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**Appendix 1: Relevant case details for the interviews used as data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym of child interviewed</th>
<th>Interviewer</th>
<th>Pseudonyms for, and relationship to child of key people talked about in interview 26</th>
<th>Year of interview</th>
<th>Age of child at time of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belinda”</td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Hannah” (sister) Shaun (accused, step-brother)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven” (witnessed homicide)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant (accused, mother’s partner)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben”</td>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Peter” (accused, son of respite worker)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet” (time 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael” (accused, grandfather)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet” (time 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren”</td>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Phillip” (accused, step brother)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Damien” (accused, step brother)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie”</td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Chris” (accused, neighbour’s teenage son)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul” (accused, uncle)</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa”</td>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Martin” (accused, friend’s brother)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandpa” (accused, grandfather)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 The names of all other persons referred to during the interview are represented in the transcripts and extracts as "((name))", except in the case of generic pronouns such as "mum", "dad", "mna", "grandpa" etc.
Appendix 2: A key to Jeffersonian transcription symbols

((sneeze))) Double parentheses contain the transcriber’s descriptions.

(            ) Empty parentheses mean the transcriber could not grasp what was said.

(hello) Single parentheses with text in-between indicates the transcriber’s best
guess at what was said.

(.) A dot in parentheses indicates a tiny, just noticeable pause.

(0.7) Numbers in parentheses indicate elapsed time in silence by tenth of
seconds, so (0.7) is a pause of seven tenths of a second.

.hhh A dot prefixed row of hs indicates the sound of inhalation.

hhh Without the dot, the hs indicate exhalation.

“words” Speech contained within quotation marks indicates speech that was spoken
as though reproducing verbatim a third person’s locution.

word Underlining indicates emphasis on that word or syllable.

WORD Uppercase indicates especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding
talk.

°yes° Utterances or utterance parts contained within degree signs are relatively
quieter than the surrounding speech.

°°yes°° Utterances or utterance parts contained within double degree signs are
whispered.

↑ ↓ Arrows indicate marked shifts into higher or lower pitch in the utterance-
part immediately following the arrow. Double arrows indicate a greater
shift.

? A question mark indicates a rising intonation, less pronounced than an
upward arrow.

. A full stop indicates a stopping fall in tone (or → stopping intonation”).

, A comma indicates continuing intonation.

bu- Hyphens mark the abrupt cut-off of the preceding sound.

We::ll Colons indicate prolongation of the immediately prior sound.

> < _greater than’ and _lesser than’ signs enclose speeded up talk. Used in
reverse for slower talk.

word= Equal signs, one at the end of one line and one at the beginning of a next,

=word indicate no discernible pause between two speaker’s turns or, if put
between two sounds within a single speaker’s turn, show that they run
together. This is often called latching.

heh heh Indicates laughter.
A parenthesized \( h \) within a word indicates plosiveness, associated with laughter, crying or breathlessness. Sometimes the \( h \) is italicized without the brackets with the same meaning.

Square brackets mark the start and end of overlapping speech.

Attempt at representing a "lip smacking" sound (in capitals means louder)

The sound of lips parting combined with an in-breath at the very start of a speaker's turn

An italic letter at the start of a word implies an incipient sound, hearable as the speaker being barely audible for the very first sound of the word (almost like a hesitating start)

Combinations of underscore and colons represent intonation shifts within a word. The underscore "punches up" the sound it occurs under.

When the letter before the colon is underscored, then the word has an "up to down" contour

When the colon itself is underlined, then the sound at the point of the colon is "punched up" and the word has a "down to up" contour

In multi-syllabic words, if the consonant is underlined, then all syllables after that are "punched up"

In multi-syllabic words, if the vowel is underlined, then pitch drops at the second syllable

Notation adapted from ten Have (2007) and Jefferson (2004)
Appendix 3: How to read the body movement transcription

Red frames enclose the body movements of the child.

Blue frames enclose the body movements of the interviewer.

Descriptions of body movements are contained in the column to the right of the transcribed talk, with the corresponding line number and colour (see example below).

Where I notate both people’s body movements over the same line of talk, I describe their movements in the column against the same line number, starting with the colour and description for the person whose movement occurs first and therefore appears first in their coloured frame on the line of talk. For example, in line 4 below, the first thing that happens is the interviewer folds her hands over her legs, and she is still looking away to the left as she was earlier in the sequence. When I describe the child’s body movements (looking upward, in this example) I change colour to red and start with the transcript label for the child (e.g. C9, which means the child from interview 9 out of the 11 interviews). If the movements overlap, as they do in line 6, there is no special order to who I describe first.

Where the same person does two or more body movements over the same line, I put multiple frames over the bits of talk the movements correspond with. In the description column I mark the transition from describing one body movement to another with the word “then”. For example, on line 6, the interviewer looks up as C9 utters “he told me” (this is the first rectangle) and then looks down to her notes and moves to write on her notepad as C9 utters “bum up?” (this is the second rectangle). Sometimes, as for C9 on line 6, I do not split all the movements but describe them as they occur sequentially within the one rectangle of talk.

1. I8: Okay, what happened. *me* how I can see
2. he’s laying on top?
3. C9: yep ((clears throat))
4. I8: what’s, the first thing that happens.
5. (0.4)
6. C9: um: he told me to lift (.). my bum up?

1. angles her head and body to her left and brings both hands to her temples
2. pushes hands outward in a chopping motion, brings hands back with fingertips touching at end, still looking to left and down
3. drops chin to chest
4. folds hands over crossed legs, still looking away to left
5. looks back to her notes but not at C9, shifts her papers
6. looks up at C9, then down to notes and moves to write. C9 looks away to his right, and back to the table/I8's notes, nodding on "bum"
Appendix 4: Layout of the interview room for each interview

**Interview 1 – “Belinda”**

Interviewer 1

Belinda

Video camera

**Interview 2 – “Ben”**

Ben

Interviewer 2

Video camera
Interview 3 – “Ben”

Interview 4 – “Harriet” (1st interview)
Interview 5 – “Harriet” (2\textsuperscript{nd} interview)

Interview 6 – “Susie”
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Interview 7 – “Lisa”

Interview 8 – “Robert”
Interview 9 – “Sarah”

Interview 10 – “Richard”
Interview 11 – “Steven”
Appendix 5: Potential analytic lines of inquiry generated from the transcription process

Lines of Inquiry to possibly follow
What is it about the “rapport” section of police interviews that causes it to be labelled thus – its connection to mundane conversation? Is it that the ‘business’ of sexual abuse is not raised here? – How does it differ from the ‘business’ section (Heydon looked at this).

How do police achieve rapport AND institutional ends – (this would permit me to retain the institutional flavour and the stuff on eliciting free narrative as being a major goal in “good” interviews).

Gather a corpus of anti-rapport instances (see p.29 of journal) – note where interviewer interrupts child – any evidence that this disturbs subsequent interaction?

Feelings questions – how do Is respond when children don’t respond adequately.

Naive challenges – how do Is do these challenges, which are potentially damaging to rapport? – (22) collect corpus of these instances and note where it goes smoothly versus badly.

Embarrassment – look through the corpus labelled embarrassment and use sequence organisation to note how Interviewers navigate. How can this be linked with rapport?

Look at the I who uses fewer SCTs (Interview 5). Is it a means of promoting free narrative? Look for sections where kids are talking freely, and note what the interviewers are doing.

Look at those times where children offer up explanations for why the perpetrator did it, and what should happen as a result.

When children initiate a FPP they do it as an insert sequence, not a base adjacency pair (does this also hold true in the rapport section of the interview?) – this suggests something about the norms of who has rights to initiate FPPs in this setting.

Follow up the idea of coordination in the rapport literature and see if I can connect it to the concept of progressivity in CA. Cannot ‘get to’ subjective states like ‘positivity’ and ‘trust’ but can observe coordinated, smooth interaction and spates of talk that elicit free narrative in forensic interviews.

How do talk and behaviour line up as a means of analysing rapport? (see behavioural mimicry article) – may not have time to do this.

So + context + FPP – (see thesis writing for detail) – versus SCT, FPP and context (32) – do kids misunderstand the FPP when this order gets confused?
Where kids are asked a yes/no question, when do they just answer as per the question format, and when to the format plus the implicit request for information? (17)

Look at how pre-sequences are used in the build-up to base FPPs – context setting? (17)

Heritage chapter on Institutional talk has a section on quantification, which is grounded in turn design – could use this to guide me in quantifying how different Is construct their turns and the impact. Also, within interviews, use it to quantify what marks the “rapport” stage from the “business” stage and how diversions from this arise.

Useful section in Schegloff “Confirming Allusions” on the three elements of a proper account of an action embodied within an utterance.

Possibly collect a corpus of ‘repeats’ for analysis – account for their function and ubiquity.
Appendix 6: Written information sheet provided to families

Information about a study into ways of interviewing children about alleged sexual abuse

Dear

My name is Kathy Fogarty and I am a researcher in the Department of Psychology at The University of Adelaide. Presently I am conducting a research study into evidential interviews with children in cases of alleged sexual abuse for my combined Masters/Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology.

What is the research about?

The aim of the research is to find ways to improve the process of interviewing children when gathering evidence about alleged sexual abuse. To do so I need to analyse video-tapes of police conducting evidential interviews with children. Evidential interviews conducted by police are an important early step in the justice process and the job is a challenging one. Interviewers need to build rapport with children, so that children feel free to talk openly. It is vital that interviews produce credible and reliable evidence that will stand up to close scrutiny in court, if necessary. By looking closely at the interviews I hope to find out more about the things that work best when interviewing children, which provides the best hope of gathering robust evidence. Finding out more about what works best in interviews may also help to make sure that any stress upon children is kept to a minimum.

Why have you been approached?

Your child’s matter was identified by South Australia Police because it has been finalised, either through a court outcome or no further action. By now, a police officer from the Sexual Crime Investigation Branch has contacted you to ask permission to receive this information. I realise that it may be upsetting for you to be contacted about a distressing episode that is in the past, and it seemed most sensitive to have the officer who conducted the interview contact you first.

Your consent (and your child’s, if they are now aged 16 or older) for me to view your child’s interviews as part of my study is entirely voluntary. You may decline or withdraw consent at any time.

If you still wish to give your formal consent, please read the enclosed consent form and sign it at the bottom. If your child is now 16 years of age or more, a separate consent form is also required to be signed by them.

But before you do, I need to make sure that you fully understand what the research project is about, its purpose, and address any concerns you may have about releasing the interview for research purposes.
Who is conducting this study?

I am a researcher in the Department of Psychology at the University of Adelaide and this particular research is part of earning my combined Masters/Doctor of Philosophy in Clinical Psychology. When I finish in three years time I hope to work as a professional psychologist and also to do more research that benefits vulnerable children.

One of my supervisors, Dr Lisa Kettler, previously worked in a Child Protection Service conducting evidential interviews with children and she helped to identify this research as important. The South Australian Police (SAPOL) did not initiate the project. Rather, I approached SAPOL and after careful thought they approved the project because they have a commitment to supporting outside research with the potential to help them improve their practices. However, whilst SAPOL have agreed to me doing this research, and they have identified your child’s interview for possible inclusion, they will not release your child’s interview to me without your agreement. If you do not consent, the interview will not be released.

Why is this study important?

The findings may help police, psychologists and others whose job it is to conduct evidential interviews to gather better quality evidence from children. The findings may also be used to help lawyers and judges to better understand the way that children give oral evidence. Finally, if the study achieves these two objectives, then it may help children who have been sexually abused to gain protection from further harm and to attain justice.

Some concerns you may have

You probably have two main concerns. Firstly, you may be wondering how I will keep the interview secure so that no-one else sees it. Secondly, you might be wondering if there is any chance your child or someone in your family could be identified if you allow the interview to be used for research.

1. How will the data be kept secure?

I will only watch the video-taped interview on location at the Sexual Crime Investigation Branch. This is where I will also make a detailed written transcript of the interview. At that stage, any details that could identify your child or any other person mentioned in the interview will be removed. This transcript will be stored on a secure computer within the Branch. Any printed versions of these transcripts will be stored securely when the researcher is not reading them. These transcripts will not be seen by anyone except me, although I may need to ask my two supervisors to look at parts of them from time to time.

2. How will your child’s identity be protected along with the identities of other people mentioned in the interview?

It will not be possible to identify anyone who is mentioned in the interview because I will remove all identifying details when I make the written transcripts of the videotaped interview. This means removing all names and replacing them with invented names, or codes.
Eventually, I will write the research up as a thesis to be placed in the Barr Smith Library at The University of Adelaide. I may also write some articles about the main findings of the research for publication in journals read by people who work in the child protection field, such as psychologists, police and social workers.

However, only very small parts of your child’s interview will be used at any time to illustrate the findings (maybe just a few lines of conversation from the interview) and these will be intermingled with short examples from other people’s cases. So be reassured that without any names and with such a small amount of data, it will not be possible for any person to be identified.

Who should I contact if I need more information?

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, or you (or your child if now aged 16 years or more) wish to withdraw consent for the use of your child’s interview at any time, please telephone me or either of my two supervisors named below. And if you are interested in knowing the findings from this research, please feel free to contact me directly and I would be pleased to provide you with a summary when the project is completed.

Kathy Fogarty, Student in combined PhD/ Master of Psychology (Clinical)
Telephone: 0423 979 050
Professor Martha Angoustinos, Lecturer, Department of Psychology
Telephone: 8303 4627
Dr Lisa Kettler, Lecturer, Department of Psychology
Telephone: 8303 5737

The University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee has approved the ethical integrity of this project, as has the SAPOI Research and Survey Coordination Committee. However, if you have any complaints about the project, please refer to the attached form entitled: The Independent Complaints Procedure, which outlines the steps that you can take to make a complaint.
Appendix 7: Consent form for families

Consent form for Parents/Caregivers

1. I, ............................................................................................ (please print name) consent to allow the video-taped interview conducted by officers from the Sexual Crime Investigation Branch within SAPOL with my child,

........................................................................................................ (child’s name)

to be used as part of the research project entitled: A conversation analytic study into evidential interviewing of children in cases of suspected or alleged child sexual abuse.

2. I understand that this research is an initiative of The University of Adelaide and is being undertaken by the main researcher as part of a PhD in Clinical Psychology. SAPOL has played no part in initiating this project, but has consented to allow the researcher access to data if individual parents or caregivers give their consent.

3. I have read the attached Information Sheet entitled: Information about a study into ways of interviewing children about alleged sexual abuse and I understand how this project impacts upon my child and/or our family.

My consent is given freely.

In addition, I acknowledge the following on behalf of:

........................................................................................................ (child’s name)

(Please turn over)
4. Whilst I understand that the purpose of this research project is to improve the process of interviewing children in cases of suspected or alleged sexual abuse, I understand that there is unlikely to be any direct benefit to my child by agreeing to release his/her videotaped interview to the research worker.

5. I have been informed that the videotape and any material that is used from it will be stored securely. I understand that any material that is used from the interview will be de-identified to ensure that my child, my family and any other person mentioned in the interview remain anonymous.

6. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time by contacting any of the three research workers named on the Information Sheet.

7. I am aware that I should retain a copy of this Consent Form, when completed, and the attached Information Sheet.

Signature of Parent/Caregiver and relationship to child:

...........................................................

Date:  /  /2006
Appendix 8: Independent complaints procedure

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

The Independent Complaints Procedure

The Human Research Ethics Committee is obliged to monitor approved research projects. In conjunction with other forms of monitoring it is necessary to provide an independent and confidential reporting mechanism to assure quality assurance of the institutional ethics committee system. This is done by providing research participants with an additional avenue for raising concerns regarding the conduct of any research in which they are involved.

The following study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Adelaide Human Research Ethics Committee:

Project title: A conversation analytic study into evidential interviewing of children in cases of suspected or alleged child sexual abuse.

1. If you have questions or problems associated with the practical aspects of your participation in the project, or wish to raise a concern or complaint about the project, then you should consult the project co-ordinator:

   Name: Professor Martha Augustinos
   Telephone: 8303 4627

2. If you wish to discuss with an independent person matters related to
   • making a complaint, or
   • raising concerns on the conduct of the project, or
   • the University policy on research involving human participants, or
   • your rights as a participant

   contact the Human Research Ethics Committee’s Secretary on phone (08) 8303 6028.
Appendix 9: Examples of body diagrams