The Usability and Effectiveness of the Finnish Investigative Instrument of Child Sexual
Abuse in Mock Evaluations

Alessandro Tadei^{1*}, Pekka Santtila², Jan Antfolk¹

¹ Department of Psychology, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland. Email: atadei@abo.fi
(Alessandro Tadei); jantfolk@abo.fi (Jan Antfolk).

² Faculty of Arts and Sciences, New York University (Shanghai), China. Email:
pekka.santtila@nyu.edu (Pekka Santtila).

* Corresponding author

Alessandro Tadei, E-mail: atadei@abo.fi. Address: Fabriksgatan 2, 20500, Turku, Finland

Abstract

The Finnish Investigative Instrument of Child Sexual Abuse (FICSA) is a computerized tool that uses Bayesian statistics to estimate the probability that a reported child sex abuse (CSA) is true or false based on population level information regarding the correlates of CSA. FICSA can be used to assist decision-making in investigations of CSA. We compared forensic experts' and students' ability to use FICSA and whether its use affected the estimates of the probability of CSA in mock-scenarios. The use of FICSA was compared to only having access to the empirical information about CSA risk and protective factors, which FICSA is based on, and to unassisted decision-making. The 54 participants analyzed two scenarios of possible CSA and estimated the probability of the CSA allegation being true. The results show that participants using FICSA were prone to make technical mistakes that affect the correctness of the probability estimation. The performance of experts and students was equivalent in all the conditions, but in the group using FICSA, where experts tended to deviate from the probability provided by FICSA more than students. Having only access to empirical information did not improve estimates compared to unassisted decision-making. Both students and experts tended to adjust the estimates provided by FICSA downwards, that is, to decrease the probability of abuse. We conclude that FICSA can assist investigators to correctly integrate evidence and calculate probabilities but that proper training is required.

Keywords: FICSA, child sexual abuse, forensic psychology, Bayesian statistics, decision-making

The Usability and Effectiveness of the Finnish Investigative Instrument of Child Sexual Abuse in Mock Evaluations

The Finnish Investigative Instrument of Child Sexual Abuse (FICSA, [1]) is a decision-making support tool that uses Bayesian statistics to estimate the probability of a child being victim of child sexual abuse (CSA) without requiring any proximate information about the alleged event. The information FICSA uses to assess the probability of CSA having occurred is instead related to the child's previous experiences with crime, alcohol, drugs and smoking, domestic violence, relation with peers, and common life habits. According to a simulation study [1], FICSA has a very high discriminatory effectiveness ($AUC = .97$ for boys and $AUC = .88$ for girls). Although these diagnostic utility values are very promising, it is yet unclear how well FICSA will perform in actual investigations of CSA allegations. Figure 1 shows the logic FICSA is based on and how data from the case under investigation are entered.

FICSA was created to provide a possible solution to the multiple issues, theoretical and practical, that can negatively affect CSA investigations. The first problem the investigators have to deal with is the under-reporting of CSA (i.e., real cases that are never reported to the authorities). However, recently attention has been paid to the dangers of over-reporting (i.e., false cases reported to authorities as real ones) as well [2,3]. It is complicated to estimate the extent of the under-reporting of CSA. However, a recent study estimated that approximately 20% of CSA victims do not disclose the event to anyone [4]. In this study, the question whether cases reported to someone reached the authorities remained unanswered, as 48% of the disclosures were to friends, and only 12% were disclosures directly to authorities. The over-reporting of CSA is also difficult to estimate with high precision. However, Melkman, Hershkowitz and Zur [3] estimated that about 58% of disclosures made by the alleged victims could be considered credible. Comparable results have been reached by

Korkman, Antfolk, Fagerlund, and Santtila [5], who report that 25-40% of CSA allegations in Finland might be unfounded.

Figure 1. Example of a simple Bayesian model that uses FICSA's logic. The model starts from the child sexual abuse base rate for the population under examination and updates the probability after new evidence is added. Panel A shows a base rate of .03 and no other observation has been made yet. Panel B shows the updated probability after that we discover that the child has been pushed or shaken by the father more than 12 months ago (the probability that it happened is .15 for CSA victims and .03 for non-victims). Panel C shows the final CSA probability, .46, based on the fact that this child also smokes daily and that no one unknown behaved in a rude way on the Internet in the last year.

A second problem that may lead to wrong conclusions in alleged CSA cases is the lack of witnesses and of corroborating evidence [6,7]. In these cases, the child's statements are what legal professionals usually have to base their decisions on. For this reason, it is of paramount importance that forensic interviews are conducted according to the highest standards (see [8]). However, research shows that the quality of expert interviews and assessments varies and may sometimes be low [9,10]. This is also evidenced by the low inter-rater reliability among purported experts [11]. Finally, in our own research, we have found that legal professionals are not always sufficiently equipped to evaluate expert testimony [12], nor to correctly match expert witness competencies to topics to be addressed [13].

FICSA aims to provide information that can improve and facilitate CSA investigations. Research already has demonstrated that in many fields actuarial decision-making processes lead to more accurate assessments than clinical decisions [14,15]. One clear advantage of an automated decision-support tool is that it is in principle free from different kinds of cognitive biases affecting investigators. The risk of confirmation bias is especially relevant in this context. When using FICSA, available and modellable information is integrated objectively. Also, the information needed as input for FICSA can be gathered through a background questionnaire that the child answers in written form. This avoids many possible negative effects of verbal interaction between an interviewer and the child, which risks the creation of false memories *in primis* (see [16]). These negative effects are more likely to appear when the interviewers have already made up their mind about the case or ask suggestive questions [10,17], and FICSA can potentially limit their problematic impact already in the early stage of investigations.

FICSA gives a more accurate base rate to start the rest of the investigation from. Being based only on information that is not directly related to the CSA allegation, FICSA's result can and must, however, be integrated with other pieces of evidence discovered during the

investigation. Furthermore, the use of FICSA at an early stage of an investigation permits the investigators to order the CSA allegations from the most to the least probable, and allow investigations to proceed following this order in case prioritization is needed. This would likely increase the number of cases that are correctly solved by facilitating effective use of investigative effort. It could also speed up the investigative process, which is important considering that the time between the alleged CSA event and the forensic interviews is one of the most crucial predictors for the reliability of the information collected as well as for a higher child's resistance to suggestion [18–20].

The Role of CSA Investigative Units in Finland

In Finland, evaluations of CSA allegations are generally conducted by the police. However, in the case of very young (i.e. pre-school age) children or children with special needs (e.g., developmental challenges) or otherwise particularly complex cases, the police can request the assistance of forensic expert units, which include psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers[21,22]. The role of these expert units is to produce evidence (i.e., videotaped forensic interviews with the child) that are used in a trial [21,22], should the prosecutor raise charges. The units often write expert statements listing the background information of the allegation, defining alternative hypotheses for the allegation, and weighting the information provided by the child in the light of these hypotheses. These statements are also considered in court, and albeit not binding for the court (as explicitly stated in a Supreme Court case [23]), the statements may be influential for the outcome of a potential trial. Currently, expert are required to follow evidence-based guidelines and complete training on interviewing. There is no instrument or no guidelines regarding how to deal with background factors to the abuse, to set a baseline for the probability wherefore the estimation of the base rate is based on subjective integration of available empirical literature. There are five units in Finland, with 5-15 professionals working in each unit.

The Present Study

In the present study, we wanted to examine the usability of FICSA and whether its use would increase the accuracy of assessments by the Finnish CSA Investigative Unit experts, compared to having access to the empirical information about the risk and protective factors FICSA is based on, and compared to unassisted decision-making. We also compared forensic experts and psychology students. All the participants received two scenarios that briefly described the lives of a boy and a girl. Participants were either provided with scenarios only, with scenarios and empirical information about the relation between CSA and the variables included in the scenarios, or with scenarios and FICSA. Participants were asked to estimate the probability that each of the two described children had been victim of CSA. We formulated a series of hypotheses. The first was that FICSA could be used properly after a very short training, that is, we expected that the participants would be able to accurately code the information in the cases they were presented into FICSA and then correctly interpret the probability calculated by the system correctly. Therefore, we expected perfect accuracy in the participants' ability to use FICSA and, therefore, also no difference in the correct use of the tool between forensic experts and students. Our second hypothesis was that forensic experts would assess CSA cases more accurately than students both when provided with access to empirical information about the case under examination and when provided with the case only (i.e., using prior knowledge and clinical experience alone). This hypothesis was based on the fact that many experts have formal training in this specific context. We therefore also expected that experts would trust the probability calculated by FICSA less than students as we expected them to possess more relevant knowledge about other influential evidence that should be taken into consideration.

When comparing the use of FICSA with the other two conditions, we expected that participants using FICSA would give a more accurate estimation of the CSA probability than

the other participants. Similarly, we expected a better performance of the group provided with the empirical information, when compared with the group that could count only on their experience and knowledge.

When asked to assess the probability of the alleged CSA under examination as either a substantiated case or not, we expected the participants to use the range 0-49% for the cases they considered unfounded, and 51-100% for the probable ones. We did not have any precise hypothesis about how participants would consider situations where the probability was exactly 50%.

Finally, when we, at a later stage, added details that could not be modeled in FICSA (i.e., we could not define the impact of these variables, if any, on the CSA probability) to the cases, we expected all participants to update their estimation according to the type of evidence (i.e., increasing the probability of abuse for the girl scenario and decreasing the probability of abuse in the boy scenario).

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 54 participants. Of these, 27 were medical doctors, psychologists and social workers employed in three of the five Child Sexual Abuse Investigative Units operating in Finland. The other 27 participants were students who had completed two non-compulsory courses in Forensic Psychology offered at Åbo Akademi University. Of the participants, 83% ($n = 45$) were women, and 17% ($n = 9$) were men. The mean age of the experts was 42 ($SD = 10$) and 24 ($SD = 4$) for the students. The experts had, on average, five years of work experience and had, on average, handled 116 ($SD = 123$) CSA cases each. All but one participant provided an answer to all the questions in the questionnaire. The participant who did not fill the questionnaire in its entirety was excluded from the analyses that required the missing information.

Ethical Permission

All participants signed an informed consent form that specified the topic of the research, policies about anonymity, and their right to withdraw from the study at any point. Before data collection commenced, the Institutional Review Board of the Faculty of Arts, Psychology and Theology, Åbo Akademi University, granted permission to carry out this study.

Measures and Procedures

Participants were given two scenarios (the order of scenarios was counterbalanced across participants) that shortly described the life of two 15-year-old Finnish children: A girl, *Milla* and a boy, *Otto*. Each scenario was created to contain information about 15 out of the 42 variables that FICSA uses to estimate the probability of a child being victim of CSA. This means that the base rate probability that Milla and Otto had been abused could be modeled based on the population-based information regarding the associations between these variables and the risk of sexual abuse.

Participants were randomly divided into three experimental conditions, making sure that each condition had the same number of participants, equally divided between students and experts. We also aimed to balance the number of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers. The three experimental conditions were: participants who received the scenarios only (since now scenarios only group), participants who received the scenarios and a written summary containing all and only the empirical information FICSA uses to calculate the probability of abuse (empirical info group), and participants who received the scenarios and a laptop running FICSA (FICSA group).

Training. FICSA group was instructed how to use FICSA using a short scenario about a non-sensitive topic: Under the supervision of the researchers, FICSA group members entered the data from this example scenario in a simple model created for training purposes

and, finally, obtained a probability estimate. Only when participants learned how to correctly use the software, were they allowed to proceed to the actual experiment. For clarity, here is an example of how the correct information should be entered in FICSA. In the first lines of Milla's scenario we read "[her father] forbids her to have a cellphone and to make use of social networks. She says she has never been bullied, threatened, or sexually harassed by phone or phone messages". The respondents had a list of 15 questions that started with "Bullied or insulted through text messages during the last year?" and a drop down menu with the possible answers, "Yes" and "No" in this case. They had to click on the correct answer, "No", and to move on to the second question.

Reporting. After having read a scenario, all participants had to say if they believed the child in question was a CSA victim or not and express the probability that CSA had occurred. The two questions were formulated as follows: *i)* "Would you conclude that the child in question has been victim of CSA or not? (Yes/No)", and *ii)* "What is for you the probability of the CSA? (0-100%)". FICSA group, also, had to report the probability calculated by the FICSA model. This last measurement was used to measure the impact of FICSA on the decisional process, as well as to verify that FICSA had been used properly. After having answered these questions, participants were presented with two additional pieces of information about the child's life. This information could not be modeled in FICSA. After this, participants were asked to update their previous answers to the questions. Figure 2 summarizes the entire procedure.

Figure 2. Study design for one scenario. The exact procedure was repeated for the second scenario.

Scenarios. For clarity, we report here the two scenarios, together with the non-modellable information.

Scenario concerning Milla: “Milla is a 15-year-old Finnish girl. Her father is a retired officer of the Finnish army. He has always been extremely strict with the daughter. He forbids her to have a cellphone and to make use of social networks. She says she has never been bullied, threatened, or sexually harassed by phone or phone messages. Also, no one has ever behaved in a rude way towards her on the web, and she is not aware of any bad gossip in social networks that would concern her person.

Milla is also not allowed of being out after 10pm, not even during weekends or when a party is organized by her classmates. At home, she has dinner with the family every day—it is considered as a sort of ritual. Two years ago Milla was studying for the entire afternoon at her best friend’s place and came back one hour late for dinner. Her father got very angry, violently shook her by the shoulders and told her she was ‘a stupid little girl if she thought she could do whatever she wanted in that house’.

On the other hand, Milla fights her father’s authority when she is out of home. She admits to having tried ecstasy a couple of times and that she sometimes smokes cigarettes with her friends at school, not daily. However, she has never drunk alcohol.

Milla has a boyfriend that she keeps secret. They never had sex. Also no one among her peers has tried to have sex with her.

251 Milla says that in the last six months she certainly feels worried, but she does not say
252 why.”

253 *Non-modellable information concerning Milla:* i) The math teacher said that in the last
254 months, she saw several times a group of dangerous looking guys waiting for Milla outside
255 the school. She never looked happy to follow them. When the teacher asked her if they were
256 her friends, she replied they were, but in a very elusive way. ii) A gynecologist has examined
257 Milla. She had some concerns for partially damaged hymen she observed during the
258 examination, but she could not draw a definite conclusion about abuse. The gynecologist did
259 not find other signs of possible violence.

260 *Scenario concerning Otto:* “Otto is a 15-year-old Finnish boy. He is going through a
261 difficult period. His father had an accident on the job and lost mobility in his legs. This
262 happened one year ago. After this, the father started drinking heavily, and, maximum once a
263 month, Otto finds his father completely drunk and has to take care of him.

264 Otto’s classmates have heard about the father’s problems and started to mock Otto. In
265 particular, there are some boys his age calling him names every time they run into him on the
266 public transport. Because of his father, the boys call Otto ‘alcoholic’ and ‘junkie’—even if
267 Otto never drank or smoked anything. It is not rare that, on the public transport, these boys
268 also attack Otto physically, and once he ended up with a black eye. Recently, the bullying also
269 happens through messages to his phone. No one has encouraged him to talk to some authority
270 or to his teachers about the situation.

271 Even if Otto doesn’t like his classmates, he feels the need to belong to his peer group
272 and to stay out of his home as much as possible. Often he hangs out with peers in the park or
273 at the main square. He stays out late, fairly often even until after midnight. During these
274 moments it sometimes happened that the peer group plays a game, in which someone chosen
275 at random needs to touch someone else’s genitalia. Otto recalls he has done this with about

five of his peers. This is the only form of sexual contact he had with someone his age. Otto, in fact, disagrees to some extent when asked if the others consider him handsome. He has never had a girlfriend or a boyfriend, and no peers never showed any interest in having sex with him. Otto says no one ever asked him for anything sexual online.

Last month Otto was victim of a robbery where his wallet was taken and his phone was broken. Otto thinks he recognized the attacker as a classmate's 27-year-old brother."

Non-modellable information concerning Otto: i) The suspicion of CSA comes from Otto's worried grandmother. She said that her grandson had changed, was frequenting bad company, and she was sure someone was doing "bad things, sexual things" to him. The woman, in the past, already has reported possible CSA for other grandchildren. Some of these cases are still under investigation, the others have been classified as "unfounded". ii) Otto denies having been victim of any sexual violence.

Statistical Analyses

To test our hypothesis that FICSA can be correctly used after only short training, we first calculated the percentage of the FICSA group members who were able to use FICSA without making mistakes (i.e., FICSA calculated the correct probability for the scenario under examination). We used the Fisher's Exact Test to understand if being a student or an expert was associated with the capacity to use FICSA. Pearson correlation was used to understand if the number of mistakes (i.e., each question answered wrong counted as one mistake) in the two scenarios were correlated.

Independent samples *t*-tests were used to test whether the order in which the scenarios were presented influenced the number of errors in using FICSA, and investigate if, as we expected, forensic experts were more accurate in assessing the CSA probability compared to students in scenarios only group and empirical info group. Independent samples *t*-tests were also used to investigate if the use of FICSA increases the accuracy of CSA assessments

compared to scenarios only group and empirical info group, and if the use of empirical information helps the assessment rather than not.

Paired-samples *t*-tests were used to investigate if the FICSA group participants tended to decrease, increase, or keep the probability calculated by FICSA, and to investigate if they updated their estimates after being presented with the non-modellable information. Finally, we identified the probability range participants used to assess a case they considered CSA rather than not. We investigated in particular the use they did of 50%.

For each *t*-test we used a bootstrapping procedure with 1000 re-samples because, as concerns Otto's scenario, the distribution of the probabilities estimated by scenarios only group, empirical info group and FICSA group presented unequal variances (Otto's scenario, all participants: $F(2, 50) = 5.60, p < .01$; Otto's scenario, wrong FICSA excluded: $F(2, 37) = 3.46, p < .05$; Milla's scenario, all participants: $F(2, 50) = .40, p = .67$; Milla's scenario, wrong FICSA excluded: $F(2, 44) = .28, p = .76$). For similarity, we decided to use bootstrapping also on the analyses about Milla's scenario.

Results

Correct Use of FICSA

Whereas both scenarios only group and empirical info group were asked to base their probability estimations on their own reasoning only, the probability estimations of FICSA group were potentially influenced by the FICSA outcome. This outcome could be correct or incorrect, depending on whether the software was used properly or not (i.e., entering correct or incorrect information into the FICSA). Therefore, we first calculated the proportion of participants who correctly entered all information in the FICSA. The analyses indicated that only 35% of participants in FICSA group made no mistake in using FICSA in the scenario about the boy. The corresponding percentage was 70% in the scenario about the girl. The Fisher's exact test showed that being a student or a forensic expert was not associated with the

probability of using FICSA correctly ($\chi^2 = 2.51, p = .21$). Also, correct use of the FICSA was not influenced by the order in which the scenarios were presented to the participants (mistakes when starting with the boy's scenario, $M = .85, SD = 1.14$, and mistakes when starting with the girl's scenario, $M = 1.25, SD = 1.89$, and the difference between these means, $-.40$, BCa 95% CI $[-1.47, 0.56]$ was not statistically significant, $p = .42$). On the other hand, the number of mistakes ($M = 1.45, SD = 1.70$ for Otto's scenario and $M = .65, SD = 1.31$ for Milla's scenario) in one scenario correlated positively with the number of mistakes in the other one, $r = .74, p < .001$.

Accuracy in Estimating CSA Probability

We also investigated whether, in the three different experimental conditions separately and altogether, experts were more accurate than students in assessing the CSA probability. The CSA probability calculated by FICSA was 67.8% for Otto and 25.5% for Milla. Table 1 shows the differences between experts and students, investigated through independent samples *t*-tests with bootstrapping. Contrary to our expectation, we found that the only experimental condition in which experts differed statistically significantly from students was FICSA group. In the FICSA group, the students followed FICSA's results more closely than the experts.

Table 1

CSA Assessment Accuracy in Experts vs. Students

Scenario	Experimental condition	Experts <i>M</i> <i>SE</i>	Students <i>M</i> <i>SE</i>	Mean differ.	BCa 95% C.I.	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>
Boy	Scenarios only	24.50 7.21	10.65 6.08	-13.87	-32.47, 4.65	15	-1.45
	Empirical info	14.86 6.66	11.71 4.37	-3.15	-21.47, 13.81	14	-.41
	FICSA group	7.50 6.25	58.75 10.48	51.25	29.05, 75.47	5	3.81 *
	Total	18.26 4.40	20.26 5.37	1.99	-12.15, 16.69	38	.284
Girl	Scenarios only	13.11 5.45	3.23 1.59	-9.88	-21.84, -.52	15	-1.65
	Empirical info	15.57 6.42	9.67 2.95	-5.90	-21.14, 6.13	14	-.90
	FICSA group	4.00 1.70	22.39 4.04	18.39	10.81, 26.98	12	3.25 **
	Total	11.76 3.22	12.09 2.35	0.33	-8.70, 8.93	45	.08

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ **The Impact of FICSA and the Empirical Information on Probability Estimates**

Through independent samples *t*-tests with bootstrapping, we investigated the differences between participants who used FICSA correctly (FICSA group) and participants without FICSA (scenarios only group and empirical info group). On average, participants using FICSA estimated a more correct CSA probability for both scenarios, but the difference from the other two groups was not statistically significant. Concerning the scenario about the boy (correct probability = 67.8%), the FICSA group estimated a higher probability ($M = 36.79$, $SE = 12.06$) than the scenarios only group and the empirical info group together ($M = 15.60$, $SE = 3.06$). The mean difference, 21.18, BCa 95% CI [-1.44, 46.17], was, however, not statistically significant, $p = .10$. In the scenario about the girl (correct probability = 25.5%), the FICSA group again estimated a higher probability ($M = 15.82$, $SE = 3.45$) than the scenarios only group and the empirical info group together ($M = 10.30$, $SE = 2.19$). The

difference was 5.52, BCa 95% CI [-2.22, 12.75] was not, however, statistically significant, $p = .18$.

As we found no difference between the FICSA group and the two other groups, we investigated the correlation between the probability calculated by FICSA and the one estimated by its users. Hence, we investigated if the FICSA group was influenced by FICSA's estimations at all. Since here we did not investigate the correctness of the estimations, we included also participants who did not use FICSA correctly, and joined the two scenarios together for increased statistical power. We observed a moderate positive correlation between the probability calculated by FICSA and the one expressed by the participants, $r = .43$, $p < .01$. A higher probability calculated by FICSA thus tended to increase the value estimated by FICSA group members, meaning that it is likely they were influenced by FICSA's result. We used paired samples t -tests with bootstrapping to investigate whether the FICSA group tended to decrease, increase, or keep the probability calculated by FICSA. We considered the entire FICSA group also for this analysis. Results showed that in both scenarios the respondents tended to decrease the value offered by FICSA. As concerns Otto's scenario, participants decreased the estimation from $M = 64.69$ ($SE = 7.05$) to $M = 25.89$ ($SE = 6.07$) with a mean difference of 38.80, BCa 95% CI [23.77, 54.05], $p = .001$. For Milla's scenario, participants decreased the FICSA's result from $M = 23.50$ ($SE = 2.70$) to $M = 14.35$ ($SE = 3.03$) with a mean difference of 9.15, BCa 95% CI [4.18, 14.50], $p < .01$.

Using independent samples t -tests with bootstrapping, we also analyzed whether having empirical information necessary for the calculation (empirical info group) available increased the accuracy compared to only having only scenarios (scenarios only group). The analyses showed that scenarios only group and empirical info group did not differ in terms of CSA assessment accuracy. Concerning the scenario about the boy, the estimation of the empirical info group was 13.09 ($SE = 3.64$), whereas the estimation of scenarios only group

was 17.97 ($SE = 4.68$). The mean difference was 4.88, BCa 95% CI [-6.34, 17.56], and not statistically significant, $p = .44$. Concerning the scenario about the girl, the estimation of the empirical info was 12.25 ($SE = 3.25$), and the scenarios only 8.46 ($SE = 3.15$). The mean difference was -3.79, BCa 95% CI [-12.11, 5.32], and not statistically significant, $p = .44$.

Non-modellable information

We then investigated whether participants updated their estimates after being presented with non-modellable information, and, if so, in which direction. For this analysis, we used paired samples t -tests with bootstrapping. Table 2 shows that the participants did not modify their estimation about Otto, while they increased it significantly for Milla, considering the experimental conditions both separately and together.

Table 2

CSA Assessment before and after Additional, Non-Modellable, Information

Scenario	Experimental condition	Before <i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	After <i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	Mean differ.	BCa 95% C.I.	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	
Boy	Scenarios only	17.97	4.80	14.27	3.40	3.71	-1.11, 9.41	16	1.25	
	Empirical info	13.09	3.72	13.57	4.16	-.48	-2.50, 1.55	15	-.51	
	FICSA group	25.89	6.02	24.46	5.92	1.43	-3.74, 8.72	19	.43	
	Altogether	19.48	3.04	17.90	2.82	1.58	-.96, 4.42	52	.99	
Girl	Scenarios only	8.46	3.11	24.14	4.97	-15.68	-25.34, -7.50	16	-3.60	**
	Empirical info	12.25	3.25	26.13	0.15	-13.88	-22.10, -7.37	15	-3.96	*
	FICSA group	14.35	3.04	32.86	5.18	-18.51	-27.00, -10.64	19	-4.41	**
	Altogether	11.83	1.81	28.03	2.80	-16.20	-20.90, -11.94	52	-6.95	***

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Probability Threshold to Define Abuse or Non-abuse

We were finally interested in understanding which probability range was used by our sample to indicate situations of abuse and of non-abuse. Table 3 shows the percentages of participants who used a value that was lower, equal, or higher than 50% to indicate the two possible outcomes of their assessment.

Table 3

Probability Ranges Used to Indicate Situations of Abuse and Non-Abuse

	0-49%	50%	51-100%
Abuse	0.6	10.5	92.9
Non-abuse	99.4	89.5	7.1

These results indicate that 50% is mostly used to indicate situations of non-abuse, while the most part of the sample used values between 0 and 49% to indicate non-abuse, and 51-100% for abuse.

Discussion

We investigated how the use of FICSA and of empirical information affects the quality of CSA assessments made by forensic expert and students of forensic psychology. Furthermore, we investigated how difficult it is to use FICSA after only short training. We also investigated if forensic experts perform better than students in assessing CSA cases with the tools we provided. Finally, we aimed to identify the probability ranges used to define a case as abuse or non-abuse.

Correct Use of FICSA

Contrary to our expectations, many participants made mistakes when coding FICSA variables from the case scenarios, with 65% of participants making at least one mistake in

Otto's scenario and 30% in Milla's scenario. Equally many experts and students made mistakes, and the number of mistakes was not affected by the order of the scenarios. Furthermore, we found a positive correlation between the number of mistakes in the two scenarios, indicating that people who made mistakes in one scenario were likely to do the same in the second scenario as well. Since even one mistake in entering data in FICSA can result in inaccurate probabilities calculated by the software, the goal is to bring the number of errors down to zero. Apart from more extensive training, one possibility is to delete the step in which the expert manually enters the collected information in FICSA. Instead, the alleged victim could answer a list of questions directly and these answers could automatically be entered into the FICSA. In case of questionable validity of the information entered in FICSA provided by the child, the investigative interview could also be designed to retrieve information about the FICSA variables. We currently advise that the data entered in FICSA are always double-checked by a second expert. Bringing the mistakes down to zero, together with an extensive training about the logic behind FICSA and the interpretation of its results, could also likely help improving the inter-rater reliability that is now undoubtedly negatively affected by wrong data entered in the tool.

The Effects of FICSA on Decision-Making

We hypothesized that forensic experts would have been more accurate than students in estimating the CSA probability when provided with the scenarios only or with the scenarios and the empirical information necessary to calculate the correct probability. This hypothesis was not supported as the forensic experts' performance did not differ from that of the students. These two groups, instead, performed differently when they used FICSA. As predicted, students estimated a CSA probability closer to that calculated by FICSA compared to the forensic experts. The experts, instead, adjusted the probability downwards. This does not mean that students are better than forensic experts in assessing CSA cases, but only that

the experts were more conservative in their estimates. Neither scenario included details about the alleged sexual abuse, but only about the children's life habits, relations and personal experiences. Currently, forensic experts would not consider these pieces of information as informative in CSA investigations. Therefore, it is possible that when FICSA calculated a probability as high as 67.8%, experts did not consider this probability reliable and justifiable to police and other legal professionals. It should also, however, be considered that experts may be overly conservative. The theory behind the model, the choice of the questions asked to the children, and the interpretation of the results should be more clearly illustrated so that experts can make clearer choices regarding whether to adjust or not the probability created by FICSA. When we compared the performance of the group that used FICSA with the other two groups, we noticed that the average answers from FICSA group were closer to the correct ones, suggesting that FICSA improved probability estimates. The finding was, however, not statistically significant, perhaps as a result of high variation in the answers or limited statistical power. Hence, we cannot fully conclude that the use of FICSA increases the accuracy of CSA assessment. However, having observed a moderate positive correlation of .43 between FICSA results and FICSA group estimations, we can claim that FICSA influences the reasoning of its users, even if both students and forensic experts tended to decrease the probability calculated by the model.

Interestingly, the estimations of the participants in all the experimental conditions were much closer to the estimate provided by FICSA in the scenario about the girl, than in the one about the boy. It is possible that perceptions about the increased likelihood of girls (vs. boys) being victims of abuse led to this finding. In fact, independently of the scenario and the experimental condition, all the participants tended to provide quite low probabilities (19.5% for the boy and 11.8% for the girl). With the corresponding FICSA estimates being 25.5% for

the girl and 67.8% for the boy, it is clear how consistently estimating low probabilities results in a more accurate results for Milla's scenario.

Our hypothesis about the advantage of using empirical information was disconfirmed. Even if, with proper calculus skills, it is possible to estimate the correct probability using only the provided empirical information, our data showed no difference between scenarios only group and empirical info group. We can therefore conclude that having access to empirical information had no impact in itself on the accuracy of the assessment. However, we had low statistical power to identify differences.

Non-Modellable Information and the Final Decision

Once the non-modellable information was added, we expected that all the participants would update their estimations, increasing it for Milla and decreasing it for Otto. This hypothesis was supported only in the scenario about the girl, where the participants increased their estimation. In the scenario about the boy, the estimations before and after non-modellable information did not differ. Not knowing exactly which impact the provided non-modellable information should have on the CSA probability, we cannot define adjustments as correct or incorrect. We encourage updating the FICSA's result in the light of new evidence, especially when there is sound empirical evidence of the evidence substantially impacting the likelihood of abuse (e.g., confession by the alleged perpetrator, DNA evidence, or images of the abuse).

Almost all participants used the range 0-49% to define a case as non-abuse, and the range 51-100% to define abuse. This is in line with our expectations. In line with our previous argument about conservatism in this decision-making, 89.5% of the sample used the probability 50% to define a case as non-abuse. However, it should be noted that the amount of cases defined as abuse or non-abuse was strongly unbalanced towards the latter (92.6%).

Limitations

Even if our sample can be considered small, which negatively impacts statistical power, it is highly representative of the population of interest. We collected data from more than half of the existing CSA Investigative Units in Finland and two out of the included units are among the largest in the country. The number of students involved was limited to equal the number of forensic experts we recruited.

Using only two scenarios, one with a high and one with a low CSA probability to estimate, might have limited the conclusions we could draw from our study. Including four scenarios would have allowed to orthogonally manipulate gender and low/high CSA probability. However, doubling the scenarios, and consequently the time required to the participants to answer all the questions, would have further decreased the sample size.

Conclusions

The present study examined the use of the Finnish Investigative Instrument of Child Sexual Abuse, and if having access to empirical information about CSA improves the accuracy in CSA assessments. Only having access to empirical information did not improve decision-making, therefore a tool that can assist in properly using evidence is of paramount importance. On the other hand, the current study demonstrated that, without a proper training, participants had difficulties in using FICSA and interpreting its outcomes. More research is also required to explore the integration between information provided by FICSA and non-modellable evidence to updating the FICSA in the light of pertinent new evidence.

References

1. Tadei A, Pensar J, Corander J, Finnilä K, Santtila P, Antfolk J. A Bayesian Decision-Support Tool for Child Sexual Abuse Assessment and Investigation. *Sex Abuse A J Res Treat.* 2017; doi:10.1177/1079063217732791
2. Bolen RM, Scannapieco M. Prevalence of child sexual abuse: A corrective metanalysis. *Soc Serv Rev.* 1999;73: 281–313. doi:10.1086/514425
3. Melkman EP, Hershkowitz I, Zur R. Credibility assessment in child sexual abuse

- investigations: A descriptive analysis. *Child Abuse Negl.* Pergamon; 2017;67: 76–85.
doi:10.1016/J.CHIABU.2017.01.027
4. Lahtinen H-M, Laitila A, Korkman J, Ellonen N. Children’s disclosures of sexual abuse in a population-based sample. *Child Abuse Negl.* Pergamon; 2018;76: 84–94.
doi:10.1016/J.CHIABU.2017.10.011
5. Korkman J, Antfolk J, Fagerlund M, Santtila P. The Prevalence of Unfounded Suspicions of Child Sexual Abuse in Finland. *Nord Psychol.*
doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/19012276.2018.1470554
6. Goodman GS, Batterman-Faunce JM, Schaaf JM, Kenney R. Nearly 4 years after an event: children’s eyewitness memory and adults’ perceptions of children’s accuracy. *Child Abuse Negl.* Pergamon; 2002;26: 849–884. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(02)00354-X
7. Herman S. The role of corroborative evidence in child sexual abuse evaluations. *J Investig Psychol Offender Profiling.* 2010;7: 189–212. doi:10.1002/jip.122
8. La Rooy D, Brubacher SP, Aromäki-Stratos A, Cyr M, Hershkowitz I, Korkman J, et al. The NICHD protocol: a review of an internationally-used evidence-based tool for training child forensic interviewers. *J Criminol Res Policy Pract.* 2015;1: 76–89.
doi:10.1108/JCRPP-01-2015-0001
9. Zajac R, Garry M, London K, Goodyear-Smith F, Hayne H. Misconceptions about childhood sexual abuse and child witnesses: Implications for psychological experts in the courtroom. *Memory.* 2013. pp. 608–617. doi:10.1080/09658211.2013.778287
10. Korkman J, Santtila P, Westeråker M, Sandnabba NK. Interviewing techniques and follow-up questions in child sexual abuse interviews. *Eur J Dev Psychol.* 2008;5: 108–128. doi:10.1080/17405620701210460
11. Jackson H, Nuttall R. Clinician responses to sexual abuse allegations. *Child Abus Negl.* 1993;17: 127–143. doi:10.1016/0145-2134(93)90013-U
12. Tadei A, Finnälä K, Reite A, Antfolk J, Santtila P. Judges’ Capacity to Evaluate Psychological and Psychiatric Expert Testimony. *Nord Psychol.* Routledge; 2016;68: 1–14. doi.org/10.1080/19012276.2015.1125303
13. Tadei A, Finnälä K, Korkman J, Salo B, Santtila P. Features used by judges to evaluate expert witnesses for psychological and psychiatric legal issues. *Nord Psychol.* 2014;66: 239–253. doi:10.1080/19012276.2014.963648
14. Dawes RM, Faust D, Meehl PE. Clinical versus actuarial judgment. *Science* (80-). 1989;243: 1668–1674. doi:10.1126/science.2648573

15. Janus ES, Prentky RA. Forensic use of actuarial risk assessment with sex offenders: Accuracy, admissibility and accountability. *American Criminal Law Review*. 2003. pp. 1443–1499.
16. Otgaar H, de Ruiter C, Howe ML, Hoetmer L, van Reekum P. A Case Concerning Children’s False Memories of Abuse: Recommendations Regarding Expert Witness Work. *Psychiatry, Psychol Law*. 2017;24: 365–378.
doi:10.1080/13218719.2016.1230924
17. Korkman J, Santtila P, Sandnabba NK. Dynamics of verbal interaction between interviewer and child in interviews with alleged victims of child sexual abuse. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*. 2006. pp. 109–119. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2006.00498.x
18. Quas JA, Malloy LC, Melinder A, Goodman GS, D’Mello M, Schaaf J. Developmental Differences in the Effects of Repeated Interviews and Interviewer Bias on Young Children’s Event Memory and False Reports. *Dev Psychol*. 2007;43: 823–837.
doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.4.823
19. Pipe ME, Sutherland R, Webster N, Jones C, La Rooy D. Do early interviews affect children’s long-term event recall? *Appl Cogn Psychol*. 2004;18: 823–839.
doi:10.1002/acp.1053
20. Antfolk J, Rönholm M, Salo B, Rantamäki S, Santtila P. Children’s Suggestibility in Interviews – A Meta-analysis of the Effects of Child’s Age, Post-Event Delay, Event-Type, and Question-Type.
21. Duodecim (the Finnish Medical Society). Current Care Guidelines: Investigating Suspicions of Child Sexual Abuse. 2013;
22. Korkman J, Pakkanen T, Laajasalo T, Korkman J, Pakkanen T, Laajasalo T. Child Forensic Interviewing in Finland: Investigating Suspected Child Abuse at the Forensic Psychology Unit for Children and Adolescents. *Collaborating Against Child Abuse: Exploring the Nordic Barnahus Model*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham; 2017. pp. 145–164.
doi:10.1007/978-3-319-58388-4
23. Finnish Supreme Court. A Decision Concerning a Child Sexual Abuse Allegation. 2014.