

Initial report: Forensic interviewers' and interpreters' attitudes regarding their collaboration during investigative interviews of children.

KYRIAKIDOU, Marilena, DEKENS, Karen, COLEMAN, Charlotte, DRABBLE, Jennifer, ADLARD, Jane and RAMDEHAL, Amy

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/24583/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

KYRIAKIDOU, Marilena, DEKENS, Karen, COLEMAN, Charlotte, DRABBLE, Jennifer, ADLARD, Jane and RAMDEHAL, Amy (2019). Initial report: Forensic interviewers' and interpreters' attitudes regarding their collaboration during investigative interviews of children. Technical Report. Sheffield Hallam University. (Unpublished)

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Initial Report:

Forensic interviewers' and interpreters' attitudes regarding their collaboration during investigative interviews of children

Dr. Marilena Kyriakidou, *Principal Investigator, Lecturer, Sheffield Hallam University*

Drs. Karina Dekens, *Co-Applicant, Police trainer, Police Academy of the Netherlands*

Further research collaborators: Dr. Charlotte Coleman, Dr. Jennifer Drabble, Dr. Jane Adlard, Miss. Amy Ramdehal (*Sheffield Hallam University*)

Funded: By the International Investigative Interviewing Research Group (www.iiirg.org) under the Networking Grants funding theme

Submitted the 5th of May 2019 to the: Association of Police and Court Interpreters (UK), Children's House (Cyprus), Cyprus Police, National Register of Public Service Interpreters (UK), Netherlands Police Academy, Society of Official Metropolitan Interpreters and South Yorkshire Police.

Summary

Following the recent increase of foreign language interpretation services in investigative interviews; the present project aspires to understand the strengths and challenges of these services with particular attention to any training needs. Our aim was to develop an education video (the Interviewers and Interpreters' Collaboration in Investigative Interviews of Children, **ICIC**) to support interviewers and interpreters in the various difficulties they encounter. Survey data from 16 participants (interviewers and interpreters with experience in investigative interviews of children), from three countries, were used to examine experience of interviewers' and interpreters' collaborative working, and their training needs. Numerous police and interpreters guidelines on how best to conduct investigative interviews with children have been reviewed and summarised in the form of a narrative for a five minutes educational video. Participants were given the opportunity to comment on this narrative. Thematic analysis showed the value practitioners placed on a number of topics; including identifying a suitable interpreter, interviewers' briefing interpreters on the case, introducing each speaker's role to children as well as establishing a productive collaboration between the interviewer, the interpreter, and the child. Participants perceived as very beneficial having interpreters who accurately interpret children's and interviewers' utterances and having interviewers who appropriately approached children. Some disagreements arose (e.g. usage of simultaneous or consecutive interpretation) that should be clarified prior the investigative interview. This survey helped in finalising the narrative of ICIC, the education video to be developed.

To avoid challenging the quality of investigative interviews, interviewers' and interpreters' collaboration should be studied and supported with the various difficulties they encounter. The present project brings together forensic interviewers, interpreters, and academics to produce a short educational video, the Interpreters and Interviewers Collaboration in Investigative Interviews of Children (ICIC).

Methodology

Participants: Five interviewers from Cyprus Police, five interviewers from the Netherland Police Academy, one interpreter from the Netherlands and five interpreters from England (APCI) generated 16 usable surveys ($n=13$ female, $n=2$ male, $n=1$ unknown). Participants experience in conducting interviews in collaboration with interviewers or interpreters ranged from one to more than 50

interviews. Nine participants ($n=7$ interviewers, $n=2$ interpreters), ($n=5$ Cyprus, $n=2$ Netherlands, $n=2$ England) received training on how to collaborate with an interviewer or an interpreter to gain investigative interviews from children. Six participants did not receive such training, and one participant did not provide details on this.

Materials: Participants were asked to complete a survey to describe: a) At least two examples of good collaboration with an interviewer or interpreter, b) at least two examples of a problematic collaboration with an interviewer or interpreter, c) the ideal training to facilitate collaboration with an interviewer or an interpreter during an investigative interview. To develop the fourth question we have identified manuals for police officers and interpreters, regarding language interpretation in forensic settings. We have summarised these manuals in a form of a narrative for the educational video. The fourth question of the survey gave participants the opportunity to comment on this narrative.

Procedure: This study was approved by Sheffield Hallam University Ethics Committee (number ER12399880). Permission to access each organisation was gained by the relevant committee or authorised individual. Each participant was given an information sheet (e.g. on confidentiality), the opportunity to contact the research team, a consent and a debrief form. No personal data (e.g. names) were used in our analysis. The surveys were distributed by an authorised individual to the members of each organisation. In some organisations, that authorised individual gathered and then returned the surveys to the research team. In other organisations the participants emailed their surveys to the research team directly.

Thematic analysis: Participants' answers were analyzed using the thematic analysis procedure (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As a first step, the answers were read carefully to identify common patterns or meaningful points in participants' responses. These patterns or points consisted the codes. The codes were combined into thematic categories. The answers were systematically reviewed to ensure each code was represented in the thematic categories. As a second step, the thematic categories were added on a timeline starting from themes prior to the interview, themes at the rapport phase of the interview, themes during the interview and themes after the completion of the interview, as well as a category of general themes. These are presented on three tables below. As a third step, we used these outcomes to improve the narrative of the ICIC.

Results

Themes: Prior the investigative interview

There were three themes and 24 codes addressing procedures prior to the interview (Table 1). First, '**Interpreter's features**' consisted of eight codes such as interpreter's accent, and the interpreter's familiarity with the child. As examples of good collaboration, participants mentioned interpreters who accurately interpreted children's language. As examples of problematic collaboration, participants mentioned interpreters who could not interpret or speak the children's language or dialect. Second, '**Interviewers' briefing interpreters**' described briefing interpreters' prior an interview. This consisted of 11 codes such as interviewers explaining how best to interpret questions, and how best to direct eye contact between speakers. This theme was perceived as very important and was described across all four questions e.g. good example (interviewers' briefing interpreters), problematic example (interviewers' refusing to brief interpreters), training comments (familiarising interpreters with interview procedures, providing brief written guidelines to interpreters), and video narrative (approving to inform interpreters on interview procedures).

Third, '**Other: Interviewers' preparation, examples, drinks, culture and child-interpreter discussion**' described five topics via five codes. Examples of good collaboration were: a) a well prepared interviewer and b) sharing examples of useful and dysfunctional interviews prior the interview. This was also suggested for future trainings. c) A simple gesture of offering a drink to interpreters and d) informing interviewers' on the child's culture. This was also suggested for future training. However, an interpreter mentioned this may not be possible for all cases. e) Interpreters having a brief discussion with the child on topics unrelated with the case, prior to the interview, may help interpreters and children get familiar with each other communication style e.g. accent.

Participants mentioned this should be done with caution and should not give the impression that the interpreter will have the leading role in the interview afterwards.

Themes: During the investigative interview

There were 10 themes and 31 codes addressing procedures during the interview (Table 2). First, ***'Introductions to children'*** described three topics to be said to children at the rapport phase of the interview. As examples of good collaboration, participants mentioned the importance of explaining each speaker's role to children and familiarising children with the procedures to be followed. Participants mentioned interpreters should be present at this stage. As an example of problematic collaboration, participants mentioned not making any introductions to children.

Second, ***'Accurate interpretation of children's and interviewers' utterances'*** which was mentioned extensively by participants, something that reflects the importance of this theme. An accurate interpretation of children's and interviewers' utterances was fundamental to determine whether the collaboration was judged as good or problematic. As examples of problematic collaboration, participants referred to interpreters' asking questions not being asked by interviewers, rephrasing interviewers' questions, asking leading questions that interviewers' did not ask and providing wrong information to children. These were indications by participants that interpreters' exceeded their role and were not interpreting as requested.

Third, ***'Leading the interview'*** covers who is leading the interview. The basic principle here was that if interviewers were leading the interview, it was considered an example of good collaboration as compared with an interview where interpreters: took over the interview; conducted independent discussions with children; and attracted the child's attention. Fourth, ***'Mimicking children's tone and non-verbal expressions'***, where participants addressed as examples of good collaborations interpreters who mimic children's tone or intonations very well. Participants suggested that mimicking children's non-verbal expressions e.g. body language, may be beneficial for an interview. This expands earlier literature on how important it is for children's emotions to be shown via their tone and non-verbal expressions. Perhaps having interpreters mimicking these tones and gestures will help in reflecting children's emotions.

Fifth, ***'Interviewers', interpreters' and children's collaboration'*** addressed the nature of collaboration between all speakers. Welcoming collaborations were the ones where interviewers and interpreters collaborated very well during the interview, interpreters and children collaborated very well and interpreters' who have managed to make the child feel comfortable in order to collaborate. Interviewers and interpreters collaboration was mentioned across all four questions showing how important this was for the practitioners. Sixth, ***'Point of view usage'*** analysed how the point of view was used. Participants mentioned that both the interpreters and interviewers should use the first person. Both interpreters and interviewers should avoid the use of the third person, as this was considered an example of a problematic interview. This theme was also mentioned in participants' suggestions on their training.

Seventh, ***'Interpreters' side comments to interviewers'*** mentioned efforts to explain to interviewers the issues arising from the interpretation during the interview. For example, it was perceived very positively by participants when interpreters explained to interviewers that the interpretation may sound slightly longer than the original utterance as the child's language is more descriptive than the interviewer's language. Having a patient interpreter was also very welcoming. Eighth, ***'Interviewers' approaches'*** concerned the quality of interviewers' approaches. Having an interviewer who knew how to appropriately approach a child was perceived as very beneficial for the interview.

Ninth, ***'Interpretation style and principles'*** covers the different interpretation styles as well as principles on how best to allow the interpretation to take place. Some participants found simultaneous interpretation useful, but others expressed concerns that this may not be suitable for investigative interviews as it may be better for one person to talk at a time. Interviewers and interpreters should therefore clarify prior to the interview their preferences regarding the interpretation style. It was considered problematic when an interpreter had a dictionary with them during the interview as the interpreter was advising the child to look in the dictionary as well. Participants mentioned the importance of interviewers allowing time to complete the interpretation, not asking questions before the interpretation is completed, and not interrupting the interpreter. Tenth ***'Informing interpreters on***

the closure phase, where interpreters welcomed interviewers' explaining to them how the closure of the interview should take place.

Themes: Following the investigative interview

There were three themes and four codes on procedures to be followed after an interview is completed (Table 3). First, a '*debriefing*' session between interviewers and interpreters is a suggestion that participants outlined often. For example, interpreters mentioned having a few minutes to discuss the interview and perhaps any '*feedback*' on the interview. Second, there were mixed comments regarding back translation (where a transcription is interpreted back to the original language). Some participants perceive this as welcoming but other raised concerns that this is not doable for all cases but only for cases ending in court. Third, interpreters' had some concerns on how best to '*handle any emotional distress*' after the completion of the interview.

Themes: General Comments

There were six themes and 12 codes regarding general comments (Table 3). First, comments on '*training*' stated the lack of training in this area, the need for joint training and that the training should address mainly interpreters needs. Second, the '*educational video*' was judged as very good, appropriate, that it should be used during training and that the video follows already existing procedures. Third, there was uncertainty on whether interpreters should be seen on the '*camera*' along with the child and the interviewer. As the interpreter is advised to mimic the child's tone and expression it is suggested that the interpreter should be also shown on the camera footage. Fourth, participants mentioned it is important for interviewers and interpreters to identify '*sources of poor quality*' testimony. It may be that a poor quality interview may not be the fault of the interviewer or the interpreter but the child e.g. a child not collaborating. A suggestion was also made in discussing potential challenges during training. Fifth, participants mentioned how '*embarrassment*' may impact the speakers' performance. Sixth, interpreters were asking to clarify how different are children and adult interviews as well as whether interpreters should make interviewers' language friendlier to children. For the latest question it is strongly advised for interpreters to accurate interpreter interviewers' utterances without any changes.

Discussion

The findings that emerged revealed a need to invest in training for interviewers' and interpreters' collaboration. Practitioners' concerns were consistent with the general literature on investigative interviews. This is an area that seems it can benefit from further studies and support from academia. These can be used to form policies and training programmes to assist front line interviewers and interpreters when collaborating to interview children.

What is next? We are expecting members of the National Register of Public Service Interpreters in UK and interviewers from South Yorkshire Police to complete our survey by the end of May 2019. Following their submission the research team will conduct thematic analysis to combine the findings of the present survey with the additional responses. This will help form the final guidelines and training program for practitioners in April 2020. The educational video is expected to be presented at the International Investigative Interviewing Research Group conference end of June 2019. The video will be also uploaded within the research team's website and links of the video will be shared with the organisations who participated in the present study. Below the final narrative to be used in our educational video is presented. Interviewers' and interpreters' efforts should be supported further by academia with a particular focus on the practicalities of this important collaboration.

Video narrative

ICIC Educational video on: Interpreters and Interviewers Collaboration in Investigative Interviews of Children

This video is for experienced and inexperienced interviewers or interpreters who are about to interview a child victim or witness. The video is not comprehensive and should not replace any training.

Prologue

A good collaboration between the interviewer and the interpreter can help in gaining a good quality interview from a child. Understanding the roles of each speaker in the interview can aid this

collaboration. By having a good collaboration between the interviewer and the interpreter, it will help the child to collaborate better with the interpreter and as a result increase the possibilities of gaining a good interview.

Prior the interview, interviewer:

Introduce the basic characteristics of the case under investigation to the interpreter e.g. sexual abuse who is the suspect. Inform the interpreter regarding any complex or unusual vocabulary or police jargon to be used in the interview. Prepare the interpreter that sexual topics may be discussed during the interview. Inform the interpreter of any notes you have. Share with the interpreter any questions you have prepared and likely to ask the child. Inform the interpreter of any documents to be read out in full and provide a copy to the interpreter or give interpreter timely sight of the documents beforehand. Inform the interpreter of the rapport phase (or introduction) phase of the interview (e.g. ground rules, discussion of truth and lies), of the closure phase of the interview e.g. asking the child if she/he has anything else to say, thanking the child. Interviewer ask if the interpreter to ask any questions about the introductory comments you have shared with him/her.

Prior the interview, interpreters:

Please consider if necessary, to provide a brief cultural overview about the child's background to the interviewer to support interpreting process. Interpreters, please, never talk alone with the child before or after the interview. Under the supervision of an authorised person, have a brief discussion with the child on topics unrelated with the case. This will allow you and the child to become accustomed to each other's communication style. This will also ensure you are familiar with the child's language, dialect and accent. Inform the interviewer of any communication difficulties with the interviewee.

Prior the interview, the interviewer and the interpreter should:

Discuss their preferences of the interpretation style. For example, do you prefer a simultaneous interpretation or do you prefer a consecutive interpretation? In case you choose consecutive interpretation, the interviewer should give time to the interpreter to interpret an utterance without interrupting or asking questions before the interpreter complete the interpretation. Avoid bringing any dictionaries or other documents aiming to assist the interpretation in the investigating room.

Prior the interview, ask for child's preferences:

There are mixed opinions among practitioners of whether a child should express preferences on interpreters' religion, regional origins, political affiliation and cultural background. Try to avoid offering such choices to the child but in case the child feels uncomfortable with some of the interpreter's features consider ending the interview and identifying another interpreter. Practitioners agree that the child can express preferences on the interpreter's gender. Ask the child if she or he prefers a female or a male interpreter.

The 'I' cue' suggestions:

Interviewers be prepared: Interviews are already challenging communication channels. Be very well prepared especially when an interview is to be conducted with the assistance of an interpreter.

Liquid: Ensure there is water available for everybody.

Camera: Before starting ensure all speakers are clearly visible on camera. Interpreters are advised to mimic children's tone and expressions. These should be shown on the camera footage, because they influence the way we perceive a testimony.

Unknown: Ensure the child does not know the interpreter other than in this professional capacity.

Extended: Interviews with interpreters may take longer than other interviews. Interviewers do not shorten the interview. Take your time to elicit the necessary details.

Understanding each other's accent:

Before starting the interview, interviewers and interpreters, make sure you can understand each other's accent.

Things to keep in mind prior the interview:

Interviewers and interpreters: Be patient. Be caution: A poor quality interview may not be the result of the interviewer's or interpreter's input but other factors e.g. a child not collaborating.

Prepare for side comments by interpreters:

Before (and sometimes during) the interview, the interpreter may need to inform the interviewer about any specific information regarding the interpretation. For example, the interpreter may explain to the interviewer that the interpretation may sound slightly longer than the interviewer's original utterance as the child's language is more descriptive than the interviewer's language.

At the rapport phase of the interview:

The interviewer should introduce each speaker to the child and provide a brief description of each speaker's role to the child e.g. 'My name is Xxxx, I am a police officer and I will be asking questions. Yyyy is our interpreter and s/he will be interpreting these questions.' Also, at the rapport phase of the interview, interviewers should inform the child that s/he can ask for a break and point out any lack of understanding.

The FAARE guidelines, suggested to be followed during the interview:

First person: Interviewer should always direct questions to the child and NOT the interpreter. For example, look at the child and say 'tell me what happened'; do NOT look at the interpreter and say 'ask him to tell me what happened'. Both the interviewer and the interpreter should use the first person throughout the interview (e.g. Tell me about) and avoid the third person (e.g. Ask her to tell me ...).

Approaches: Interviewer should not shorten questions to make the interpretation easier. Ask the question as you would have asked it without the interpreter's presence. Interviewers should not change their approach (such as interview structure, question types) because of the interpretation. Use the same approach you would have used without the interpreter's presence.

- Some approaches are considered more appropriate than others. Interviewers should make every effort to follow their national interviewing guidelines. Research suggests that TED (Tell, Explain, Describe) approaches are one of the safest approaches to rely on when interviewing children. For example 'tell me about it'. Another safe approach is the use of silence. Facilitators are also a safe approach. Facilitators are sounds like hmm, uhu, mmm, go on.
- Some approaches are considered more inappropriate than others and should be avoided. Approaches that should be avoided are yes/no questions. For example, 'was he tall?'. Choice questions should also be avoided. For example, 'was the car white or blue?'. Interviewers should take use possible means to avoid suggestive or leading or misleading approaches. These include approaches that suggest the answer to the child. For example, 'He was tall, wasn't he?' or 'He was tall, right?'. When a new case detail is introduced by the interviewer, this can be considered as suggestive, leading or misleading approach. For example, the interviewer may say 'I know he was a tall person'.
- Interpretation of interviewers' questions: Interpreters should be careful to interpret the approaches/questions as they are phrased. If the interviewer says 'Describe the room'. The interpreter should say 'Describe the room', NOT say 'can you describe the room?' Use the exact words and type of question the interviewer used, do not change question type e.g. an open-ended approach into a yes/no question or rephrase a question to a leading question. Do not change the question to make it more suitable or child friendly. Ask the question the way the interviewer asked it. Ask only the questions the interviewer asked. Do not provide any information to the child if the interviewer did not mention this.

Answers: Both the interviewer and the interpreter should give children the opportunity to fabricate their answer. Interviewers should make sure to use silence and facilitators. Interpreters should make sure to interpret these appropriately.

Repeating questions: Interpretation may make things challenging to understand. As an interviewer you may need to repeat questions to clarify some things. If this is necessary, remind the child you are repeating the question to make sure you (the interviewer) understood things right. Rephrase the question by using different words. Follow your guidelines on how best to ask repeating questions.

Eye contact: Interviewer should maintain eye contact with the child and NOT the interpreter. Both interviewer and interpreter should try to encourage the child to have more eye contact with the interviewer. For example, you should consider doing the following: Interviewer always look at the child e.g. when you are asking questions, when the interpreter is interpreting, when the child is answering, when the interpreter is interpreting the child's answer. Interpreter should look at the interviewer when questions are asked, and should look at the child when interpreting the interviewers question and look at the interviewer when interpreting the child's response. This should encourage the

child to have more eye contact with the interviewer. Eye contact should feel natural so try to adjust this based on the atmosphere in the room.

During the interview, interpreters please:

Replicate the same register, vocabulary, manner of speech and style of the interviewer and child. Replicate the tone or intonation of the interviewer and child e.g. hesitation. The tone is as important as words and if not mimic correctly it may change the message. Replicate the body language of the interviewer and child e.g. hands gestures. By mimicking these it will help lawyers and judges (and/or juries) understand better the emotions expressed by the child through your interpretation. Emphasize the same words the interviewer and child emphasized.

Interpretation of children's utterances during the interview:

Special attention should be given when interpreting children's words. Make sure not to change the word. If the child said 'boobies', the interpreter should NOT say 'breast' but interpret this as 'boobies'. Children's words should be accurately interpreted throughout the interview e.g. use the exact word the child used and do not change children's words into more socially acceptable words. Interpret word for word and NOT a summary of what is said. If the child elaborates his/her answers you can take notes. If the child says 'I do not understand', do NOT rephrase the question but pass this reply to the interviewer.

During the interview, interpreters ensure the interviewer is always leading the interview:

Avoid side conversations with the interviewee. Do NOT support or side with the child or the interviewer. Do NOT make additional comments or express opinion about the case. Only ask the question asked by the interviewer. It is the interviewer's responsibility to investigate or clarify things.

During the interview, interpreters point out any misunderstandings:

There will be ongoing linguistic issues for the interpreter to handle during the interview as information may be encoded differently from one language to another. Interpreter: If necessary point out any misunderstandings to the interviewer to help produce an accurate interpretation.

Back translation following the interview:

After the interview consider 'back translation' where interpreters can check if they agree with the interpretation by looking at a transcription or the recording. Any concerns or misunderstandings should be noted.

Debriefing following the interview:

A debriefing after the interview would be useful to discuss any feedback regarding the collaboration (e.g. concerns on the interpretation). During the debriefing interviewers or the police force should provide to interpreters contact details of psychologists or charities they can visit to discuss any emotional distress arisen from their collaboration with the police. If possible back translation should take place otherwise this can be minimised to cases proceeding to court.

Acknowledgments:

Funder by the International Investigative Interviewing Research Group
Principal investigator: Dr. Marilena Kyriakidou, Sheffield Hallam University, England,
Co-investigator: Drs. Karina Dekens, The Police Academy in Netherlands
Film maker: Mrs. Andrew Tsareas, University of Aristotle, Greece,
Many thanks to our participants from the:

- Association of Police and Court Interpreters (UK),
- Cyprus Police
- Police Academy in Netherlands

To our collaborators:

- Dr. Charlotte Coleman, Sheffield Hallam University
- Dr. Jane Adlard, Sheffield Hallam University
- Dr. Jennifer Drabble, Sheffield Hallam University
- Miss. Amy Ramdehal, Sheffield Hallam University

Table 1: Themes regarding procedures prior the investigative interviews


Collaboration: Good examples	Collaboration: Problematic examples	Training comments	Comments on video narrative	
Interpreter can interpret the language	Interpreter cannot interpret the language	---	---	
---	Interpreter's accent difficult to understand	---	---	
---	Interpreter not speaking the child's dialect	---	---	
---	Use of wrong interpreter	---	---	
---	Interpreter not really needed	---	---	
---	---	Interpreters' gender	---	
Having an experienced interpreter	---	Interpreters' experience	---	
---	Interpreter's pressure from familiarity with the case	---	Agree: Child should not know interpreter	
---	---	---	Mixed comments: Children's preference on interpreter	
Interviewer explained to interpreter the interview procedure prior the interview	No briefing at the beginning of the interview	Familiarising interpreters with the interview procedures	Agree: Informing interpreter on instructions and potential questions	
---		---	Agree: Briefing	
---		Brief written guidelines given to interpreters	---	
---		Physical positions during interview	---	
Interviewer explained to interpreter prior the interview how to interpret children's words		---	---	---
Interviewer explained to interpreter prior the interview how to interpret questions		---	---	---
Introducing the case to the interpreter		Interviewer refuses to give details of the case	---	Agree: Informing interpreter on alleged case
Interpreter asked questions on the case prior the interview		---	---	---
---		---	---	Agree: Informing interpreter on instructions and potential questions
Interviewer explained interpreter's role during interview		---	Familiarising interpreters and interviewers with each other's work/role	Added explaining interpreter's role
Interviewer explained eye contacts during interview		Interviewer said to Interpreter to have no eye contact with the child at all	Eye contact and direction of communication	---
Interviewers were well prepared	---	---	---	
Interviewer asked interpreter for examples of good practice prior the interview	---	Practical training and examples	---	
Interviewer offer drink to interpreter and make the interpreter feels comfortable	---	---	---	
Interpreter explained the child's culture to interviewer	---	Explain cultural differences	Disagreed: Cultural awareness	
---	---	---	Agree but with caution: Interpreter's and child's brief discussion prior interview	

Table 2: Theme regarding procedures during the investigative interview

Collaboration: Good examples	Collaboration: Problematic examples	Training comments	Comments on video narrative
Interpreter or interviewer explained each person's role to the child ---	No introductions at the beginning to the child ---	---	---
Interpreter part of rapport building	---	Familiarising children with the interview procedure ---	How to guide children ---
Accurate interpretation of children's words ---	Not accurate interpretation of children's words Interpreter asking questions not asked by the interviewer ---	Important for interpreters to interpreter accurate children's words ---	---
---	Interpreter asking leading questions ---	Important for interpreters to interpreter question types and avoid using leading questions ---	---
---	Interpreters rephrasing questions ---	Important for interpreters to interpreter question types accurately ---	---
---	Interpreters provide wrong information to interviewees Interpreter not interpreting ---	---	---
Not interfering with interview ---	Interpreters taking over the interview Interpreters conduct independent discussions with interviewees ---	---	Agree: Never side with one party ---
More interaction with interviewer rather than interpreter ---	Interpreter's attracts attention so child is not focusing on interviewer Interpreters answering children's questions ---	---	---
Interpreter adjusted to child's movements in space Interpreter mimics the child's expressions ---	---	---	---
---	---	Important for interpreters to interpreter accurate children's tone or intonation Body language ---	---
Good collaboration ---	Interviewer does not working with interpreters Not good collaboration between interpret and interviewer ---	Explain interviewers' and interpreters' collaboration ---	Problematic collaboration ---
Child felt comfortable with interpreter or Interpreter made the child feel comfortable	---	---	---
Interpreter used the first person ---	Interpreter used the third person Interviewer was using the third person ---	Usage of first person ---	---
Interpreter explained the need for further description Patient interpreter	---	---	---
Interviewer used appropriate approaches	Interviewer used problematic approaches	---	Disagree: Echo

---	---	---	Added: Naming or addressing emotions during interview
Simultaneous interpretation	---	---	Disagree: Simultaneous interpretation
---	---	Clarify whether interpreters' could intervene if necessary	---
---	Interpreter used a book	---	---
Interviewer gave time for interpretation	Interviewer was asking questions before the interpreter completed the previous question	Clarify interpreters' preferences of interpretation	---
---	Interviewer was interrupting	---	---
---	---	---	Added: Informing interpreter on closure

Table 3: Themes regarding procedures after the interview and general comments

Collaboration: Good examples	Collaboration: Problematic examples	Training comments	Comments on video narrative
After the interview			
Debriefing at the end of the interview	---	Feedback after the interview	---
---	---	De-briefing sessions	---
---	---	---	Mixed: Back translation
---	---	Handling emotions after interview	---
General comments			
---	---	Need for a joint training	---
---	---	Training focusing on interpreters	---
---	---	Lack of training	---
---	---	---	Judge the video as satisfying
---	---	Usage of proposed educational video	---
---	---	---	The video is following already existing procedures
---	---	---	Unsure: Camera
Sources of poor quality testimonies	---	---	---
---	---	Address potential challenges	---
Embarrassment	Embarrassment	Embarrassment	---
---	---	Are Children's and adults' interviews the same	Children's' and adults' interviews
---	---	Should interpreters make interviewers' language friendlier to children?	---