

February 29, 2024

## 109. The Utility of Direct Questions About Actions with the Hands in Child Forensic Interviews

Owen W. Friend, *University of Texas at Austin*

Agnieszka M. Nogalska, *CUNY John Jay College*

Thomas D. Lyon, *University of Southern California Law School*

**The Utility of Direct Questions About Actions with the Hands in Child Forensic Interviews**

Owen W. Friend, Agnieszka M. Nogalska, and Thomas D. Lyon

University of Southern California, Gould School of Law

In press, *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*

**Author Note**

Owen W. Friend is now at the University of Texas at Austin, Department of Psychology. Agnieszka M. Nogalska is now at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Department of Psychology.

Portions of the results were presented at the American Psychology-Law Society Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA, 2023.

The authors would like to thank Lindsey Sloan and Alexa Burkow for their assistance in legal research, and to Jina Hur and Mansi Guar for their research assistance in data coding.

This study was supported in part by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (Grant HD101617). Declarations of interest: none.

The study was not preregistered. Data and code is available at:  
[https://osf.io/kmh4x/?view\\_only=None](https://osf.io/kmh4x/?view_only=None)

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Owen W. Friend, University of Texas at Austin Department of Psychology, 108 E. Dean Keeton St. A8000 Austin, TX 78712. Email: ofriend@utexas.edu.

### **Abstract**

This study evaluated the utility of asking direct hands questions (“what did he do with his hands” and “what did you do with your hands”) during forensic interviews with 197 5- to 17-year-old children disclosing sexual abuse. Interviewers had been previously trained to engage children in narrative practice, to maximize their use of invitations and directives, and minimize their use of option-posing questions. We examined the extent to which direct hands questions elicited novel information about force, duress, resistance, and the nature of touch and body mechanics. Fifty-nine percent of children’s responses to the direct hands questions elicited novel details. Age, child productivity, and time spent on narrative practice exhibited few relations with novelty. The number of prior invitations was consistently negatively related to novelty; when more invitations were asked, the hands questions were less likely to elicit novel information. Direct questions about hands may supplement invitations in eliciting legally significant details about child sexual abuse.

### **The Utility of Direct Questions About Actions with the Hands in Child Forensic Interviews**

Research examining child interviews has shown that general invitations and cued invitations elicit the most productive responses from children (Lamb et al., 2018). General invitations are broad open-ended requests for recall, and cued invitations request free recall elaboration of prior responses. Furthermore, lab research has identified general invitations as eliciting the most accurate information (Brown et al., 2013). Interviewers following the NICHD structured protocol, the most researched interview protocol for interviewing children about abuse, are advised to exhaust general invitations and cued invitations (hereinafter referred to as “invitations”) before moving to directives – wh- questions that tap recall memory but are more specific than invitations (Lamb et al., 2018). A significant difficulty that arises for interviewers is how to determine when invitations have exhausted children’s memory, and, once they have moved to directive questions, how best to ask directives so as to maintain accuracy and increase productivity.

In contact child sexual abuse cases, touching is always central to the allegations. Once children have described the abusive events in response to invitations, directive questions about actions with the hands may be productive in eliciting new information. These questions could document aspects of the physical interaction between the suspect and the child, including the use of force, duress, or resistance, and provide additional details about the mechanics of sexual touch. Examining a sample of 197 forensic interviews with child sexual abuse victims between the ages of 5 and 17 years of age in which interviewers asked large percentages of invitations, we evaluated the utility of asking direct hands questions (“what did he do with his hands?” and “what did you do with your hands?”), examining what types of information children provided,

and assessing how often direct hands questions elicited novel information. In what follows, we review the research on the productivity and accuracy of invitations and directives and discuss the potential significance of actions done with the hands in sexual abuse cases.

### **Invitations and Directives**

Best practice child interviewing guidelines widely recommend the use of open-ended prompts to elicit narrative information from child victims including general invitations, which are broad requests for free recall (such as “what happened next?” and “tell me more”), cued invitations, which are requests for elaboration of child-generated content (such as “tell me more about [topic]”), and directives, which are more specific wh- questions about the child’s report (American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children [APSAC], 2012; Lamb et al., 2018;). Moreover, in order to give children practice in answering invitations, practice guides suggest that interviewers engage children in several minutes of narrative practice about the child’s non-abusive experiences before moving to the substantive phase of the interview (APSAC, 2012; Lamb et al., 2018). On a question-by-question basis, invitations are maximally productive and less likely to elicit inaccurate information than yes-no and forced-choice questions (also known as option-posing questions; Lamb et al., 2018).

### **Productivity of Invitations and Directives**

A significant challenge for interviewers is that they are often seeking specific information about an allegation, and children may not produce the needed information in response to general invitations. Examining forensic interviews with 6- to 16-year-olds alleging sexual abuse, Wolfman and colleagues (2016) found that general invitations elicited the highest number of non-responses, which included “I don’t know,” “I don’t remember,” and “I don’t understand,” off-topic responses, restatements of previous utterances, and silence (see also Korkman et al.,

2006, 2008). The authors noted that “[t]he very openness of [general] invitations, deemed a positive attribute because they do not contaminate or bias responses, may contribute to the difficulty children had in responding to them” (p. 114).

One partial solution to children’s difficulty in responding to general invitations is to ask cued invitations, which enable interviewers to become more specific by asking children to elaborate on previously generated content. Cued invitations remain broad and open-ended in their approach, since the interviewer simply asks the child to “tell more” about that content (Lamb et al., 2003), and have been found to be highly productive (Lamb et al., 2018). Nevertheless, invitations may fail to elicit needed information when the child forgets, is reluctant, or fails to appreciate the importance of the information (Henderson et al., 2023).

Researchers examining the NICHD structured protocol have identified specific types of content that often necessitate that invitations be supplemented with directive questions, including children’s subjective reactions to abuse (Katz et al., 2016), identification of the suspect (Lamb et al., 2003), the child’s prior disclosures of abuse (Malloy et al., 2013), and temporal information about the abuse (Orbach and Lamb, 2007). For example, Katz and colleagues (2016) found that 36% of 3- to 14-year-old children interviewed with the NICHD protocol failed to produce any subjective information, and the authors emphasized the need to include “probes about emotions” in order to elicit emotional language (p. 257). Other research has found that directly questioning sexually abused children about their reactions (e.g., “How did you feel?”) is highly productive (Lyon et al., 2012), and more likely to elicit subjective reactions than either invitations or option-posing questions (Stolzenberg et al., 2019). The Revised NICHD protocol has added emotionally supportive techniques to the original protocol, including questions about unexpressed emotions,

and the revised protocol has been found to facilitate emotional language (Karni-Visel et al., 2019).

### **Accuracy of Invitations and Directives**

Lab research has shown that children are likely to make more errors when interviewers move from free recall questions to more specific questions, particularly when those questions are option-posing questions (Lamb et al., 2018), or highly specific directive questions that facilitate guessing (e.g., “how many” and “what color” questions; McWilliams et al., 2021). Two studies have compared the accuracy of general invitations, cued invitations, and directives (Brown et al., 2012, 2013). General invitations consistently elicited more accurate responses than cued invitations. In turn, cued invitations were sometimes superior to directives (Brown et al., 2012). However, Brown and colleagues (2013) observed that the decreased accuracies in moving from general to cued invitations appeared predominantly due to drops in the accuracy of peripheral, descriptive details (e.g., “the color or pattern of costume items, descriptions of the room”; p. 373). Brown and colleagues (2012, 2013) did not specify the directives asked in their studies, though their descriptions and examples suggest they were quite specific. The authors noted that directives “typically elicit a single word or phrase in response,” (p. 369) and provided examples such as “what color was the sword?”, “what are their names?” (Brown et al., 2013), and “which plaster did you choose?” (Brown et al., 2012). Notably, questions about color are one type of directive that McWilliams and colleagues (2021) found to be particularly susceptible to guessing and error.

Several studies have identified types of directive questions that increase children’s productivity without increasing the likelihood of error. These questions ask about perceptions, including what the child saw and heard (Elischberger & Roebbers 2001; Poole & Lindsay, 1995),

conversations, including the gist of what people said (Brown & Pipe, 2003; Canning & Peterson, 2020; Kulkofsky, 2010; Stolzenberg et al., 2018), and actions, including what people did (Brown & Pipe, 2003; Canning & Peterson, 2020; Kulkofsky, 2010). The fact that the directives elicited responses as accurate as free recall was particularly impressive since the free recall questions were general invitations, with little or no use of cued invitations.

### **Direct Questions about Actions with the Hands**

One potentially productive type of directive question following invitations asks about actions with the hands, including both the suspect's actions (e.g., "what did he do with his hands?") and the child's actions (e.g., "what did you do with your hands?"). These questions are more specific than invitations but do not identify or suggest specific actions, and can easily be answered "nothing" if the child has no information to provide (Henderson et al., 2023). Because the questions inquire into actions, rather than descriptions, they should be better remembered by children (Peterson et al., 1999), and should be more productive than other directives (Ahern et al., 2018). We predicted that directive hands questions would be productive in at least two areas: 1) suspects' use of force or duress in order to accomplish the abuse, and 2) the mechanics of abuse, including details about the location, nature, and invasiveness of intimate touch.

Force is broadly defined as the use of "power, violence, or pressure," while duress is defined as including threats of force and the use of confinement (Black's Law Dictionary, 2019). Of course, child sexual abuse does not necessitate force, duress, or the lack of consent. Nevertheless, whether suspects use force or duress is legally significant in several ways. First, force or duress is often an aggravating feature of sexual crimes against children, enabling prosecutors to charge the suspect with a more serious offense (Cal. Penal Code Section 288, 2023). Review of California case law reveals that force is often proved through the suspect's use



of the hands, including “grabbing, holding, and restraining” (California v. Morales, 2018; p. 506), using the child as an instrument (California v. Pitmon, 1985), removing the child’s clothing (California v. Bolander, 1994), and persisting despite the child’s resistance (California v. Babcock, 1993). Similarly, children’s attempts to resist typically involve actions with their hands (e.g., California v. Alvarez, 1993, p. 172 [child “attempted to push him away”]). Because it involves threats of harm, proof of duress includes reports of the suspect’s statements, including warnings to keep the abuse a secret (California v. Senior, 1992). Of course, statements do not involve use of the hands, but we anticipated that the hands questions would remind children of less overtly coercive actions by the suspects.

Second, in the most serious cases, force and duress may obviate the need to prove that the child was a specific age at the time of the crime. It is often difficult for children to report their age when abuse occurred, both because of their difficulty in recalling temporal information and the fact that abuse may occur over a long period of time (Wandrey et al., 2012). Some jurisdictions will define crimes in the alternative: they either require force/duress, or they require that the child be under a specific age. In New York, for example, rape in the first degree is defined as sexual intercourse with another person either “by forcible compulsion” or when the other person is “less than eleven years old.” (N.Y. Penal Law Section 130.035, 2023). Hence if a child is unsure whether they were younger than 11, force can substitute for proof of age.

Third, proof of force increases the likelihood of successful prosecution. Prosecutors are often more willing to charge abuse when there is evidence of force (Cross et al., 1994). Juries may also be more willing to convict; Stolzenberg and Lyon (2014a) found that, controlling for other case characteristics, adding force or duress to a charge of sexual abuse against a child under 14 increased the odds of conviction by nine times. Survey evidence has suggested that

adults expect children to resist sexual abuse (Shackel, 2008) and mock juror research has found that participants are less likely to believe children and view them as more blameworthy if they failed to resist (Hatton & Duff, 2016).

Direct hands questions might also be productive in eliciting details regarding the mechanics of abuse, including information about the location, nature, and invasiveness of the touching. Hands are likely to figure prominently in the abusive act, since most touching by the suspect occurs with the hands, and because bodily interactions in abuse will implicate both the suspect's and the child's hands. When disclosing abuse, children tend to be reticent about disclosing the details of sexual touch, particularly the most serious acts (Allard-Gaudreau et al., 2021), and typically fail to provide unambiguous descriptions of genitalia (Burrows et al., 2017). These difficulties can lead to vague and inconsistent testimony in court (Sullivan et al., 2021; Szojka et al., in press). Moreover, asking questions about the hands may reduce the need to use the word "touch," which can be problematic for younger children whose understanding of "touch" may exclude more specific terms, such as "tickle" or "rub" (Bruck, 2009; Sullivan et al., 2021).

### **The Current Study**

We evaluated the utility of asking direct hands questions ("what did he do with his hands" and "what did you do with your hands") during forensic interviews with 5- to 17-year-old children who had disclosed sexual abuse earlier in the interview. We were interested in the likelihood that children would provide substantive information, the type of information children would provide, and its novelty. We predicted that the direct hands questions would frequently elicit novel details regarding legally significant facets of abuse including force, duress, resistance, and descriptions of touch and body mechanics. We considered whether various

factors influenced the likelihood that the direct hands questions would elicit novel information, including the age and productivity of the child, the amount of narrative practice engaged in prior to the interview, and the number of prior invitations a child was asked. Examining these factors allowed us to assess the likelihood that the hands questions are productive across different interviews, different interviewers, and different children.

## **Method**

### **Sample**

We examined 197 forensic interviews of children aged 5 to 17 ( $M_{age} = 11.14$  years,  $SD = 2.54$ ) in cases of suspected sexual abuse in which children disclosed abuse and direct hands questions were asked, identifying a total of 14,605 substantive interviewer utterances and 530 direct hands questions. All forensic interviews were conducted between 2017 and 2022 at Child Advocacy Centers in Los Angeles County, with 94% (185) conducted by University of Southern California (USC) Child Interviewing Lab. These interviews had been requested by dependency courts, who preside over cases in which children are alleging abuse by a parent, guardian, or member of their household, and the child protective services agency, after substantiating abuse, has petitioned the court to allow intervention to protect the child. The interviews were transcribed and submitted to the dependency court requesting the interview, and then anonymized for training purposes with the permission of the Presiding Judge of Juvenile Court. Use of the archived anonymized transcripts for research was approved as exempt by the USC Institutional Review Board (45 CFR Section 46.014(d)(4)(ii)). The interviewers had been trained to utilize the Ten-Step Interview (Lyon, 2014), a modification of the NICHD protocol that includes interview instructions or ground rules, narrative practice rapport building (with narratives regarding things the child likes to do, doesn't like to do, and the child's last birthday),

an allegation phase that begins with a question asking the child the reasons for their interview (cf. Lamb et al., 2003), and follow-up questions that maximize the use of invitations and directive questions and avoid option-posing questions. The interviewers were specifically trained to ask, “what did [the suspect] do with his hands?” and “what did you do with your hands?” as follow-up questions after they had elicited as much information as they could about individual episodes of abuse with invitations.

### **Coding**

We identified all direct hands questions in the sample ( $n = 530$ ), including 367 questions asking about the suspects’ hands and 162 questions asking about the child’s hands (see Supplemental Table 1). Based on our review of case and statutory law regarding child sexual abuse, and research identifying difficulties in children’s descriptions of sexual abuse (Sullivan et al., 2021; Szojka et al., in press), we identified the primary coding categories: suspect’s use of force, suspect’s use of duress, the child’s resistance, and references to other aspects of the sexual act, including descriptions of touch and body mechanics. In order to provide additional qualitative details within each coding category, we identified subcategories based on our prior experience in interviewing and a preliminary review of transcripts. For full coding criteria and examples, see Table 1. Two coders evaluated children’s responses. Responses were not mutually exclusive and could fall into more than one category and subcategory. For example, children describing “persistence despite resistance” necessarily described resistance, and children who referred to the subject “making” them do something or referred to how they “tried” to resist, almost always referred to an associated codable action. Responses were coded as uninformative if the child responded that nothing happened with the hands, requested clarification (e.g., “I don’t know what you mean,” “Like how?”), or gave a don’t know/don’t remember response

(Hershkowitz, 2018; Szojka et al., in press). Both coders coded 100% of the sample and reliability was assessed with Cohen's Kappa (K). Prevalence-adjusted and bias-adjusted Kappa (PABAK) scores were used to assess reliability for coding subcategories comprising less than 10% of the overall sample. Reliability scores were very high, ( $K/PABAK > 0.8$ ), and after reliabilities were calculated, all discrepancies were resolved to reach 100% agreement.

**Table 1**

***Coding Criteria***

<b>Code</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Example(s)</b>
<b>Force</b>		
Suspect used hands to restrain child	Suspect used their hands to physically restrain the child.	-He would try to <b>hold my hand down</b> -He would be <b>holding me still</b>
Suspect used child as instrument	Suspect used the child's body as an instrument in order to accomplish the sex act	- <b>He grabbed me by my back of my head and pushed my head down</b> , or he <b>pulled my hair</b> -Sometimes he <b>grabs my hands and make me touch his private</b>
Removing/manipulation of clothing/covering	Suspect manipulated or removed the child's clothing or bedding	-He used to <b>put his hands under my shirt and then like under my bra too</b> -He would <b>take off my clothes</b>
Persistence despite resistance	Suspect persisted in completing abuse, despite the child resisting	-He was just like <b>holding me still because I was trying to get away</b>
<b>Duress</b>		
Instructions or communicative gestures	Suspect showed or told the child what to do during abuse	-He would <b>say pull your pants down and open your legs</b>
Suspect "made" the child act	Child stated that the suspect "made" them do something	-He <b>made</b> me touch myself

Secrecy behaviors	Suspect took actions to conceal abuse	-When Mom came into the room or into the house he would <b>tell me to quickly pull [my pants] up</b> , and then he would <b>pretend that nothing happened</b>
<b>Resistance</b>		
<b>Physical resistance</b>		
Resisted suspect's hand	Child resisted the suspect's hands by manipulating the suspect's hands	-I just either try to <b>push his hands away</b> -I would <b>take his hands off</b>
Resisted suspect without specifying hand	Child physically resisted the suspect	-Try to <b>push him off</b> . Try to <b>make him stop</b> - <b>I just bit him</b> and he just let go of me and <b>I started running away</b>
Could not resist	The child stated that they could not resist	-He was kind of just holding them down as hard as he can so <b>I wouldn't do anything</b> -My hands <b>felt like they were glued to the bed</b>
Resisted removal of clothing or covering	Child resisted the suspect's attempts to remove the child's clothes or covering	-I kept trying to <b>pull my shorts up</b> (mm-hmm) and <b>every time I would like pull them up</b>
Attempted to restore clothing or covering	Child attempted to cover themselves or put their clothes back on	- <b>Covering my body parts</b> -I went like this [ <b>puts hands over chest</b> ]
"Tried" to stop the abuse	Child used the word "try" when referring to resistance	-I would <b>try</b> to push him -I was <b>trying</b> to get away
<b>Verbal/passive resistance</b>		
Told suspect to stop	Child verbally resisted	-He made me touch myself and <b>I said no</b> - <b>I would tell him to stop</b>
Sought help	Child sought the help of another person after the abuse	-And then <b>I used to tell somebody</b> , but then <b>I used to call my mom</b>
Passive resistance	Child passively resisted by closing or covering their eyes	-I just <b>closed my eyes</b> and tried to forget about it

**Descriptions of touch and body mechanics**

Specific body part	Child referred to a specific part of their body	-Vagina, private parts, middle part, etc.
Manual manipulation terms	Child described the abuse using an action verb	- <b>Move</b> them around. -It <b>went up and down</b> -He started <b>squeezing them</b>
Demonstrative action	Child demonstrated an action with their hands	-Massaging, like that [ <b>moves hand back and forth</b> ] -Just like touch like this [ <b> rubs hands together</b> ]
“Touch” only verb	Child described the abuse only by using the word “touch”	-Just like, just <b>touching</b> it - <b>Touch</b> my private parts
Placement of hands	Child mentioned the placement of the suspect’s hands, specifying the mechanics of abuse (e.g., on the bed)	-His hands would either be <b>on the wall [puts both hands up] in front of my bed, on my bed, on me</b> and yeah
Fingers	Child described actions with the suspect’s fingers	-He would sometimes like try to <b>use his fingers</b>
Penetration	Child specifically mentioned penetration or that the hands went “in” or “inside”	-He like had like two fingers and he <b>put it in</b>
Self-stimulation behaviors	Child described suspect touching himself	-He was <b>touching his middle part</b>
<b>Other responses</b>		
Cleaning up	Child described cleaning up behaviors that occurred after the abuse incident ended	- Just touch me, and <b>after that</b> he used to <b>wash his hands</b> -He told me to <b>take a shower</b> , so was <b>washing them</b>
Feelings and emotions	The child mentioned how they felt during the abuse	- I just <b>didn't like it</b> -That got me <b>mad</b>

*Note. Bolded words identify material that qualified the utterance for a specific subtype. Select elaborated examples are provided in Supplemental Table 2.*

To assess response novelty, all substantive words and phrases from each response to a direct hands question were identified in all preceding questions. Search terms included action

verbs (i.e., rubbing, grabbing) and all of their conjugated forms, all nouns and proper nouns, (i.e. specific body parts, relevant people/places, articles of clothing), prepositions/directional terms (i.e. on top of, behind), and feelings/emotions (i.e. scared, hurt). Responses in which any of these terms appeared were automatically flagged, and the same coders then each re-coded 50% of the sample, verifying whether the substantive words/phrases were uniquely elicited by the direct hands question or were previously elicited. If a substantive term was never used prior to the direct hands question or its original use was unrelated to the substantive details elicited by the direct hands question, the direct hands question was coded as novelly eliciting the substantive word/phrase. If the substantive word/phrase was previously elicited by a different question, that previous question was indexed as uniquely eliciting the word/phrase and its subsequent use in response to the direct hands question was coded as not novel. When a child nonverbally demonstrated an action in response to a direct hands question, all previous demonstrative actions were reviewed to code for novelty. For all unique search terms, see Supplemental Table 3. Next, two additional coders independently coded the entire sample for question type (Ahern et al., 2018), including invitations, directives, and option-posing questions, and responses, including don't know/don't remember responses and requests for clarification. Reliability scores for all question and response variables were high ( $K > 0.80$ ).

Last, machine codes were added for variables which potentially influenced children's tendencies to provide novel information in response to direct hands questions. First, in order to quantify children's varying productivity, the average word count in children's responses to invitations was calculated for each interview (hereinafter *productivity*; Dickinson & Poole, 2000). Second, in order to identify whether spending additional time on narrative practice may have affected children's tendencies to provide novel details in response to the direct hands



question, “minimum narrative practice time” was calculated (hereinafter *narrative practice time*). Each interview transcript contained timestamps every two minutes, and minimum narrative practice time was calculated as the difference between the timestamp immediately *preceding* the beginning of the substantive phase and the timestamp immediately *following* the beginning of the narrative practice phase. Thus, time spent on narrative practice could range from the calculated minimum narrative practice time to the minimum narrative practice time plus four minutes. Finally, to explore how response tendencies varied based on interviewers’ use of invitations, the number of invitations interviewers asked prior to asking a direct hands question in each interview was calculated (hereinafter *prior invitations*).

### **Analysis Plan**

We first generated descriptive statistics to explore the types of details children provided in response to the direct hands questions, and the frequency of each type of detail. We additionally evaluated the extent to which children’s responses to direct hands questions were novel, such that they had not been elicited by any prior questions. Utilizing generalized linear mixed-effects models (GLMMs), we then assessed the rates at which several variables reflecting characteristics of the interviews affected children’s tendencies to provide novel responses to direct hands questions. Continuous predictor variables included the child’s age in years, productivity, narrative practice time, and prior invitations. Dependent response variables included the novelty of details provided in children’s responses to direct hands questions related to force, duress, resistance, descriptions of touch and body mechanics, efforts to clean up following abuse, and children’s subjective emotional reactions to abuse. GLMM’s for requests for clarification and don’t know/don’t remember responses additionally included question type as a predictor, comprised of two levels (direct hands question vs. non-direct hands question,

baseline non-direct hands question), and compared direct hands questions to all questions preceding them in each interview. All GLMM models additionally included a by-subject random intercept to account for individual differences between children and interviewers across interviews.

Machine-coding of responses was implemented with custom Python code, while all GLMM analyses were performed using the *glmer* function with the bobyqa optimizer and Laplace approximations from the *lme4* R package (Bates et al., 2015). Models are reported accompanied by the unstandardized fixed effect estimates (*B*), standard errors of the estimates (*SE*), estimates of significance (*Z* and *p* values), and 95% confidence intervals.

### **Preregistration and Data Availability**

This study was not preregistered. We have created a datafile with the question and response codes and a coding guide and uploaded it to the [APA repository](#).

### **Results**

Of 14,605 substantive interviewer utterances examined, 4% ( $n = 530$ ) were direct hands questions, 33% ( $n = 4,835$ ) were invitations, 34% ( $n = 4,923$ ) were directives (not including direct hands questions), and 8% ( $n = 1,174$ ) were option-posing. The remaining 22% of interview utterances ( $n = 3,142$ ) were classified as “other” utterances, and included echoes of children’s statements, instructions, and partial questions. Excluding the “other” utterances, there were 11,467 questions, 5% of which were hands questions, 42% were invitations, 43% were directives, and 10% were option-posing. Children were asked an average of 2.72 direct hands questions per interview (range 1-8,  $SD = 1.55$ ).

On average, interviewers spent at least 6.7 minutes on the narrative practice phase (range 0-4 to 16-20 minutes). Prior to each direct hands question, children were asked, on average, 26.4

questions, 9.1 of which were invitations (range: 1 to 35.5 invitations). On average, children responded to the invitations with 39.0 words (range 1-1593,  $SD = 69.6$ ), direct hands questions with 18.6 words per question (range 1-263,  $SD = 27.1$ ), other directives with 19.5 words (range 1-657,  $SD = 36.2$ ), and option-posing questions with 11.1 words (range 1-144,  $SD = 35.2$ ). Average responsiveness to invitations significantly exceeded average responsiveness to other question types (pairwise  $ps < .001$ ), and directives elicited greater responsiveness than option-posing questions ( $p < .001$ ). Average word count to direct hands questions did not significantly differ from other directives.

### **Overall Informativeness and Novelty**

Children's informativeness to the direct hands questions are reported in Table 2. Children gave informative answers to 76% ( $n = 402$ ) of the hands questions, and 59% ( $n = 312$ ) of their answers to hands questions provided novel information. The likelihood that children's responses to the direct hands questions elicited novel information was not related to age, productivity, or narrative practice time. However, novelty was negatively associated with the number of prior invitations ( $B = -0.382$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $Z = -4.897$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [-0.535, -0.229]). Hence, interviewers who had asked more invitations were less likely to elicit novel information with the hands questions.

### ***“Nothing” Responses***

Children responded to 12% ( $n = 62$ ) of direct hands questions with a response indicating that nothing happened with the hands. Children were less likely to provide “nothing” responses when more invitations were asked prior to the hands question ( $B = -0.690$ ,  $SE = 0.226$ ,  $Z = -3.048$ ,  $p = 0.002$ , 95% CI [-1.134, -0.246]). “Nothing” responses were not significantly associated with age, productivity, or narrative practice time.

***Requests for Clarification***

Children requested clarification in response to 5% ( $n = 25$ ) of direct hands questions. Age, productivity, narrative practice time, and prior invitations were not significantly associated with children's requests for clarification. We also assessed whether hands questions elicited different rates of requests for clarification compared to other question-types. There were no statistically significant differences in children's requests for clarification to direct hands questions compared to preceding invitations (6%,  $n = 308$ ) or directives (6%,  $n = 271$ ). Option-posing questions (2%,  $n = 27$ ) were less likely to elicit requests for clarification than direct hands questions ( $B = -0.708$ ,  $SE = 0.286$ ,  $Z = -2.476$ ,  $p = 0.01$ , 95% CI [-1.268, -0.147]).

***Don't Know/Don't Remember***

Children responded to 5% ( $n = 26$ ) of direct hands questions with a don't know/don't remember response. Age, narrative practice time, and prior invitations were not significantly associated with children's tendency to provide don't know/don't remember responses, although more productive children were generally less likely to provide don't know/don't remember responses ( $B = -0.92$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $Z = -5.55$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [-1.25, -0.60]). As with requests for clarifications, we also compared hands questions to all other question-types. There were no significant differences in don't know/don't remember responses to direct hands questions compared to preceding invitations (3%,  $n = 141$ ), directives (5%,  $n = 231$ ), or option-posing questions (1%,  $n = 14$ ).

**Table 2*****Informativeness to Direct Hands Question***

	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Informative</b>	402	76
Novel information	312	59

Non-novel information	86	16
<b>Non-informative</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>21</b>
“Nothing”	62	12
Request for clarification	25	5
Don’t Know/Don’t Remember	26	5

### Response Types and Subcategories

The frequency and novelty of each major substantive response type and its subcategories are listed in Table 3.

**Table 3**

#### *Response Type Frequency and Novelty*

	Responses to direct hands question including response type ( <i>n</i> and % of responses to all hands questions)		Novel responses ( <i>n</i> and % of responses in that type)	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Force</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>52</b>
Suspect used hands to restrain child	36	7	22	61
Suspect used child as instrument	26	5	10	39
Removing/manipulation of clothing/covering	17	3	10	59
Persistence despite resistance	27	5	15	56
<b>Duress</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>49</b>
Instructions or communicative gestures	20	4	9	45
Suspect “made” the child act	11	2	6	55
Secrecy behaviors	14	3	7	50
<b>Resistance</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Physical resistance</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>63</b>
Resisted suspect’s hand	28	5	17	61

Resisted suspect without specifying hand	58	11	34	58
Could not resist	12	2	9	75
Resisted removal of clothing or covering	4	1	0	0
Attempted to restore clothing or covering	10	2	7	70
“Tried” to stop the abuse	36	7	22	61
<b>Verbal/passive resistance</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>54</b>
Told suspect to stop	16	3	9	56
Sought help	1	0.2	1	100
Passive resistance	7	1	3	43
<b>Descriptions of touch and body mechanics</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>44</b>
Specific body part	133	25	55	41
Manual Manipulation Terms	129	24	73	57
Demonstrative actions	72	14	60	83
“Touch” is only verb	68	13	4	6
Placement of hands	36	7	28	78
Fingers	14	3	13	93
Penetration	10	2	4	40
Self-stimulation behaviors	6	1	5	83
Cleaning up	16	3	12	75
Feelings and emotions	26	5	11	42

### ***Force***

Children responded to 18% ( $n = 95$ ) of direct hands questions with descriptions of force used to facilitate sexual abuse, 52% of which ( $n = 49$ ) were novel. Age and narrative practice time were not significantly related to novelty. Children’s productivity was positively associated with novel descriptions of force in response to the hands questions ( $B = 0.27$ ,  $SE = 0.12$ ,  $Z =$

2.26,  $p = 0.02$ , 95% CI [0.04, 0.51]). Prior invitations were unrelated to novelty ( $B = -0.364$ ,  $SE = 0.195$ ,  $Z = -1.862$ ,  $p = 0.06$ , 95% CI [-0.746, 0.019]).

### ***Duress***

Children responded to 8% ( $n = 45$ ) of direct hands questions with descriptions of duress used to facilitate sexual abuse, 49% of which ( $n = 22$ ) were novel. Age and narrative practice time were not significantly related to novelty. Children's productivity was positively associated with novelty ( $B = 0.58$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $Z = 3.49$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [0.25, 0.90]). Prior invitations were unrelated to novelty ( $B = -0.266$ ,  $SE = 0.289$ ,  $Z = -0.924$ ,  $p = 0.36$ , 95% CI [-0.832, 0.299]).

### ***Resistance***

Children responded to 24% ( $n = 126$ ) of direct hands questions with descriptions of resistance, 60% of which ( $n = 76$ ) were novel. Narrative practice time was not significantly related to novelty. Children's age was positively associated with novel descriptions of resistance ( $B = 0.31$ ,  $SE = 0.14$ ,  $Z = 2.31$ ,  $p = 0.02$ , 95% CI [0.05, 0.58]). The number of prior invitations was negatively associated with novelty ( $B = -0.56$ ,  $SE = 0.17$ ,  $Z = -3.31$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [-0.90, 0.23]).

### ***Descriptions of Touch and Body Mechanics***

Children responded to 70% ( $n = 372$ ) of direct hands questions with descriptions of touch and body mechanics, 44% ( $n = 232$ ) of which were novel. Age and narrative practice time were not significantly related to novelty. More productive children were more likely to provide novel information ( $B = 0.12$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $Z = 2.57$ ,  $p = 0.01$ , 95% CI [0.03, 0.22]). Additionally, the number of prior invitations was negatively associated with novelty ( $B = -0.23$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $Z = -3.52$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [-0.36, -0.10]).

### ***Cleaning Up and Feelings***

There were two categories of children's responses that went beyond descriptions of touch or body mechanics, and thus were separately analyzed. Children provided descriptions of the suspect cleaning up or telling the child to clean up following abuse in response to 3% ( $n = 16$ ) of direct hands questions, 75% of which were novel ( $n = 12$ ). Children provided descriptions of their subjective emotional reactions to abuse in response to 5% ( $n = 26$ ) of direct hands questions, 42% of which were novel ( $n = 11$ ). Because of the small number of responses in these two categories, we do not report inferential statistics for the relation between novelty and other factors.

### ***Exploratory analyses of perpetrator's hands vs. child's hands***

A reviewer suggested we examine novelty in terms of whether the question asked about the perpetrator's hands or the child's hands. This failed to predict novelty for most categories. However, questions about the child's hands were more likely to elicit novel descriptions of resistance (35% vs. 5%;  $B = 2.507$ ,  $SE = 0.317$ ,  $t = 7.89$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [1.885, 3.123]) and less likely to elicit novel descriptions of touch and body dynamics than questions about the perpetrator's hands (30% vs. 49%;  $B = -0.87$ ,  $SE = 0.202$ ,  $Z = -4.285$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [-1.263, -0.470]). Additionally, children were more likely to respond that nothing happened when asked what they did with their own hands than when asked about what the perpetrator did with their hands (22% v. 7%;  $B = 1.55$ ,  $SE = 0.334$ ,  $Z = 4.654$ ,  $p < .001$ , 95% CI [0.899, 2.201]).

## **Discussion**

We examined the utility of direct questions about actions with the hands in 197 forensic interviews with 5- to 17-year-olds who disclosed sexual abuse. Interviewers supplemented invitations with directive questions asking about actions done with the hands, with respect to both the suspect ("what did he do with his hands?") and the child ("what did you do with your



hands?). We categorized children's answers as pertaining to different legally significant types of details, and considered whether the information was novel. We found that children provided information in response to 76% of the hands questions and that 59% of these details were novel. Whereas children most often provided descriptions of touch and body mechanics (70%, 44% novel), substantial percentages also provided information pertaining to force (18%, 52% novel), duress (8%, 49% novel), and resistance (24%, 61% novel). We analyzed whether novelty was related to the age and productivity of the child, the amount of narrative practice, and the number of prior invitations. Age, productivity, and narrative practice time showed few if any relations with novelty of the responses elicited by the hands questions. On the other hand, we usually found that the number of invitations was inversely related to the novelty of their responses to the hands questions. Below we expand on the results and their implications, provide some examples of productive use of the hands questions, describe the limitations of the study, and suggest future directions.

### **Age, Productivity, and Narrative Practice Time**

The results yielded only one age effect. Age was related to the likelihood that children disclosed new details about resistance in response to the hands questions, with older children being more likely to provide novel details. This could mean that the hands questions were more effective in eliciting disclosures of resistance from older children, but might also reflect the fact that older children offer greater resistance than younger children to sexual abuse (Asdigian & Finkelhor, 1995; Katz & Barnett, 2014). Productivity was sometimes related to novelty, but there was no discernable pattern, and productivity and novelty were unrelated when examining the sample as a whole. Narrative practice time never predicted novelty. These findings demonstrate that the hands questions were equally productive across a wide age range of

children, interviews with varying lengths of narrative practice, and children of different capacities and willingness to provide information.

### **Prior Invitations**

The number of prior invitations was the only interview feature which consistently predicted whether the hands questions elicited novel information. The exceptions were force and duress, but the lack of significance could be due to the smaller percentages of children who reported force and duress, limiting statistical power. When interviewers asked more invitations, the hands questions were less likely to elicit new details. This result can be interpreted in two ways. On one hand, it suggests that interviewers may be able to increase their use of invitations and elicit details about actions done with the hands without moving to direct questions. On the other hand, it suggests that in cases in which interviewers have difficulty asking additional invitations (which could reflect interviewer difficulties, child difficulties, or both), then direct questions are a useful means of eliciting novel details.

Interviewers may be able to continue to increase their use of invitations with further training. Studies of forensic interviews before development of the NICHD protocol typically found that only a small percentage (2-7%) of forensic interviewers' questions were invitations (Lamb et al., 2018). With intensive training and feedback, most studies found that the percentage of invitations rose to between 30 and 48% (Lamb et al. 2018). Feedback is particularly important, since intensive training by itself achieves less impressive gains (Cyr et al., 2012), and interviewers who do not receive feedback show declines in their use of invitations over time (e.g., from 34% to 20%; Lamb et al., 2002).

Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that the interviewers in this study could have obtained the novel information elicited by the hands questions with more persistent use of invitations. They

asked large percentages of invitations (42%), rates which are comparable to interviewers trained in the NICHD protocol. Moreover, they engaged children in narrative practice (6.7 min. on average), comparable to the approximately seven minutes found in Sternberg et al. (1997) to increase the productivity of children's initial disclosures of sexual abuse. Virtually all their remaining questions were directives (43%, excluding the hands questions). Indeed, interviewers' infrequent use of option-posing questions (10%) appears lower than the norm in NICHD protocol interviews (18-26%; Lamb et al., 2018). The hands questions elicited novel details 59% of the time, which compares favorably to the percentage of questions in NICHD protocol interviews that elicit new details (Blasbalg et al., 2019: 49% in Standard Protocol, 53% in Revised Protocol).

### **Direct Hands Questions in Practice**

Several interviews provide examples of how the hands questions elicited novel details about the nature of touching and the mechanics of abuse. Six-year-old Brittany was productive in describing the circumstances surrounding her disclosure of abuse, but was less forthcoming when describing the abuse itself. She disclosed that she had been touched, but failed to elaborate beyond reporting that "it hurted a lot." After 50 questions, including 24 invitations, the interviewer asked Brittany "what exactly did your dad do with his hand when he was touching your private," and Brittany responded, "he like smelled it." Eight-year-old Darlene disclosed that the suspect had "touched" her but had difficulty elaborating in response to invitations. When the interviewer attempted to define the sequence of events by asking Darlene the first thing that happened, Darlene responded "he just touched me and I was waking my mom and she defended me." When the interviewer followed up with "tell me more about him touching you." Darlene replied, "and then my mom started to get mad at him and told him to stop a lot." When the

interviewer asked, “you said that he touched you, so what did his hands do?” Darlene responded, “one hand was in his computer, this one, the right hand, he was doing something and the other one was in my middle part.”

The hands questions also effectively shifted children’s focus to their own actions. 11-year-old Samantha provided highly detailed descriptions of sexual abuse to invitations, including descriptions of the suspect’s use of force to facilitate the abuse, stating he was “holding my arms like at my sides and then he just put his private in me.” Samantha additionally disclosed verbal resistance to the abuse, describing how she cried and told the suspect to stop. A direct hands question, asked following 32 invitations (65 total questions), elicited novel information regarding physical resistance to abuse, as Samantha described for the first time “smacking,” “scratching,” and “hitting” the suspect, followed by stating that despite her resistance “he was too strong. He’s an adult, I’m a little girl and I couldn’t move him.”

Even when children’s responses were not coded as novel, they were often evocative, elaborating on children’s narratives. When asked invitation questions, 14-year-old Karen described the suspect’s use of force and her resistance: The suspect “pulled [her] pants down” despite her “trying” to “pull [them] up.” In response to the direct hands questions, she repeated this information, but elaborated: “[E]very time I would like pull them up I would try to keep them there, but like keep my hands tight there on the side, and he would like, he would just like pull them back down.”

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

There are several limitations to this study. First, because we examined interviews with children alleging sexual abuse, we were not able to conclusively establish ground truth. Children’s accusations had been substantiated by police and child protective services

investigations, but of course their conclusions may have been in error. Children making false claims of abuse may provide different types of details; for example, they might be more inclined than children making true claims to assert that force was used. On the other hand, to the extent that false claims tend to be less detailed than true claims (Hershkowitz, 1999), inclusion of false claims in the sample would have led to underestimation of the productivity of both invitations and the hands questions.

Second, our measure of productivity was limited to codable content in children's immediate responses to the hands questions. We did not assess whether children provided additional information that fell outside the coded subtypes, or whether they were productive in responding to interviewers' subsequent invitations. Furthermore, we conservatively assumed that "nothing" responses to the hands questions were uninformative. Supplemental Table 2 provides examples of children's full responses, enabling the reader to see how children often provided additional uncoded information. With respect to follow-up questions, we observed many cases in which children's novel responses to the hands questions provided interviewers an opportunity to ask additional invitations. Moreover, even when children's responses weren't novel, focusing their attention on actions with the hands may have enhanced the productivity of subsequent questioning. Future research can explore the potential downstream benefits of hands questions and other types of direct questions.

Third, because direct questions appear to presume that something happened with the hands, it might have been preferable to preface (or "pair") the questions with screening yes-no questions. Interviewers are often advised to use pairing when inquiring into unmentioned details (Lamb et al., 2018): the interviewer first asks a yes-no question (e.g., "did you do anything with your hands?") and then follows up affirmative responses with a "tell me more about that"

invitation. However, yes-no questions may elicit false “no” responses. Questioning 6- to 11-year-old maltreated children about recent events, Henderson and colleagues (2023) showed that across a variety of topics (seeing, hearing, saying, and doing anything with the hands or mouth), asking yes-no questions (e.g., “did you do anything with your hands?”) led to twice as many uninformative responses as the corresponding direct question (e.g., “what did you do with your hands?”), because of children’s tendency to respond with “no” to the yes-no question. With respect to concerns that direct questions are suggestive, Henderson and colleagues noted that children could (and often did) simply respond with “nothing” or “that’s it” when they had nothing to report. Furthermore, as noted in the introduction, direct questions presupposing that children have information about perceptions, conversations, or actions have elicited responses as accurate as their responses to general invitations (e.g., Poole & Lindsay, 1995).

Fourth, although our interviewers were trained to ask “what happened next” invitations and “tell me more about [child-generated content]” invitations, and did so frequently, there may be other effective means of eliciting information about suspects’ and children’s use of hands short of the specific direct questions assessed here. For example, although they did not systematically assess productivity, Katz and colleagues (2020) noted that invitations such as “What happened with you during this time?” and directives like “What did you do when he did this to you?” were useful in eliciting descriptions of children’s responses to abuse.

Future research can examine the optimal level of specificity for eliciting actions with the hands. More broadly, a promising direction for future research is to study the productivity of invitations and directives in eliciting other specific types of information important in assessing children’s allegations of abuse. For example, how often do children spontaneously report descriptions of the suspect’s statements during and about abuse in response to invitations, and

are there specific types of invitations or directives that are most likely to elicit that information? Furthermore, research examining suspect's statements could go beyond generic descriptions of productivity, and assess types of suspect's statements (cajolery, threats, promises). It could also identify subtypes that give readers a finer-grained understanding of how children perceive abuse, and how able they are to describe it.

### **Implications for Practice and Policy**

As noted in the introduction, the law routinely makes distinctions among different types of sexual abuse, classifying as more severe abuse accomplished by the means of force or duress. Furthermore, in some jurisdictions proof of force or duress obviates the need to establish the age of the victim at the time of the abuse, a notoriously difficult task for children (Wandrey et al., 2012). Questions that elicit specific details of sexual abuse help investigators to distinguish between less and more credible allegations (Hershkowitz et al., 2020).

Questions about the use of hands may be useful in other contexts as well. Direct questions about use of the hands may assist prosecutors and plaintiffs questioning children about alleged abuse in court. Prosecutorial examinations of children alleging sexual abuse predominantly consist of option-posing questions (Andrews et al., 2015). This is attributable to many factors, including the perception that option-posing and even leading questions are necessary to elicit complete reports from child witnesses, given their immaturity and reluctance (Fanshera & del Carmen, 2016), and avoidance of questions that "call for a narrative," which many courts consider objectionable (Mueller et al., 2018). However, prosecutors' assumptions about the necessity of closed-ended questions may be exaggerated. In court, invitations and wh-questions have been shown to be more productive than option-posing questions (Andrews et al., 2016). This is true even for the highly sensitive information regarding the location and

invasiveness of sexual touch (Szojka et al., in press). Better training of attorneys, including educating them about the productivity of hands questions, could assist them in increasing children's productivity on the stand.

This study also contributes to a growing literature that discusses how question-type effects are important for developmental researchers to understand (Fritzley & Lee, 2003), and argues that researchers could incorporate forensic interviewing principles into their research designs. Force is a factor in research examining the correlates (Ventus et al., 2017), effects (Tyler, 2002), and disclosure of abuse (Sjoberg & Lindblad, 2002), but how force is assessed is often unmentioned.

In conclusion, this study examined the productivity of direct questions about the suspect's and child's actions with their hands in 197 forensic interviews with 5- to 17-year-old children disclosing sexual abuse. Interviewers had been trained to engage children in narrative practice, maximize their use of invitations, ask directives when invitations seemed to have exhausted children's memory, and avoid option-posing questions. The hands questions elicited informative and novel responses from most children, including details about the nature of touch and the mechanics of abuse, as well as evidence of force, duress, and resistance. The results provide further insight into how interviewers can maximize the productivity of children disclosing sexual abuse without resorting to often unproductive and inaccurate option-posing questions.



### References

- Ahern, E. C., Andrews, S. J., Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2018). The productivity of wh-prompts in child forensic interviews. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(13), 2007-2015. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515621084>
- Ahern, E. C., Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2015). Do prosecutors use interview instructions or build rapport with child witnesses? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 33(4), 476-492. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2183>
- Allard-Gaudreau, N., Laforest, M., & Cyr, M. (2021). Les modalités du non-dévoilement dans les récits d'enfants victimes d'agression sexuelle: une étude de l'ellipse narrative. [The modalities of non-disclosure in the accounts of child victims of sexual assault: a study of narrative ellipsis]. *Travaux neuchâtelois de linguistique*, (75), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.26034/tranel.2021.3002>
- 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*, 28(2), 253-261. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3103>
- Andrews, S. J., Ahern, E. C., Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2016). The productivity of wh-prompts when children testify. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 30(3), 341-349. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3204>
- American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (2012). *Practice guidelines: Forensic interviewing in cases of suspected child abuse*. <https://www.apsac.org/guidelines>
- Asdigian, N. L., & Finkelhor, D. (1995). What works for children in resisting assaults? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10(4), 402-418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626095010004002>

Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed., 2019).

Blasbalg, U., Hershkowitz, I., Lamb, M. E., Karni-Visel, Y., & Ahern, E. C. (2019). Is interviewer support associated with the reduced reluctance and enhanced informativeness of alleged child abuse victims? *Law and Human Behavior*, 43(2), 156-165.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000303>

Brown, D. A., Lamb, M. E., Lewis, C., Pipe, M., Orbach, Y., & Wolfman, M. (2013). The NICHD investigative interview protocol: An analogue study. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 19(4), 367–382. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035143>

Brown, D., & Pipe, M. E. (2003). Individual differences in children's event memory reports and the narrative elaboration technique. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 195–206.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.2.195>

Bruck, M. (2009). Human figure drawings and children's recall of touching. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 15(4), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017120>

Burrows, K. S., Bearman, M., Dion, J., & Powell, M. B. (2017). Children's use of sexual body part terms in witness interviews about sexual abuse. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 65, 226–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.02.001>

California v. Alvarez, 101 Cal. Rptr. 3d 169 (Cal. App. 4th Dist. 2009).

California v. Babcock, 17 Cal. Rptr. 2d 688 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1993).

California v. Bolander, 28 Cal. Rptr. 2d 365, 368 (Cal. App. 6th Dist. 1994), disapproved on other grounds by California v. Soto, 245 P.3d 410, 418 (Cal. 2011).

California v. Morales, 240 Cal. Rptr. 3d 499 (Cal. App. 6th Dist. 2018).

California v. Pitmon, 170 Cal.App.3d 38, 48 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 1985), disapproved on other grounds by California v. Soto, 245 P.3d 410, 418 (Cal. 2011).

California v. Senior, 3 Cal.App.4th 765 (1992).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2019.1687045>.

Canning, H. S., & Peterson, C. (2020). Encouraging more open-ended recall in child interviews.

*Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 27(1), 81–94

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2019.1687045>

Cross, T. P., DeVos, E., & Whitcomb, D. (1994). Prosecution of child sexual abuse: Which cases are accepted? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 18(4), 663–677. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(94)90016-7)

[2134\(94\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(94)90016-7)

Cyr, M., Dion, J., McDuff, P., & Trotier-Sylvain, K. (2012). Transfer of skills in the context of non-suggestive investigative interviews: Impact of structured interview protocol and feedback. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 26(4), 516-524.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2822>

Denne, E., St George, S., & Stolzenberg, S. N. (2022). Myths and misunderstandings about child sexual abuse in criminal investigations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38(1-2), 1893-1919. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221093679>

Dickinson, J. J., & Poole, D. A. (2000). Efficient coding of eyewitness narratives: A comparison of syntactic unit and word count procedures. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 32(4), 537-545. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03200826>

Elischberger, H. B., & Roebbers, C.M. (2001). Improving young children's free narratives about an observed event: The effects of nonspecific verbal prompts. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25(2), 160–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250042000203>

Fanshera, A., & del Carmen, R.V. (2016). The child as witness: Evaluating state statutes on the court's most vulnerable population. *Children's Legal Rights Journal*, 36, 1-27.

- Fritzley, H.V., & Lee, K. (2003). Do young children always say yes to yes–no questions? A metadevelopmental study of the affirmation bias. *Child Development*, 74(5), 1297-1313.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00608>
- Friend, O.W., Nogalska, A.M., & Lyon, T.D. (2023). Data and code from the utility of direct questions about actions with the hands in child forensic interviews. Retrieved from  
[https://osf.io/kmh4x/?view\\_only=1887abb8208149479d9e5176d2786068](https://osf.io/kmh4x/?view_only=1887abb8208149479d9e5176d2786068)
- Hatton, V. A., & Duff, S. (2016). A systematic literature review: which factors influence English and Welsh perceptions towards victims of child sexual abuse? *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 22(3), 275-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2016.1191683>
- Henderson, H. M., Konovalov, H., Williams, S., & Lyon, T. D. (2022). The utility of the birthday prompt in narrative practice with maltreated and non-maltreated 4-to 9-year-old children. *Applied Developmental Science*, 26(4), 679-688.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2021.1963729>
- Henderson, H. M., Lundon, G. M., & Lyon, T. D. (2023). Suppositional wh-questions about perceptions, conversations, and actions are more productive than paired yes-no questions when questioning maltreated children. *Child Maltreatment*, 28(1), 55-65.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559521106728>
- Hershkowitz, I. (1999). The dynamics of interviews involving plausible and implausible allegations of child sexual abuse. *Applied Developmental Science*, 3(2), 86-91  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0302\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532480xads0302_3)
- Hershkowitz, I., & Lamb, M. E. (2020). Allegation rates and credibility assessment in forensic interviews of alleged child abuse victims: Comparing the revised and standard NICHD

- protocols. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 26(2), 176-184.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000230>
- Karni-Visel, Y., Hershkowitz, I., Lamb, M. E., & Blasbalg, U. (2019). Facilitating the expression of emotions by alleged victims of child abuse during investigative interviews using the Revised NICHD Protocol. *Child Maltreatment*, 24(3), 310–318.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559519831382>
- Katz, C., & Barnett, Z. (2014). The behavior patterns of abused children as described in their testimonies. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(6), 1033-1040.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.08.006>
- Katz, C., Paddon, M. J., & Barnett, Z. (2016). Emotional language used by victims of alleged sexual abuse during forensic investigation. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 25(3), 243-261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538712.2016.1137666>
- Katz, C., Tsur, N., Nicolet, R., Klebanov, B., & Carmel, N. (2020). No way to run or hide: Children's perceptions of their responses during intrafamilial child sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 106, 104541. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2020.104541>
- Korkman, J., Santtila, P., & Sandnabba, N. K. (2006). Dynamics of verbal interaction between interviewer and child in interviews with alleged victims of child sexual abuse. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 47(2), 109–119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2006.00498.x>
- Korkman, J., Santtila, P., Westeråker, M., & Sandnabba, N. K. (2008). Interviewing techniques and follow-up questions in child sexual abuse interviews. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 5(1), 108–128.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17405620701210460>

- Kulkofsky, S. (2010). The effects of verbal labels and vocabulary skill on memory and suggestibility. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 31*(6), 460–466.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2010.09.002>.
- Lamb, M. E., Brown, D. A., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. W. (2018). *Tell me what happened* (2nd ed.). Wiley.
- Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P. W., & Mitchell, S. (2002). Is ongoing feedback necessary to maintain the quality of investigative interviews with allegedly abused children? *Applied Developmental Science, 6*(1), 35-41.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0601\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532480XADS0601_04)
- 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.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.71.5.926>
- Leclerc, B., Wortley, R., & Smallbone, S. (2010). An exploratory study of victim resistance in child sexual abuse: Offender modus operandi and victim characteristics. *Sexual Abuse, 22*(1), 25-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063209352093>
- Lyon, T.D. (2014). Interviewing children. *Annual Review of Law & Social Science, 10*(1), 73–89. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110413-030913>
- Lyon, T.D. (2021). *Ten Step Investigative Interview* (Version 3).  
<http://works.bepress.com/thomaslyon/184/>
- Lyon, T. D., & Henderson, H. M. (2021). Increasing true reports without increasing false reports: Best practice interviewing methods and open-ended wh- questions. *American*

*Professional Society on the Abuse of Children Advisor*, 33(1), 29–39.

<https://ssrn.com/abstract=3759908>

Lyon, T. D., Scurich, N., Choi, K., Handmaker, S., & Blank, K. (2012). “How did you feel?”:

Increasing child sexual abuse witnesses’ production of evaluative information. *Law &*

*Human Behavior*, 36(5), 448-457. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093986>

Malloy, L. C., Brubacher, S. P., & Lamb, M. E. (2013). “Because she’s one who listens” children

discuss disclosure recipients in forensic interviews. *Child Maltreatment*, 18(4), 245-251.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559513497250>

McWilliams, K., Williams, S., Stolzenberg, S.N., Evans, A.D., & Lyon, T.D. (2021). Don't know

responding in young maltreated children: The effects of wh- questions type and enhanced

interview instructions. *Law & Human Behavior*, 45(2), 124-137.

<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/lhb0000404>

Mueller, C.B., Kirkpatrick, L.C., & Richter, L.L. (2018). *Evidence (6th Ed.)*. Aspen.

Peterson, C., Dowden, C., & Tobin, J. (1999). Interviewing preschoolers: Comparisons of yes/no

and wh- questions. *Law & Human Behavior*, 23(5), 539–555.

<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022396112719>

Poole, D. A., & Lindsay, D. S. (1995). Interviewing preschoolers: Effects of nonsuggestive

techniques, parental coaching, and leading questions on reports of nonexperienced

events. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 60(1), 129–154.

<https://doi.org/10.1006/jecp.1995.1035>

Shackel, R. L. (2008). The beliefs commonly held by adults about children's behavioral

responses to sexual victimization. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 32(4), 485-495.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.04.016>

- Sjöberg, R. L., & Lindblad, F. (2002). Delayed disclosure and disrupted communication during forensic investigation of child sexual abuse: A study of 47 corroborated cases. *Acta Paediatrica*, 91(12), 1391-1396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1651-2227.2002.tb02839.x>
- Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Hershkowitz, I., Yudilevitch, L., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P. W., & Hovav, M. (1997). Effects of introductory style on children's abilities to describe experiences of sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 21(11), 1133–1146. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(97\)00071-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(97)00071-9)
- Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2014a). Evidence summarized in attorneys' closing arguments predicts acquittals in criminal trials of child sexual abuse. *Child Maltreatment*, 19(2), 119-129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559514539388>
- Stolzenberg, S. N., & Lyon, T. D. (2014b). How attorneys question children about the dynamics of sexual abuse and disclosure in criminal trials. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 20(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035000>
- Stolzenberg, S. N., McWilliams, K., & Lyon, T. D. (2018). Children's conversational memory regarding a minor transgression and a subsequent interview. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, 24(3), 379–392. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/law0000176>.
- Stolzenberg, S.N., Williams, S., McWilliams, K., Liang, C., & Lyon, T.D. (2021). The utility of direct questions in eliciting subjective content from children disclosing sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 116, 103694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.02.014>
- Sullivan, C., George, S. S., Stolzenberg, S. N., Williams, S., & Lyon, T. D. (2021). Imprecision about body mechanics when child witnesses are questioned about sexual abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 37(13-14), NP12375–NP12397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260521997941>



Szojka, Z.A., Moussavi, N., Burditt, C., & Lyon, T.D. (in press). Attorneys' questions and children's responses referring to the nature of sexual touch in child sexual abuse trials.

*Child Maltreatment.*

Tyler, K. A. (2002). Social and emotional outcomes of childhood sexual abuse: A review of recent research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(6), 567-

589. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(01\)00047-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00047-7)

Ventus, D., Antfolk, J., & Salo, B. (2017). The associations between abuse characteristics in child sexual abuse: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 23(2), 167-180.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2017.1318963>

Wandrey, L., Lyon, T. D., Quas, J. A., & Friedman, W. F. (2012). Maltreated children's ability to estimate temporal location and numerosity of placement changes and court visits.

*Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 18(1), 79-104. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024812>

Wolfman, M., Brown, D., & Jose, P. (2016). Talking past each other: Interviewer and child verbal exchanges in forensic interviews. *Law and Human Behavior*, 40(2), 107-117.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000171>

Supplemental Table 1

***Possible phrasings of hands questions:***

What did he do with his hands?

What did you do with your hands?

What did his hand(s) do?

What were/was his hand(s) doing?

What did your hand(s) do?

Tell me everything/what he did with his hands.

Tell me everything/what you did with your hands.

What was he doing with his hand(s)?

What were you doing with your hand(s)?

What would he do with his hands?

What would you do with your hands?

Any of the above + anchor to episode (e.g., 'what did he do with his hand when he was touching you?')

Supplemental Table 2

***Expanded question/answer pairs from coding examples:***

Q: Ok, and so what exactly did he do with his hands when he would pull down your pants?

A: Then he would tell me to hold them down (mm-hmm, ok), and when Mom come, came into the room or into the house (mm-hmm), he would **tell me to quickly pull them up**, and then he would **pretend that nothing happened**.

Q: Mm-hmm. Ok so what, so when he would touch your breast, what did he do with his hands?

A: He would just, like, he would just pretend it was an accident, he would make it look like an accident (mm-hmm) but when I told him, when **I would tell him to stop**, or when I would take his hands off he would just laugh after.

Q: Mm-hmm. And what did he do with his hands?

A: Got to like this hand, I mean like this middle finger [holds up middle finger] (mm-hmm). He stick it on me [touches finger to nose], but I couldn't see it (mm-hmm), but then he was like [points finger towards interviewer] (mm-hmm). **And then I used to tell somebody, but then I used to call my mom**. I go in the room, lock it, and then I used to call my mom, and then she's, he was used to sleep but I call, and then I put the volume down, down, and then I say [whispers inaudibly]. Then she came, and then that's all she did (mk). And my dad said, where are you? Where are you? Don't want to play hide and seek like granny (mk). You know what's granny?

Q: Like I know you had said that he had kind of like, he rubbed

A: I don't remember, **I just closed my eyes and tried to forget about it**.

your back and he touched your thigh, so I just wanna know everything that his hands did during this time.

Q: Ok. And so what did he do with his hands?

A: He like put it like right here [touches thigh] (mm-hmm) or something, and **I just didn't like it.**

Q: Mm-hmm. And what did you do with your hands?

A: I just keep it to myself again (mm-hmm), because I was still sleeping and I was like, he better not be in here (mm-hmm), he better not be in here and then I turned around [looks over shoulder]. He was right there (mm-hmm). He was so quiet that he, I couldn't even hear him (mm-hmm). **That got me mad.**

### Supplemental Table 3

#### *Unique search terms extracted from child answers to direct hands questions*

Code	Search Terms
<b>Force</b>	
Suspect used hands to restrain child	grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, held, holding, hold, holds, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, flipped, flip, flipping, flips, flipped, flip, flipping, flips, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, hugging, hugged, hug, hugs, hugging, hugged, hug, hugs, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, opening, open, opened, opens, keeps, kept, keep, keeping, back of head, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, having, have, has, had, hand, held, holding, hold, holds, holded
Suspect used child as instrument	grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, make, makes, made, making, move, moves, moving, moved, put, putting, puts, couch inside his pants pants grabbed, slapped assaulted, assaults, assault, assaulting, sexual, hits, hit, hitting

Removing/manipulation of clothing/covering	takes off, took off, taking off, taken off, take off, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pants, underwear, shorts, short, put, putting, puts, shorts, shorts, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up, undone, undoes, undoing, undid, undo, bra, pick up, picking up, picks up, picked up, pillow, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, shirt, bra, under, opening, open, opened, opens, curtain, [pulls front of shirt out], look, looking, looks, looked, [pulls front of shirt out], [pulls front of shirt out and looks down], under, clothes, under, clothes, shirt, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pull down, pulling down, pulls down, pulled down, pants, under, sweatpant
Persistence despite resistance	same, often, always, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, stopped, stopping, stops, stop, opening, open, opened, opens, close, closing, closed, closes, move, moves, moving, moved, every time, scoot, scoots, scooting, scooted, everytime, every time, [extends arms and grabs table], held, holding, hold, holds, [puts hands over chest], [pulls front of shirt out], [pulls front of shirt out and looks down], [puts hands over chest], having, have, has, had, lets, let, letting, keeps, kept, keep, keeping, tries, trying, try, tried, comes on, come on, coming on, came on, stranger, always, couldn't, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, closer, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, make, makes, made, making, lying, lain, lie, lay, lies, put, putting, puts, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, backs, back, backing, backed, opening, open, opened, opens, keeps, kept, keep, keeping, didn't stop, stopped, stopping, stops, stop, trying to go more far leting, lete, letes, leted, pull down, pulling down, pulls down, pulled down, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up, put, putting, puts, back, held, holding, hold, holds, tight, tighter

---

**Duress**

Instructions or communicative gestures	sinking, sank, sinks, sink, sunk, tell, told, telling, tells, say, said, says, saying, wanting, want, wants, wanted, tell, told, telling, tells, fine, say, said, says, saying, took, taken, take, takes, taking, strong, adult, slapped, slaps, slap, slapping, stay still, put your hands together, relax your shoulders, hard
Compulsion language	making, make, makes, make, makes, made, making, he's like, you have to come on, come on, coming on, came on, stranger, say, said, says, saying, lets, let, letting, tell, tells, told, telling
Secrecy behaviors	mom, brothers, shouldn't, should not, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pants, tell, told, telling, tells, shower, sleeping, slept, sleeps, sleep, quiet

---

**Resistance**

---

**Physical resistance**


---

Resisted suspect's hand	pushing, pushes, push, pushed, tries, trying, try, tried, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, move, moves, moving, moved, tries, trying, try, tried, taken, takes, took, take, taking, move, moves, moving, moved, his hand, his hands, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, put, putting, puts, move, moves, moving, moved, slip, slipping, slips, slipped, [grabs hand] , takes off, took off, taking off, taken off, take off, his hands, his hand, taken, takes, took, take, taking, my hand, my hands, back, takes off, took off, taking off, taken off, take off, got off, getting off, get off, gets off, gotten off, smacks, smack, smacked, smacking, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, kicked, kick, kicks, kicking, didn't let him do it pushing, pushes, push, pushed, away, takes off, took off, taking off, taken off, take off, let, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, shooting, shoots, shot, shoot, move, moves, moving, moved, hand, keeps, kept, keep, keeping, move hands pushing, pushes, push, pushed, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed
Resisted suspect without specifying hand	move, moves, moving, moved, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, make, makes, made, making, stopped, stopping, stops, stop, tries, trying, try, tried, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, tries, trying, try, tried, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, hits, hit, hitting, put, putting, puts, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, close, closing, closed, closes, bite, bites, bitten, bit, biting, ran, running, run, runs, pinch, pinches, pinched, pinching, cover, covers, covered, covering
Could not resist	couldn't, move, moves, moving, moved, strong, glue, glued, wouldn't, would, could
Resisted removal of clothing or covering	held, holding, hold, holds, pants, tries, trying, try, tried, keeps, kept, keep, keeping, shorts, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up
Attempted to restore clothing or covering	grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, cover, covers, covering, covered, towel, spread, spreads, spreading, spreaded, curtain, [puts hands over chest], brought, bring, brings, bringing, bringing up, bring up, brings up, brought up, underwear, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up, pants, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up, pull up, shorts, put, putting, puts, blanket, cover, covers, covering, covered, fixing, fixed, fixes, fix, shirt, cover, covers, covering, covered, pillow

---

**Verbal/passive resistance**


---

Told suspect to stop	no, yell, yells, yelling, yelled, tell, tells, telling, tell, get, got, getting, gets, off, say, says, said, saying, stop, hey
Sought help	called, call, calling, calls, mom
Passive resistance	cover, covers, covering, covered, eyes, clutch, clutches, clutching, clutched, curl up, curls up, curled up, curling up, close, closing, closed, closes, eyes, pretend, pretending, pretends, pretended, asleep, stayed, staying, stay, stays, still
<b>Descriptions of touch and body mechanics</b>	
Specific body part	vagina, thigh, private, vaginal area, butt, chest, head, hips, hip, cheek butt, breast, vagina, breast, breasts, breast, middle part, legs, body, back, hip, palm, hips, head, hair, side, private, chest, hand, stomach, pelvis, leg, penis, leg, legs, body, mouth, area, waist, dick, part, hip, hips, tummy, hair, feet, foot
Manual manipulation terms	grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, massages, massaging, massage, massaged, move, moves, moving, moved, shake, shaking, shakes, shook, squeezed, squeezing, squeezes, squeeze, rubs, rubbed, rub, rubbing, move, moves, moving, moved, pinch, pinches, pinched, pinching, touches, touch, touched, touching, hugging, touch tickle, tickles, tickling, tickled, tickle, tickles, tickling, tickled, touches, touch, touched, touching, sticking, sticks, stick, stuck, crosses, crossed, cross, crossing, scratching, scratch, scratches, scratched, goes, go, gone, went, going, motioned, motioning, motion, motions, cup, cups, cupping, cupped, goes, go, gone, went, going, opening, open, opened, opens, held, holding, hold, holds, jiggle, jiggles, jiggled, jiggling, shake, shaking, shakes, shook, pinch, pinches, pinched, pinching, put, putting, puts, gripped, grip, grips, gripping, squeezed, squeezing, squeezes, squeeze, held, holding, hold, holds, put, putting, puts, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, go up, gone up, goes up, went up, going up, going down, gone down, go down, went down, goes down, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, back and forth, hits, hit, hitting, move, moves, moving, moved, opening, open, opened, opens, taken, takes, took, take, taking, take out, taking out, takes out, taken out, took out, touches, touch, touched, touching, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, hugging, hugged, hug, hugs, move, moves, moving, moved, belt, pushing, pushes, push, pushed, finger, fingers, fingered, fingering, assaulted, assaults, assault, assaulting, wiggling, wiggle, wiggled, wiggles, tickle, tickles, tickling, tickled, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, squish, squished, squishes, squishing, twists, twist, twisting, twisted, squish, squished, squishes, squishing, squeezed, squeezing, squeezes, squeeze, squish, squished,

squishes, squishing, squish, squished, squishes, squishing, rubs, rubbed, rub, rubbing, pressing, presses, press, pressed, touches, touch, touched, touching, held, holding, hold, holds, having, have, has, had, move, moves, moving, moved, rubs, rubbed, rub, rubbing, pet, petted, pets, petting, move, moves, moving, moved, lower, slides, slid, slide, sliding, circular motion, circular motions, hits, hit, hitting, pinch, pinches, pinched, pinching, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, touches, touch, touched, touching, put, putting, puts, move, moves, moving, moved, going down, gone down, go down, went down, goes down

#### Demonstrative action

[wiggles fingers], [moves hand back and forth], [rubs hands together], [links arms in front of chest], [gestures hands], [touches hips], [motions rubbing butt], [touches thigh], [motions with flat hand], [Slides hand down], [pokes palm slides hand down body], [makes hand into fist and pulling motion], [puts both hands up], [moves hand back and forth, [tries to put up middle finger], [pokes desk], [touches finger to nose], [points finger towards interviewer], [crosses fingers], [points at crossed fingers], [puts crossed fingers in front of crotch], [shapes hand into circle and extends it away from body], [moves hand back and forth], [shapes both hands into circles and rotates them in opposite directions], [shapes both hands into circles and rotates them in opposite directions], [pulls hands apart], [raises hand], [slaps right thigh], [slides finger on table], [slides hand on table opposite direction], [rubbing motion], [lifts arm in front], [crosses arms], [covers back of left hand with the right hand], [pushes forward], [child lays one hand flat on the table and moves it back and forth], [hands together at pelvis], [puts hand on thigh], [holds up hand with open palm], [grabs thigh], [points to forearm], [bends arm], [extends arms and grabs table], [holds one arm stiff as she hits it with the other], [away from child], [crosses forearms], [pulls front of shirt out], [puts hands over chest], [pulls front of shirt out], [pulls front of shirt out and looks down], [points to thigh], [moves hands on table], [rests forearms on table], [holds hands in front of body], [swats arm], [crosses arms over chest], [touches chest], [puts arms in front of her], [places palm down on table], [crosses other hand on top], [places hand on table], [strokes hand up and down], [Child mimics squeezing motion with hand], [shakes hands], [crosses arms and holds them in front of him], [child motions hands], [gestures outside the view of the screen], [gestures

	off-screen], [child does rubbing motion near crotch], [lifts arms], [bends fingers], [rubs knee], [places hand on side of head], [put hands on hips], [puts hands on hips], [touches hair], [grabs chair], [points to middle of chest], [touches toy dog with both hands], [holds hands out in front of body], [hands by her side], [makes a grabbing motion], [points to middle of chest]
“Touch” only verb	Touch, touches, touching, touched
Placement of hands	in there, over clothes, clothes, inside, inside pants, pants, wall, bed, floor, back, shoulders, shoulder, side, on me, behind, in, crossed, bed, down, around, on her, ladder, together, door, leaving, left, leaves, leave, places, placing, place, placed, keeps, kept, keep, keeping, having, have, has, had, standing, stood, stand, stands, stayed, staying, stay, stays
Penetration	in, inside, finger, fingering, fingered, fingers, in there, where I pee, in me
Self-stimulation behaviors	tell, told, telling, tells, hair, inside, touches, touch, touched, touching, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, smelled, smells, smelling, smell, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, rubs, rubbed, rub, rubbing
<b>Other responses</b>	
Cleaning up	wash, washes, washing, washed, pulled up, pulling up, pulls up, pull up, pulling, pull, pulls, pulled, pants, opening, open, opened, opens, eyes, wash, washes, washing, washed, hands, wash, washes, washing, washed, dry, dries, drying, dried, pick up, picking up, picks up, picked up, grabs, grab, grabbing, grabbed, needed, needing, need, needs, towel
Feelings and emotions	didn't like, uncomfortable, confused, not supposed to do that disgusting, gross, said no mad, didn't know what was going on scared, uncomfortable glue, panic, hurt, scare, scare, wrong, want, ew, weird, ick, disgust, shock, tear, cry