2e SUR AUJOURD’HUI, EN UTILISANT “JUSQU’À CE QUE TU VIENNES ICI” COMME ÉVÉNEMENT FINAL.

“C’est très important que tu me dises tout sur les choses qui te sont vraiment arrivées.”

La partie déclarative de l’entretien

IV. Transition vers les contenus déclaratifs

“Maintenant que je te connais un peu mieux, je veux parler de ce pourquoi tu es ici aujourd’hui.”

[Si l’enfant commence à répondre, attendez.] [Si l’enfant résume l’allégation (Exemple : “David a touché à mon zizi” ou “Papa m’a frappé”) allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant ne fait pas d’allégation, continuez avec la question 1.]

1. “Je comprends que quelque chose t’est peut-être arrivé. Dis-moi tout ce qui s’est passé du début à la fin.”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant ne fait pas d’allégation, continuez avec la question 2.]

2. “Comme je t’ai déjà dit, mon travail est de parler avec les enfants des choses qui peuvent leur être arrivées. C’est très important que tu me dises pourquoi [tu es ici/ tu es venu ici/ je suis ici]. Dis-moi pourquoi tu penses que [ta mère, ton père, ta grand- mère] t’a amené ici aujourd’hui [ou “pourquoi tu penses que je suis venu(e) te parler aujourd’hui”].”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.]

9.] [Si l'enfant ne fait pas d'allégation et que vous ne savez pas s'il y a eu précédemment un contact avec les autorités, allez à la question 4 ou 5.] [Si l'enfant ne fait pas d'allégation, et que vous savez qu'il y a eu précédemment un contact avec les autorités, allez à la question 3.]

3. “J’ai entendu dire que tu avais parlé à [un médecin/ un professeur/ un travailleur social/ un autre professionnel] à [moment/ lieu]. Dis-moi de quoi vous avez parlé.”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l'enfant fait une allégation, allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant ne fait pas d'allégation, et qu'il n'y a aucune marque visible, passez à la question 5.] [Quand des marques sont visibles, que l'interviewer a vu des photos ou s'est fait dire qu'il y avait des marques ou que l'entretien a lieu à l'hôpital ou tout de suite après l'examen médical, dites :]

4. “Je vois [j’ai entendu dire] que tu as des [marques, blessures, bleus] sur ton/ ta/ tes _____ . Dis-moi tout sur ça.”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l'enfant fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant ne fait pas d'allégation, passez à la question 5.]

5. “Est-ce que quelqu’un a fait quelque chose que tu n’as pas aimé ?”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l'enfant confirme ou fait une allégation, allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant ne confirme pas et ne fait pas d'allégation, passez à la question 6.]

6. “Est-ce que quelque chose t’est arrivé à [lieu/ moment de l’incident présumé] ?” [Note : Ne mentionnez pas le nom du suspect ni aucun détail de l’allégation.]

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l'enfant confirme ou fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant ne confirme pas ou ne fait pas d'allégation, allez à la question 7.]

7. “Est-ce que quelqu’un t’a fait quelque chose que tu penses qui n’était pas bien ?”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l'enfant confirme ou fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l'enfant ne confirme pas ou ne fait pas d'allégation, passez à la question 8.]

PAUSE. ÊTES-VOUS PRÊT À POURSUIVRE? SERAIT-IL PRÉFÉRABLE DE PRENDRE UNE PAUSE AVANT D'ALLER PLUS LOIN?

SI VOUS DÉCIDEZ DE POURSUIVRE, VOUS DEVRIEZ AVOIR FORMULÉ DES VERSIONS SPÉCIFIQUES DE LA QUESTION 8 ET 9, EN UTILISANT LES FAITS DONT VOUS DISPOSIEZ AVANT L'ENTRETIEN. SOYEZ CERTAIN(E) QUE CES QUESTIONS SUGGÈRENT AUSSI PEU DE DÉTAILS QUE POSSIBLE À L'ENFANT. SI VOUS N'AVEZ PAS FORMULÉ CES QUESTIONS, PRENEZ UNE PAUSE MAINTENANT POUR BIEN LES FORMULER AVANT DE POURSUIVRE.

- 8. “Est-ce que quelqu’un [résumez brièvement l’allégation ou les soupçons sans mentionner le nom du présumé agresseur ni fournir trop de détails].” (Par exemple : “Est-ce que quelqu’un t’a frappé” ou “Est-ce que quelqu’un a touché ton pipi (zizi/vulve, parties intimes de ton corps) ? ”).**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant confirme ou fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant ne confirme pas ou ne fait pas d’allégation, passez à la question 9.]

- 9. “Ton professeur [le médecin/ psychologue/ voisin] m’a dit /m’a montré [que tu as touché au pipi (parties intimes) d’autres enfants / un dessin que tu as fait], et je veux savoir si quelque chose t’est peut-être arrivé. Est-ce que quelqu’un [résumez brièvement les allégations ou les soupçons sans mentionner le nom du présumé agresseur ni fournir trop de détails].” [Par exemple : “ Est-ce que quelqu’un dans ta famille t’a frappé ” ou “ Est-ce que quelqu’un a touché ton pipi (zizi/ vulve) ou d’autres parties intimes de ton corps?”]**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant confirme ou fait une allégation allez à la question 10 de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant donne une description détaillée, allez à la question 10a de la page 9.] [Si l’enfant ne confirme pas ou ne fait pas d’allégation, allez à la section VIII de la page 13.]

V. Investigation des incidents

Questions ouvertes

- 10.** [Si l’enfant a moins de 6 ans, RÉPÉTEZ L’ALLÉGATION EN UTILISANT LES MOTS DE L’ENFANT et sans fournir de détails ou de noms que l’enfant n’a pas mentionnés.]

[Puis dites :] “[résumé de l’allégation] **Dis-moi tout sur ça.**”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant a plus de 6 ans dites simplement:] **“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

[Attendez une réponse.]

10a. “Après, qu’est-ce qui est arrivé ?” ou “Parle-moi plus de cela.”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire jusqu’à ce que vous ayez une description complète de l’incident présumé.]

[NOTE : SI LA DESCRIPTION DE L’ENFANT EST GÉNÉRALE, ALLEZ À LA QUESTION 12 (SÉPARATION DES INCIDENTS). SI L’ENFANT DÉCRIT UN INCIDENT SPÉCIFIQUE, CONTINUEZ AVEC LA QUESTION 10b.]

10b. “Pense à cette [journée-là / nuit-là] et dis-moi tout ce qui s’est passé depuis [un événement mentionné par l’enfant qui a précédé l’incident présumé d’agression] jusqu’à [l’incident présumé d’agression tel que décrit par l’enfant.]”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire afin de s’assurer que toutes les parties de l’incident aient été élaborées.]

10c. “Parle-moi plus de [personne/ objet/ activité mentionné par l’enfant.]” [Attendez une réponse.]

[Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.] **10d. “Tu as parlé de [personne/ objet/ activité mentionné par l’enfant]. Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.] [Si vous êtes confus(e) concernant certains détails (par exemple, la séquence de certains événements), il peut être utile de dire :]

“Tu m’as dit beaucoup de choses et cela m’est vraiment très utile mais je suis un petit peu mêlé(e). Pour être certain(e) que je comprenne bien, s’il-te-plaît commence au début et dis-moi [comment tout a commencé/ exactement ce qui s’est passé/ comment cela a fini/ etc.]”

Questions spécifiques concernant l’information mentionnée par l’enfant.

[Si certains détails centraux de l’allégation sont toujours manquants ou ambigus après avoir épuisé les questions ouvertes, utilisez des questions directes. Il est important d’associer des questions ouvertes (“invitation à parler”) avec les questions directes à chaque fois que cela est

approprié.] [Note: Centrez tout d'abord l'attention de l'enfant sur le détail mentionné, puis posez la question directe.]

Voici le format général des questions directes :

11. “Tu as dit [personne/ objet/ activité]. [Comment/ quand/ où/ qui/ quel/ qu'est-ce que], [complétez la question directe.]”

Exemples

1. **“Tu as dit que tu étais “au centre d'achat” . Où étais-tu exactement ?”** [Attendez une réponse]. **“Parle-moi de ce centre d'achat.”**
2. **“Tout à l'heure, tu as dit que ta mère t'avait “frappé avec quelque chose de long. ”Parle-moi de cette chose.”**
3. **“Tu as parlé d'un voisin. Connais-tu son nom?”** [Attendre une réponse] **“Parle-moi de ce voisin.”** [Ne pas demander de description]
4. **“Tu as dit qu'un(e) de tes camarades de classe a vu ça. Quel est son nom ?”** [Attendez une réponse] **“Parle-moi de ce qu'il(elle) faisait là.”**

Distinction des incidents

12. “Est-ce que c'est arrivé une fois ou plus d'une fois ?”

[Si l'incident s'est produit une fois, allez à la Pause à la page 12.] [Si l'incident s'est produit plus d'une fois, continuez à la question 13. **RAPPELEZ- VOUS D'EXPLORER EN DÉTAIL CHAQUE INCIDENT RAPPORTÉ EN DÉTAILS COMME SUIT :**]

Exploration des événements spécifiques dans le cas d'incidents multiples.

Questionnement par questions ouvertes

13. “Dis-moi tout sur la dernière fois [la première fois/ la fois à [un endroit]/ la fois où [une activité spécifiée]/ une autre fois dont tu te souviens bien] que quelque chose est arrivé.”

[Attendez une réponse.]

13a. “Et après qu'est-ce qui est arrivé?” ou **“Parle-moi plus de ça.”**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant

cette section.]

13b. “Pense à cette [journée-là/ soirée-là/ nuit-là] et dis-moi tout ce qui s’est passé depuis [événements précédents mentionnés par l’enfant] jusqu’à [l’incident présumé d’agression tel que décrit par l’enfant].”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez des variantes de cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire jusqu’à ce que toutes les parties de l’incident aient été élaborées.]

13c. “Parle-moi plus de [personne/ objet/ activité mentionné par l’enfant].” [Attendez une réponse.]

[Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

13d. “Tu as parlé de [personne/ objet/ activité mentionné par l’enfant]. Dis-moi tout sur ça.”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.]

Questions spécifiques concernant l’information mentionnée par l’enfant.

[Si certains détails centraux de l’allégation sont toujours manquants ou ambigus après avoir épuisé les questions ouvertes, utilisez des questions directes. Il est important de jumeler des ‘invitations’ ouvertes avec des questions directes à chaque fois que cela est approprié.]

[Note: Attirez tout d’abord l’attention de l’enfant sur le détail mentionné, puis posez la question directe.]

Voici le format général des questions directes :

14. “Tu as dit [personne/ objet/ activité]. [Comment/ quand/ où/ qui/ quel/ qu’est-ce que], [complétez la question directe.]”

Exemples

1. **“Tu as dit que tu regardais la télévision. Où étais-tu exactement ?”** [Attendez une réponse.] **“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

2. **“Tout à l’heure, tu as dit que ton père t’avait “donné un gros coup”. Dis-moi exactement ce qu’il a fait.”**

3. **“Tu as dit qu’un(e) ami(e) était là . Quel est son nom?”** [Attendez une réponse] **“Dis-moi ce qu’il(elle) faisait.”**

4. **“Tout à l’heure, tu as dit que ton oncle t’a “touché”** [“embrassé dans la bouche” / “a eu du sexe avec toi” / etc.]. **“Dis-moi exactement ce qu’il a fait ?”**

RÉPÉTEZ LA SECTION EN ENTIER POUR CHAQUE INCIDENT MENTIONNÉ PAR L’ENFANT POUR LEQUEL VOUS VOULEZ UNE DESCRIPTION. À MOINS QUE L’ENFANT N’AIT INDIQUÉ QUE DEUX INCIDENTS, DEMANDEZ POUR LE ‘DERNIER’ ENSUITE LE ‘PREMIER’ ET ENSUITE ‘UNE AUTRE FOIS DONT TU TE SOUVIENS BIEN’.

VI. Pause

[Dites à l’enfant :]

“Maintenant je veux m’assurer que j’ai tout compris et voir s’il y a autre chose que j’ai besoin de te demander. Je vais [penser à ce que tu m’as dit/ réviser mes notes/ aller vérifier avec ...]”

[Pendant la pause, révisez l’information que vous avez reçue, remplissez la liste de contrôle légale, voyez s’il reste des informations manquantes et planifiez le reste de l’entretien. ASSUREZ-VOUS DE FORMULER PAR ÉCRIT DES QUESTIONS SPÉCIFIQUES.]

Après la pause

[Afin d’obtenir d’importants renseignements additionnels qui n’ont pas été mentionnés par l’enfant, posez d’autres questions directes et ouvertes, tel que décrit ci-dessus. Retournez aux questions ouvertes (“Dis-moi tout sur ça”) après chaque question directe posée. Après avoir terminé avec ces questions, passez à la section VII.]

VII. Obtenir de l’information qui n’a pas été mentionnée par l’enfant

[Vous devriez poser des questions proposant un choix seulement si vous avez déjà essayé des questions moins spécifiques et que vous sentez encore que d’importantes informations légales sont manquantes. Il est très important de jumeler des questions ouvertes (“Dis-moi tout sur ça”) à chaque fois que cela est approprié.]

[Note : Dans le cas d’incidents multiples, vous devriez orienter l’enfant vers les événements pertinents en utilisant ses propres mots, en posant des questions proposant un choix seulement après avoir donné à l’enfant la possibilité d’élaborer sur les détails centraux.]

[AVANT DE POURSUIVRE AVEC L'INCIDENT SUIVANT, ASSUREZ-VOUS D'AVOIR OBTENU TOUS LES DÉTAILS MANQUANTS CONCERNANT L'INCIDENT DONT IL EST QUESTION.]

Le format général des questions qui recherchent de l'information non mentionnée par l'enfant.

“Quand tu m’as parlé de [incident spécifique identifié par le temps ou le lieu], tu as dit que [personne/ objet/ activité]. Est-ce que [question proposant un choix] ?”

[Attendez une réponse.] [À chaque fois que c’est approprié, faites suivre d’une “invitation à parler” ; dites :]

“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”

Exemples

1. **“Quand tu m’as parlé de la fois dans le sous-sol, tu as mentionné qu’il a enlevé ses pantalons. Est-ce que quelque chose est arrivé à tes vêtements ?”**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Après que l’enfant ait répondu, dites :]

“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”

[Attendez une réponse.]

2. **“Quand tu m’as parlé de la dernière fois, tu as mentionné qu’il t’a touché. Est-ce qu’il t’a touché par-dessus tes vêtements ?”**

[Attendez une réponse.] [Après que l’enfant ait répondu, dites :]

“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”

[Attendez une réponse.]

3. **“Est-ce qu’il t’a touché en-dessous de tes vêtements ?”** [Attendez une réponse.] [Après que l’enfant ait répondu, dites :] **“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

4. **“Tu m’as parlé de quelque chose qui est arrivé au terrain de jeu. Est-ce que quelqu’un a vu ce qui s’est passé ?”** [Attendez une réponse.] [Lorsque approprié, dites :] **“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

5. **“Sais-tu si quelque chose comme cela est arrivé à d’autres enfants ?”** [Attendez une réponse.] [Lorsque approprié, dites :] **“Dis-moi tout sur ça.”**

6. “Tu m’as parlé de quelque chose qui est arrivé dans la grange. Sais-tu quand cela est arrivé?”

VIII. Si l’enfant ne mentionne pas l’information que vous attendiez

Utilisez seulement les énoncés qui sont pertinents.

Si vous savez qu’il y a eu des conversations dans lesquelles l’information a été mentionnée, dites :

1. “J’ai entendu que tu avais parlé à [personne] à [lieu/moment]. Dis-moi de quoi vous avez parlé.” [Si l’enfant ne donne pas plus d’information, posez la question 2; si l’enfant donne certaines informations, dites :] “Dis-moi tout sur ça.” [Continuez avec d’autres énoncés ouverts comme “Parle-moi de ça” si nécessaire.] Si vous savez des détails provenant d’un dévoilement antérieur et que ces informations ne vous ont pas été dévoilées, dites :
2. “J’ai entendu [il (elle) m’a dit] que tu as dit [résumez l’allégation, de façon spécifique mais sans mentionner des détails compromettants si possible]. Dis-moi tout sur ça.” [Continuez avec d’autres énoncés ouverts comme “Parle-moi de ça” si nécessaire.]
3. Si quelque chose a été observé, dites : a. “J’ai entendu que quelqu’un a vu []. Dis-moi tout sur ça.” [Continuez avec d’autres énoncés ouverts comme “Parle-moi de ça” si nécessaire.] Si l’enfant nie, allez à 3b. b. “Est-ce que quelque chose t’est arrivé(e) [lieu/moment]? Dis-moi tout sur ça.” [Continuez avec d’autres énoncés ouverts comme “Parle-moi de ça” si nécessaire.] Si l’enfant a/avait des marques ou des blessures, dites :
4. “Je vois [J’ai entendu] que tu as des [marques / bleus] sur ton (ta) []. Dis-moi tout sur ça.” [Continuez avec d’autres énoncés ouverts comme “Parle-moi de ça” si nécessaire.]
5. “Est-ce que quelqu’un [résumez sans dire le nom de l’agresseur (à moins que l’enfant l’ait déjà nommé) ou donnez les détails les plus compromettants]?” Si l’enfant nie, allez à la section suivante. Si l’enfant reconnaît quelque chose, dites : “Dis-moi tout sur ça.” [Continuez avec d’autres énoncés ouverts comme “Parle-moi de ça” si nécessaire.]

IX. Information concernant le dévoilement

“Tu m’as dit pourquoi tu es venu(e) me parler aujourd’hui. Tu m’as donné(e) beaucoup d’information et ça m’aide vraiment à comprendre ce qui s’est passé.”

[Si l’enfant a mentionné avoir parlé de l’incident (des incidents) à quelqu’un, allez à la question 6. Si l’enfant n’a pas mentionné en avoir parlé, explorez la possibilité d’un dévoilement immédiat en disant :]

- 1. “Dis-moi ce qui s’est passé après [le dernier incident].” [Attendez une réponse.]**
- 2. “Et après qu’est-ce qui s’est passé ?” [Note : Utilisez cette question aussi souvent que nécessaire durant cette section.] [Si l’enfant mentionne un dévoilement, allez à la question 6. Sinon, posez les questions suivantes.]**
- 3. “Est-ce que quelqu’un d’autre sait ce qui s’est passé ?” [Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant confirme mais ne mentionne pas de nom, demandez :] “Qui est-ce ?” [Si la réponse de l’enfant n’est pas claire, demandez :]**
- 4. “Maintenant, je veux savoir comment d’autres personnes ont su à propos [du dernier incident].” [Attendez une réponse.] [Si des informations sont manquantes, posez les questions suivantes.]**
- 5. “Qui a été la première personne à part toi et [l’agresseur] à savoir que [l’agression présumée telle que décrite par l’enfant] ?” [Attendez une réponse.]**
- 6. “Dis-moi tout ce que tu peux sur comment [la première personne mentionnée par l’enfant] l’a su.” [Attendez la réponse.] [Puis dites :] “Parle-moi plus de ça.” [Attendez une réponse.] [Si l’enfant décrit une conversation, dites :] “Dis-moi tout ce que vous vous êtes dit.”**

[Attendez une réponse.]

- 7. “Qui a été la deuxième personne à savoir que [l’agression présumée telle que décrite par l’enfant] ?” [Attendez une réponse.]**

[Puis dites :]

“Parle-moi plus de cela.”

[Si l’enfant décrit une conversation, dites :]

“Dis-moi tout ce que vous vous êtes dit.”

[Attendez une réponse.] [Si l'enfant ne mentionne pas en avoir parlé à quelqu'un, passez à la section suivante:]

RÉPÉTEZ LA SECTION EN ENTIER POUR CHAQUE INCIDENT MENTIONNÉ PAR L'ENFANT

X. Fermeture

[Dites :]

“Tu m’as dit beaucoup de choses aujourd’hui et je veux te remercier de m’avoir aidé.”

1. **“Y a-t-il d’autres choses que tu penses que je devrais savoir ?”** [Attendez une réponse.]

2. **“Y a-t-il autre chose que tu veux me dire?”** [Attendez une réponse.]

3. **“Y a-t-il des questions que tu veux me poser?”** [Attendez une réponse.]

4. **“Si tu veux encore me parler, tu peux m’appeler à ce numéro de téléphone.”** [Donnez à l’enfant une carte avec votre nom et numéro de téléphone.]

XII. Sujet neutre

“Qu’est-ce que tu vas faire aujourd’hui en partant d’ici ?”

[Parlez à l’enfant pendant quelques minutes d’un sujet neutre.] **“Il est [spécifiez l’heure] et l’entretien est maintenant terminé.”**

Traduction Mireille Cyr, Jacinthe Dion, Roxane Perreault et Nancy Richard Département de psychologie, Université de Montréal (08/06/2002)