



Comprehensive Statement Evaluation Tool (CSET)

Denial Position Criteria	Description
Evasion and Distancing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding Direct Answers: Using evasive language to sidestep questions or avoid providing clear responses. • Hedging Language: Using words like “maybe” or “I think” to reduce commitment to denials.
Deflection and Blame-Shifting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redirecting Blame: Shifting responsibility away from oneself and onto others. • Projection: Blaming others (e.g., victims or witnesses supportive to the victim) for aspects of the offense or situation.
Conditional and Qualified Denials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Absolute Denials: Using language that leaves room for doubt or alternative explanations, such as “If I did that, I don’t remember doing it.” • Qualified Statements: Adding qualifiers to denials that reduce conviction (e.g., “To the best of my knowledge...” “Basically...” or “Not really...”).
Excessive Details / Irrelevant Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary Elaboration: Providing irrelevant details that do not pertain to the accusation but serve to distract from the main issues in the interview. • Character Appeals: Highlighting past good behavior or unrelated noble intentions to divert from the issues surrounding the alleged offense being investigated.
Appeals to Sympathy / Self-Victimization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portraying Self as a Victim: Seeking sympathy or justifying actions by casting oneself as a victim in this situation. This may coincide with the alleged offender playing the role of the “hero” and/or the “victim.” • Attempts to Elicit Pity: Making emotional appeals to gain understanding or deflect blame.
Assertions of Impossibility/Improbability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claims of Physical or Situational Impossibility: Insisting that it was impossible for the offense to have occurred due to certain factors (e.g., in a sexual offense, the offender makes claims that impotence prevents them from being able to sexually abuse the victim). • Conspiracy Accusations: Alleging that they were set up or maliciously targeted, but in a manner that are incredibly improbable in the real world.
Declarations of Honesty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over-Emphasis on Truthfulness and Honest Intent: The alleged offender comes to the interview and engages in their own “theme development” that they are there to: tell the truth, be honest, have nothing to hide, clear their name, etc... and engage in the use of phrasing that are intended to reinforce their denials through “honesty.”



Comprehensive Statement Evaluation Tool (CSET)

Multifactorial Criteria	Description
Partial and Graduated Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shift from Denial Position to Mitigation Position: Offender initially makes concrete denials on collateral facts, but then shifts and changes those statements, making admissions but shifting from “denial” to “mitigation” where the offender softens their involvement in the issues at hand. • Incremental Disclosures: Offering smaller admissions initially, then revealing more significant or previously hidden details over time, while still attempting to control the narrative in their favor.
Contradictions and Inconsistencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent Statements: Changes in the narrative or discrepancies between their account and established facts or evidence. • Implausible Sequencing: Describing events that are unrealistic or do not logically follow.
Stalling and Delaying Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delaying Tactics: Repeating questions, asking for clarification, or using filler phrases to buy time before answering.
Unintentional Revelations (Freudian Slips) and Body Language Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involuntary Cues: Micro-expressions or body language indicators that demonstrate anxiety, discomfort, rigidity, or defensive postures not contextually appropriate for truthful accounts. • Freudian Slips: Verbal indicators through “leakage” where the offender accidentally says something that is very telling regarding the truth of the events, or the truth of what they think and believe.
Mitigation Position Criteria	Description
Minimization & Comparative Minimization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downplaying Severity: Making the offense seem less severe through the use of language and contextual explanations. • Shifting Focus to Lesser Aspects: Highlighting minor aspects to reduce the perceived impact of the offense to make it less severe, and more manageable for the offender.
Rationalization and Justification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting Actions as Necessary: Framing the behavior as a logical or unavoidable response to circumstances. • Appeals to Social Norms: Justifying their actions as common or socially acceptable (e.g., “You know... women say ‘no’ but they really mean ‘yes’.”)
Cognitive Dissonance and Distortions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotion and Action Misalignment: Displaying emotions that are incongruent with the nature of the allegations/offense (seriousness of the situation). • Distorted Justifications: Rationalizing the offense in a way that reflects internal conflict or guilt that has been excused through distorted thinking patterns.
Redefining the Offense and Legal Technicalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appealing to Legal Loopholes: Trying to minimize guilt by referencing legal technicalities that make them less guilty, culpable, etc... (e.g., citing legal definitions or statute of limitations issues, referring to lack of physical evidence or DNA, referring to issues surrounding civil litigation such as divorce and child custody court).
Contextualization and Normalization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placing Offense in Broader Context: Framing the offense as a normal reaction given the situation. • Appealing to Common Practices: Justifying behaviors by aligning them with social or cultural norms.
Victim-Initiation and Self-Defense Claims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blaming the Victim: Arguing that the victim provoked the behavior or instigated the act, and that the offender was the victim, or acted in self-defense.