Published in final edited form as:

J Exp Child Psychol. 2015 June ; 134: 30–42. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2015.01.010.

Young children's ability to use 2-dimensional and 3-dimensional symbols to show placements of body touches and hidden objects

Nicole Lytle¹, Kamala London¹, and Maggie Bruck²

¹University of Toledo

²Johns Hopkins Medical Institution

Abstract

In two experiments, we investigated 3- to 5-year-old children's ability to use dolls and human figure drawings as symbols to map body touches. In Experiment 1 stickers were placed on different locations of children's bodies, and they were asked to indicate the location of the sticker using three different symbols: a doll, a human figure drawing, and the adult researcher. Performance on the tasks increased with age, but many 5-year-olds did not attain perfect performance. Surprisingly, younger children made more errors on the 2D human figure drawing task compared to the 3D doll and adult tasks. In Experiment 2, we compared children's ability to use 3D and 2D symbols to indicate body touch as well as to guide their search for a hidden object. We replicated the findings of Experiment 1 for the body touch task: for younger children, 3D symbols were easier to use than 2D symbols. However, the reverse pattern was found for the object locations task with children showing superior performance using 2D drawings over 3D models. Though children showed developmental improvements in using dolls and drawings to show where they were touched, less than two-thirds of the 5-year-olds performed perfectly on the touch tasks. Developmental as well as forensic implications of these results are discussed.

Keywords

child witness; anatomical dolls; anatomical drawings; forensic interviews; props

In the past several decades a great amount of developmental research has focused on children's ability to accurately report prior events (see London & Ceci, 2012). Much of this research has been spurred by actual cases of child sexual abuse which generally are

© 2015 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Address correspondence to: Kamala London, University of Toledo, 2801 W. Bancroft St. MS# 948, Toledo, OH 43606, USA; +1-419-530-2352, kamala.london@utoledo.edu.

¹University of Toledo, Department of Psychology, 2801 W. Bancroft St. MS# 948, Toledo, OH 43606, USA;

²Johns Hopkins Medical Institution, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, 550 Building, Rm. 204, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

characterized by the absence of physical evidence and eyewitnesses other than the alleged child victim and adult perpetrator. Consequently, researchers have attempted to develop interviewing techniques that reliably elicit complete and accurate accounts from children. The major challenge in this effort has been to identify developmentally sensitive techniques that take into account the social and psychological strengths and weaknesses of children at various ages. In the present experiments, we focus on the developmental requirements for using two common types of forensic interview props. The first study focuses on dolls and line drawings. In the second study, scale models of larger objects were added to the research tool kit.

In the past decades, interviewers have used a number of potentially useful but untested techniques with children (see Poole & Bruck, 2012, for a review; Poole, Dickinson, Brubacher, Liberty, & Kaake, 2014). For example, in the 1980s, anatomically detailed dolls (AD dolls) were commonly used in the forensic arena. Children were asked to “show what happened” while demonstrating with one or more AD dolls (Boat & Everson, 1986; Conte, Sorenson, Fogarty & Rosa, 1991; Kendall-Tackett & Watson, 1992). More recently, 2-dimensional (2D) human figure drawings (HFDs) have replaced or supplemented the 3-dimensional (3D) dolls. In most contemporary HFD focused interviews, children are shown line drawings of a same-sexed child and typically asked to name the body parts. Interviewers then ask children about touch experiences and invite children to report touch locations by pointing to the drawings.

The conceptual motivation for the use of both AD dolls and HFDs is that such props should help children overcome linguistic deficits or potential embarrassment that might be associated with disclosing sexual information (Everson & Boat, 2002; Russell, 2008). Another assumption is that AD dolls and HFDs might act as memory cues or reminders for to-be-remembered events while at the same time clarifying for interviewers the names that children use for various body parts (Russell, 2008).

Despite their popularity in the forensic and clinical arenas, there is little empirical support for the primary assumptions just listed above (see Poole & Bruck, 2012, for a detailed review). Some studies have reported that AD dolls increase the amount of information produced by children, though it is at the expense of errors (of touching). For example, Goodman, Quas, Batterman-Faunce and Riddlesberger (1997) questioned 3- to 10-year-old children who had undergone genital touch during the course of a needed medical procedure. While the use of AD dolls led to increases in the amount of information provided, the youngest children made more mistakes when using dolls than they did during verbal recall of the event. In fact, when questioned with AD dolls, 3- and 4-year-olds provided as much incorrect information as they did correct information (also see Bruck, Ceci, & Francoeur, 2000; Bruck, Ceci, Francoeur, & Renick, 1995; DeLoache & Marzolf, 1995; Lamb, Hershkowitz, Sternberg, Boat & Everson, 1996; Steward & Steward, 1996; Thierry, Lamb, Orbach & Pipe, 2005).

Similar data have been reported for HFDs. For example, in their investigation of 4- to 9-year-olds, Poole and Dickinson (2011) found that HFDs did not affect most aspects of 4- to 9-year-olds' reports about a previously experienced science demonstration. Generally, the

same amount of information was elicited in the non-HFD interview as in the HFD focused protocol. There was one exception. The HFD interview resulted in more true and false statements about bodily touch during the open-ended phase of questioning. Other investigators have reported similar results for this age group of children (e.g., Brown, Pipe, Lewis, Lamb, & Orbach, 2007; Bruck, 2009; Poole et al., 2014; Steward & Steward, 1996; Willcock, Morgan & Hayne, 2006). Thus, although there are sometimes benefits to using HFDs, there are also accompanying risks.

Several explanations may account for the general failure of dolls and drawings to promote children's reports. First, the dolls and HFDs may be suggestive (Bruck et al., 2000; Bruck, 2009; Poole & Dickinson, 2011). Interview props may also be viewed by some children as play objects that may act to encourage children to thoughtlessly point to body locations (Poole & Dickinson, 2011; Poole et al., 2014). Another possibility, one that is the focus of the present paper, is that for cognitive reasons, young children simply struggle to use dolls and drawings to demonstrate where they have been touched. In order to successfully show where touch occurred on their bodies, children must recall the location of touch and have the ability to accurately transfer that information onto the symbol. In the next section we review the literature on the age at which children understand dolls and drawings as symbols.

Children show a very early, albeit limited, appreciation of symbols. They begin to recognize objects in 2D pictures at a very early age (Ganea, Allen, Butler, Carey, & DeLoache, 2009; Preissler & Carey, 2004) even when such materials are not available in their cultures (Jahoda, Derogowski, Ampene, & Williams, 1997; Kennedy & Ross, 1975). By age 15- to 18-months, children understand that a picture stands for something else (Ganea et al., 2009). By the end of the second year, toddlers' generally do not attempt to pick up and manipulate objects represented by pictures (i.e., they realize they cannot pick up and eat a picture of a cookie) but rather point to the images in pictures. Also, by age 2, children engage in pretend play with dolls (Belsky & Most, 1981; though see Tomasello, Striano, & Rochat, 1999, for a discussion of whether children are truly pretending versus simply copying previously witnessed actions). Children's early play and exploration of drawings and dolls certainly give forensic interviewers reason to intuit that the props may be helpful in interviews.

In a large body of work, DeLoache and colleagues have shown that symbolic development is not an all-or-nothing attainment. Children's ability to flexibly use symbols continues to develop as a function of the task demands. DeLoache (1987, 1991) argues that, in order to understand a symbolic object (termed *representational insight*), children must mentally represent it both as an *object* and a *symbol* (i.e., they must achieve *dual representation*). DeLoache and colleagues have examined children's developing ability to use 2D pictures and 3D models as symbols in order to guide their search for an object in a larger space. In their standard task (DeLoache, 1987), a small Snoopy doll is hidden in a small-scale model room. The child must use the small-scale model as a symbol to gather information about where the larger doll is hiding in the "big room". DeLoache and colleagues (e.g., DeLoache, 1987, 1991; DeLoache & Burns, 1994; Marzolf & DeLoache, 1994) consistently find that 2.5-year-olds have difficulty in using information from a scale model to guide their search of a larger room, but by age 3 most children succeed on the task. However, DeLoache and colleagues have identified a number of conditions and parameters that moderate children's

symbol performance, including explicit verbal instructions on the task (DeLoache, 1989) and the degree of iconicity between the model and the room (DeLoache et al., 1991; Ganea et al., 2009). An additional finding from this lab is that, for their standard search tasks, children consistently show an appreciation of 2D symbols before 3D symbols (DeLoache, 1987, 1991; DeLoache & Burns, 1994; Marzolf & DeLoache, 1994).

DeLoache and colleagues' findings imply that, in order for props to bolster forensic reports, children first must acquire the representational insight that dolls or drawings are symbols of themselves. Children also must be able to accurately map from the self to the doll or the drawing. Based on DeLoache's work, one would predict that children would be able to use a drawing before a doll since the drawing is 2D and serves only a representational function whereas dolls are both symbols and play objects with which children can interact (see DeLoache, 1990; DeLoache & Burns, 1993; DeLoache, Kolstad, & Anderson, 1991; DeLoache, Pierroustakos, & Troseth, 1996).

Limited research addresses the age at which children acquire the representational insight that dolls or drawings are symbols of themselves. In one report, DeLoache and Smith (1999) briefly reviewed several of their unpublished studies that examined children's ability to map body touches using dolls and drawings. In one study (Smith, 1995), the researcher placed a sticker on a child and asked the child to indicate the sticker placement on a doll or on a color drawing of the doll. The rates of correct sticker placements were similar for 2.5- to 3.5-year-old children in the doll (62%) and drawing conditions (55%). Despite the lack of methodological details and statistical analyses, the most interesting finding is that, at this age range, children had great difficulty mapping their own body parts onto a doll/drawing. Though their paradigm and preliminary findings are intriguing, children's developing ability to use symbols to demonstrate bodily touch has yet to be systematically examined. Such developmental findings are not only important theoretically, but also would set some empirically driven guidelines for the appropriate use of various types of props in the forensic arena.

Experiment 1 of the present paper was designed to minimize memory demands in order to directly examine children's ability to use dolls and HFDs as symbols to map the location of body touches. Unlike past studies where children used dolls and drawings to recount an earlier event, in this paradigm, a sticker remains placed somewhere on the child's body so that memory for the original touching event is not an issue. We sought to directly examine the basic question regarding at what age children can reliably use dolls and drawings to show contemporaneous body touching. Experiment 2 was a replication and follow-up of Experiment 1; we added tasks requiring children to use 2D and 3D symbols to locate the positions a hidden object.

Experiment 1

Method

Design—A large sticker was placed on a specific location on the child's body. The child was then given a smaller sticker and told to place it on the exact same place on a symbol of

the child's body. There were three within-subjects touch conditions with four trials each: 1) a human drawing touch task, 2) a doll touch task, and 3) an adult touch task.

Participants—There were 85 3- to 5-year-old children ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .79$) recruited from schools and daycares in a large Eastern city ($n = 41$) and a medium sized Midwestern city ($n = 44$). There were 29 3-year-olds (16 females), 32 4-year-olds (19 females), and 24 5-year-olds (15 females). Written parental permission was obtained for all participants. The study was approved by our Institutional Review Boards.

Materials—In the drawing task, HFDs were taken from a forensic interviewing manual. The drawings showed the front and back of a child (as is the practice in forensic proceedings). Clothes were drawn onto the HFDs. For the doll task, 22 inch *My Buddy* brand dolls were used. The dolls were fully clothed. Four different dolls and drawings were available so the props could approximate children for sex and race (white or black, male or female).

Procedures—Children were tested individually in a single 20-minute session at a quiet location at their school or daycare. After establishing rapport with children, the testing began.

Human Drawing Touch Task: The researcher showed the child the drawings (front and back), stating it was like them in a lot of ways. The child was then asked to point to four specific body parts (i.e., ear, nose, foot, shoulder) on the drawing. For example, the researcher stated, "See she has an ear. Point to the ear on the drawing." This procedure provided an estimation of the child's ability to locate various body parts on the drawing.

Next the researcher explained that she was going to place a big sticker on the child. After the placement, the researcher gave the child an identical but smaller sticker and told the child to place it on the drawing in exactly the same place as where the sticker was on her/his body. There were four trials, each for a different body part. All 12 placements were in innocuous locations on the child. Different body parts were used, similar to DeLoache hiding a Snoopy doll in different parts of a room. We did not want to touch the child in the same place repeatedly which could lead to a response pattern. Though we used different body parts for the doll and drawing, the body parts always appeared in the same order (e.g., elbow, knee, foot, etc). We systematically counterbalanced the order for the tasks (doll, drawing, adult; drawing, doll, adult, etc.) so the different body parts appeared equally often for each symbol type. This ensures that any differences in performance according to symbol type (e.g., doll vs. drawing) is due to actual differences in these symbolic mediums versus in certain body parts (e.g., shoulder) being challenging for young children.

Doll Touch Task: Children again were asked to point to four different body parts before starting the task. This task was identical to the previous one except the child was asked to use a doll as the symbol, and there were four new body part placements (counterbalanced across different orders of the symbol tasks).

Adult Touch Task: This task was identical to the previous two except four new body part placements were used (again with counterbalanced task orders). In addition, the child was told by the researcher to place the sticker “on me in just the same place as it is on you”.

Scoring: Correct placements were liberally coded, and responses were scored correct if the child placed the sticker on the correct location regardless of side (e.g., right vs. left hand).

Results

In preliminary analyses, there were no differences based on gender or data collection site, so the data were collapsed across these variables. All analyses were conducted on raw scores although percentages are reported for ease of reading.

Body Part Identification—When asked to point to different body locations, regardless of age, children were highly successful with all three symbols (overall 91% accuracy rates) with no age trends. Overall, the children understood the names and could point to the parts of the body that were to be touched in the next phase of the study.

Body Touch Data—A 3 (age: 3-, 4- and 5-year-olds) by 3 (symbol type: drawing, doll, and adult researcher) repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with symbol type as a within subjects variable was conducted on the number of correct placements. There was a main effect of age, $F(2, 82) = 17.53, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .30$, and symbol type, $F(2, 164) = 7.10, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .08$. There was also a significant Symbol by Age interaction, $F(4, 164) = 2.66, p = .035, \eta_p^2 = .06$. As shown in Table 1 and confirmed by planned contrasts, the 3- and 4-year-olds made more errors in the drawing task compared to the doll, $t(60) = -3.46, p = .001$, and adult researcher tasks, $t(60) = -3.42, p = .001$; there were no significant differences between the doll and adult researcher tasks ($p = .91$). Five-year-olds did not show an effect of symbol condition, performing well across all three symbol tasks. A trend analysis confirmed overall improved linear performance among 3- to 5-year-olds on the symbol tasks, $F(1, 84) = 34.93, p < .001$.

From a forensic standpoint, any errors at all could be highly costly. That is, if a child falsely points to the genitals when asked if anyone has touched them, this one mistake could set an intense investigation into motion. Therefore, we next examined children’s errorless performance on the symbol tasks. See Table 2.

Does body identification ability predict symbol performance?—Finally, we examined whether children’s ability to identify body parts on the symbol predicted their performance on the symbol task. This is an important applied issue since body diagram-focused forensic interviewers tend to commence their interviews by asking children to point to the different body parts on the symbol. The assumption seems to be, that if children show they understand the drawing has the same body parts (i.e., they can point to the hand) as them, they should be able to demonstrate the location of touch experiences using the drawing. We examined whether an association existed between children’s ability to point to the body parts and their performance on the symbol tasks in three ways. First, we examined whether performance on the body identification task was correlated with performance on the symbol tasks while controlling for age. Bonferroni corrections (for 3 comparisons) were

made due to repeated comparisons. None of the correlations were significant (r 's = .19 to .25). Next, we coded children's body identification into a dichotomous variable according to whether they scored perfectly in labeling the body parts. We used this variable as a predictor variable (along with age in years) with performance on the symbol tasks as the response variable. Performance on the body identification task did not predict symbol performance (all F 's < 2.75, p 's < .10). Finally, we examined whether performance on the body identification task reduced our odds in predicting performance on the symbol tasks. All lambdas were between 0.00 – 0.16 with all p 's > .10. By knowing whether a child can identify body parts on a drawing or a doll, we do not reduce our odds in predicting their ability to use the prop as a symbol for them.

Discussion

Our results are interesting in two regards. First, we found significant deficits in 3-year-old children's ability to use symbols to show body touches. Though performance improved with age, even the 5-year-olds made some errors, with slightly under half the 5-year-olds showing perfect performance on all three tasks. In contrast, DeLoache and colleagues consistently find 3-year-olds perform well is using symbols to guide their search of another space. However, our findings are consistent with DeLoache's theoretical framework that children's understanding and use of symbols undergoes extended development and is a function of the properties of the task. In fact, DeLoache and Smith's (1999) hypothesized that the ability to use symbols to guide one's search of a larger space might be acquired earlier than the ability to use a symbol to map bodily touch.

A second interesting finding of Experiment 1 was that 3- and 4-year-olds performed better in the doll task compared to the human drawing task. While the effect size for this finding was relatively modest, the clinical implications are significant given the findings are in the opposite directions from practice; namely, HFDs have replaced dolls in forensic practice with the assumption that children could use drawings earlier than dolls to show body touch. Our findings suggest the opposite pattern with regarding to using forensic interview props to map bodily touch.

Experiment 2 had two objectives. One goal was to replicate the superiority of 3D versus 2D symbols when mapping body touches. Second, we sought to examine children's performance in using symbols to show the location of an object that was placed in a large-scale space (similar to DeLoache & Burns, 1994) versus to map body touch (as was the case in Experiment 1). Though we can conclude from Experiment 1 that children's developmental trajectory was later compared to that in DeLoache's studies, a more compelling design would be to compare symbol performance on an object locations task versus a touch task *within* participants.

Given these considerations, we hypothesized that children would perform better on the object locations task than the touch locations task, approaching ceiling at an earlier age on the former task. We also hypothesized that on the touch locations task children would again perform better using the 3D symbol compared to the 2D drawing, and that the opposite pattern would be found for the object locations task.

Experiment 2

Method

Participants—Ninety-seven 3- to 5-year-old children ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .79$) were recruited from schools and daycares in a medium sized Midwestern city. There were 32 3-year-olds (19 females), 35 4-year-olds (14 females), and 30 5-year-olds (13 females). Written parental permission and child assent was obtained for all participants. The study was approved by our Institutional Review Board. All testing was completed in a single 30-minute session.

Procedure—The procedures of this study were essentially the same as those of Experiment 1 except that an object locations task (similar to that used by DeLoache & Burns, 1994) was included. We also eliminated the adult researcher as a symbol on the touch location task since there was no comparable task that could be created for the object locations task (as further described below). The two tasks were designed to be as comparable as possible in terms of instructions and other cognitive demands.

A second change to the methodology is that half of the children were randomly assigned to receive “I don’t know” instructions in order to systematically observe whether “don’t know” instructions affect children’s tendency to use *don’t know* as a response. We found it quite surprising in Experiment 1 that children almost always demonstrated a touch location, even if they were completely haphazard in their placements. Although we informally observed that children almost never said “I don’t know” in Experiment 1, we did not systematically record these responses. In Experiment 2, we added the “don’t know” instructions to examine whether such instructions might lessen children’s tendency to provide incorrect responses. In forensic interview protocols, children often are given ground rule instructions where the interviewer explains they can answer “don’t know.” In the “don’t know” instruction condition, children were told they might not know the answers to all of the questions and that it was okay to respond by saying “I don’t know.” They were then given two practice questions in which they did not have the information necessary to answer (e.g., “I have this piece of paper and on the other side is a picture. What is it a picture of?”). If children guessed at the answer, the researcher reminded them that for this question they did not know the answer and so should respond with “I don’t know.” If children correctly responded with “I don’t know”, the researcher moved to the next practice question.

Task 1: Touch Locations Task: As in Experiment 1, each time a new symbol was introduced the child was asked to identify four body parts. Next, the interviewer placed a sticker somewhere on the child and asked the child to show on a 2D human figure drawing (8"×11") or 3D clothed *My Buddy* brand doll where they were touched. There were four placements for each symbol (for a total of 8 placements).

Task 2: Object Locations Task: The task was designed to be as similar as possible to the touch task and was inspired by DeLoache’s Snoopy paradigm, though modified to match the touch task as closely as possible. The large-scale space was a child-sized cardboard barn play area (55"L × 36"W × 49"H). Like the touch task, there were 3D and 2D symbol conditions.

For the 3D object locations condition, the child was shown a small-scale 3D toy barn (13"L × 8"W × 10"H). As with the touch task, before the test trials, the child was asked to identify four barn locations (e.g., point to the barn's roof) on the small-scale barn. Next, the researcher explained to the child that she would hide an apple in or around the big barn. The child's job was to place a small apple replica in the 3D small-scale barn "in just the same place as the *large apple* in the *big barn*."

For the 2D object locations condition the child was shown 8 ½" × 11" line drawings (front and back) of the barn. The line drawings were intended to provide a similar amount of detail as the human figure drawings and both front and back were provided to be consistent with the way in which HFDs are used during forensic evaluation. All barns had an open backside so that children could easily see and replicate placements made inside the barn. Sufficient detail was provided on the drawings so that children were able to discriminate the space within the barn from the outside. Children were then asked to identify four different barn locations, similar to naming four body parts for the touch task. After the researcher placed an apple in or around the big barn while the child was watching, she gave the child a small apple sticker and asked him/her to place it in the same place on the 2D barn drawing. Thus, instructions for the touch task and the object locations task were identical with the substitution of the names of the referent and symbols (e.g., "in just the same place as the *big sticker* is on *you*."

Half the children were randomly assigned to receive the object locations task first, and half the children received the touch locations task first. For both tasks, symbol presentation was fully counterbalanced across the different locations.

Results

Preliminary analyses revealed only 6 children responded "don't know" to the researcher's prompts (4 children who received "don't know" instructions and 2 children who did not receive the instructions). Therefore, the data were collapsed across this variable. All analyses were conducted on raw scores although percentages are reported for ease of reading.

Body Part and Barn Identification—As in Experiment 1, children in all age groups were highly successful in identifying body parts on both the 2D human drawing and the 3D doll (98–100% correct). Children were also at ceiling pointing to different locations on the 2D barn drawing and 3D small-scale barn (99–100% correct).

Touch Locations and Object Locations Data—A 3 (age: 3-, 4- and 5-year-olds) by 2 (task: touch vs. object locations) by 2 (symbol type: 2D vs. 3D) ANOVA with repeated measures on the last two factors was conducted on the number of correct placements. As described in the methods section, there were four different trials for each of the symbol types (i.e., 2D vs. 3D, for a total of 8 placement trials for the touch locations task and 8 placement trials for the object locations task). There was a main effect of age, $F(1, 94) = 14.72, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .24$ and task, $F(1, 94) = 37.92, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .29$. There were also two significant interactions, a Task by Symbol Dimension interaction, $F(1, 94) = 16.06, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .15$ and a Task by Age interaction, $F(2, 94) = 4.00, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .08$. For the

touch task, children performed better on the 3D doll ($M = .85$ of the 4 trials) than on the 2D drawing ($M = .77$ of the 4 trials), $F(1, 94) = 9.75, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .09$. For the object locations task, the opposite was true: children performed better on the 2D drawing ($M = .95$ of the 4 trials) than on the 3D small-scale barn ($M = .90$ of the 4 trials), $F(1, 94) = 7.23, p = .008, \eta_p^2 = .07$. See Table 3.

Follow up comparisons of the Task by Age interaction revealed that the touch task was more difficult than the object locations task for the 3- and 4-year-old children. The 5-year-olds outperformed the younger two age groups and performed comparably across the two tasks. There were also different developmental curves as a function of task. Each task had 8 trials. For the more difficult touch task, there was a linear trend, $F(1, 96) = 26.20, p < .001$: 5-year-olds ($M = .93$), 4-year-olds ($M = .83$), and 3-year-olds ($M = .68$). However, for the easier object locations task, 4- and 5-year-olds performed comparably ($M = .97$ for both age groups) but better than the 3-year-olds ($M = .83$).

We again examined children's errorless performance on the touch tasks and also on the object locations task. See Table 4.

Does body identification predict symbol performance?—Like Experiment 1, we examined whether children's ability to identify body parts on the symbol predicted their performance on the symbol task in three ways. First, we examined whether performance on the body identification task was correlated with performance on the symbol tasks while controlling for age. Bonferroni corrections (for 3 comparisons) were made due to repeated comparisons. None of the correlations were significant ($r's = 0.04$ – $0.16, p's > .10$). Next, we coded children's body identification into a dichotomous variable according to whether they scored perfectly in labeling the body parts. We used this variable as a predictor variable (along with age in years) with performance on the symbol tasks as the response variable. Performance on the body identification task did not predict symbol performance (all $F's < 2.4, p's < .10$). Finally, we examined whether performance on the body identification task reduced our odds in predicting performance on the symbol tasks. All lambdas were between 0.00 to 0.08 with all $p's > .10$. By knowing whether a child can identify body parts on a drawing or a doll, we do not reduce our odds in predicting their ability to use the prop as a symbol.

Summary

Consistent with the results of Experiment 1, 3- and 4-year-olds performed better using the 3D symbol than the 2D symbol on the touch locations task. Consistent with our prediction, however, the reverse pattern was shown on the object locations task.

General Discussion

Three major findings emerged from Experiments 1 and 2. First, the touch locations task was more difficult than the object locations task, especially for 3- and 4-year-olds. Second, in the touch locations task, children made more errors on the 2D symbol than the 3D symbol, whereas the reverse pattern was found for the object locations tasks for the 3-year-old children. The 4- and 5-year-olds both scored near ceiling on the object locations task and

outperformed the 3-year-olds. Third, competence on symbolic tasks was not categorical and showed different developmental trends as a function of task. Specifically, children showed a later onset of symbol use when mapping touch versus object locations. Children also showed much slower growth in their symbol skills when mapping touch versus objects locations. Even though performance improved with age on the touch tasks, 37% of the 5-year-olds committed at least one error on this liberally coded touch task in Experiment 2. Over 85% of the 4- and 5-year-old children scored perfectly using both the 3D and 2D symbols in the object locations tasks (which parallels DeLoache's body of work). The corresponding percentages of children scoring perfectly using both the 3D and 2D symbols in the touch locations tasks for Experiment 2 were 23% and 63% of 4- and 5-year-olds, respectively. These findings elaborate and qualify those of DeLoache and colleagues who have conducted nearly 30 years of research exploring symbolic development in the context of an object location search task. It is within this framework that we discuss our findings.

First DeLoache and colleagues consistently have found that children's ability to use symbols to guide their search for hidden objects undergoes rapid development between ages 2.5- and 3-years (DeLoache, 1987, 1991; DeLoache & Burns, 1994; Marzolf & DeLoache, 1994). Our findings identify a later age of competence in using symbols to demonstrate body touch. As has been argued by DeLoache (1987, 1991), symbolic development is not categorical, but rather cognitive skills that underlie flexible symbol use undergo continued development and depend on the nature of the task. Various studies have documented continued development into the school years for flexible symbol use (e.g., Constable, Campbell, & Brown, 1988; Lee, 1989; Liben, Kastens, & Stevenson, 2002).

Second, there is a discrepancy between the results of the present study and those of DeLoache in terms of the relative difficulty of 2D versus 3D symbols. One possible explanation is that our tasks comparing children's performance on mapping body touch versus object locations are not reliable but suffer from some methodological flaw. However, the design of Experiment 2 helped rule out the possibility that some spurious task demands unrelated to the actual mapping of touch were driving younger children's relatively poor performance on the touch locations task and on the 2D (human drawing) condition in that task. In Experiment 2, we designed an object locations task (similar to those used by DeLoache) that was modified to match in every way the possible the instructions and other cognitive demands of the touch task. Furthermore, it cannot be argued that children were less familiar with the labels or images of the body than of the locations task. Children's ability to name body parts did not predict their ability to use dolls and drawings as symbols to demonstrate body touch. Even 3-year-olds readily pointed to the correct location on the body when asked to do so (e.g., could point to the elbow on the drawing when asked). There was very little variability in children's body identification performance, with children scoring extremely well in labeling the body parts of the props. This finding mirrors DeLoache's finding (as well as those in Experiment 2) that children can point to similar locations in a small-scale model and a large room, demonstrating they appreciate the corresponding items (Troseth, Bloom, & DeLoache, 2007). Despite being able to point out the similarity of the spaces, until age 3, children do not recognize they can use information from the scale model in order to guide their search of the referent space. Thus, other factors

must be considered in resolving discrepancies between the touch locations and object locations tasks. Below we offer several possibilities.

The first concerns differences in psychological distance in the two tasks. In the object locations task, the child must use symbols to represent psychologically distant spatial entities that are apart from the child. In the touch locations task, the child must integrate their own body -- the referent -- into the mapping task. This may involve a special set of underlying psychological skills, including self-concept or self-awareness that undergo continuing development through childhood (Moore & Lemmon, 2001; Rochat, 2003) as well as theory of mind and perspective taking (i.e., putting themselves apart from the scene to determine what another person would perceive, see Wellman, 2011, for a review). This interpretation is consistent with the long held view that psychological distance helps children to view an object as a symbol (Langer, 1942; Potter, 1979; Sigel, 1970, 1990; Werner & Kaplan, 1963).

Another explanation is that different parameters of the referent-symbol relationship predict performance in the touch locations and the object locations task. In the present experiments, because of the close psychological distance in the touch locations task, increased iconicity may be necessary in order to gain representational insight. Interestingly, in the body-touch task, the three-dimensionality of the symbols (both the doll and the adult researcher) allowed the children to more easily assess the connection between their own bodies and the symbols. In other words, the factors of iconicity and of psychological distance may conspire to produce not only developmental differences between object locations and body touch tasks but also may contribute to differences in the relative difficulty and reverse patterns of 2D versus 3D symbols in each of the tasks. Future studies are needed to elucidate why children perform better when using dolls (3D) over drawings (2D) to map body touch compared to the reverse pattern of the 2D superiority when using symbols to guide their search of a larger space.

Forensic Implications

Over 30 years ago, AD dolls emerged onto the forensic scene as interviewers struggled with how to best elicit event reports from children in cases of suspected child abuse. Presently, the popularity of AD dolls has greatly decreased, and dolls have been replaced by HFDs in some of the major interview protocols (see Poole & Dickinson, 2012, for review). Clinically, the movement away from dolls and subsequent adoption of HFDs among child abuse professionals likely was propelled by data showing that very young children struggled to use 3D objects as symbols and that AD dolls increase errors among preschool-aged children. While there is good reason to suspect children would perform better using 2D versus 3D symbols (based on DeLoache's body of work), the 3- and 4-year-olds in our studies found it difficult to demonstrate touch on the human drawings as compared with the dolls. While children's performance increased linearly with age, even the 4-year-olds' error rate was approximately 25% in showing body touch on the human drawings. Recall in our study, we bypassed memory demands by asking children to show where touch was currently occurring on their body. Likely, young children's performance would be worse when adding in factors such as time delay, memory decay, or exposure to post-event misinformation. Thus,

unfortunately interviewers have replaced one developmentally inappropriate task (AD dolls) with another (HFDs), as shown by the results of this study and by those of other researchers (Brown et al., 2007; Bruck, 2009; Poole & Dickinson, 2011; Poole et al., 2014; Steward & Steward, 1996; Willcock et al., 2006, see Poole & Bruck, 2012 for a review).

The findings from our experiments also indicate that child protection professionals cannot assume that children understand the symbolic representational intent of HFDs simply because children can easily label body parts. Even the 3-year-olds in our study readily could point to body parts on dolls and HFDs. However, doing so did not ensure their success in demonstrating on dolls and drawings where touch had occurred on them. By knowing whether a child could successfully label the body parts of the drawings and the dolls, we cannot reliably predict whether they will succeed in using the prop as a symbol.

The major recommendation that emerges from our findings echoes that of past research. Interviewers should commence interviews with open-ended questions that do not rely on props or other types of symbols (e.g., Lamb, Orbach, Hershkowitz, Esplin, & Horowitz, 2007; Lyon, 2005; Memorandum of Good Practice, 1992; Poole & Dickinson, 2011; Steward & Steward, 1996). Compared with more directive questions, open-ended prompts produce more substantive and complete reports even from young children (Lamb et al., 2007). The continued use of dolls and HFDs is a potentially dangerous practice and is inconsistent with past and current research examining children's understanding and use of such props.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by Grant 5R01HD52034 from National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to Maggie Bruck.

References

- Aldridge J, Lamb ME, Sternberg KJ, Orbach Y, Esplin PW, Bowler L. Using a human figure drawing to elicit information from alleged victims of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology*. 2004; 72:304–316.10.1037/0022-006X.72.2.304 [PubMed: 15065963]
- Belsky J, Most RK. From exploration to play: A cross-sectional study of infant free play behavior. *Developmental Psychology*. 1981; 17:630–639. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.17.5.630>.
- Boat, BW.; Everson, MD. Unpublished manuscript. University of North Carolina School of Medicine. Department of Psychiatry; Chapel Hill, NC: 1986. Using anatomical dolls: Guidelines for interviewing young children in sexual abuse investigations.
- Brown DA, Pipe ME, Lewis C, Lamb ME, Orbach Y. Supportive or suggestive: Do human figure drawings help 5- to 7- year-old children to report touch? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2007; 75:33–42.10.1037/0022-006X.75.1.33 [PubMed: 17295561]
- Bruck M. Human figure drawings and children's recall of touching. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*. 2009; 15:361–374.10.1037/a0017120 [PubMed: 20025421]
- Bruck M, Ceci SJ, Francoeur E. Children's use of anatomically detailed dolls to report genital touching in a medical examination: Developmental and gender comparisons. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*. 2000; 6:74–83. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.6.1.74>. [PubMed: 10937313]
- Bruck M, Ceci SJ, Francoeur E, Renick A. Anatomically detailed dolls do not facilitate preschoolers' reports of a pediatric examination involving genital touch. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*. 1995; 1:95–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-898X.1.2.95>.

- Constable H, Campbell B, Brown R. Sectional drawings from science textbooks: An experimental investigation into pupils' understanding. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1988; 58:88–102.10.1111/j.2044-8279.1988.tb00881.x
- Conte JR, Sorenson E, Fogarty L, Rosa JD. Evaluating children's reports of sexual abuse: Results from a survey of professionals. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 1991; 61:428–437.10.1037/h0079264 [PubMed: 1951650]
- DeLoache JS. Rapid change in the symbolic functioning of very young children. *Science*. 1987; 238:1556–1557.10.1126/science.2446392 [PubMed: 2446392]
- DeLoache JS. Young children's understanding of the correspondence between a scale model and a larger space. *Cognitive Development*. 1989; 4:121–137.10.1016/0885-2014(89)90012-9
- DeLoache JS. Symbolic functioning in very young children: Understanding of pictures and models. *Child Development*. 1991; 62:83–90.10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01566.x
- DeLoache JS. Early understanding and use of symbols: The model model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 1995; 4:109–113.10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772408
- DeLoache JS. Dual representation and young children's use of scale models. *Child Development*. 2000; 71:329–338.10.1111/1467-8624.00148 [PubMed: 10834468]
- DeLoache, JS. The symbol-mindedness of young children. In: Hartup, W.; Weinberg, RA., editors. *Child psychology in retrospect and prospect: In celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Institute of Child Development*. Vol. 1. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2002. p. 73-101.
- DeLoache, JS.; Burns, NM. Symbolic development in young children: Understanding models and pictures. In: Pratt, C.; Garton, AF., editors. *Systems of representation in children: Development and use*. Chichester, England: Wiley; 1993. p. 91-112.
- DeLoache JS, Burns NM. Early understanding of the representational function of pictures. *Cognition*. 1994; 52:83–110.10.1016/0010-0277(94)90063-9 [PubMed: 7924202]
- DeLoache JS, Kolstad V, Anderson K. Physical similarity and young children's understanding of scale models. *Child Development*. 1991; 62:111–126.10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01518.x [PubMed: 2022133]
- DeLoache JS, Marzolf DP. The use of dolls to interview young children: Issues of symbolic representation. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 1995; 60:155–173.10.1006/jecp.1995.1036 [PubMed: 7545206]
- DeLoache, JS.; Miller, KW.; Pierroutsakos, S. Reasoning and problem-solving. In: Kuehn, D.; Siegler, RS., editors. *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 2. Cognition, perception, and language*. 5. New York: Wiley; 1998. p. 801-850.
- DeLoache, JS.; Pierroutsakos, SL.; Troseth, G. The three R's of pictorial competence. In: Vasta, R., editor. *Annals of Child Development*. Bristol, PA: Jessica Kingley; 1996. p. 1-48.
- DeLoache, JS.; Smith, CM. Early symbolic representation. In: Sigel, IE., editor. *Development of mental representation: Theories and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; 1999. p. 61-86.
- DeLoache JS, Troseth GL, Smith CM, Burch S. Young children's awareness of model-room relations. Unpublished raw data. 1995
- Everson MD, Boat BW. Sexualized doll play among children: Implications for the use of anatomical dolls in sexual abuse evaluations. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2002; 29:736–742. [PubMed: 2228926]
- Flavell, JH.; Miller, PH.; Miller, SA. *Cognitive Development*. 3. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; 1993.
- Ganea PA, Allen ML, Butler L, Carey S, DeLoache JS. Toddlers' referential understanding of pictures. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 2009; 104:283–295.10.1016/j.jecp.2009.05.008 [PubMed: 19560783]
- Gerhardstein P, Kraebel KS, Gillis J, Lassiter S. Visual search for high-level configural differences as well as low-level critical features is highly efficient early in childhood. *Developmental Psychobiology*. 2002; 41:241–252.10.1002/dev.10074 [PubMed: 12325139]
- Goodman GS, Quas JA, Batterman-Faunce JM, Riddlesberger MM, Kuhn J. Children's reactions to and memory for a stressful event: Influences of age, anatomical dolls, knowledge, and parental attachment. *Applied Developmental Science*. 1997; 1:54–75.10.1207/s1532480xads0102_1

- Hochberg J, Brooks V. Pictorial recognition as an unlearned ability: A study of one child's performance. *American Journal of Psychology*. 1962; 75:624–628.10.2307/1420286 [PubMed: 13963734]
- Jahoda, G.; Deregowski, JB.; Ampene, E.; Williams, N. Pictorial recognition as an unlearned ability: A replication with children from pictorially deprived environments. In: Butterworth, G., editor. *The child's representation of the world*. New York: Plenum Press; 1977. p. 203-213.
- Kail, RV. Information processing and memory. In: Bornstein, MH., et al., editors. *Well-being: Positive development across the line course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 2003. p. 269-279.
- Kendall–Tackett KA, Watson MW. Use of anatomical dolls by Boston-area professionals. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 1992; 16:423–428.10.1016/0145-2134(92)90051-R [PubMed: 1617476]
- Kennedy JM, Ross AS. Outline picture perception by the Song of Papua. *Perception*. 1975; 4:391–406.10.1068/p040391
- Lamb ME, Hershkowitz I, Sternberg KJ, Boat B, Everson MD. Investigative interviews of alleged sexual abuse victims with and without anatomical dolls. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 1996; 20:1251–1259.10.1016/S0145-2134(96)00121-4 [PubMed: 8985616]
- Lamb ME, Orbach Y, Hershokowitz I, Esplin PW, Horowitz D. A structured forensic interview protocol improves the quality and informativeness of investigative interviews with children: A review of research using the NICHD Investigative Interview Protocol. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2007; 31:1201–1231.10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.03.021 [PubMed: 18023872]
- Langer, SKK. *Philosophy in a new key*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press; 1942.
- Lee M. When is an object not an object? The effect of 'meaning' upon the copying of line drawings. *British Journal of Psychology*. 1989; 80:15–37.10.1111/j.2044-8295.1989.tb02301.x
- Liben LS, Kastens KA, Stevenson LM. Real-world knowledge through real-word maps: A developmental guide for navigating the educational terrain. *Developmental Review*. 2002; 22:267–322.10.1006/drev.2002.0545
- London K, Ceci SJ. Competence, credibility, and reliability of children's forensic reports: Introduction to special issue on child witness research. *Developmental Review*. 2012; 32:161–164.10.1016/j.dr.2012.06.001
- Lyon, TD. *Ten step investigative interview*. Los Angeles, CA: Author; 2005.
- Marzolf DP, DeLoache JS. Transfer in young children's understanding of spatial representations. *Child Development*. 1994; 65:1–15.10.2307/1131361 [PubMed: 8131641]
- Mash C. Multidimensional shape similarity in the development of visual object classification. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 2006; 95:128–152.10.1016/j.jecp.2006.04.002 [PubMed: 16793055]
- Moore, C.; Lemmon, K. The nature and utility of the temporally extended self. In: Moore, C.; Lemmon, K., editors. *The Self in Time: Developmental Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; 2001. p. 1-13.
- Office, H. Department of Health. *Memorandum of Good Practice on Video Recorded Interviews with Child Witnesses for Criminal Proceedings*. London: Stationery Office; 1992.
- Poole DA, Bruck M. Divining testimony? The impact of interviewing props on children's reports of touching. *Developmental Review*. 2012; 32:165–180.10.1016/j.dr.2012.06.007 [PubMed: 23144526]
- Poole DA, Dickinson JJ. Evidence supporting restrictions on uses of body diagrams in forensic interviews. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. 2011; 35:654–669.10.1016/j.chiabu.2011.05.004
- Poole DA, Dickinson JJ, Brubacher SP, Liberty AE, Kaake AM. Deficient cognitive control fuels children's exuberant false allegations. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*. 2014; 188:101–109.10.1016/j.jecp.2013.08.013 [PubMed: 24157217]
- Potter, MC. Mundane symbolism: The relations among objects, names, and ideas. In: Smith, NR.; Franklin, MB., editors. *Symbolic functioning in childhood*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1979. p. 41-65.
- Preissler M, Carey S. Do both pictures and words function as symbols for 18- and 24-month-old children? *Journal of Cognition and Development*. 2004; 5(2):185–212.10.1207/s15327647jcd0502_2

- Rochat P. Five levels of self-awareness as they unfold early in life. *Consciousness and Cognition*. 2003; 12:717–731.10.1016/S1053-8100(03)00081-3 [PubMed: 14656513]
- Russell A. Out of the woods: A case for using anatomical diagrams in forensic interviews. Update. 2008; 21(1):2–6. Retrieved from http://www.ndaa.org/pdf/update_vol_21_no_1_2008.pdf.
- Smith, CM. Young children's use of dolls as self symbols. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development; Indianapolis, IN. 1995 Mar.
- Sigel, IE. The distancing hypothesis: A causal hypothesis for the acquisition of representational thought. In: Jones, MR., editor. *Miami Symposium on the prediction of behavior, 1968L Effects of Early Experiences*. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press; 1970. p. 99-118.
- Sigel, IE. Journeys in serendipity: The development of the distances model. In: Sigel, IE.; Brody, GH., editors. *Methods of family research: Biographies of research projects: Vol. 1. Normal families*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates; 1990. p. 87-120.
- Steward MS, Steward DS, Farquahar L, Myers JEB, Reinart M, Welker J, Joye N, Driskill J, Morgan J. Interviewing young children about body touch and handling. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 1996; 61(4–5 Serial No 248)10.2307/1166205
- Thierry KL, Lamb ME, Orbach Y, Pipe ME. Developmental differences in the function and use of anatomical dolls during interviews with alleged sexual abuse victims. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2005; 73:1125–1134.10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1125 [PubMed: 16392985]
- Tomasello M, Striano T, Rochat P. Do young children use objects as symbols? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*. 1999; 17(4):563–584.10.1348/026151099165483
- Troseth GL, Bloom ME, DeLoache JS. Young children's use of scale models: Testing an alternative to representational insight. *Developmental Science*. 2007; 10:763–769.10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00625.x [PubMed: 17973793]
- Wellman HM. Developing a theory of mind. *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of childhood cognitive development*. 2011; 2:258–284.
- Werner, H.; Kaplan, H. *Symbol formation*. New York: Wiley; 1963.
- Willcock E, Morgan K, Hayne H. Body maps do not facilitate children's reports of touch. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*. 2006; 20:607–615.10.1002/acp.1212

Highlights

- Young children are able to use symbols to guide their search of a hidden object by about age 3.
- Children are able to name body parts on dolls and drawings by age 3.
- Knowledge of body parts is not associated with children's ability to use dolls and drawings to demonstrate body touch.
- Though children's use of dolls and drawings to show where they were touched improved with age, less than two-thirds of the 5-year-olds performed perfectly on the touch tasks.
- Three- and 4-year-old children performed better mapping body touch on a 3D doll versus a 2D human drawing.

Table 1

Percentage correct on the touch locations tasks by symbol type and age in Experiment 1.

Symbol	3-year-olds	4-year-olds	5-year-olds
Human Drawing	44.0%	70.3%	93.8%
Doll	64.7%	78.1%	93.8%
Adult Researcher	64.7%	78.9%	93.8%

Table 2

Percentage of children with errorless performance by symbol type and age for Experiment 1.

Symbol	3-year-olds	4-year-olds	5-year-olds
Human Drawing	6.9%	37.5%	75.0%
Doll	27.6%	50.0%	75.0%
Adult Researcher	24.1%	53.1%	75.0%
Errorless on all 3 symbols	0.0%	28.1%	45.8%

Table 3

Percent correct by task, symbol type, and age for Experiment 2.

Task/Symbol	3-year-olds	4-year-olds	5-year-olds
Touch Locations			
2D Human Drawing	64.1%	75.7%	92.5%
3D Doll	72.7%	89.3%	94.2%
Object Locations			
2D Barn Drawing	88.3%	97.9%	98.3%
3D Small-Scale Barn	78.1%	96.4%	95.8%

Table 4

Percentage of children with errorless performance by task, symbol type, and age for Experiment 2.

Task/Symbol	3-year-olds	4-year-olds	5-year-olds
Touch Locations			
2D Human Drawing	34.4%	31.4%	70.0%
3D Doll	43.8%	65.7%	80.0%
Errorless on both symbols	18.8%	22.9%	63.3%
Object Locations			
2D Barn Drawing	65.6%	91.4%	93.3%
3D Small-Scale Barn	46.9%	85.7%	90.0%
Errorless on both symbols	34.4%	80.0%	86.7%