STATEMENT ANALYSIS CRITERIA

Comprehensive Statement Evaluation Tool (CSET)

POSITION 1 – DENIAL

Direct rejection, distancing, and identity protection

- **Criteria # 1 - External Attribution**
  - Definition: The subject shifts responsibility away from themselves and onto another person, substance, misunderstanding, or situation.
  - Examples:
    - "She started it."
    - "I was drunk. That's why it happened."
- **Criteria # 2 - Strategic Denigration**
  - Definition: The subject attacks the credibility or motives of the accuser, witnesses, professionals, or the system.
  - Examples:
    - "They're lying."
    - "That detective has it out for me."
- **Criteria # 3 - Impossibility or Improbability Claims**
  - Definition: The subject claims it would have been physically, morally, religiously, or situationally impossible for them to commit the act.
  - Examples:
    - "I would never do something like that."
    - "It couldn't have happened. I wasn't even capable."
- **Criteria # 4 - Selective Amnesia**
  - Definition: The subject claims they cannot remember key details specifically tied to the allegation.
  - Examples:
    - "I don't remember that part."
    - "That whole night is a blur."
- **Criteria # 5 - Hedging, Non-Commitment, & Qualifiers**
  - Definition: The subject uses uncertain or soft language that avoids clear denial or commitment.
  - Examples:
    - "I think that's what happened."
    - "To the best of my knowledge…"
- **Criteria # 6 - Passive or Impersonal Construction**
  - Definition: The subject describes events as things that happened rather than actions they took.
  - Examples:
    - "It happened."
    - "Things got out of hand."
- **Criteria # 7 - Virtuous Self-Branding / Virtue-by-Association**

- o Definition: The subject highlights moral standing, profession, religion, or reputation to deflect suspicion.
- o Examples:
  - ▪ "I'm a church leader."
  - ▪ "Everyone knows I'm a good parent."
- **Criteria # 8 - Emphatic Truth Assertions**
  - o Definition: The subject repeatedly insists they are telling the truth instead of addressing specific facts.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I swear I'm telling you the truth."
    - ▪ "Honestly, I would never lie about this."
- **Criteria # 9 - Conspiracy or Persecution Framing**
  - o Definition: The subject claims they are being targeted, set up, or treated unfairly.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "This is revenge."
    - ▪ "The system is trying to ruin me."

POSITION 2 – MOVEMENT

Leakage, instability, adaptive repositioning

- **Criteria # 10 - Graduated Admissions**
  - o Definition: The subject starts with denial and slowly admits increasing levels of involvement.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "Okay, I was there."
    - ▪ "Fine, I touched them, but not like they're saying."
- **Criteria # 11 - Accidental or Misinterpretation Framing**
  - o Definition: The subject admits contact or involvement but claims it was accidental or misunderstood.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "It was an accident."
    - ▪ "You're taking it the wrong way."
- **Criteria # 12 - Narrative Gaps or Temporal Skipping**
  - o Definition: The subject skips over or compresses the most critical parts of the timeline.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "We argued and then it was over."
    - ▪ "Next thing I knew, it was done."
- **Criteria # 13 - Contradictions & Inconsistencies**
  - o Definition: The subject's story changes or conflicts with earlier statements or evidence.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I wasn't there." Later: "I stopped by for a minute."
    - ▪ "It happened at night." Later: "It was mid-afternoon."
- **Criteria # 14 - Stalling & Response Delay**

2

- o Definition: The subject delays answering by repeating the question or asking for clarification unnecessarily.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "What do you mean?"
    - ▪ "Let me think about that."
- **Criteria # 15 - Excessive or Irrelevant Detail**
  - o Definition: The subject gives long, unnecessary details that distract from the main issue.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "It was 72 degrees outside, and I had just finished dinner…"
    - ▪ "Before that, earlier that day, I went to the store…"

POSITION 3 – MITIGATION
Downscaling harm, reframing intent, moral disengagement

- **Criteria # 16 - Minimization & Comparative Minimization**
  - o Definition: The subject reduces the seriousness of the behavior or compares it to something worse.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "It wasn't that bad."
    - ▪ "At least I didn't hurt anyone."
- **Criteria # 17 – Rationalization**
  - o Definition: The subject explains the behavior as logical or necessary given the situation.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I had no choice."
    - ▪ "Anyone in my position would have done the same."
- **Criteria # 18 - Justification / Victim Provocation**
  - o Definition: The subject claims the other person caused or triggered the behavior.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "They pushed me first."
    - ▪ "If they hadn't done that, this wouldn't have happened."
- **Criteria # 19 – Normalization**
  - o Definition: The subject frames the behavior as common or culturally acceptable.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "That's just how we do things."
    - ▪ "Everyone acts like that."
- **Criteria # 20 - Mutuality Framing**
  - o Definition: The subject portrays the event as shared, consensual, or co-created.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "We both agreed."
    - ▪ "It was mutual."
- **Criteria # 21 - Martyrdom & Self-Victimization**
  - o Definition: The subject focuses on how they have suffered because of the situation.

- Examples:
  - "This ruined my life."
  - "I'm the one who's really hurting."
- **Criteria # 22 - Legal Redefinition or Technicality Appeals**
  - Definition: The subject shifts focus to legal definitions, loopholes, or procedure instead of conduct.
  - Examples:
    - "Technically, that's not illegal."
    - "You didn't read me my rights."
- **Criteria # 23 - Reform & Temporal Distancing**
  - Definition: The subject emphasizes that the event was long ago or that they have changed.
  - Examples:
    - "That was years ago."
    - "I'm not that person anymore."

PART I – CLASSIFICATION & POSTURE SYNTHESIS

STAGE 1 – DOMAIN CLASSIFICATION

Each domain produces a categorical posture output.

Domain 1. Ownership Analysis
Forensic Question: Does the subject linguistically claim agency for the behavior?

Possible Classifications:

- Full Ownership
  - The subject clearly and directly claims personal agency for the behavior using active, first-person language. The act is described as something they chose and performed, without distancing, diffusion, or mechanical framing. Responsibility is not shared or displaced.
- Partial Ownership
  - The subject acknowledges involvement in the behavior but limits or narrows their agency. Responsibility may be conceded for certain actions while minimizing scope, severity, or initiation. Language often reflects selective acceptance rather than full behavioral accountability.
- Diffused Ownership
  - The subject blends their agency with others, circumstances, or vague situational forces. Responsibility is shared, mutualized, or embedded in "we," "things," or contextual inevitability language. The act is framed as emerging from interaction rather than clear individual choice.
- No Ownership

- o The subject does not linguistically claim agency for the behavior. The act is denied, externalized, described in passive construction, or attributed entirely to others or uncontrollable forces. Personal involvement is either rejected or absent from the narrative.

Domain 2. Intent Framing

Forensic Question: How is mental state represented?

Possible Classifications:

- Acknowledged Intent
  - o The subject openly recognizes that their actions were purposeful. Language reflects awareness of what they were doing and why, including acknowledgment of goals, decisions, or anticipated outcomes. The behavior is framed as intentional rather than reactive or accidental.
- Impulse Framing
  - o The subject describes the behavior as spontaneous, emotionally driven, or occurring in the heat of the moment. Mental state is portrayed as overwhelmed, reactive, or lacking deliberation. The act is framed as a loss of control rather than a planned or reasoned choice.
- Accident Framing
  - o The subject characterizes the outcome as unintended and unintendedly caused. Language emphasizes mishap, miscalculation, or unforeseeable consequence. The behavior may be acknowledged, but harmful results are framed as incidental rather than purposeful.
- Intent Denial
  - o The subject rejects the presence of purposeful mental state entirely. They assert that no deliberate wrongdoing occurred, even if conduct is partially acknowledged. The narrative minimizes or eliminates awareness, foresight, or conscious decision-making.
- Externalized Causation
  - o The subject attributes the mental state behind the behavior to external forces, such as another person's actions, environmental pressure, stress, intoxication, or situational dynamics. Responsibility for intent is shifted outward, reducing personal volitional ownership of the underlying motive.

Domain 3. Harm Framing

Forensic Question: How does the subject conceptualize impact?

Possible Classifications:

- Full Harm Recognition
  - o The subject clearly acknowledges the physical, emotional, or psychological impact of their actions. Language reflects awareness of injury or damage and

recognition of the victim's experience without minimization, comparison, or qualification.

- Minimized Harm
  - The subject acknowledges that harm occurred but reduces its severity, duration, or significance. Language may scale down injuries, emotional impact, or consequences. The behavior is framed as less serious than alleged or as causing only minor or temporary effect.
- Denied Harm
  - The subject rejects the existence of meaningful impact. They assert that no real injury occurred or that the alleged harm is exaggerated or fabricated. Even if behavior is discussed, consequences are portrayed as nonexistent or insignificant.
- Justified Harm
  - The subject acknowledges harm but frames it as necessary, deserved, corrective, or unavoidable. Language emphasizes rationale over impact. The harm is presented as an acceptable outcome given the circumstances.
- Victim Inversion
  - The subject repositions themselves as the true injured party or reframes the alleged victim as responsible for the outcome. Language shifts focus from the impact on the victim to perceived harm done to the subject, often portraying the victim as manipulative, provoking, or deceptive.

Domain 4. Decision Mapping

Forensic Question: How is the decision pathway described?

Possible Classifications:

- Coherent Volitional Chain
  - The subject describes a clear sequence of thoughts and choices leading to the behavior. The narrative reflects identifiable decision points, cause and effect reasoning, and internal deliberation. The subject articulates how they evaluated options and chose a course of action.
- Fragmented Decision Chain
  - The subject provides a disrupted or incomplete account of how decisions were made. The sequence lacks continuity, omits key cognitive steps, or jumps from circumstance to outcome without clear internal reasoning. Decision-making appears partially described or inconsistently reconstructed.
- Externalized Decision Chain
  - The subject attributes the progression of events to outside forces rather than internal choice. The pathway is framed as driven by another person, situational pressure, emotional overwhelm, or environmental factors. Personal deliberation is minimized or displaced.
- Non-Articulated Decision Process
  - The subject is unable or unwilling to describe how the behavior was decided upon. There is little to no discussion of internal reasoning, alternatives considered,

or evaluative thought. The behavior is presented as occurring without a discernible cognitive pathway.

Domain 5. Memory Integrity Indicators

Forensic Question: Does recall resemble experiential encoding or defensive reconstruction?

Possible Classifications:

- Experiential Recall Pattern
  - The subject's account reflects characteristics commonly associated with lived experience. The narrative includes contextual embedding, natural variation in detail density, appropriate sensory references, and stable sequencing when revisited. Recall appears anchored in event memory rather than constructed explanation.
- Defensive Reconstruction Pattern
  - The subject's account appears organized around explanation or protection rather than lived sequence. Details cluster around justification, denial, or image management. The narrative may lack contextual depth while remaining focused on outcomes or defenses. Memory appears structured to support a position rather than reflect experience.
- Rehearsed Narrative Pattern
  - The subject delivers a polished, consistent account that appears scripted or pre-formulated. Language may repeat across retellings with minimal natural variation. The narrative often contains controlled phrasing and predictable structure, suggesting preparation rather than spontaneous recall.
- Instability Under Cognitive Load
  - The subject's account shows breakdown when subjected to increased cognitive demand, such as reverse order recall, contextual probing, or detail expansion. Sequencing shifts, new information emerges inconsistently, or previously stated elements change. The instability suggests vulnerability in narrative structure under pressure.

Domain 6. Role and Power Framing

Forensic Question: How does the subject position themselves relative to the victim and system?

Possible Classifications:

- Authority Normalization
  - The subject frames their position of control, authority, or influence as natural, appropriate, or expected. Language reflects entitlement to direct, correct, discipline, or manage the other person. Power differentials are minimized or portrayed as legitimate.
- Equalization Framing

- o The subject presents the relationship as balanced or mutual, even where structural power differences exist. Responsibility and influence are described as shared. The narrative reduces asymmetry in age, status, or authority.
- Self-Victimization Posture
  - o The subject portrays themselves as harmed, targeted, or mistreated within the situation. Focus shifts toward their emotional distress, reputation damage, or perceived unfair treatment. Their suffering becomes central in the narrative.
- System Persecution Posture
  - o The subject frames law enforcement, courts, medical providers, or other institutions as biased, hostile, or unjust. The narrative emphasizes unfair scrutiny, false allegations, or institutional overreach. The system becomes the primary antagonist.
- Victim Role Reversal
  - o The subject reframes the alleged victim as the aggressor, manipulator, or responsible party. Language shifts culpability toward the victim's behavior, decisions, or character. The subject positions themselves as reacting to or managing the victim's conduct rather than initiating harm.

Domain 7. Stability and Revision Behavior

Forensic Question: How stable is the narrative under scrutiny?

Possible Classifications:

- Stable Across Retellings
  - o The subject's account remains materially consistent across repeated tellings and varied questioning. Core facts, sequencing, and key descriptors do not meaningfully shift. Minor variations reflect normal memory fluctuation rather than structural change.
- Progressive Contraction
  - o The subject's narrative becomes increasingly narrow over time. Details are reduced, qualifiers increase, and prior descriptive elements are abandoned. The account shrinks toward minimal admission or minimal exposure.
- Strategic Expansion
  - o The subject adds new details in response to pressure or confrontation that were previously omitted without explanation. Additions often serve to clarify, justify, or insulate earlier statements rather than naturally elaborate on memory.
- Reactive Editing
  - o The subject modifies wording, reframes statements, or redefines earlier language when challenged. Corrections appear defensive rather than memory-based, often adjusting phrasing to reduce culpability or implication.
- Material Fact Drift
  - o Core facts change across retellings in ways that affect substance rather than minor detail. Sequencing, presence of key individuals, level of force, or critical actions

shift in meaningfully different directions. The instability affects the structural integrity of the narrative.

STAGE 2 - GLOBAL POSTURE SYNTHESIS

After domain classification, the analyst answers:

What overall defensive orientation best describes this narrative?

Global Posture Categories

Absolute Denial Posture
Characterized by domain clustering of:

- No Ownership
- Intent Denial
- Denied Harm
- Non-Articulated Decision
- System Persecution

Strategic Denial Posture
Characterized by:

- Diffused Ownership
- Intent Denial
- Fragmented Decision
- Rehearsed Narrative Pattern

Movement Posture
Characterized by:

- Partial Ownership
- Accident or Impulse Framing
- Minimized Harm
- Externalized Decision Chain

Mitigation Posture
Characterized by:

- Full Ownership
- Acknowledged Intent
- Minimized or Justified Harm
- Stable Narrative

Hybrid Defensive Posture

- Mixed domain outputs
- Oscillation across posture categories

PART II – OFFENSE-SPECIFIC OVERLAYS

Now we define how posture expresses differently by crime category.

SEXUAL ABUSE OVERLAY

Ownership Focus Areas:

- Sexual Euphemisms Replacing Explicit Behavior
  - Instead of naming the sexual act directly, the subject substitutes softened or ambiguous terms.
  - Examples:
    - "Messing around."
    - "Fooling around."
    - "Stuff happened."
    - "We were just close."
  - This reduces perceived severity and creates semantic distance from the behavior. It often reflects discomfort with explicit ownership of sexual conduct.
- Mutual Participation Framing
  - The subject linguistically shifts the act from something they did to something "we did."
  - Examples:
    - "We got carried away."
    - "She came onto me."
    - "We both crossed a line."
  - This reframes agency as shared. It reduces individual responsibility and is particularly significant when the victim is a child, where mutuality is structurally impossible.
- Body Part Distancing
  - The subject describes the act in ways that detach themselves from the behavior through passive or anatomical phrasing.
  - Examples:
    - "My hand ended up there."
    - "Things touched."
    - "There was contact."
  - The body part becomes the actor. The person disappears from the sentence. This weakens direct ownership.
- Contact Reframed as Affection

- o Sexual behavior is reframed as caring or bonding behavior.
- o Examples:
  - "I was comforting her."
  - "It was just affection."
  - "I was showing love."
- o This is especially common in grooming dynamics. It transforms a sexual act into a nurturing act linguistically.
- Linguistic Downgrading of Sexual Acts
  - o Explicit sexual conduct is reduced in intensity through minimizing language.
  - o Examples:
    - "It was just touching."
    - "It wasn't intercourse."
    - "It wasn't like what you're thinking."
  - o The act is acknowledged but scaled down. The focus shifts from whether it occurred to how "serious" it was.

Intent Focus Areas:

- Curiosity Framing
  - o The subject describes the behavior as exploratory or experimental rather than purposeful exploitation.
  - o Examples:
    - "I was curious."
    - "We were just experimenting."
    - "I didn't know what I was thinking."
  - o This frames the act as driven by interest rather than intent to gratify, dominate, or exploit. It lowers perceived deliberateness.
- Developmental Minimization
  - o The subject reduces intent by appealing to age or immaturity, even when the subject is an adult.
  - o Examples:
    - "I wasn't thinking like that."
    - "I was immature."
    - "I didn't understand boundaries."
  - o This reframes intent as ignorance rather than knowing violation.
- "It Just Happened" Escalation Logic
  - o The subject describes progression without identifiable decision points.
  - o Examples:
    - "One thing led to another."
    - "It just happened."
    - "It got out of hand."
  - o This removes conscious decision-making from the narrative. Escalation appears organic rather than chosen.
- Grooming Reframed as Bonding

- o Behavior that facilitated access or secrecy is described as relational closeness rather than strategic preparation.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "We had a special connection."
    - ▪ "I was just being there for her."
    - ▪ "I was helping her feel understood."
  - o This reframes preparatory behavior as emotional support rather than intentional conditioning.
- Absence of Anticipatory Thinking
  - o The subject describes the act without acknowledging awareness of risk, consequences, or boundary violation.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I didn't think about it."
    - ▪ "I wasn't thinking ahead."
    - ▪ "I didn't consider what it would do."
  - o There is no reference to foreseeable harm, discovery risk, or moral conflict. Intent appears impulsive or cognitively absent.

Harm Focus Areas:

- Child Desire Projection
  - o The subject attributes sexual interest, consent, or initiation to the child.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "She wanted it."
    - ▪ "She started it."
    - ▪ "He was curious too."
  - o This reframes harm as mutual participation. The child's alleged desire is used to dilute or neutralize impact. The offender shifts focus from exploitation to shared experience.
- "No Force, No Harm" Logic
  - o The subject equates absence of physical violence with absence of harm.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I didn't force her."
    - ▪ "I never hurt her."
    - ▪ "There was no violence."
  - o This narrows the definition of harm to visible injury or overt force. Emotional, psychological, and developmental impact are excluded from consideration.
- Emotional Impact Denial
  - o The subject rejects or minimizes psychological consequences.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "She seemed fine."
    - ▪ "He never complained."
    - ▪ "It didn't affect her."

- o The evaluation of harm is based on outward presentation rather than internal impact. The subject substitutes surface behavior for trauma assessment.
- Age-Based Normalization
  - o The subject reframes the conduct as typical or common at that age.
  - o Examples:
    - "Kids experiment."
    - "Teenagers do this."
    - "It's not unusual."
  - o This attempts to normalize behavior that is structurally abusive by equating it with peer-level exploration.

Decision-Mapping Focus Areas:

- Boundary Erosion Sequences
  - o The subject describes progressive shifts in physical, emotional, or relational boundaries over time.
  - o Examples:
    - "It started with hugs."
    - "We just got closer over time."
    - "It gradually became more."
  - o The narrative reflects staged movement from appropriate contact to inappropriate conduct. Each step is framed as small or harmless, reducing perception of deliberate escalation.
- Secrecy Conditioning
  - o The subject describes behaviors that reinforced privacy or exclusivity.
  - o Examples:
    - "That was just between us."
    - "It was our little secret."
    - "She didn't want anyone to know."
  - o Secrecy may be framed as protection of the relationship rather than concealment of misconduct. The decision pathway may omit acknowledgment that secrecy was strategic.
- Testing Behavior Language
  - o The subject references small exploratory actions before more serious conduct.
  - o Examples:
    - "I just brushed against her."
    - "I wanted to see how she'd react."
    - "I was checking if it was okay."
  - o These statements indicate incremental risk assessment. Testing behavior often precedes more explicit acts but is framed as isolated or insignificant.
- Incremental Escalation
  - o The subject describes progression without clearly identifying decision points.
  - o Examples:
    - "One thing led to another."

- "It just went further."
- "It didn't happen all at once."
  - o Escalation appears organic rather than chosen. The subject may avoid articulating specific moments where they decided to cross a line.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OVERLAY

Ownership Focus Areas:

- Reaction Framing
  - o The subject describes their behavior as a response rather than an initiation.
  - o Examples:
    - "She pushed me first."
    - "I reacted."
    - "I responded to what she was doing."
  - o The focus shifts from what the subject chose to do to what triggered it. Agency becomes secondary to provocation.
- Mutual Combat Language
  - o The subject frames the incident as a two-sided physical altercation.
  - o Examples:
    - "We both hit each other."
    - "It got physical on both sides."
    - "We were going at it."
  - o This equalizes responsibility, even when power differentials or injury patterns suggest asymmetry.
- "We Were Fighting" Diffusion
  - o The subject blends personal action into collective conflict language.
  - o Examples:
    - "We were fighting."
    - "We got into it."
    - "Things escalated between us."
  - o Individual acts become absorbed into a shared event. Personal agency becomes less visible within relational chaos.
- Injury Displacement
  - o The subject acknowledges injury but shifts attention away from their own conduct.
  - o Examples:
    - "She got hurt when she fell."
    - "I didn't mean for her to get injured."
    - "That happened during the struggle."
  - o The injury is described as a byproduct of circumstance rather than a result of directed force.
- Governance Language
  - o The subject describes imposing rules, expectations, or restrictions.

- o Examples:
  - ▪ "I told her who she could hang out with."
  - ▪ "I set the rules in my house."
  - ▪ "She had to respect boundaries."
- o Ownership may be partial but framed as rightful authority.
- **Autonomy Minimization**
  - o The subject reduces the significance of restricting freedom.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "She didn't need to go out."
    - ▪ "I just preferred she stay home."
    - ▪ "It wasn't a big deal."
  - o The restriction is acknowledged but downgraded.
- **Surveillance Normalization**
  - o Monitoring behavior is framed as reasonable.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I checked her phone."
    - ▪ "I tracked her location."
    - ▪ "I needed to know what she was doing."
  - o The behavior is owned but justified as appropriate oversight.
- **Pattern Denial**
  - o The subject reframes repeated behaviors as isolated.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "That only happened once."
    - ▪ "I don't usually do that."
  - o Ownership becomes episodic rather than systemic.

Intent Focus Areas:

- **Heat-of-the-Moment Narratives**
  - o The subject frames the behavior as occurring during intense emotional arousal.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I was angry."
    - ▪ "It happened in the moment."
    - ▪ "Things got heated."
  - o The emphasis is on emotional intensity rather than conscious decision-making. The act is presented as reactive rather than deliberate.
- **Provocation Logic**
  - o The subject attributes their mental state to the victim's behavior.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "She wouldn't stop yelling."
    - ▪ "She pushed my buttons."
    - ▪ "She knew how to trigger me."
  - o The narrative suggests that the victim's actions generated the intent. Responsibility for the mental state is partially transferred outward.

- Loss-of-Control Claims
    - The subject describes a temporary breakdown of self-regulation.
    - Examples:
        - "I snapped."
        - "I blacked out."
        - "I wasn't myself."
    - Intent is reframed as absent or impaired due to emotional overload. The subject presents themselves as overwhelmed rather than choosing to act.
- Stress Externalization
    - The subject attributes mental state to external pressures unrelated to the victim.
    - Examples:
        - "I was under a lot of stress."
        - "I'd had a bad day."
        - "There was too much going on."
    - Life circumstances are positioned as causal drivers of the behavior. The decision appears environmentally induced rather than internally chosen.
- Protection Framing
    - Control is justified as safety or care.
    - Examples:
        - "I was protecting her."
        - "I didn't want her around bad influences."
- Possessiveness as Love
    - Jealousy or restriction is reframed as affection.
    - Examples:
        - "I just care too much."
        - "I was worried about losing her."
- Stability Enforcement
    - The subject frames control as maintaining order.
    - Examples:
        - "I needed stability."
        - "She was out of control."
    - Intent is framed as corrective rather than dominating.
- Entitlement Logic
    - The subject asserts relational authority.
    - Examples:
        - "As her partner, I had a right."
        - "That's my role."
    - Intent is grounded in perceived hierarchy.

Harm Focus Areas:

- Injury Scaling
    - The subject acknowledges physical harm but reduces its perceived severity.
    - Examples:

- - "It was just a bruise."
  - "She wasn't seriously hurt."
  - "It wasn't that bad."
  - Language emphasizes minor injury, temporary effect, or lack of medical intervention. The seriousness of force is reframed through outcome minimization.
- Emotional Abuse Minimization
  - The subject dismisses or downplays psychological impact.
  - Examples:
    - "I didn't mean it."
    - "I was just upset."
    - "Everyone argues like that."
  - Verbal threats, intimidation, or coercive control are reframed as normal conflict. Emotional harm is treated as exaggerated or insignificant.
- Property Damage Substitution
  - The subject redirects attention from bodily harm to damaged objects.
  - Examples:
    - "I punched the wall, not her."
    - "I broke the phone."
    - "I threw something, but not at her."
  - The focus shifts to property damage as though it mitigates or replaces personal harm. Physical intimidation may be reframed as non-assaultive because the object absorbed the force.
- Emotional Harm Dismissal
  - The subject denies psychological abuse as meaningful.
  - Examples:
    - "I may have said bad things to her, but I never hit her."
    - "She was never hurt..."
- Autonomy Impact Minimization
  - Loss of freedom is reframed as preference.
  - Examples:
    - "She could have left."
    - "I didn't force her."
- Fear Denial
  - The subject rejects the idea that their behavior created fear.
  - Examples:
    - "She wasn't scared."
    - "She's exaggerating."
- Isolation Minimization
  - Cutting off support is reframed as mutual choice.
  - Examples:
    - "She didn't like her friends anyway."

Decision-Mapping Focus Areas:

- Escalation Distortion
  - The subject describes the progression of events in a way that compresses or blurs key decision points.
  - Examples:
    - "It all happened so fast."
    - "One thing led to another."
    - "Before I knew it, we were in a struggle."
  - Critical moments where force was chosen are minimized or skipped. The pathway from argument to violence appears sudden and unexamined rather than stepwise and voluntary.
- Control Reframed as Necessary
  - The subject portrays controlling or aggressive behavior as necessary in the circumstance.
  - Examples:
    - "I had to calm her down."
    - "I was trying to get her to stop."
    - "I needed to get her to stop and listen to me."
  - Force or intimidation is reframed as maintaining order or enforcing boundaries. The decision to exert control is presented as responsible rather than coercive.
- Threat Perception Exaggeration
  - The subject inflates perceived danger to justify decision-making.
  - Examples:
    - "I thought she was going to attack me."
    - "She was out of control."
    - "I felt threatened."
  - The narrative emphasizes personal fear or risk in ways that elevate the need for force. The decision appears defensive rather than aggressive.
- Rule Construction
  - The subject articulates imposed standards or conditions for safety and wellbeing.
  - Examples:
    - "I told her what I expected."
    - "She had to check in."
  - These will be framed as necessary due to the victim's own behavioral history – therefore, these things were for the victim's own good.
- Conditions, Expectations and Privilege
  - Access to resources or affection tied to compliance.
  - Examples:
    - "I just expect basic respect."
    - "I have standards in my relationship."
    - "I don't think that's unreasonable."
    - "Any man would feel the same way."
    - "I just asked for simple things."
- Escalation as Necessary Correction or Enforcing of Boundaries
  - Increasing control described as response to noncompliance.

- Examples:
  - "She kept pushing boundaries."
  - "I had to tighten things up."
- Monitoring Infrastructure
  - Deliberate systems of oversight described matter-of-factly.
  - Examples:
    - "I had access to her accounts."
    - "I made sure I knew where she was."
  - Framed as if it was mutually agreed on, or for the victim's own safety and wellbeing.

SEVERE CHILD PHYSICAL ABUSE OVERLAY

Ownership Focus Areas:

- Discipline Reframing
  - The subject describes the conduct as parenting or discipline rather than violence.
  - Examples:
    - "I was disciplining him."
    - "She needed to learn."
    - "I was correcting her behavior."
  - The act is acknowledged but categorized as legitimate parental authority. The language shifts from injury-producing behavior to behavioral management.
- Force Underreporting
  - The subject describes physical actions in softened or incomplete terms.
  - Examples:
    - "I just grabbed him."
    - "I tapped her."
    - "I swatted him."
  - The level of force is minimized relative to the injury pattern. Intensity and duration are often omitted or scaled down.
- "Correction" Language
  - The subject frames the behavior as necessary behavioral adjustment.
  - Examples:
    - "I was trying to straighten him out."
    - "She wouldn't listen."
    - "He had to understand."
  - The focus is on compliance and instruction rather than the physical act itself. The injury becomes incidental to the intended lesson.

- Caretaking Activity Framing
  - The subject frames the conduct as part of routine care.
  - Examples:
    - "I was changing him."

- - "I was burping her."
    - "I was putting him down."
  - o Force becomes embedded in normal caregiving tasks.
- Handling Minimization
  - o The subject describes physical contact as routine handling.
  - o Examples:
    - "I picked him up."
    - "I laid her down."
    - "I adjusted him."
  - o Language is neutral and mechanical. The level of force is obscured.
- Mechanism Uncertainty
  - o The subject avoids explicit description of how injury occurred.
  - o Examples:
    - "I'm not sure what happened."
    - "It must have happened when I was holding him."
  - o Ownership becomes vague rather than disciplinary.

Intent Focus Areas:

- Teaching Lesson Framing
  - o The subject describes the behavior as motivated by a desire to instruct or discipline rather than to harm.
  - o Examples:
    - "I was trying to teach him."
    - "She needed to learn consequences."
    - "I wanted him to understand."
  - o Intent is framed as educational or corrective. The physical act becomes secondary to the stated moral objective.
- Injury as Unintended Consequence
  - o The subject acknowledges injury but portrays it as accidental or excessive relative to intention.
  - o Examples:
    - "I didn't mean for it to go that far."
    - "I didn't think he would get hurt like that."
    - "It got out of hand."
  - o The mental state is presented as lacking awareness of potential injury. Harm is reframed as an unforeseen result of discipline.
- Compliance Justification
  - o The subject ties intent to the child's alleged noncompliance or behavior.
  - o Examples:
    - "He wouldn't listen."
    - "She kept defying me."
    - "I had to get his attention."

- o Intent is attributed to restoring order or obedience. The narrative suggests that the child's behavior necessitated escalation.
- Frustration Minimization
  - o The subject acknowledges irritation but not aggression.
  - o Examples:
    - "He wouldn't stop crying."
    - "I was exhausted."
    - "She was fussy."
  - o Intent is framed as caregiving stress, not harm.
- Loss-of-Patience Reframing
  - o The subject reframes escalation as momentary impatience.
  - o Examples:
    - "I got frustrated."
    - "I handled him too roughly."
  - o The mental state is softened and non-malicious.
- Accidental Force Amplification
  - o The subject claims force exceeded intention unintentionally.
  - o Examples:
    - "I didn't realize I was holding him that tight."
    - "I didn't think that would hurt him."
  - o Intent is minimized through claimed lack of awareness of infant fragility.

Harm Focus Areas:

- Child Resilience Narratives
  - o The subject frames the child as physically strong or able to recover quickly.
  - o Examples:
    - "Kids are tough."
    - "He's resilient."
    - "She bounces back."
  - o The seriousness of injury is reduced by emphasizing recovery capacity rather than the inflicted harm.
- "They Bruise Easily" Rationalizations
  - o The subject attributes visible injury to the child's physical sensitivity rather than force.
  - o Examples:
    - "He marks easily."
    - "She bruises from anything."
    - "That happens all the time."
  - o The narrative shifts causation from applied force to biological predisposition.
- Outcome Trivialization
  - o The subject acknowledges injury but downplays its significance.
  - o Examples:
    - "It wasn't that serious."

- "He didn't need stitches."
- "She was fine after."
  - o Medical severity, duration of recovery, or long-term consequences are minimized. The injury is framed as temporary or exaggerated.
- Infant Fragility Rationalization
  - o The subject attributes injury to natural vulnerability.
  - o Examples:
    - "Babies are fragile."
    - "He bruises easily."
  - o The narrative shifts causation to developmental biology.
- Medical Mystery Framing
  - o The subject implies unknown or unexplained causes.
  - o Examples:
    - "I don't know how that happened."
    - "It must have been something else."
  - o Harm is separated from behavior.
- Outcome Deflection
  - o Focus shifts to recovery rather than mechanism.
  - o Examples:
    - "He's doing fine now."
    - "She's okay."
  - o Severity is reframed through current status.

Decision-Mapping Focus Areas:

- Escalation Minimization
  - o The subject describes the progression of events as minor or gradual without identifying key decision points.
  - o Examples:
    - "I just got frustrated."
    - "It went a little too far."
    - "I didn't think it was that serious."
  - o The movement from irritation to significant force is compressed into a vague transition. The narrative avoids articulating moments where escalation was consciously chosen.
- Omitted Force Steps
  - o The subject leaves out intermediate actions that would explain the severity of injury.
  - o Examples:
    - "I grabbed him."
    - "I moved her."
    - "I pushed him."

- o The description lacks detail about duration, repetition, intensity, or physical mechanics. The injury appears disproportionate to the stated conduct because steps in the sequence are missing.
- Emotional Dysregulation Masking
  - o The subject acknowledges emotion but does not connect it to decision-making.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I was stressed."
    - ▪ "I was overwhelmed."
    - ▪ "I was tired."
  - o Emotional state is mentioned, but the subject does not articulate how that emotion translated into specific physical choices. The pathway from feeling to force is blurred.
- Cry-Response Compression
  - o The pathway from crying to injury is collapsed.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "He kept crying."
    - ▪ "I tried to calm him."
    - ▪ "Then it happened."
  - o Intermediate decision points are omitted.
- Force Mechanism Gaps
  - o No articulation of specific force application.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I moved him."
    - ▪ "I handled him."
  - o No description of duration, intensity, or repetition.
- Stress Attribution Without Linkage
  - o Emotion is acknowledged but not tied to action.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "I was overwhelmed."
    - ▪ "I hadn't slept."
  - o The cognitive bridge between emotion and force is absent.

HOMICIDE OVERLAY

Ownership Focus Areas:

- Weapon Distancing
  - o The subject shifts focus from themselves to the weapon as the actor.
  - o Examples:
    - ▪ "The gun went off."
    - ▪ "The knife slipped."
    - ▪ "It discharged."

- o The weapon becomes the grammatical subject of the sentence. The person disappears from the action.
- Mechanical Descriptions of Death
  - o The subject describes the event in technical or physical terms rather than personal action.
  - o Examples:
    - "There was an impact."
    - "A shot was fired."
    - "He sustained a wound."
  - o Language becomes clinical or detached. The act is framed as a physical occurrence rather than a chosen behavior.
- Passive Fatality Framing
  - o The subject describes the death without identifying an active agent.
  - o Examples:
    - "He ended up dead."
    - "She died during the struggle."
    - "It resulted in a fatality."
  - o Death is presented as an outcome without clear attribution to the subject's action.

Intent Focus Areas:

- Accident Reconstruction
  - o The subject describes the death as an unintended outcome of an event that was not meant to be lethal.
  - o Examples:
    - "It was an accident."
    - "I didn't mean for it to happen."
    - "I was just trying to scare him."
  - o The narrative reconstructs the sequence in a way that removes purposeful lethal intent. Harm is presented as an unforeseen or unintended consequence.
- Self-Defense Inflation
  - o The subject amplifies perceived threat to justify lethal force.
  - o Examples:
    - "I thought he was going to kill me."
    - "I had no choice."
    - "He was coming at me."
  - o The perceived danger is elevated to a level that makes lethal action appear necessary. The subject's mental state is framed as protective rather than aggressive.
- Immediacy Exaggeration
  - o The subject compresses the decision timeline to minimize deliberation.
  - o Examples:
    - "It happened in a split second."

- "I didn't have time to think."
- "It was instinct."
  - o The act is framed as reflexive rather than reasoned. The absence of time becomes a substitute for absence of intent.

Harm Focus Areas:

- Dehumanization
  - o The subject reduces the victim's identity, worth, or individuality.
  - o Examples:
    - "He was a monster."
    - "She was crazy."
    - "He was nothing but trouble."
  - o Language shifts from describing a person to describing a problem, threat, or character flaw. This reduces emotional weight attached to the loss of life.
- Moral Righteousness
  - o The subject frames their actions as ethically justified.
  - o Examples:
    - "I did what anyone would do."
    - "It was the right thing."
    - "I stood my ground."
  - o The narrative centers on perceived moral correctness rather than the gravity of the outcome.
- Necessity Justification
  - o The subject presents the death as unavoidable.
  - o Examples:
    - "There was no other option."
    - "It had to happen."
    - "I had no choice."
  - o Lethal force is framed as the only viable solution. The harm becomes secondary to survival or resolution.

Decision-Mapping Focus Areas:

- Split-Second Inevitability Narrative
  - o The subject frames the lethal act as unavoidable within an instant.
  - o Examples:
    - "It happened in a split second."
    - "There was no time."
    - "It was over before I knew it."
  - o The timeline is compressed to eliminate identifiable decision points. The act is portrayed as reflexive rather than chosen.
- Threat Perception Inflation
  - o The subject expands the perceived danger to justify rapid escalation.

- Examples:
    - "He was coming at me."
    - "I thought he had a weapon."
    - "I believed my life was in danger."
- The cognitive focus centers on perceived risk rather than decision analysis. The threat is amplified to support inevitability.
- Compressed Decision Timeline
    - The subject describes the sequence from conflict to death as continuous and uninterrupted.
    - Examples:
        - "One second we were arguing, the next it was done."
        - "It all happened at once."
        - "There wasn't a moment to think."
    - Intermediate evaluative steps are absent. There is no articulation of hesitation, reconsideration, or alternative choices.

MBPA/MCA OVERLAY

Ownership Focus Areas:

- Medical Delegation Language
    - The subject shifts agency to medical professionals or systems.
    - Examples:
        - "The doctor decided."
        - "They ran the tests."
        - "I just followed instructions."
    - The caregiver positions themselves as passive participant rather than initiator. Medical providers become the actors in the narrative.
- Symptom Inflation Without Act Ownership
    - The subject describes severe or dramatic symptoms but does not connect them to personal behavior.
    - Examples:
        - "She stopped breathing."
        - "He was constantly seizing."
        - "It was terrifying."
    - The focus is on the child's condition, not on what the caregiver did. Escalation of symptoms is described without corresponding ownership of actions that may have contributed.
- "I Was Advocating" Reframing
    - The subject frames persistent medical pursuit as protective advocacy.
    - Examples:
        - "I was fighting for my child."
        - "No one was listening to me."
        - "I had to push for answers."

- o Aggressive doctor shopping, exaggeration, or manipulation is reframed as parental vigilance. Control of the narrative becomes framed as responsible caregiving.

Intent Focus Areas:

- Protection Narrative
  - o The subject frames their actions as driven by concern for the child's safety.
  - o Examples:
    - "I was trying to protect her."
    - "I was scared something serious was wrong."
    - "I didn't want to miss something."
  - o Intent is positioned as preventive rather than deceptive. Escalation of medical involvement is justified through fear of harm.
- Physician Reliance Claims
  - o The subject attributes decision-making to medical professionals.
  - o Examples:
    - "I trusted the doctors."
    - "They said it was necessary."
    - "I was following medical advice."
  - o The caregiver minimizes personal volition by emphasizing compliance with professional authority. Intent is reframed as obedience rather than initiative.
- Safety-First Justification
  - o The subject emphasizes caution over risk tolerance.
  - o Examples:
    - "I'd rather be safe than sorry."
    - "You can't take chances with a child."
    - "I wasn't going to ignore symptoms."
  - o Medical escalation is justified as prudence. The narrative frames excess intervention as responsible vigilance rather than exaggeration.

Harm Focus Areas:

- "Better Safe Than Sorry" Framing
  - o The subject justifies invasive or repeated medical intervention as precaution.
  - o Examples:
    - "I wasn't going to risk it."
    - "You can't be too careful with kids."
    - "I'd rather overreact than miss something."
  - o Potential harm from procedures is minimized in comparison to hypothetical medical danger. The focus shifts from actual impact to avoided catastrophe.
- Medical Necessity Defense
  - o The subject asserts that interventions were required.
  - o Examples:

- "The doctors said it had to be done."
                - "It was medically necessary."
                - "There was no alternative."
            o Procedures, testing, or hospitalizations are framed as essential rather than discretionary. Harm is subsumed under perceived necessity.
    - Procedure Minimization
        o The subject downplays the invasiveness or burden of medical intervention.
        o Examples:
                - "It was just a test."
                - "It wasn't that big of a deal."
                - "She handled it fine."
        o The physical and psychological toll of repeated evaluations, procedures, or hospital stays is reduced or dismissed.

Decision-Mapping Focus Areas:

- Complex Medical Layering
    o The subject embeds the narrative in detailed medical terminology and overlapping symptoms.
    o Examples:
            - "She had respiratory issues, GI problems, and neurological episodes."
            - "It could have been seizures, apnea, or reflux."
            - "There were multiple differential diagnoses."
    o The decision pathway becomes difficult to isolate because it is wrapped in complexity. The caregiver may describe multiple consultations, tests, and theories without clearly articulating their own evaluative choices.
- Provider Deflection
    o The subject shifts responsibility for escalation onto medical professionals.
    o Examples:
            - "The specialist recommended more testing."
            - "They admitted her."
            - "I was following what they told me."
    o The narrative emphasizes professional authority at each step. The caregiver's independent decision points are minimized or omitted.
- Manufactured Urgency Narratives
    o The subject describes situations as time-sensitive or emergent.
    o Examples:
            - "It was critical."
            - "I thought she was going to stop breathing."
            - "There was no time to wait."
    o Escalation is framed as necessary due to immediate danger. The urgency may not align with documented medical findings but serves to justify rapid intervention.

COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC & PSYCHOLEXICAL MARKERS

DOMAIN 1 – OWNERSHIP ANALYSIS

Forensic Question: Does the subject claim agency?

- **Agency Dilution**
  - Description
    - The subject reduces personal agency by using passive constructions, event-based phrasing, or mechanical descriptions instead of active, first-person language. The act is described as something that occurred rather than something they did.
  - Examples
    - "It happened."
    - "There was contact."
    - "A mistake was made."
    - "Things escalated."
    - "The gun went off."
  - Forensic Value
    - Active phrasing reflects volitional ownership. Passive phrasing weakens it. Persistent agency dilution strengthens Partial, Diffused, or No Ownership classifications.
- **Externalization of Authority**
  - Description
    - The subject attributes decision-making or action initiation to another person, institution, or situational structure. Personal agency is reduced by emphasizing compliance or instruction.
  - Examples
    - "They told me to do it."
    - "I was just following orders."
    - "That's what the policy required."
    - "The doctor decided."
    - "She said it was fine."
  - Forensic Value
    - When volition is consistently attributed outward, ownership posture shifts from Full to Partial or Diffused. The key question becomes: what did you choose?
- **Pronoun Instability**
  - Description
    - The subject shifts pronouns when describing critical conduct. They may begin with "I" but transition to "we," "you," "they," or the person's name during high-risk segments.
  - Examples

- ▪ "I was talking to her and then we started arguing."
- ▪ "I picked him up and then he got hurt."
- ▪ "We were fighting."
- ▪ "She ended up injured."
  - o Forensic Value
    - ▪ Pronoun shifts at critical action points can indicate psychological distancing from agency. It strengthens Diffused or No Ownership classifications when clustered.
- **Strategic Vagueness**
  - o Description
    - ▪ The subject provides minimal, high-level summaries in areas where specific detail would be expected. Core conduct is described abstractly while safer segments may be detailed.
  - o Examples
    - ▪ "It just went too far."
    - ▪ "One thing led to another."
    - ▪ "I handled it."
    - ▪ "We had an incident."
  - o Forensic Value
    - ▪ When the alleged act is described vaguely but peripheral material is detailed, it strengthens No Ownership posture.
- **Over-Specificity Asymmetry**
  - o Description
    - ▪ The subject provides excessive detail in low-risk segments but limited detail in high-risk segments. Detail density is uneven across the narrative.
  - o Examples
    - ▪ Detailed description of the day's schedule, weather, or clothing.
    - ▪ Minimal description of the actual physical contact or force.
    - ▪ Precise timing of arrival, vague description of what happened inside.
  - o Forensic Value
    - ▪ Asymmetrical detail distribution suggests narrative engineering. It strengthens Diffused Ownership when act segments are disproportionately thin.
- **Semantic Leakage**
  - o Description
    - ▪ The subject unintentionally reveals motive, knowledge, or agency through slips in language, choice of wording, or embedded admissions that contradict the defensive posture.
  - o Examples
    - ▪ "I had to make them listen."
    - ▪ "I needed something to change."
    - ▪ "I shouldn't have gone that far."
    - ▪ "I didn't think anyone would notice."
  - o Forensic Value

- ▪ Semantic leakage can override a denial posture because it reflects unguarded cognition. When consistent with other markers, it strengthens Full or Partial Ownership despite surface denial.

DOMAIN 2 – INTENT FRAMING

Forensic Question: How is mental state represented?

- **Counterfactual Avoidance**
  - ○ Description
    - ▪ The subject struggles or refuses to articulate alternative choices they could have made. When asked what else they could have done, they default to inevitability, helplessness, or single-path logic.
  - ○ Examples
    - ▪ "There was nothing else I could do."
    - ▪ "That was the only option."
    - ▪ "I didn't have a choice."
    - ▪ "It just happened."
  - ○ Forensic Value
    - ▪ A person who acted deliberately can usually describe options considered, even if rejected. Avoidance of alternatives strengthens Impulse Framing or Intent Denial posture.
- **Immediacy Compression**
  - ○ Description
    - ▪ The subject compresses the timeline between stimulus and action, minimizing deliberation. The narrative eliminates reflective space between perception and behavior.
  - ○ Examples
    - ▪ "It happened in a split second."
    - ▪ "I didn't even think."
    - ▪ "It was instinct."
    - ▪ "One minute we were talking, the next it was done."
  - ○ Forensic Value
    - ▪ When the timeline is collapsed, deliberation disappears. This strengthens Accident or Impulse Framing classifications.
- **Displacement of Emotional Target**
  - ○ Description
    - ▪ The subject redirects emotional intensity away from the alleged victim and toward institutions, third parties, or circumstances. Emotional energy focuses on perceived injustice rather than internal decision-making.
  - ○ Examples
    - ▪ "They treated me like a criminal."
    - ▪ "No one listened to me."
    - ▪ "The system ruined everything."
    - ▪ "I'm angry at how this was handled."

- o Forensic Value
  - When emotion centers on external actors rather than personal mental state at the time of action, it strengthens Externalized Causation posture.
- **Identity Threat Sensitivity**
  - o Description
    - The subject reacts disproportionately when intent is questioned. Challenges to their character, morality, or self-image produce defensive escalation or moral grandstanding.
  - o Examples
    - "I would never do something like that."
    - "That's not who I am."
    - "You don't know me."
    - "I'm not that kind of person."
  - o Forensic Value
    - Overreaction to intent questioning suggests identity protection over cognitive explanation. This strengthens Strategic Denial posture.
- **Narrative Over-Structure**
  - o Description
    - The subject presents a tightly constructed explanation of intent that appears rehearsed or pre-formulated. The justification flows smoothly, with little spontaneous searching or cognitive effort.
  - o Examples
    - "I was only trying to help."
    - "My intention was always to protect."
    - "I was responding to what was happening."
    - "I was trying to calm the situation."
  - o Forensic Value
    - When justification appears polished and consistent but lacks reflective complexity, it strengthens Accident Reconstruction or Strategic Denial posture.

DOMAIN 3 – HARM FRAMING

Forensic Question: How is impact conceptualized?

- **Minimization and Euphemism**
  - o Description
    - The subject reduces the severity of harm through softened language, scaled-down descriptors, or comparative framing. Serious impact is linguistically downgraded.
  - o Examples
    - "It wasn't that bad."
    - "It was just an argument."
    - "She was fine."
    - "It was only a bruise."

- "It was a misunderstanding."
  - o Forensic Value
    - When impact is acknowledged but linguistically reduced, this strengthens a Minimized Harm classification.
- **Empathy Deflection**
  - o Description
    - The subject avoids describing the other person's internal experience. When asked about impact, they shift to facts, logistics, or their own experience rather than articulating how the other person may have felt.
  - o Examples
    - "I don't know how they felt."
    - "They didn't say anything."
    - "It wasn't my intention."
    - "They seemed okay."
  - o Forensic Value
    - Failure to engage with the other person's perspective strengthens Denied Harm or Justified Harm posture, especially when consistent across questioning.
- **Negative Emotion Suppression**
  - o Description
    - The subject shows limited or absent remorse, sadness, or concern when discussing serious harm. Emotional tone may be flat, defensive, or focused on self-impact.
  - o Examples
    - "I've moved on."
    - "It is what it is."
    - "I can't change it now."
    - "I'm more upset about how this affected me."
  - o Forensic Value
    - Absence of expected affect strengthens Justified Harm or Victim Inversion posture, particularly when the narrative centers on self-consequence rather than impact.
- **Moral Polarization**
  - o Description
    - The subject frames the situation as a moral divide, portraying themselves as justified and the other party as wrong, unstable, or deserving of consequence.
  - o Examples
    - "They were out of control."
    - "I was standing up for myself."
    - "Anyone would have done the same."
    - "They brought this on themselves."
  - o Forensic Value

- Binary moral framing strengthens Victim Inversion posture by shifting focus from harm to righteousness.
- **Metaphorization of Suffering**
  - Description
    - The subject uses dramatic or metaphorical language to describe their own experience while minimizing the other person's harm.
  - Examples
    - "This has been a nightmare for me."
    - "My life has been destroyed."
    - "I've been through hell."
  - Limited equivalent emotional depth is given to the other person's experience.
  - Forensic Value
    - When suffering language centers on the subject rather than the injured party, it strengthens Harm Minimization or Victim Inversion classification.

DOMAIN 4 – DECISION MAPPING

Forensic Question: How is the decision pathway described?

- **Omitted Intermediate Steps**
  - Description
    - The subject skips key behavioral links between perception, emotion, and action. The transition from stimulus to outcome lacks identifiable choice points.
  - Examples
    - "We were arguing and then it happened."
    - "I went in there and next thing I know it was done."
    - "I grabbed it and then everything went bad."
  - Missing are the internal steps such as evaluation, hesitation, reconsideration, or escalation.
  - Forensic Value
    - When critical steps are absent, the decision chain appears fragmented. This strengthens a Fragmented Decision Chain classification.
- **Time Compression**
  - Description
    - The subject collapses the timeline between trigger and act, eliminating space for deliberation. The event is described as instantaneous or inevitable.
  - Examples
    - "It all happened so fast."
    - "I didn't have time to think."
    - "One second we were talking, the next it was over."
  - Forensic Value

- Compressed timelines reduce perceived volition. This strengthens Externalized or Non-Articulated Decision Process classifications.
- **Cognitive Overload Breakdown**
    - Description
        - Under increased questioning about decision points, the subject's language becomes unstable. They may contradict themselves, lose sequencing, or revert to vague summaries.
    - Examples
        - "I don't remember exactly."
        - "It's hard to explain."
        - "That's not really how it happened."
    - Revisions mid-sentence or abandonment of earlier details.
    - Forensic Value
        - Instability under cognitive demand suggests defensive reconstruction rather than stable experiential recall. This strengthens Fragmented Decision Chain classification.
- **Counterfactual Avoidance**
    - Description
        - When asked what else they could have done, the subject resists articulating alternatives. The pathway is presented as singular and unavoidable.
    - Examples
        - "There wasn't another option."
        - "That's just how it unfolded."
        - "I couldn't have done anything different."
    - Forensic Value
        - Absence of alternative pathways strengthens Non-Articulated Decision Process posture.
- **Excessive Quantification**
    - Description
        - The subject substitutes numerical detail, lists, or technical sequencing for genuine internal deliberation. The structure appears logical but lacks reflection.
    - Examples
        - "There were three steps."
        - "I waited exactly ten minutes."
        - "I followed procedure 1, 2, and 3."
    - Forensic Value
        - When logic is presented mechanically without internal reasoning, it strengthens Defensive Reconstruction posture within decision mapping.

DOMAIN 5 – MEMORY INTEGRITY
Forensic Question: Does recall resemble experiential encoding?

- **Narrative Over-Structure**
  - Description
    - The subject presents a polished, linear, and consistently formatted account with minimal searching, hesitation, or sensory fluctuation. The cadence feels practiced rather than reconstructed in real time.
  - Examples
    - A clean beginning-to-end timeline delivered with identical wording across retellings.
    - Little variation in phrasing despite repeated questioning.
      Immediate answers without reflective pauses during complex segments.
  - Forensic Value
    - Experiential memory often contains uneven pacing and cognitive searching. Over-structured recall strengthens a Rehearsed Narrative Pattern classification.
- **Over-Specificity Asymmetry**
  - Description
    - The subject provides extreme detail in peripheral or safe segments but limited detail in central or high-risk segments. Memory density is uneven.
  - Examples
    - Detailed description of clothing, weather, or unrelated events.
    - Minimal description of the critical act itself.
    - Precise times before and after, vague description during.
  - Forensic Value
    - Uneven detail distribution suggests selective reconstruction. This strengthens a Defensive Reconstruction Pattern classification.
- **Self-Contradictory Statements**
  - Description
    - The subject contradicts themselves within the same interview or across retellings, particularly when cognitive demand increases.
  - Examples
    - "It happened at night." Later: "It was early afternoon."
    - "I never touched them." Later: "I might have brushed against them."
    - "I wasn't angry." Later: "I was furious."
  - Forensic Value
    - Instability under load strengthens an Instability Under Cognitive Load classification.
- **Strategic Vagueness**
  - Description
    - The subject responds with generalized statements when detail would normally be available in experiential memory. Core segments are summarized rather than described.
  - Examples
    - "It was normal."
    - "Nothing unusual."

- "It went how it usually goes."
- "I don't really remember specifics."
  - o Forensic Value
    - When experiential anchors are absent and summaries replace detail, this strengthens a Defensive Reconstruction classification.
- **Affective Mismatch**
  - o Description
    - The emotional tone expressed does not align with the content described. The subject may appear emotionally flat when describing severe events, or overly composed during claimed chaos.
  - o Examples
    - Neutral tone while describing serious injury or death.
    - Smiling or calm demeanor when recounting alleged panic.
    - Overly dramatic emotion during non-critical segments.
  - o Forensic Value
    - Emotional incongruence strengthens a Rehearsed Narrative Pattern classification, particularly when clustered with other structure markers.

DOMAIN 6 – ROLE & POWER FRAMING

Forensic Question: How is relational position constructed?

- **Possessive Dominance Language**
  - o Description
    - The subject uses repeated possessives or ownership phrasing that implies control over people, decisions, or systems. The relational dynamic is framed as proprietary rather than mutual.
  - o Examples
    - "My child."
    - "My patient."
    - "My house."
    - "My rules."
    - "They belong with me."
  - o Forensic Value
    - When possessives are used excessively or emphatically, especially in contested relational contexts, this strengthens an Authority Normalization posture.
- **Relational Isolation Framing**
  - o Description
    - The subject subtly or overtly minimizes the importance of other relationships in the other person's life. Third parties are excluded, criticized, or framed as unnecessary.
  - o Examples
    - "They don't need anyone else."

- "I'm the only one who understands them."
- "Other people just confuse things."
- "No one else really helps."
  - o Forensic Value
    - Isolation language strengthens Control Posture or Victim Role Reversal classifications when the subject portrays themselves as the sole stabilizing force.
- **Weaponized Advocacy**
  - o Description
    - The subject frames controlling or escalating behavior as protective, necessary, or heroic. Control is linguistically reframed as care.
  - o Examples
    - "I was fighting for them."
    - "I had to step in."
    - "No one else would protect them."
    - "I escalated it because no one listened."
  - o Forensic Value
    - When dominance behaviors are framed as advocacy, this strengthens a System Persecution posture.
- **Professional Grooming Lexicon**
  - o Description
    - The subject over-aligns with institutional language, policies, or professional terminology to signal credibility and authority. Language mirrors that of professionals rather than personal experience.
  - o Examples
    - "I was fully compliant."
    - "We followed protocol."
    - "The intervention was appropriate."
    - "I documented everything."
  - o Forensic Value
    - Overuse of institutional language strengthens Status Alignment and Control Posture classifications, particularly when relational warmth is absent.
- **Conditional Regard Language**
  - o Description
    - The subject frames approval, affection, or stability as contingent on compliance or agreement. Positive relational status is portrayed as earned through obedience.
  - o Examples
    - "When they respect me, everything is fine."
    - "If they follow the rules, there's no problem."
    - "I just expect cooperation."
    - "They know how to avoid conflict."
  - o Forensic Value

- Conditional relational framing strengthens Dominance Architecture posture by revealing control contingencies embedded in the relationship.

DOMAIN 7 – STABILITY & REVISION BEHAVIOR

Forensic Question: How stable is narrative under scrutiny?

- **Self-Contradictory Statements**
  - Description
    - The subject alters factual elements within the same interview or across retellings. Changes affect timing, sequence, physical actions, or stated mental state.
  - Examples
    - "I never went in the room." Later: "I stepped in for a second."
    - "I didn't touch them." Later: "I may have brushed past."
    - "It happened once." Later: "Maybe twice."
  - Forensic Value
    - When factual elements shift in response to questioning, this strengthens a Material Fact Drift classification.
- **Cognitive Overload Breakdown**
  - Description
    - As questioning becomes more specific or layered, the subject's narrative destabilizes. They may hesitate more, contradict earlier statements, revert to vague phrasing, or abandon structured sequencing.
  - Examples
    - "I don't remember."
    - "That's not exactly how it happened."
    - "I'm getting confused."
    - Abrupt topic shifts when pressed.
  - Forensic Value
    - Instability under increased demand strengthens a Reactive Editing classification, especially when the original narrative appeared structured.
- **Identity Threat Sensitivity**
  - Description
    - When the subject perceives a challenge to their character or moral identity, the narrative expands defensively. They may introduce new justifications, grievances, or unrelated virtuous acts.
  - Examples
    - "You don't understand who I am."
    - "I've always been a good person."
    - "I would never hurt anyone."
  - Introduction of unrelated positive behaviors when pressed on inconsistencies.
  - Forensic Value
    - Narrative expansion under identity threat strengthens a Strategic Expansion classification.

- **Emphatic Truth Claiming**
  - Description
    - Repetitive assertions of honesty increase when inconsistencies are introduced. The subject emphasizes sincerity instead of addressing discrepancies directly.
  - Examples
    - "I swear that's what happened."
    - "I'm telling you the truth."
    - "I have nothing to hide."
    - "You have to believe me."
  - Forensic Value
    - Spikes in emphatic truth language often precede or accompany narrative revision. This strengthens instability classification when paired with fact shifts.
- **Time Compression**
  - Description
    - When challenged about inconsistencies, the subject begins shortening or collapsing previously detailed segments. Earlier elaborations are reduced to simplified summaries.
  - Examples
    - "It all just happened."
    - "It wasn't a big deal."
    - "You're overcomplicating it."
    - "That part doesn't matter."
  - Forensic Value
    - Progressive reduction of detail under scrutiny strengthens a Progressive Contraction classification.