Introduction

This report includes additional information about materials and data analyses to supplement Poole and Lindsay (2001). Throughout the published manuscript, comments inviting the reader to "see supplementary report" refer to the expansions below, listed in order of their appearance in the publication. The complete transcript set and data files are available from the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect, Cornell University, FLDC-MVR Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853 (www.ndacan.cornell.edu).

Witnessed and Nonwitnessed Events

Witnessed events were four demonstrations from the following list of eight, subdivided into two sets and counterbalanced across subjects: (a) lifting a can by pulling on ropes attached to one- and two-pulley systems, (b) spinning plastic tops and reaching for them with and without prism glasses, (c) floating a paper clip with a magnet, and (d) folding two types of paper airplanes, or (e) observing Mr. Science blow up balloons by mixing baking soda and vinegar in a bottle, (f) raising and lowering an eyedropper submerged in water by squeezing the container, (g) making a telephone out of a rubber tube and two funnels, and (h) lifting newsprint with play putty.

Parents contaminated children's reports by reading them a story, "A Visit to Mr. Science," that described two witnesses science demonstrations, two nonwitnessed science demonstrations, and one of two descriptions of bodily touch. Appendix A lists sample versions of the story.

The Interviews

The interviewing protocol is described in the published report; Appendix B lists the 10 question pairs for direct questioning.

Additional Results

Interview form. We were interested in whether the looked and heard prompts were useful for eliciting additional information from children. To separate the effects of these prompts from effects due to their positions in the interview protocol, we produced two interview forms to counterbalance the order of these two prompts. Each child received the same form for each of the three interview sessions.

To evaluate whether one prompt order was more successful in eliciting detailed information, we conducted four separate 2 (form) by 6 (age) trend analyses for each session, using the following dependent variables:  the number of Total SUs mentioned across Questions

1-5, the number of New SUs mentioned (i.e., SUs for Question 1 plus the New SUs for Questions 2-5), the proportion of Total SUs that were inaccurate, and the proportion of New SUs that were inaccurate. Despite the large number of tests, there was no evidence for an advantage of one question order over another: $F$ statistics for the form effect ranged from .01 to .82, all $ps >$ .36, and $F$ statistics for the Form x Linear Age Trend interaction ranged from .23 to 1.48, all $ps$ $> .22$.

  In Session 1, the <u>looked</u> and <u>heard</u> prompts elicited comparable amounts of new information ($Ms$ = 7.4 vs. 7.1), $p > .82$. In Sessions 2 and 3, however, the <u>looked</u> prompt elicited more new information from the children. In Session 2, children volunteered an average of 8.8 new pieces of information to the <u>looked</u> prompt compared to 6.3 to the <u>heard</u> prompt, $F(1, 108) =$ 5.32, <u>MSE</u> = 69.41, $p < .05$, although the advantage of the <u>looked</u> prompt did not vary significantly across age, $p > .74$. In Session 3, the children volunteered an average of 9.03 new pieces of information to the <u>looked</u> prompt compared to only 5.45 to the <u>heard</u> prompt, $F(1, 108)$ = 16.01, <u>MSE</u> = 46.68, $p < .001$; here again the Question x Linear Age Trend interaction did not reach significance, $p > .05$.

  <u>Impact of continued prompting with open-ended questions.</u> Table 1 lists the proportion of children who reported any new accurate information in response to each of the five free recall prompts in Session 1, before exposure to misinformation. Continued prompting was useful at all ages, although more of the older children responded to each prompt.

  Table 2 details the amount and accuracy of the new information that was elicited across repeated prompts in Session 1. Because these means are based only on those subjects who produced some information in response to specific questions, age groups were collapsed (3-4, 5-6, and 7-8 years) to simplify data presentation and increase sample sizes for more stable estimates of error rates. Note that rates of detail errors and intrusions were generally low across prompts.

  Table 3 lists the proportion of children who reported any new accurate information in response to each of the five free recall prompts in Sessions 2 and 3, after exposure to misinformation. As in Session 1, continued prompting was useful at all ages, although more of the older children responded to each prompt and relatively few children responded to the final <u>think</u> prompt with additional accurate information. Table 4 lists the mean number of new SUs reported by the children in response to each open-ended question, with rates of detail errors, intrusion errors, and suggested information. Age groups were collapsed into 3-4, 5-6, and 7-8 to simplify data presentation and stabilize the means. Scanning across the five questions, it is encouraging that rates of detail errors and intrusions generally remained low across prompts even after delays of 3 to 4 months, and there was no evidence that continued prompting with open-ended questions increased the risk of these types of errors.

  <u>Response to leading questions.</u> Table 5 lists the proportion of children who provided an event description when prompted to do so after "yes" and "no" responses to direct questions. As indicated in the article, these data make it possible to compute the impact of different criteria for deciding whether or not an event occurred from answers to direct yes-no questions. First, one could base judgments solely on whether the child correctly answered "yes" or "no" to the initial question in each pair. With this criterion for Session 2, one would correctly identify 71% of the experienced-only events that occurred 3 months earlier for the 3- to 4-year-olds, 75% for the 5-

to 6-year-olds, and 87% for the 7- to 8-year-olds. To explore a nonexperienced event category, we computed the percentages of these groups with correct "no" responses to touch-heard events during Session 2; these values were 61%, 64%, and 65%.

Because it is known that children sometimes falsely acquiesce and other times falsely deny events, some interviewers might prefer to prompt all children to provide narrative responses—regardless of their initial answers—on the grounds that narrative descriptions are more diagnostic of accurate memories. Therefore, we computed the percentage of accurate decisions that would be made if narrative responses alone were the criterion. For the 3 age groups in Session 2, the percentages of experienced-only events that were narrated were 49%, 75%, and 81%, and the corresponding percentages of touch-heard events that were not narrated were 45%, 53%, and 55%. In other words, decision accuracy would <u>decline</u> for both experienced-only and nonexperienced events if the presence of a narrative alone was the basis for deciding whether or not an event occurred. This is a result of the differential impact of prompting on responses regarding experienced and misled events: Few children denied an experienced-only event but then proceeded to describe it when they were encouraged to do so, presumably because those who did not remember it had little basis for generating a description. In contrast, children frequently denied a nonexperienced event but then described it after prompting, basing their narratives on the recent suggestions from their parents.

This pattern of higher decision accuracy from yes-no responses alone than from narrative responses alone was also evident in Session 3. For experienced-only events, decision accuracy was 76%, 85%, and 87% from yes-no answers alone, and 51%, 78%, and 84% for narrative answers alone. For touch-heard events, decision accuracy for yes-no answers alone was 45%, 78%, and 87%, compared to 42%, 61%, and 82% for narrative responses alone. Of course, decision accuracy could be improved for touch-heard events by requiring both a "yes" response and a subsequent narrative to verify an event (to 71%, 67%, and 67% in Session 2 and 53%, 81%, and 93% in Session 3), but such a strategy would also lower decision accuracy for the experienced-only events (to 45%, 69%, and 79% in Session 2 and 51%, 74%, and 83% in Session 3).

Because adults often take children's answers to specific or leading questions at face value, it is interesting to look closely at the types of errors that infiltrated children's responses to questions about experienced and nonexperienced events. Tables 6a and 6b present, for Sessions 2 and 3 respectively, the mean number of SUs mentioned by the various age groups in response to questions in each condition, and the proportion of those SUs that fell into various accuracy categories. To reiterate the coding scheme, accurate information included only SUs that accurately described experienced demonstrations or other aspects of participation in the study. "Wrong event" refers to information that is accurate for an event other than the one under discussion, but that might be mistaken by an interviewer as information regarding the event in question. (Only 10 children contributed to the wrong event category.) Detail errors refer to minor errors in describing experienced events. Intrusions were errors that bore no obvious relationship to events that the child experienced or heard, but that might be mistaken as information about the event in question. Incorrect rejections were narrative denials of an experienced event ("I didn't do that one"), and suggested information included any information about a nonexperienced event suggested in the story, including the child's spontaneous elaborations on those topics. The final column, Total Inaccurate, sums detail errors, intrusions, incorrect rejections, and suggested information.

Several findings are apparent in Tables 6a and 6b. First, error rates were predictably lower for questions about experienced events than for those about nonexperienced events. Error rates for experienced events were not as low as one might expect, however. For example, .25 of the information volunteered by 3-year-olds about experienced-only demonstrations in Session 2 was clearly inaccurate, owing to intrusions (.11), incorrect rejections (.03), and suggested information regarding a heard-only event (.10). Furthermore, an additional .10 was wrong question information that could make it difficult for an adult accurately to reconstruct the event. Average error rates on experienced-heard demonstrations were between .01 and .06 across the two Sessions for 4- to 8-year-olds; these rates are typical of free recall performance in studies that test subjects before they are misled, although this error rate was higher (.16) in both sessions for the 3-year-olds.

Error rates associated with questions about nonexperienced events were substantial. Note that, for nonexperienced conditions, accurate information includes correct denials (e.g., "I can't tell you, because I didn't see it") as well as any information about other experienced events that the children spontaneously volunteered. For heard-only demonstrations, average rates of inaccurate information across ages ranged between .74 and .89 in Session 2, and between .56 and .86 in Session 3. For touch-heard events, the average ranges were between .44 and .87 in Session 2, and between .33 and 1.00 in Session 3. For these conditions, the majority of wrong information stemmed directly from exposure to the story. Inaccuracy rates were somewhat lower at all ages on control events, with errors stemming from children's tendency to be cooperative in conversation by piping in from general knowledge. For example, in response to the control question, "Can you tell me about the tops?," one 6-year-old remarked, "They go around." Average error rates for control demonstrations ranged between .29 and .53 in Session 2, and between .23 and .67 in Session 3. For touch-heard events, error rates ranged from .44 to .87 in Session 2, and from .33 to 1.00 in Session 3; these error rates were higher at all ages than those for touch-control events, which ranged between .00 and .49 in Session 2, and .00 and .57 in Session 3.

Examples of intermixing experienced and nonexperienced events into event narratives. Appendix C lists sample responses to open-ended questions for a 4-year-old, 6-year-old, and 8-year-old to illustrate reports of experienced and nonexperienced events. Appendix D lists example responses to direct questions for three event conditions (e.g., experienced-only, heard-only, and touch-heard).

Table 7a lists the mean utterance length for children who produced some information in response to direct questions that would likely be assumed to be related to the question. One must be cautious in comparing individual means in this table, because some values are based on a very small number of responses (e.g., touch-heard events for the 7-year-olds). A preliminary look at the data, however, revealed a marked discontinuity between the length of narratives from the 3-year-olds and the older children, and therefore we did not collapse into three age groups. For experienced-only and experienced-heard demonstrations, tabled values represent the mean number of SUs that were coded as accurate, wrong event, detail error, or intrusion, per question, for those subjects who produced at least some information in these categories. These means thus represent the length of narratives that appeared to be descriptions of the events in question. For the four nonexperienced categories, tabled values are the mean numbers of SUs categorized as wrong event, suggested, or intrusions.

4

It is clear from Table 7a that 3-year-olds typically generated shorter descriptions than did the older children. Beyond age 3 years, however, leading questions function as an "equalizer" for young children (i.e., relative to their production in response to open-ended questions, which is typically less elaborated than that of older children). For example, the 4- to 5-year-olds who responded averaged 11.1 SUs for questions about experienced-only events in Session 2, only slightly less than the 12.8 SUs given by the 7- to 8-year-olds. The 4- to 5-year-olds responded with slightly more information to heard-only and touch-heard events then did the older children.

The data in Table 7a indicate that it would be difficult to discern the truth status of children's utterances only from the amount of information they provided in response to leading questions. To evaluate this conclusion statistically, we conducted condition comparisons at each session for the three major age groups (3-4, 5-6, 7-8), which are detailed in Table 7b. Keep in mind that these statistics are based only on the subset of subjects who reported narrative information in each of the two event conditions that are being compared. These analyses therefore address whether we can use the size of individual children's narratives for events that we know occurred (i.e., experienced-only), or did not occurred (i.e., control), as a standard to judge the truth status of allegations (i.e., heard-only or touch-heard). At Session 2, (a) descriptions of experienced-only events were not significantly longer ($M$ = 11.5, $SD$ = 7.3) than descriptions of heard-only events ($M$ = 11.3, $SD$ = 7.4), and (b) descriptions of heard-only events were longer than descriptions of control events ($M$ = 7.6, $SD$ = 7.2). (Only 7 children in Session 2 and 8 children in Session 3 produced narratives for both touch-heard and touch-control events; the comparisons were not statistically significant despite somewhat longer narratives for touch-heard than touch-control events.) These data show that children's descriptions of heard-only events were longer, on average, then the descriptions they generated when interviewers asked them specific questions about novel events, but individual variability was large. Furthermore, narrative length did not discriminate between experienced and heard events, and there were no significant differences between conditions 1 month later.

Spontaneously mentioning the misleading story. Prior to formal source-monitoring questions, few children spontaneously mentioned the misleading story in a way that would alert interviewers to a contaminating influence. Thirty-one children (27%) mentioned the story at some point during their two post-contamination interviews, but eight of these children merely referenced the story during rapport building, when interviewers asked them to report the day's events (e.g., "And read some with my mom"). Of the 23 (20%) who mentioned the story during questions about the science experience, 20 (18%) did so in Session 2, shortly after their parents had read the story. Unexpectedly, the older children were not more likely to mention the story spontaneously: The 20 children who referred to the story in Session 2 included five 3-year-olds, three 4-year-olds, six 5-year-olds, one 6-year-old, three 7-year-olds, and two 8-year-olds. Approximately a month later, in Session 3, only ten children (9%) mentioned the story during substantive questioning (four 5-year-olds, one 6-year-old, two 7-year-olds, and three 8-year-olds). Furthermore, across both of the final sessions, only seven children who mentioned the story explicitly rejected the event with comments such as "I heard in the book that it said that. . .but it's not true" or "No, I'll tell you but it's in the story;" the remaining sixteen children made more ambiguous references to the story, such as "It was a wet wipe, and in the story it got around my mouth and tasted really yucky."

Accuracy on source-monitoring questions about the story and the events. Table 8a lists the mean proportion of accurate responses to story and event questions separately as a function of event condition, age, and session, with overall accuracy rates across the 10 events listed in the right-most column. Summary information at the bottom of each panel reports the results of separate session by linear age trend analyses for each condition, which are detailed in Table 8b.

Regarding the story questions, accuracy increased significantly with age for experienced-only, heard-only, and touch-heard questions. Because the correct response was "no" to experienced-only demonstrations but "yes" to heard-only demonstrations and touch-heard events, age differences in yeah-saying cannot account for these patterns. There was no significant age trend for touch-control questions (with performance close to ceiling), and age trends also failed to reach significance for experienced-heard questions (with even the youngest children responding correctly about 74% of the time). The overall pattern is one of significant age trends for identifying the source of events with which children became familiar through one source only, but flatter age trends for events with which children became familiar through both sources or not at all. In other words, compared to the older children the younger children had more difficulty specifying the source of events that they encountered through only one of the two possible sources.

Reliable session effects in responses to source-monitoring story questions regarding experienced-only, heard-only, and touch-control events were not modified by an interaction with age. For these event conditions, accuracy declined across sessions comparably for all age groups. The reliable sessions effect for control demonstrations, however, was qualified by a significant interaction with age. It can be seen in Table 8a that there was an age trend in Session 2, with older children correctly indicating that these demonstrations had not appeared in the book the majority of the time, but no age trend at Session 3, when even the 6- to 8-year-olds often falsely responded "yes" to these questions. Although this result might reflect poor memory for the story due simply to delay, it may also be the case that leading and source-monitoring questions in Session 2 produced feelings of familiarity about control demonstrations which the children falsely attributed to the story in Session 3.

Across all types of events, accuracy on questions about the contents of the story improved with age, but there also was a significant session effect and a Session x Linear Age Trend interaction. Age differences in reconstructing the book attenuated with time since last exposure: At Session 2, there was a difference of 19% between the youngest two age groups and the oldest two, but this difference was only 9% by Session 3.

In contrast to the story questions, there were significant age trends across all conditions for the event questions, with the older children performing better. This finding of more consistent age trends for event questions is a predictable consequence of the fact that the actual events took place 3-4 months previously, whereas the story questions asked about recently-presented information. There was only one significant session effect, for experienced-only events, with more accurate "yes" responses during Session 3. There was only one Session x Linear Age Trend interaction, for touch-control events. As shown in Table 8a, for touch-control events a linear age trend emerged only during Session 3, when the youngest children made more erroneous "yes" responses (whereas all ages were at or near ceiling for touch-control events during Session 2). Averaging across all event types, the older children answered more event questions accurately, and age trends were statistically stable across sessions.

We conducted separate question type (story vs. event) by linear age trend analyses on overall accuracy at each session to compare directly the children's ability to reconstruct the story, which they had heard relatively recently, with their ability to identify the actual events, which were experienced 3 or 4 months earlier. At Session 2, there was the expected linear age trend favoring the older children, $F(1, 108) = 77.00$, $\underline{MSE} = .02$, $\underline{p} < .001$, with no effect of question type, $\underline{p} > .12$, and no Question Type x Linear Age Trend interaction, $\underline{p} > .46$. Thus the children were equally accurate at Session 2 in answering source questions about the story and the actual events. In contrast, there was a significant effect of question type in Session 3, $\underline{F}(1, 108) = 90.36$, $\underline{MSE} = .02$, $\underline{p} < .001$, with a Question Type x Linear Age Trend interaction, $\underline{F}(1,108) = 12.45$, $\underline{MSE} = .02$, $\underline{p} < .01$. One month after exposure to the story, the children were more accurate in answering questions about actual events than about what was in the story, and this was especially true for the older children.

      Source-monitoring performance only on items that received a "yes" response. We (Poole & Lindsay, 2001) reported how accurately children assigned individual events to sources by accurately answering questions about whether the event had actually happened and whether the event had been mentioned in the story. Although the children answered event questions only for events to which they responded "yes" during leading questions, they were asked a story question about each event they did not spontaneously mention, and incorrect rejections on these questions could have contributed to low overall performance. To analyze whether or not this was the case, we recomputed accuracy rates using only items that received a "yes" response to either a leading question or a story question. Comparing the data in Poole and Lindsay with Tables 9a and 9b in this report shows that the children's overall performance for most conditions was not improved by focusing only on events with which they had claimed to be familiar at some point in the interview. The severe reductions in accuracy on control and touch-control events in this table reflect poor source-monitoring for control items that were falsely recognized earlier in the interview.

      Statistical analyses of Figure 1. In Poole & Lindsay (2001), Figure 1 summarized the children's performance before and after the source-monitoring procedure. To evaluate those data statistically, for science demonstration events we computed the decline in acceptances as a result of the source-monitoring procedure for each event condition (proportion acceptances to leading questions - proportion acceptances after the source-monitoring procedure) and entered these difference scores into a condition (experienced, heard-only, or control demonstration) by linear age trend analysis at each session. At Session 2, there was a highly significant main effect of condition, $\underline{F}(2, 216) = 12.68$, $\underline{MSE} = .04$, $\underline{p} < .001$, and a Condition by Linear Age Trend interaction, $\underline{F}(2, 216) = 3.22$, $\underline{MSE} = .04$, $\underline{p} < .05$. Separate age trend analyses for each condition confirmed no linear age trends for experienced or control events, indicating that reductions in acceptances from the source-monitoring procedure were constant across ages for these conditions, $\underline{p}s > .09$. The linear age trend also failed to reach significance for heard-only events, $\underline{p} = .065$, but there was a significant quadratic trend, $F(1, 108) = 4.71$, $\underline{MSE} = .08$, $\underline{p} < .05$. It is apparent from Figure 1 that there was a gradual increase in the impact of the source-monitoring procedure between ages 3 and 6, followed by somewhat less of an impact for the 7- and 8-year-olds (who had lower rates of acceptances on heard-only events going into the source procedure). At Session 3, there was a significant age trend, $\underline{F}(1, 108) = 8.22$, $\underline{MSE} = .03$, $\underline{p} < .01$, but no

7

condition effect nor a Condition by Linear Age Trend interaction, ps > .29. In this final session, the reduction in acceptances from the source-monitoring procedure was greater at the younger than at the older ages, due to the fact that the older children infrequently rejected experienced events and were almost at floor before the source-monitoring procedure for accepting nonexperienced events.

The rate of false reports of an instance of unpleasant touching did not reliably vary as a function of age in Session 2. As shown in Figure 1, however, age effects were quite dramatic following the source-monitoring procedure. In Session 2, the 3- and 4-year-old failed to benefit at all from the source-monitoring training: False reports of suggested touching remained as high after the source-monitoring procedure as they had been in response to leading questions, with 39% of the children continuing to allege that the suggested touch had really occurred. In contrast, the rate of false reporting by older children was quite substantially reduced by the addition of the source-monitoring procedure (from 36% reporting touching initially to only 16% reporting touching with source-monitoring questions). The statistical significance of these patterns were confirmed by entering difference scores (acceptance rates on leading questions - acceptance rates after source monitoring) into a condition (touch-heard vs. touch-control) by linear age trend analysis. As depicted in Figure 1, there was a significant linear age trend, $F(1, 108) = 6.78$, $\underline{MSE}$ = .05, $\underline{p}$ < .05, with the older children benefiting more from source-monitoring questions, and, due to floor effects on touch-control events, a significant main effect of condition, $F(1, 108) = 18.03$, $\underline{MSE} = .05$, $\underline{p} < .001$, with a Condition x Linear Age Trend interaction, $F(1, 108) = 6.78$, $\underline{MSE} = .05$, $\underline{p} < .05$.

For younger children the rate of falsely reporting the touching events increased from Session 2 to 3, whereas for older children false reports of the touching events decreased across these two sessions (perhaps partly because of residual benefits of the Session 2 source-monitoring procedure). As for Session 2, difference scores for Session 3 were entered into a condition (touch-heard vs. touch-control) by linear age trend analysis. There was a significant effect of condition, $F(1, 108) = 7.61$, $\underline{MSE} = .05$, $\underline{p} < .01$, due to reductions in acceptances for the suggested touch events but not the control events (which were already at floor). There was no significant linear age trend, and no Condition x Linear Age Trend interaction, however, ps > .28. Note in Figure 1 that the older children were already near floor for nonexperienced touch events in Session 3. Consequently, although the source-monitoring procedure was highly effective in eliminating most of the older children's false responses, the absolute decline in acceptances was comparable across age groups.

Stability of true and false reports. Investigators are interested in reporting patterns for individual events because consistency is often touted as an indicator of the veracity of a report (Fisher & Cutler, 1995). Indeed, Brewer, Potter, Fisher, Bond, and Luszcz (1999) found that subject/jurors identified inconsistency across statements as the strongest indicator of inaccuracy of the witness's final statements. On the other hand, reports that do not vary may be viewed as artificial, because reporting with some variation is seen as a characteristic of normal recall (e.g., Pence & Wilson, 1994).

Table 10 details stability findings for the current project. For these analyses, we tracked the stability of "yes" responses to source-monitoring event questions between Sessions 2 and 3. We expected that memories of the experienced events (which were already 3 or 4 months old during Session 2) would be more stable than memories of the recently presented story. This was

the case: Across all age groups, the probability that experienced-only events accepted in Session 2 were also accepted in Session 3 was .94, which was higher than the unconditional probability of acceptance in Session 3 (.78). Reports of suggested events showed stability across sessions, but were not as consistent as reports of actual events. Unfortunately, there were not sufficient "yes" responses to control events to provide reliable stability estimates at all ages, and therefore we cannot adequately test the prediction that endogenous errors will be more stable than errors based on recently suggested information (e.g., Brainerd & Poole, 1997).

The data on session effects and these analyses converge on some interesting conclusions. First, the greater persistence of true versus implanted reports lends some support for the practice of viewing allegations that drop out of children's reports with greater suspicion than stable reports. This suggests that it could be informative to conduct a second interview to test for the consistency of reports over short time periods that normally are not associated with forgetting of actual events. Even false reports showed some stability over time, however, and thus the reiteration of a report does not by itself diagnose accuracy, and even accurate reports are not perfectly stable.

Individual differences data. In Poole and Lindsay (2001), we summarized correlations between various individuals differences variables and suggestibility. Table 11 reports the complete matrix of zero-order and partial correlations.

References

Brainerd, C. J., & Poole, D. A. (1997). Long-term survival of children's false memories: A review. Learning and Individual Differences, 9, 125-151.

Brewer, N., Potter, B., Fisher, R. P., Bond, N., & Luszcz, M. A. (1999). Beliefs and data on the relationships between consistency and accuracy of eyewitness testimony. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 13, 297-313.

Fisher, R. P., & Cutler, B. L. (1995). The relation between consistency and accuracy of eyewitness testimony. In G. Davies, S. Lloyd-Bostock, M. McMurran, & C. Wilson (Eds.), Psychology, law and criminal justice: International developments in research and practice (pp. 21-28). Berlin: DeGruyter.

Pence, D., & Wilson, C. A. (1994). Team investigation of child sexual abuse: The uneasy alliance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Poole, D. A., & Linday, D. S. (2001). Children's eyewitness reports after exposure to misinformation from parents. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied.

Appendix A

Sample Stories

Two examples of "A Visit to Mr. Science" (from 16 possible stories that differed in terms of which four events were described, their order, and whether the description of body touching involved the wet-wipe or the sticker).

Science Set #1

Today Stacey was going to visit Mr. Science. Mr. Science works at the university. He has a closet filled with games and toys so that children can learn about their world.

Stacey put on her coat when it was time to go. They got in the car and drove to a parking lot next to a big brick building. The building had ivy growing all over it. Stacey was a little scared at first, but it was a friendly place inside. A nice lady met Stacey in a big room. The room had candy and pop machines, two sofas to sit on, and a box full of toys to play with until it was Stacey's turn to see Mr. Science.

Mr. Science works in a little room with a closet and a big window. There is a table to put the games on, and a camera that takes pictures of the children while they are playing. Mr. Science showed Stacey a timer that looked like a red tomato. They set the timer for 16 minutes. This was how much time Stacey had to play.

First Mr. Science brought out a can with a top. "I'll show you how to make a paper clip float in the air!" said Mr. Science. There was a magnet at the end of a rod on the top of the can, and a piece of thread with a paper clip tied to the bottom. The paper clip wanted to stick to the magnet, but the thread wasn't long enough for the paper clip to reach the magnet. Mr. Science showed Stacey how to move the rod to make the paper clip follow the magnet. It looked like the paper clip was floating in the air.

Next Mr. Science put a big pop bottle on the table. The bottle was filled with water. There was an eyedropper in the bottle that had a blue rubber top. The eyedropper was filled with little metal balls. Mr. Science showed Stacey how to squeeze the bottle to make the eyedropper sink to the bottom of the bottle. "When you squeeze the bottle," said Mr. Science, "it pushes water into the eyedropper and makes it heavier." Stacey had fun trying to squeeze the bottle to make the eyedropper go up and down.

Next Mr. Science brought out some paper and put it on the table. "Have you ever made paper airplanes?" he asked. Mr. Science said that they were going to make two different paper airplanes. Then they would see how each one flies. Stacey and Mr. Science folded the airplanes and threw them to see which one flew the best. Mr. Science said that one plane flew a little differently because it had more weight up in front.

Next Mr. Science brought out a balloon and said that he could blow up the balloon without blowing air into it. He took a pop bottle and poured some vinegar into it. Then he put some baking soda into the balloon. The baking soda looked like white powder. When he put the end of the balloon on the bottle, the powder fell into the vinegar, and the balloon filled up with gas. It was fun to see the balloon fill up when nobody was blowing into it!

Then the timer made a loud noise and Stacey's time with Mr. Science was over. Stacey's hands were dirty from playing all of the games. Mr. Science wiped Stacey's hands and face with a wet-wipe. The cloth got close to Stacey's mouth and tasted really yucky. Then the lady gave her some money for playing with Mr. Science. The grownups talked while Stacey looked at her money.

Science Set #2

Today Nathan was going to visit Mr. Science. Mr. Science works at the university. He has a closet filled with games and toys so that children can learn about their world.

Nathan put on his coat when it was time to go. They got in the car and drove to a parking lot next to a big brick building. The building had ivy growing all over it. Nathan was a little scared at first, but it was a friendly place inside. A nice lady met Nathan in a big room. The room had candy and pop machines, two sofas to sit on, and a box full of toys to play with until it was Nathan's turn to see Mr. Science.

Mr. Science works in a little room with a closet and a big window. There is a table to put the games on, and a camera that takes pictures of the children while they are playing. Mr. Science showed Nathan a timer that looked like a red tomato. They set the timer for 16 minutes. This was how much time Nathan had to play.

First Mr. Science put some strange things on the table. There was a long black rubber hose and some plastic funnels. "We are going to build our own telephone" he said. He put one funnel on one end of the hose, and another funnel on the other end of the hose. Then Nathan put a funnel over his ear and Mr. Science asked questions into their telephone. Mr. Science and Nathan took turns listening and talking into the telephone. Mr. Science said that our voices travel through the funnels and hose and this makes our voices louder.

Next Mr. Science took out a big wooden machine that had ropes hanging from it. This was the pulley machine. Mr. Science showed Nathan how to put a soup can on the ropes with a hook. Nathan pulled on the ropes to lift the can. It was easy to lift the can with one of the ropes. The easy rope had two pulleys to help with the work. It was harder to lift the can with the other rope. The hard rope only had one pulley. Nathan had fun lifting the can until Mr. Science said it was time to do something different.

Next Mr. Science brought out a red egg that had some putty inside. He put newspaper on the table and said, "Do you know how to lift words and pictures with Silly Putty?" Mr. Science showed Nathan how to squish and flatten the putty onto the newspaper. When they took the

putty off the paper, Nathan saw that the words and pictures from the paper were stuck to the putty. Mr. Science and Nathan had fun pulling the putty to make the pictures stretch. Sometimes the pictures on the putty were nice and clear, but other times the putty did not work so well.

Next Mr. Science brought out a bowl filled with plastic tops. First Mr. Science showed Nathan how to spin the tops on the table with his fingers. They practiced spinning the tops and reaching for them. Then Mr. Science gave Nathan a pair of funny glasses that made everything look weird. Mr. Science asked Nathan to put on the glasses and try to reach for the spinning tops. "It is hard to grab the tops with the glasses on," said Mr. Science.

Then the timer made a loud noise and Nathan's time with Mr. Science was over. Mr. Science took a sticker that said "Science is Fun!" and put it on Nathan's tummy. He had to push kind of hard to make the sticker stick on Nathan's tummy, and it hurt a little bit at first. But Nathan laughed. Then the lady gave him some money for playing with Mr. Science. The grownups talked while Nathan looked at his money.

Appendix B

The Ten Leading Question Pairs

The order of questions was randomized for each subject with the restriction that one question representing experienced-only, experienced-heard, heard-only, control, and touch event conditions appeared in the first and second block of five questions.

Did Mr. Science have a machine with ropes to pull?
      Yes:    Tell me about the machine.
      No:    Can you tell me about the machine?

Did Mr. Science blow up a balloon?
      Yes:    Tell me about the balloon.
      No:    Can you tell me about the balloon?

Did you see Mr. Science make a paper clip float with a magnet?
      Yes:    Tell me about the magnet.
      No:    Can you tell me about the magnet?

Did Mr. Science show you how to make an eyedropper go up and down in a bottle?
      Yes:    Tell me about the eyedropper.
      No:    Can you tell me about the eyedropper?

Did you make paper airplanes with Mr. Science?
      Yes:    Tell me about the airplanes.
      No:    Can you tell me about the airplanes?

Did you make a telephone with Mr. Science?
      Yes:    Tell me about the telephone.
      No:    Can you tell me about the telephone?

Did you spin tops with Mr. Science?
      Yes:    Tell me about the tops.
      No:    Can you tell me about the tops?

Did Mr. Science let you lift words or pictures with silly putty?
      Yes:    Tell me about the silly putty.
      No:    Can you tell me about the silly putty?

Did Mr. Science put something yucky in your mouth?
      Yes:    Tell me about that yucky thing.
      No:    Can you tell me about that yucky thing?

Did Mr. Science push your tummy?

Yes:    Tell me what Mr. Science did to your tummy.

No:    Can you tell me what Mr. Science did to your tummy?

Appendix C

Sample Free Recall Narratives

The following are examples of how children interspersed reports of experienced and suggested events in their responses to open-ended questions. Responses based on suggested information are underlined.

4 Years Old

Interviewer: I'm interested in getting to know more about you today. I'm going to ask you some questions, and I might write down some notes so that I can remember what you say. This tape recorder will pick up what you say too, so I need you to talk nice and loud, okay? First, let's talk about today. You know a lot about what you and your family have done today. Tell me everything you can about what you have done today.

Child: Eat, play, playing games.

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about what you have done today?

Child: Okay. Get ready for hunting. And that's mostly all.

Interviewer: All right. We are going to talk about something different now. A while ago you went to visit Mr. Science. Mr. Science played some games with you and then you answered some questions into a tape recorder, just like this one. Do you remember playing with Mr. Science? Good. I want you to tell me everything that happened. Start with the first thing that happened and tell me everything you can, even things you don't think are very important. But don't guess or make anything up—just tell me what you saw or heard or did the time you played in the science room with Mr. Science.

Child: Well, I don't remember that much. I played with the can lifting thing. <u>I played with the eyedropper.</u> And I played with. . .that's all I can remember. We made paper airplanes and colored them.

Interviewer: Can you tell me more so that I will know all about what happened in the science room too?

Child: I put on a black jacket to play the games and I, <u>he washed my face and it tasted yucky.</u>

Interviewer: Sometimes we remember a lot about sounds, or things that people said. Tell me about all of the things you heard in the science room.

Child:  He said we had to put on this black jacket, and he said it was time to play a different game. That's all I can remember.

Interviewer:  Sometimes we remember a lot about how things looked. Think about all of the things that were in the science room. Tell me how everything looked.

Child:  Well, the pulley can was wood, and the pop bottle was green. <u>And the balloon was. . .can't remember the balloon. Well we poured some stuff into the balloon,</u> and that's all I can remember.

Interviewer:  Think about what you told me. Is there something you didn't tell me that you can tell me now?

Child:  The timer was shaped like a tomato.

<p align="center">6 Years Old</p>

Interviewer:  (first rapport question)

Child:  I went to my friend's house but he wasn't, couldn't play and I danced for my mom and dad, my mom. And I was waiting 'til you get here. And I went to school and I and my teacher read a story. And at school we went to gym and then I got ready to go home. And I colored in my coloring book that I got today and my dad colored, I mean read the little science book. That's all I can remember.

Interviewer:  (second rapport question)

Child:  Can't remember any more.

Interviewer:  (<u>tell</u> prompt)

Child:  We played with silly putty and with the newspaper we put the silly putty on the newspaper and then we flattened it on one of the pictures and then it shows it but some didn't work. And we made our own telephones with these kind of tubes and then we talked to each other and <u>we tried to make the paperclip float in the air and we seed how the, who's airplane was that went the farthest.</u> And there was a timer that we set up for 16 seconds and it looked like a tomato. And I put on this like army coat kind of like and then at the end when the timer did a loud sound <u>then he gave me a sticker and he had to push really hard but it didn't really hurt</u>. Then it was time to go and I got some money. And while my mom and the people were talking I looked at my money and then it was time to go home.

Interviewer:  (<u>more</u> prompt)

Child:  Can't remember the rest. There were some other things we did but I can't remember.

Interviewer:  (looked prompt)

Child:  Like the silly putty was kinda like my skin and there was this one tube that looked like grayish and this thing that we talked in was red and the other one was blue. The paper airplanes were white and the paperclip was silver. Then when it was time to go home I saw my money was green.

Interviewer:  (heard prompt)

Child:  He said "We're gonna work on something until you have to go home" and then he said, "We're gonna work on paper airplanes," and then made them. Then he said, "We're gonna work with putty on newspapers." He asked me to make pictures on the silly putty and then he said, "We're gonna make this balloon float up in the air, make it blow up without even blowing it and we're gonna," he said, "We're gonna make the paperclip float in the air" and "we're gonna talk, we're gonna make our own telephone."

Interviewer:  (think prompt)

Child:  Nope.

## 8 Years Old

Interviewer:  (first rapport question)

Child:  First, I woke up and I got ready for school and then I went to school and then I went to school and we had this open house thing so my dad came and he looked at my classroom and everything and then he left and then I went outside for recess and then came in and did English then we came and went to lunch and then we did our reading and then we did our spelling and then we went home and then I went to babysitter's and then my dad came and picked me up and we went home and ate dinner and then that's all.

Interviewer:  (second rapport question)

Child:  And then, well, after we had English we went to another recess and then, that's all I can remember really.

Interviewer:  (tell prompt)

Child:  Well, first we, first we took out these like funnels and this tube and he said we our voices would travel through the tubes and the funnels so we put the funnels and the tubes together and we talked. But I don't remember what we said, and then we had this like, pulley machine, and one of them was real easy to pick up the can, because it had two of them to help, but the other one only had one so its really hard to lift

the can, and then we played with silly putty and then we lift the pictures from newspapers and then we'd bounce them and everything and that's all.

Interviewer:    (more prompt)

Child:    She took this bottle and there was this one thing in it, and it was floating at the top so he said can you try to get that to the bottom. And so I tried but it wouldn't work so then he squeezed the sides of the bottle and it went all the way down and touched the bottom. That's all really.

Interviewer:    (looked prompt)

Child:    There was this timer, it was shaped like a tomato and a pulley-machine was like wood and it had strings hanging down from it and the putty was in like a round nut and the putty was peach colored and the bottle was a Pepsi bottle and it had. . .um, that's all.

Interviewer:    (heard prompt)

Child:    He welcomed me and said "Hi" and then I said "Hello" and he said, "Today we're going to learn about Science" and then he took out these things and then he said, "How do our…do you know how our voice travels through these tubes?" I go, "No," and so he goes, "They travel because our voice sounds goes through the funnel and through the tube and through the other funnel" and then he said, "Do you know how you can get this bottle, this thing in the bottle from the top to the bottom?" I go, "No" and so he showed me how you do that and he goes, "Do you know how you lift pictures with silly putty?" I go "Yeah" and so I flattened it out and lifted the pictures.

Interviewer:    (think prompt)

Child:    No.

Appendix D

Sample Answers to Leading Questions

These answers to direct questions about experienced-only, heard-only, and touch-heard events illustrate how direct yes-no questions act as an "equalizer" to reduce age differences in the amount of information reported. Note that answers to suggested events contain many characteristics that often are associated with reports of experienced events, such as spontaneous corrections and contextual details.

## Experienced-Only

Age
3   I know. He did do something with the magnet. Didn't move but it fell off.
4   Well, I accidentally broke it. But he still taught me how to float it. It floated.
5   We, we spinned them around a lots of them and them. They spinned really fast and they were all sorts of colors.
6   It was pink. And when you put the newspaper on it had black picture.
7   Well there was, we spinned the tops and I think, before that or after that, after that I think we put those glasses on I think and the top was slanting.
8   We spun them, then he put glasses on me and then it looked blurry.

## Heard-Only

3   He put mixture in, salt and it looked like powder.
4   I can not remember anything. I remember one thing. He helped me, show me how to sunk to the bottom. I had fun doing it.
5   They spinned around and a couple of them went on the floor.
6   He didn't blow up one but he put powder in it and stuff like baking powder.
7   Well, the tops, we took turns spinning them and we used sunglasses and it looked really weird. It was fun. though.
8   It was brown, it was called a pulley machine and you can lift things with it.

## Touch-Heard

3   It hurt a little bit and I laughed. He put a sticker on it.
4   When he put a sticker on it that said, "Science is Fun."
5   That was the yucky wipe, but, but I didn't get sick. But it was yucky, but he wiped my hands with the wipe and it was, from playing with that silly putty stuck to the pictures.
6   He pushed and then the sticker stayed on. It hurt a little bit.
7   It was a baby wipe and it had soap in it.
8   He put a sticker on my tummy.

Table 1

| | Age | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Question | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1.  Tell | .21 | .58 | .83 | 1.00 | .89 | .96 |
| 2.  More | .26 | .26 | .44 | .50 | .72 | .73 |
| 3.  Looked or Heard | .37 | .37 | .78 | .78 | .78 | .82 |
| 4.  Heard or Looked | .26 | .53 | .56 | .83 | .67 | .96 |
| 5.  Think | .11 | .11 | .22 | .22 | .28 | .27 |

Note.  All information given in response to the tell prompt is, by definition, new, so the data for this prompt represent the proportion of children who gave any free-recall information that was not clearly off topic.

Table 2

Session 1:  Mean Number of New SUs in Response to the Five Open-Ended Questions,

and the Proportion of Information that was Inaccurate (with Standard Deviations)

|  | | | | Proportion Inaccurate | | | | | |
|  | Mean New SUs | | | Detail Errors | | | Intrusion Errors | | |
| Age | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 |
| Tell | 4.1 | 28.7 | 46.7 | .00 | .01 | .01 | .00 | .05 | .00 |
|  | (8.7) | (29.3) | (44.9) | (.00) | (.03) | (.02) | (.00) | (.20) | (.00) |
| More | 1.9 | 7.8 | 11.4 | .03 | .00 | .04 | .12 | .00 | .00 |
|  | (4.7) | (13.3) | (11.8) | (.08) | (.00) | (.18) | (.31) | (.00) | (.00) |
| Looked | 2.0 | 6.4 | 13.4 | .02 | .01 | .03 | .00 | .01 | .00 |
|  | (3.6) | ( 8.7) | (15.3) | (.05) | (.05) | (.05) | (.00) | (.04) | (.00) |
| Heard | 1.1 | 7.7 | 12.3 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 |
|  | (2.1) | (9.7) | (23.7) | (.00) | (.02) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) |
| Think | .5 | 1.9 | 5.7 | .00 | .02 | .09 | .20 | .06 | .00 |
|  | (1.3) | (4.4) | (12.8) | (.00) | (.05) | (.29) | (.45) | (.18) | (.00) |

Table 3

Sessions 2 and 3:  Proportion of Children Who Reported Any New Accurate SUs in Response to Each Successive Open-Ended Prompt

|  | Age | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Question | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| | | | Session 2 | | | |
| 1. Tell | .42 | .84 | .83 | 1.00 | .78 | .96 |
| 2. More | .26 | .53 | .67 | .61 | .61 | .77 |
| 3. Looked or Heard | .37 | .58 | .72 | .89 | .67 | .82 |
| 4. Looked or Heard | .47 | .63 | .67 | .72 | .67 | .96 |
| 5. Think | .00 | .26 | .28 | .22 | .33 | .23 |
| | | | Session 3 | | | |
| 1. Tell | .53 | .89 | .89 | 1.00 | .94 | .95 |
| 2. More | .32 | .37 | .56 | .56 | .56 | .41 |
| 3. Looked or Heard | .47 | .53 | .78 | .83 | .67 | .95 |
| 4. Looked or Heard | .37 | .63 | .67 | .89 | .89 | .91 |
| 5. Think | .11 | .21 | .17 | .17 | .39 | .23 |

Table 4

Sessions 2 and 3: Mean Number of New SUs in Response to the Five Open-Ended Questions, and the Proportion of Information that was Inaccurate (with Standard Deviations)

| | | | | Proportion Inaccurate | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean New SUs | | | Detail Errors | | | Intrusion Errors | | | Suggested Information | | |
| Age | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 | 3-4 | 5-6 | 7-8 |
| Tell | 20.4 | 41.1 | 60.1 | .01 | .01 | .02 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .15 | .08 | .08 |
| | (39.7) | (35.5) | (55.5) | (.03) | (.02) | (.04) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.24) | (.15) | (.14) |
| More | 6.4 | 9.3 | 14.3 | .01 | .01 | .01 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .15 | .08 | .08 |
| | (9.8) | (9.9) | (16.5) | (.02) | (.03) | (.02) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.30) | (.28) | (.23) |
| Looked | 5.5 | 8.6 | 12.1 | .00 | .00 | .04 | .04 | .00 | .00 | .06 | .01 | .01 |
| | (10.1) | (8.7) | (11.1) | (.01) | (.02) | (.08) | (.18) | (.01) | (.01) | (.17) | (.03) | (.07) |
| Heard | 3.2 | 6.7 | 8.9 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .11 | .00 | .00 | .16 | .01 | .03 |
| | (4.5) | (8.8) | (10.1) | (.01) | (.02) | (.06) | (.32) | (.00) | (.00) | (.37) | (.07) | (.09) |
| Think | 1.3 | 2.4 | 3.3 | .00 | .00 | .03 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .17 | .07 | .08 |
| | (4.0) | (6.3) | (7.4) | (.00) | (.00) | (.06) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.41) | (.21) | (.29) |

Session 2

Session 3

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <u>Tell</u> | 14.4 | 38.9 | 53.7 | .02 | .01 | .02 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .15 | .04 | .02 |
| | (18.2) | (35.3) | (45.8) | (.05) | (.02) | (.02) | (.00) | (.03) | (.00) | (.03) | (.22) | (.10) | (.08) |
| <u>More</u> | 4.7 | 7.1 | 12.5 | .00 | .02 | .00 | .03 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .17 | .06 | .04 |
| | (13.5) | (8.8) | (42.6) | (.01) | (.03) | (.02) | (.13) | (.00) | (.00) | (.03) | (.36) | (.23) | (.19) |
| <u>Looked</u> | 4.2 | 9.3 | 13.4 | .00 | .02 | .02 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .00 | .01 |
| | (8.1) | (11.0) | (14.5) | (.01) | (.06) | (.05) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.04) | (.00) | (.00) | (.03) |
| <u>Heard</u> | 3.1 | 5.2 | 7.9 | .00 | .00 | .02 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .01 | .00 |
| | (5.7) | (6.0) | (8.2) | (.00) | (.01) | (.05) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.03) |
| <u>Think</u> | .89 | 2.6 | 4.5 | .08 | .00 | .04 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .05 | .00 |
| | (2.2) | (10.0) | (10.7) | (.14) | (.00) | (.10) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.00) | (.13) | (.00) |

Table 5

Proportion of Children Who Provided Narrative Information after "No" and "Yes" Responses
to Direct Questions in Sessions 2 and 3

| | Session 2 | | | | Session 3 | | | |
| | No | | Yes | | No | | Yes | |
| Event Condition | n | Proportion Narrative | n | Proportion Narrative | n | Proportion Narrative | n | Proportion Narrative |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experienced-Only | | | | | | | | |
| Age  3-4 | 22 | .14 | 54 | .63 | 18 | .00 | 58 | .67 |
| 5-6 | 18 | .22 | 54 | .93 | 11 | .27 | 61 | .87 |
| 7-8 | 10 | .20 | 70 | .90 | 10 | .10 | 70 | .94 |
| Experienced-Heard | | | | | | | | |
| Age  3-4 | 10 | .00 | 66 | .70 | 11 | .27 | 65 | .69 |
| 5-6 | 0 | -- | 72 | .89 | 1 | .00 | 71 | .89 |
| 7-8 | 4 | .50 | 76 | .92 | 6 | .00 | 74 | .96 |
| Heard-Only | | | | | | | | |
| Age  3-4 | 28 | .14 | 48 | .58 | 29 | .10 | 47 | .60 |
| 5-6 | 35 | .31 | 37 | .89 | 50 | .30 | 22 | .91 |
| 7-8 | 52 | .13 | 28 | .89 | 66 | .05 | 14 | .79 |
| Control | | | | | | | | |
| Age  3-4 | 58 | .19 | 18 | .28 | 52 | .06 | 24 | .46 |
| 5-6 | 63 | .16 | 9 | .78 | 68 | .24 | 4 | 1.00 |
| 7-8 | 74 | .05 | 6 | 1.00 | 76 | .04 | 4 | 1.00 |
| Touch-Heard | | | | | | | | |
| Age  3-4 | 23 | .43 | 15 | .73 | 17 | .24 | 21 | .86 |
| 5-6 | 23 | .22 | 13 | .92 | 28 | .25 | 8 | .87 |
| 7-8 | 26 | .19 | 14 | .93 | 35 | .11 | 5 | .60 |
| Touch-Control | | | | | | | | |
| Age  3-4 | 35 | .11 | 3 | 1.00 | 27 | .07 | 11 | .55 |
| 5-6 | 36 | .17 | 0 | -- | 36 | .14 | 0 | -- |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7-8 | 40 | .03 | 0 | -- | 39 | .03 | 1 | 1.00 |

Note. n refers to the number of questions answered "no" or "yes"

Table 6a

Session 2: Mean Number of SUs in Response to Leading Questions, and the Proportion of

Information in Various Accuracy Categories, as a Function of Age and Question Condition

(With Standard Deviations)

| | Total SUs | Proportion Inaccurate | | | | | Total Inaccurate |
| | | Wrong Event | Detail | Intrusion | Incorrect Rejection | Suggested | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Experienced-Only | | | |
| 3 | 3.7 (6.0) | .10 (.32) | .00 (.00) | .11 (.31) | .03 (.11) | .10 (.32) | .25 (.41) |
| 4 | 16.7 (14.6) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.01) | .02 (.09) | .06 (.15) | .00 (.00) | .09 (.17) |
| 5 | 16.6 (19.6) | .00 (.00) | .06 (.12) | .00 (.00) | .12 (.28) | .00 (.00) | .18 (.28) |
| 6 | 19.8 (13.4) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.06) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.07) | .00 (.00) | .04 (.09) |
| 7 | 17.1 (12.9) | .00 (.00) | .05 (.08) | .04 (.15) | .03 (.08) | .00 (.00) | .12 (.18) |
| 8 | 25.2 (15.4) | .00 (.00) | .05 (.09) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .05 (.09) |
| | | | | Experienced-Heard | | | |
| 3 | 5.6 (8.9) | .06 (.20) | .06 (.13) | .10 (.32) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .16 (.32) |
| 4 | 23.4 (15.7) | .00 (.00) | .03 (.08) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .03 (.08) |
| 5 | 23.5 (16.9) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.04) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.04) |
| 6 | 23.4 (12.0) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.04) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.04) |
| 7 | 21.7 (17.4) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.03) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.03) |
| 8 | 24.0 (13.6) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.02) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.02) |
| | | | | Heard-Only | | | |
| 3 | 4.4 (7.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .22 (.34) | .00 (.00) | .55 (.46) | .78 (.38) |
| 4 | 15.4 (13.9) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .08 (.26) | .00 (.00) | .67 (.44) | .75 (.40) |
| 5 | 23.0 (18.2) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.03) | .02 (.06) | .00 (.00) | .75 (.41) | .78 (.37) |
| 6 | 11.6 (11.6) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .89 (.29) | .89 (.29) |
| 7 | 11.8 (17.4) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .06 (.18) | .00 (.00) | .72 (.42) | .78 (.42) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 14.4 (16.0) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .74 (.43) | .74 (.43) |

<div align="center">Control</div>

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 2.9 (4.3) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .53 (.48) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .53 (.48) |
| 4 | 10.7 (12.6) | .05 (.20) | .00 (.01) | .31 (.46) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .31 (.46) |
| 5 | 9.2 (10.8) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .29 (.42) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .29 (.42) |
| 6 | 3.6 (3.5) | .09 (.30) | .00 (.00) | .49 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .49 (.50) |
| 7 | 2.9 (4.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .43 (.53) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .43 (.53) |
| 8 | 2.9 (4.5) | .11 (.33) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.50) |

<div align="center">Touch-Heard</div>

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 4.0 (5.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .85 (.34) | .85 (.34) |
| 4 | 7.2 (6.3) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .06 (.24) | .00 (.00) | .68 (.46) | .74 (.43) |
| 5 | 8.0 (9.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.07) | .00 (.00) | .42 (.50) | .44 (.48) |
| 6 | 5.8 (5.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .62 (.49) | .62 (.49) |
| 7 | 2.7 (4.6) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .87 (.35) | .87 (.35) |
| 8 | 3.6 (4.3) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .73 (.46) | .73 (.46) |

<div align="center">Touch-Control</div>

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 1.6 (3.1) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .49 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .49 (.50) |
| 4 | 3.9 (4.2) | .07 (.26) | .00 (.00) | .20 (.41) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .20 (.41) |
| 5 | 2.6 (4.6) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.50) |
| 6 | 1.1 (2.0) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .43 (.53) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .43 (.53) |
| 7 | 1.1 (1.7) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .14 (.38) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .14 (.38) |
| 8 | .5 (1.1) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) |

Table 6b

Session 3:  Mean Number of SUs in Response to Leading Questions, and the Proportion of Information in Various Accuracy Categories, as a Function of Age and Question Condition (With Standard Deviations)

| | Total SUs | Proportion Inaccurate | | | | | |
| | | Wrong Event | Detail | Intrusion | Incorrect Rejection | Suggested | Total Inaccurate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Experienced-Only | | | |
| 3 | 4.8  (6.4) | .09 (.30) | .01 (.03) | .02 (.06) | .09 (.30) | .07 (.23) | .19 (.35) |
| 4 | 16.0 (10.4) | .03 (.11) | .07 (.18) | .00 (.00) | .04 (.10) | .00 (.00) | .11 (.19) |
| 5 | 14.1 (11.6) | .00 (.00) | .05 (.10) | .00 (.00) | .06 (.25) | .00 (.00) | .11 (.25) |
| 6 | 15.6 (16.0) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.04) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.04) |
| 7 | 18.0 (17.3) | .00 (.00) | .03 (.05) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .03 (.05) |
| 8 | 20.5 (14.2) | .00 (.00) | .04 (.06) | .00 (.00) | .05 (.22) | .00 (.00) | .09 (.22) |
| | | | | Experienced-Heard | | | |
| 3 | 4.9  (7.4) | .00 (.00) | .04 (.10) | .04 (.12) | .00 (.00) | .08 (.27) | .16 (.28) |
| 4 | 20.2 (15.2) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.04) | .03 (.13) | .02 (.07) | .00 (.00) | .06 (.14) |
| 5 | 17.3 (15.4) | .03 (.13) | .01 (.02) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.02) |
| 6 | 24.1 (17.0) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.02) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.02) |
| 7 | 22.7 (19.7) | .00 (.00) | .04 (.06) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .04 (.06) |
| 8 | 21.5 (11.5) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.02) | .00 (.00) | .05 (.21) | .00 (.00) | .06 (.21) |
| | | | | Heard-Only | | | |
| 3 | 4.6  (8.0) | .10 (.32) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .69 (.40) | .69 (.40) |
| 4 | 10.9  (9.2) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.02) | .09 (.26) | .00 (.00) | .59 (.48) | .69 (.45) |
| 5 | 7.6  (6.7) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .07 (.26) | .00 (.00) | .71 (.45) | .77 (.41) |
| 6 | 9.7 (13.7) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .02 (.05) | .00 (.00) | .85 (.32) | .86 (.32) |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 6.6 (11.6) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .11 (.20) | .00 (.00) | .52 (.41) | .62 (.46) |
| 8 | 4.7 (7.8) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .56 (.53) | .56 (.53) |
| | | | Control | | | | |
| 3 | 3.9 (5.9) | .00 (.00) | .01 (.01) | .58 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .58 (.50) |
| 4 | 5.3 (6.0) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .23 (.44) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .23 (.44) |
| 5 | 8.8 (15.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .39 (.48) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .39 (.48) |
| 6 | 4.7 (7.7) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .67 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .67 (.50) |
| 7 | 2.5 (6.1) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .43 (.43) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .43 (.43) |
| 8 | 3.6 (6.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .50 (.53) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .50 (.53) |
| | | | Touch-Heard | | | | |
| 3 | 3.1 (5.5) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | 1.00 (.00) | 1.00 (.00) |
| 4 | 6.5 (4.1) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .79 (.39) | .79 (.39) |
| 5 | 3.4 (3.1) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .07 (.27) | .00 (.00) | .32 (.46) | .39 (.49) |
| 6 | 4.3 (5.3) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .67 (.49) | .67 (.49) |
| 7 | 2.6 (5.4) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.52) | .33 (.52) |
| 8 | 1.8 (3.4) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .62 (.52) | .62 (.52) |
| | | | Touch-Control | | | | |
| 3 | 3.1 (5.8) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .57 (.53) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .57 (.53) |
| 4 | 3.9 (5.4) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .29 (.47) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .29 (.47) |
| 5 | 3.5 (3.2) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .21 (.43) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .21 (.43) |
| 6 | 1.1 (1.6) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .25 (.46) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .25 (.46) |
| 7 | .8 (2.1) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) |
| 8 | .8 (1.7) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.52) | .00 (.00) | .00 (.00) | .33 (.52) |

Table 7a

Mean Length of the Children's Narratives to Direct Questions, Across Responses with at Least
Some Narrative Information, as a Function of Question Condition, Age, and Session (with
Standard Deviations)

| | Event Condition | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age | Experienced-Only | Experienced-Heard | Heard-Only | Control | Touch-Heard | Touch Control |
| | Session 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | 5.9 (4.1) | 6.7 (4.7) | 5.5 (3.4) | 3.2 (2.2) | 8.5 (5.1) | 5.0 (2.0) |
| 4 | 10.7 (6.7) | 14.1 (6.1) | 11.3 (7.3) | 14.1 (11.5) | 8.6 (5.3) | 8.0 (6.2) |
| 5 | 11.5 (9.8) | 14.8 (8.2) | 15.3 (8.0) | 10.3 (6.0) | 8.5 (6.0) | 10.7 (6.7) |
| 6 | 11.3 (6.6) | 11.8 (5.8) | 7.7 (5.3) | 3.8 (1.7) | 8.6 (4.6) | 2.3 (.6) |
| 7 | 11.7 (4.8) | 12.8 (8.3) | 12.9 (9.6) | 5.3 (2.9) | 6.7 (5.4) | 4.0 (.0) |
| 8 | 13.6 (7.1) | 12.5 (6.5) | 12.9 (5.4) | 6.6 (4.5) | 5.8 (3.9) | -- -- |
| | Session 3 | | | | | |
| 3 | 6.7 (5.3) | 5.0 (4.1) | 5.2 (3.1) | 4.3 (4.4) | 7.4 (6.5) | 8.3 (7.8) |
| 4 | 10.6 (4.8) | 11.0 (7.1) | 8.9 (3.2) | 7.0 (4.9) | 7.6 (3.3) | 9.0 (9.3) |
| 5 | 10.0 (5.9) | 10.6 (7.0) | 7.5 (5.3) | 11.7 (10.1) | 5.7 (2.7) | 4.3 (1.5) |
| 6 | 9.3 (8.4) | 12.2 (8.4) | 9.5 (8.2) | 5.9 (5.0) | 6.1 (3.9) | 2.5 (.7) |
| 7 | 10.3 (8.0) | 12.1 (9.6) | 15.0 (11.7) | 5.7 (6.4) | 11.5 (12.0) | -- -- |
| 8 | 11.2 (6.7) | 12.3 (5.2) | 9.0 (4.5) | 12.3 (10.0) | 6.6 (4.6) | 2.5 (2.1) |

Table 7b

Mean Length of the Children's Narratives to Direct Questions, Across Responses with at Least

Some Narrative Information:  F Statistics for Condition Comparisons (with MSEs)

| | | Experienced-Only | | Heard-Only | | Touch-Heard |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | df | vs. Heard-Only | df | vs. Control | df | vs. Touch-Control |
| Session 2 | | | | | | |
| Age linear | 1 | 3.05 | 1 | .16 | 1 | .34 |
| (MSE) | (58) | (85.10) | (25) | (87.95) | (7) | (32.91) |
| Condition | 1 | .01 | 1 | 6.72* | 1 | 2.65 |
| A x C | 1 | .00 | 1 | 2.27 | 1 | 3.30 |
| (MSE) | (58) | (21.84) | (25) | (26.18) | (7) | (23.37) |
| Session 3 | | | | | | |
| Age linear | 1 | 1.32 | 1 | .53 | 1 | 1.60 |
| (MSE) | (45) | (70.14) | (19) | 93.57 | (8) | (52.42) |
| Condition | 1 | .44 | 1 | .03 | 1 | .03 |
| A x C | 1 | 1.97 | 1 | 1.68 | 1 | .52 |
| (MSE) | (45) | (19.53) | (19) | (16.16) | (8) | (23.28) |

* $p < .05$

Table 8a

Source Monitoring:  Proportion Accurate on Story and Event Questions as a Function of Event
Condition, Age and Session (with Standard Deviations)

|  | Event Condition | | | | | | |
| | Experienced-Only | Experienced-Heard | Heard-Only | Control | Touch-Heard | Touch-Control | Overall |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Story Questions | | | | |
| Session 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | .39 (.39) | .74 (.39) | .74 (.42) | .68 (.45) | .58 (.51) | .79 (.42) | .65 (.15) |
| 4 | .42 (.38) | .82 (.34) | .79 (.35) | .71 (.45) | .79 (.42) | .84 (.37) | .71 (.18) |
| 5 | .61 (.40) | .94 (.16) | .92 (.19) | .94 (.24) | .67 (.49) | 1.00 (.00) | .85 (.13) |
| 6 | .53 (.40) | .83 (.34) | .86 (.29) | .86 (.333 | .83 (.38) | 1.00 (.00) | .80 (.13) |
| 7 | .53 (.44) | .89 (.27) | .83 (.34) | .94 (.24) | .67 (.49) | 1.00 (.00) | .81 (.16) |
| 8 | .73 (.37) | .95 (.15) | 1.00 (.00) | .93 (.18) | 1.00 (.00) | 1.00 (.00) | .92 (.09) |
| Session 3 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | .34 (.37) | .76 (.42) | .61 (.36) | .68 (.38) | .53 (.51) | .58 (.51) | .59 (.15) |
| 4 | .21 (.35) | .76 (.35) | .71 (.38) | .61 (.46) | .84 (.37) | .63 (.50) | .61 (.15) |
| 5 | .36 (.38) | .81 (.35) | .72 (.35) | .72 (.39) | .56 (.51) | .67 (.49) | .64 (.15) |
| 6 | .39 (.32) | .81 (.39) | .83 (.24) | .61 (.40) | .72 (.46) | .56 (.51) | .66 (.15) |
| 7 | .33 (.38) | .81 (.30) | .75 (.35) | .78 (.35) | .72 (.46) | .56 (.51) | .66 (.15) |
| 8 | .45 (.41) | .84 (.28) | .84 (.28) | .66 (.39) | .95 (.21) | .59 (.50) | .71 (.14) |
| Age linear: | * | .08 | ** | .07 | ** | ns | ** |
| Session: | ** | .06 | ** | ** | ns | ** | ** |
| S x A: | ns | ns | ns | * | ns | .08 | ** |
| | | | Event Questions | | | | |
| Session 2 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | .50 (.37) | .68 (.42) | .39 (.46) | .84 (.34) | .63 (.50) | 1.00 (.00) | .65 (.11) |
| 4 | .79 (.25) | .89 (.21) | .50 (.47) | .74 (.42) | .58 (.51) | .84 (.37) | .73 (.19) |
| 5 | .64 (.38) | .86 (.29) | .69 (.42) | .97 (.12) | .89 (.32) | 1.00 (.00) | .82 (.13) |
| 6 | .78 (.31) | 1.00 (.00) | .78 (.31) | 1.00 (.00) | .72 (.46) | 1.00 (.00) | .88 (.12) |
| 7 | .75 (.35) | .94 (.16) | .92 (.26) | .97 (.12) | .89 (.32) | 1.00 (.00) | .91 (.10) |
| 8 | .89 (.26) | .93 (.18) | .80 (.37) | .98 (.11) | .86 (.35) | 1.00 (.00) | .90 (.11) |
| Session 3 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | .55 (.37) | .71 (.35) | .42 (.42) | .74 (.39) | .53 (.51) | .74 (.45) | .61 (.17) |
| 4 | .82 (.30) | .76 (.35) | .53 (.42) | .79 (.35) | .58 (.51) | .84 (.37) | .72 (.17) |
| 5 | .75 (.31) | .97 (.12) | .75 (.35) | .94 (.24) | .89 (.32) | 1.00 (.00) | .87 (.09) |
| 6 | .83 (.24) | 1.00 (.00) | .81 (.30) | 1.00 (.00) | .89 (.32) | 1.00 (.00) | .92 (.11) |
| 7 | .83 (.24) | .92 (.19) | .78 (.35) | .97 (.12) | 1.00 (.00) | 1.00 (.00) | .90 (.10) |
| 8 | .86 (.32) | .89 (.21) | .93 (.23) | .95 (.15) | .95 (.21) | .95 (.21) | .92 (.13) |
| Age linear: | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| Session: | * | ns | ns | ns | ns | .06 | ns |
| S x A: | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | * | ns |

 * $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

ns = nonsignificant

Table 8b

Source Monitoring:  Proportion Accurate on Story and Event Questions as a Function of Event

Condition, Age and Session:  Statistics List

<u>F</u> Values for Linear Age Trend x Session (2 vs. 3) Analyses

| | df | Experienced-Only | Experienced-Heard | Heard-Only | Control | Touch-Heard | Touch Control | Overall |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Story Questions | | | | |
| Age Linear | 1 | 5.57* | 3.18 | 8.92** | 3.43 | 9.11** | 1.43 | 27.22*** |
| (<u>MSE</u> 108) | | (.22) | (.14) | (.13) | (.18) | (.25) | (.16) | (.03) |
| Session | 1 | 26.14*** | 3.54 | 11.04** | 19.94*** | .67 | 46.76*** | 108.83*** |
| A x S | 1 | 1.78 | 1.02 | .00 | 4.46* | .00 | 3.19 | 9.11** |
| (<u>MSE</u> 108) | | (.08) | (.07) | (.07) | (.08) | (.11) | (.14) | (.01) |
| | | | | Event Questions | | | | |
| Age Linear | 1 | 12.18** | 14.02*** | 29.01*** | 13.93*** | 20.83*** | 11.47** | 85.47*** |
| (<u>MSE</u> 108) | | (.16) | (.09) | (.22) | (.10) | (.19) | (.05) | (.03) |
| Session | 1 | 3.99* | .27 | .61 | .90 | .98 | 3.61 | .55 |
| A x S | 1 | .30 | .11 | .03 | .69 | 2.77 | 4.34* | 1.18 |
| (<u>MSE</u> 108) | | (.04) | (.03) | (.06) | (.02) | (.11) | (.04) | (.01) |

 * <u>p</u> < .05

 ** <u>p</u> < .01

*** <u>p</u> < .001

Table 9a

Source Monitoring:  Proportion Accurate on Both Story and Event Questions as a Function of Event

Condition, Age and Session (with Standard Deviations)

| | Event Condition | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Experienced-Only | Experienced-Heard | Heard-Only | Control | Touch-Heard | Touch-Control | Overall |
| | Proportion Accurate on Items With at Least One "Yes" Response | | | | | | |
| Session 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | .06 (.17) | .79 (.36) | .20 (.37) | .22 (.44) | .36 (.50) | .00 (.00) | .35 (.13) |
| 4 | .26 (.42) | .79 (.35) | .36 (.48) | .00 (.00) | .50 (.52) | .00 (.00) | .46 (.22) |
| 5 | .43 (.46) | .83 (.34) | .64 (.48) | .75 (.50) | .77 (.44) | - | .67 (.25) |
| 6 | .36 (.45) | .83 (.34) | .74 (.36) | .37 (.48) | .67 (.49) | - | .66 (.21) |
| 7 | .41 (.48) | .89 (.27) | .85 (.34) | .00 (.00) | .83 (.39) | - | .72 (.21) |
| 8 | .64 (.41) | .89 (.21) | .80 (.37) | .13 (.25) | .86 (.35) | - | .78 (.20) |
| Session 3 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | .00 (.00) | .72 (.39) | .14 (.33) | .14 (.32) | .09 (.30) | .00 (.00) | .26 (.16) |
| 4 | .05 (.23) | .82 (.34) | .34 (.44) | .06 (.17) | .50 (.52) | .12 (.35) | .36 (.18) |
| 5 | .19 (.35) | .81 (.35) | .66 (.44) | .07 (.19) | .80 (.42) | .00 (.00) | .50 (.18) |
| 6 | .31 (.35) | .81 (.39) | .72 (.43) | .05 (.16) | .79 (.43) | .00 (.00) | .56 (.15) |
| 7 | .28 (.39) | .75 (.31) | .71 (.44) | .00 (.00) | .93 (.27) | .00 (.00) | .55 (.19) |
| 8 | .38 (.42) | .77 (.37) | .90 (.30) | .08 (.29) | .95 (.22) | .00 (.00) | .63 (.17) |
| Age linear: | ** | ns | ** | ns | ** | | ** |
| Session: | ** | .09 | ns | ns | ns | | ** |
| A x S: | ns | ns | ns | ns | ns | | ns |

 * $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

<u>ns</u> = nonsignificant

Table 9b

Source Monitoring: Proportion Accurate on Both Story and Event Questions as a Function of
Event Condition, Age and Session: Statistics List

| | Session ( 2 vs. 3) by Linear Age Trend | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Event Condition | F for Age Linear | MSE | F for Session | F for A x S | MSE | |
| | Proportion Accurate on Items With at Least One "Yes" Response | | | | | |
| Experienced-Only (1,99): | 22.83*** | .20 | 18.23*** | .89 | .08 | |
| Experienced-Heard (1,106): | .68 | .16 | 2.98 | .75 | .07 | |
| Heard-Only (1,95): | 58.17*** | .23 | .30 | .16 | .08 | |
| Control (1,18): | .08 | .15 | .33 | .08 | .07 | |
| Touch-Heard (1,72): | 52.69*** | .18 | .40 | 1.96 | .05 | |
| Touch-Control (insufficient "yes" responses) | | | | | | |
| Overall: | 75.03*** | .05 | 56.36*** | 1.46 | .02 | |

  * $p$ < .05

  ** $p$ < .01

*** $p$ < .001

Table 10

Stability of Reports of Experienced and Nonexperienced Events

| Event Type | Unconditional Probability (Probability of "Yes" in Session 3) | Conditional Probability (Probability of "Yes" in Session 3 Given a "Yes" in Session 2) | Phi Coefficient[a] |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3- and 4-Year-Olds | |
| Experienced Only | .68 | .90 | .62 |
| Experienced-Heard | .74 | .82 | .35 |
| Heard-Only | .53 | .74 | .47 |
| Control | .24 | .69 | .55 |
| | | 5- and 6-Year-Olds | |
| Experienced Only | .79 | .94 | .57 |
| Experienced-Heard | .99 | 1.00 | .43 |
| Heard-Only | .22 | .58 | .51 |
| Control | .03 | 1.00[b] | .70 |
| | | 7- and 8-Year-Olds | |
| Experienced Only | .85 | .97 | .73 |
| Experienced-Heard | .90 | .96 | .77 |
| Heard-Only | .14 | .50 | .44 |
| Control | .04 | 1.00[c] | .81 |

[a] Correlation between responses at Session 2 and responses at Session 3

[b] This conditional probability is based on only 1 response

[c] This conditional probability is based on only 2 responses

Table 11

Correlations between Individual Difference Variables and Suggestibility During Three Phases of the Interview

| | Suggestibility during Free Recall | | Suggestibility during Direct Questioning | | Suggestibility after Source Monitoring | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Session 2 | Session 3 | Session 2 | Session 3 | Session 2 | Session 3 |
| Age in Months | -.01 | -.13 | -.20* | -.49** | -.39** | -.47** |
| Sex$_p$ | .04 | .10 | -.06 | .04 | .03 | .00 |
| Parental Education$_p$ | -.09 | -.15 | .04 | -.16 | -.05 | -.12 |
| Family Income$_p$ | -.11 | -.12 | -.07 | -.09 | -.11 | -.19* |
| Off Topic | .25** | .06 | .12 | .15 | .12 | .15 |
| Off Topic$_p$ | .25** | .02 | .07 | .02 | .01 | .03 |
| Talkativeness Session 1 | .33** | -.02 | .18* | .01 | .03 | .10 |
| Talkativeness | | | | | | |
| All Sessions | .20* | .12 | .00 | -.10 | -.06 | -.06 |

Note. Subscript "p" indicates partial correlations with age controlled.

 * $p$ < .05

** $p$ < .01