



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Individual Differences In Children's Cognitive Ability

And The Effect Of Differing Supportive Memory Interview

Techniques.

Kirstin Ann-Marie Leat

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Psychology,

The University of Auckland, 2003

Dedicated in Loving memory of

My dear Brother-in-law

The Late Leonard Adams

Gone but never forgotten

Also to my sister Brigitte and her children, Belinda, Darren and Alicia.

*Your courage, strength and enthusiasm for life, always have been,
and continue to be, my greatest inspiration.*

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the many people that have contributed toward the completion of this thesis. First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor Dr Gina Priestley without whom I am most definite this study would have never been possible. This has been as much a product of your hard work and dedication as it has mine. Thank you for your patience and encouragement and your wisdom and expertise in this exciting field of research. Without your guidance and input I would have never even known where to start! I would like to also thank everyone that was involved both in the collection of data and all other aspects of this study especially Mylene Tribo who spent many long hours working along side me. It has been challenging at times for both of us, but your friendship and support has allowed us to make light of even the more stressful times. To our team leaders Sasha Farry and Julie Mika it was great to have you work with the children thank you for your help and for your wonderful enthusiasm. It was also a delight to work at Pakuranga Heights Primary School, thank you to Principal, Bob Oliphant, and all the teachers. Thanks also to all parents that allowed their children to be a part of this study and to the children that took part, with whom it really was a pleasure to work. Finally, thank you to my friends and family who have been a constant source of strength and support. Especially to my mother who, even when I was incredibly grumpy, always insisted on helping me in anyway she could (even bringing snacks at times!). To Ricky Vaauli your encouragement and all the little pep talks have been much appreciated. Thank you also for being incredibly sweet and staying up till the wee hours of the morning helping me sort through pages and pages of reading material!

List of Tables

<i>N.o.</i>	<i>Table Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
1	Mean Number of Correct Actions and Objects Reported in Each Interview Condition	39
2	Mean Amount of Correct Information Reported in Free and Prompted Recall in Each Interview Condition	41
3	Mean Number of Correct Actions and Objects Reported in Free and Prompted Recall in Each Interview Condition	42
4	Mean Number of Errors in Each Interview Condition for Older and Younger Children	43
5	Mean Number of Incorrect Items of Information Reported in Free and Prompted Recall for Each Interview Condition	44
6	Percentages of Gestural Representation Responses Given by Older and Younger Children	45
7	Mean Amount of Correct Information Reported in Each Interview Condition in Children with High versus Low Gestural Representation	47
8	Mean Number of Actions and Objects Reported in Free and Prompted Recall by Children with High versus Low Gestural Representation	49
9	Mean Number of Distortions and Intrusions in Free and Prompted Recall Reported by Children with High versus Low Gestural Representation	50
10	Mean Number of Actions and Objects Reported in Free and Prompted Recall by Children with High versus Low Memory Assessment Recall	54
11	Frequency of Category Card Use During the Memory Assessment Task	56
12	Mean Number of Cards Recalled During Memory Assessment by Children in Each Category Card Use Group	57
13	Mean Numbers and Standard Deviations of Correct Information Reported at the Memory Interview in Each Card Use Category	58
14	Mean Number of Correct Items Reported in Each Category Card Use Group for Actions and Objects in Free and Prompted Recall	60

List of Appendices

<i>Appendix</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
A	Event Script	81
B	Gestural Representation Task Instructions	84
C	Memory Task Instructions	85
D	Layout of category and target cards for memory assessment task	87
E	Memory Interview Scripts	88
F	Context photos	93
G	Photo prompts	95

Abstract

The following study examined the way in which children's individual differences on two dimensions of cognitive ability were able to predict their performance in response to one of four supportive memory interviews. Sixty-eight children aged between five years and seven years eight months old took part in a fun science event at school. Children were subsequently assessed on two measures of cognitive ability: gestural representation and memory strategy use (recall and behaviour). Children were interviewed about the event 10 weeks after it had taken place with either, a standard memory interview, a photo interview (including a distractor photo prompt), an interview which initially involved them mentally reinstating the context in which the event took place, or one in which context was mentally reinstated while viewing context photos. Children that were interviewed with photos reported significantly more correct information than children that were interviewed with mental context reinstatement alone. Despite this, children interviewed in the mental context reinstatement interview condition were still equally as accurate in their reports as those interviewed with photographs. There was no difference between the interview conditions in the numbers of errors children reported, additionally an increase in errors was not found in children exposed to the distractor photo. Children's individual differences in gestural representation and memory strategy recall and behaviour were significantly related to the amount children reported at the memory interview, but were not predictive of which children were able to report more information in response to any one of the interview conditions.