COPYRIGHT 1992 BY DAVID C. RASKIN, PHILLIP W. ESPLIN, AND STEVEN W. HOROWITZ.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.[1]

CONTENT CRITERIA RATING FORM
(REVISED 18 APRIL 1992)

CASE _____ WITNESS _____

INTERVIEWER _____ DATE _____

EVALUATOR _____ DATE _____

RATE EACH CONTENT CRITERION USING THE CATEGORIES: **A =** ABSENT **P** = PRESENT

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS **RATING**

1. **LOGICAL STRUCTURE** **A** **P**

   IS THE STATEMENT COHERENT? IS THE CONTENT LOGICAL? DO THE DIFFERENT SEGMENTS FIT TOGETHER? (NOTE: PECULIAR OR UNIQUE DETAILS OR UNEXPECTED COMPLICATONS DO NOT DIMINISH LOGICAL STRUCTURE)

2. **UNSTRUCTURED PRODUCTION** **A** **P**

   ARE DESCRIPTIONS UNCONSTRAINED? IS THE REPORT SOMEWHAT UNORGANIZED? ARE THERE DIGRESSIONS OR SPONTANEOUS SHIFTS OF FOCUS? ARE SOME ELEMENTS DISTRIBUTED THROUGHOUT? (NOTE: THIS CRITERION REQUIRES THAT THE ACCOUNT IS LOGICALLY CONSISTENT)

3. **QUANTITY OF DETAILS** **A** **P**

   ARE THERE SPECIFIC DESCRIPTIONS OF PLACE OR TIME? ARE PERSONS, OBJECTS, AND EVENTS SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED? (NOTEA; REPETITIONS DO NOT COUNT)

SPECIFIC CONTENTS

4. **CONTEXTUAL EMBEDDING** **A** **P**

   ARE EVENTS PLACED IN SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL CONTEXT? IN THE ACTION CONNECTED TO OTHER INCIDENTAL EVENTS, SUCH AS ROUTINE OCCURRENCES?

5. INTERACTIONS **A** **P**

ARE THERE REPORTS OF ACTIONS AND REACTIONS OR CONVERSATION COMPOSED OF A MNIMUM OF THREE ELEMENTS INVOLVING AT LEAST THE ACCUSED AND THE WITNESS?

6. REPRODUCTION OF SPEECH **A** **P**

IS THE SPEECH OR CONVERSATION DURING THE INCIDENT REPORTED IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM? (NOTE: UNFAMILIAR TERMS OR QUOTES ARE ESPECIALLY STRONG INDICATORS, EVEN WHEN ATTRIBUTED TO ONLY ONE PARTICIPANT)

7. UNEXPECTED COMPLICATIONS **A** **P**

WAS THERE AN UNPLANNED INTERRUPTION OR AN UNEXPECTED COMPLICATION OR DIFFICULTY DURING THE ALLEGED INCIDENT?

8. UNUSUAL DETAILS **A** **P**

ARE THERE DETAILS OF PERSONS, OBJECTS, OR EVENTS THAT ARE UNUSUAL, YET MEANINGFUL IN THE CONTEXT AND HIGHLY UNLIKELY TO HAVE BEEN ACQUIRED BY THIS WITNESS INDEPENDENT FROM THE ALLEGED EVENTS? (NOTE: UNUSUAL DETAILS MUST BE REALISTIC)

9. SUPERFLUOUS DETAILS **A** **P**

ARE PERIPHERAL DETAILS DESCRIBED IN CONNECTON WITH THE ALLEGED EVENTS THAT ARE NOT ESSENTIAL AND DO NOT CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO THE SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS? (NOTE: IF A PASSAGE SATISFIED ANY OF SPECIFIC CRITERIA 4-14, IT PROBABLY IS NOT SUPERFLUOUS)

10. ACCURATELY REPORTED DETAILS MISUNDERSTOOD **A** **P**

DID THE WITNESS CORRECTLY DESCRIBE AN OBJECT OR EVENT BUT INTERPRET IT INCORRECTLY?

11. RELATED EXTERNAL ASSOCIATIONS **A** **P**

IS THERE REFERENCE TO AN EVENT OR CONVERSATON THAT IS RELATED IN SOME WAY TO THE INCIDENT BUT IS NOT PART OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSES?

12. SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE **A** **P**

DID THE WITNESS DESCRIBE FEELINGS OR THOUGHTS EXPERIENCED DURING THE INCIDENT? (NOTE: THIS CRITERION IS NOT SATISFIED WHEN THE WITNESS RESPONDS TO A DIRECT QUESTION, UNLESS THE ANSWER GOES BEYOND THE QUESTION)

13. ATTRIBUTION OF ACCUSED'S MENTAL STATE **A** **P**

IS THERE REFERENCE TO THE ALLEGED PERPETRATOR'S FEELINGS OR THOUGHTS DURING THE INCIDENT? (NOTE: DESCRIPTIONS OF OVERT BEHAVIOR DO NOT QUALIFY)

14. SPONTANEOUS CORRECTIONS, ADDITIONS, OR LACK OF MEMORY **A** **P**

WERE THERE SPONTANEOUS CORRECTIONS OR ADDITIONS TO MATERIAL PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED IN THE STATEMENT? DID THE WITNESS SPONTANEOUSLY INDICATE LACK OF MEMORY OR KNOWLEDGE OF ANY ASPECT OF THE INCIDENT? (NOTE: IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION, THE ANSWER MUST GO BEYOND THE INFORMATION REQUESTED IN THE QUESTION)

GENERAL REMARKS AND SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS:

---

[1]**ADAPTED FROM: RASKIN, D.C., AND ESPLIN, P.W. (1991). STATEMENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT: INTERVIEW PROCEDURES AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF CHILDREN'S STATEMENTS OF SEXUAL ABUSE. *BEHAVIORAL ASSESSMENT, 13,* 265-291.**

COPYRIGHT 1992 BY DAVID C. RASKIN, PHILLIP W. ESPLIN, AND STEVEN W. HOROWITZ.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

VALIDITY CHECKLIST

(REVISED 18 APRIL 1992)

CASE _____ WITNESS _____

INTERVIEWER _____ DATE _____

EVALUATOR _____ DATE _____

PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. COGNITIVE-EMOTIONAL LIMITATIONS **YES** **NO**

ARE THERE INDICATIONS THAT LIMITED COGNITIVE ABILITIES, UNWILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS THE EVENTS, OR DISCOMFORT DURING THE INTERVIEW INTERFERED WITH OBTAINING ADEQUATE INFORMATION FROM THE INTERVIEW PROCESS?

2. AFFECT DURING THE INTERVIEW **YES** **NO**

DID THE WITNESS DISPLAY INAPPROPRIATE AFFECT DURING THE INTERVIEW OR WAS THERE AN ABSENCE OF AFFECT THAT WOULD BE EXPECTED TO ACCOMPANY SUCH A REPORT BY THIS WITNESS?

3. SUGGESTIBILITY **YES** **NO**

DID THE WITNESS DEMONSTRATE SUSCEPTIBILITY TO SUGGESTION OR ASK QUESTIONS DURING THE INTERVIEW TO ATTEMPT TO OBTAIN CLUES AS TO WHAT TO SAY TO THE INTERVIEWER?

INTERVIEW CHARACTERISTICS

4. INTERVIEW PROCEDURES **YES** **NO**

WAS THIS INTERVIEW INADEQUATE ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES OF STATEMENT VALIDITY ASSESSMENT? DID THE INTERVIEWER INTRODUCE DISTRACTIONS, FAIL TO ESTABLISH RAPPORT, INADEQUATELY ATTEMPT TO ELICIT A FREE NARRATIVE, FAIL TO USE OPEN QUESTIONS AND APPROPRIATE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS, OR FAIL TO ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE AMBIGUITIES AND APPARENT INCONSISTENCIES? WERE REASONABLE ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESES IGNORED?

5. INFLUENCE ON STATEMENT CONTENTS **YES** **NO**

WAS THERE LEADING OR SUGGESTIVE QUESTIONING, PRESSURE, OR COERCION IN ANY ANALYZED INTERVIEW OF THE WITNESS? WERE SUGGESTIVE TECHNIQUES OR PROPS EMPLOYED IN ANY INTERVIEW?

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS

6. MOTIVES FOR REPORTING **YES** **NO**

DOES THE WITNESS'S RELATONSHIP TO THE ACCUSED OR OTHER CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES (E.G., LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, RELATIONSHIPS AMONG SIGNIFICANT OTHERS, FINANCIAL OR OTHER GAIN) SUGGEST POSSIBLE MOTIVES FOR THE WITNESS TO MAKE FALSE ALLEGATION? HOWEVER, IF THE WITNESS MADE EXCUSES FOR OR POSITIVE COMMENTS ABOUT THE ALLEGED PERPETRATOR OR MINIMIZED THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE ACTS, THESE ARUGE AGAINST MOTIVES TO FALSELY REPORT.

7. CONTEXT OF DISCLOSURES **YES** **NO**

ARE THERE QUESTIONABLE ELEMENTS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ORIGINAL DISCLOSURE OR REPORT OF THE ACCUSATIONS? ARE THERE IMPORTANT INCONSISTENCIES IN THE REPORTS?

8. INFLUENCE BY OTHERS **YES** **NO**

ARE THERE INDICATIONS THAT OTHERS SUGGESTED, COACHED, PRESSURED, OR COERCED THE WITNESS TO MAKE A FALSE REPORT?

INVESTIGATIVE QUESTIONS

9. LACK OF REALISM **YES** **NO**

ARE ANY DESCRIBED EVENTS UNREALISTIC? ARE THERE MAJOR ELEMENTS IN THE STATEMENT THAT ARE CONTRARY TO THE LAWS OF NATURE?

10. INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS **YES** **NO**

ARE THERE MAJOR ELEMENTS IN THE STATEMENT (NOT PERIPHERAL DETAILS) THAT ARE INCONSISTENT OR CONTRADICTED BY ANOTHER STATEMENT MADE BY THIS WITNESS OR ANOTHER WITNESS?

11. CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE **YES** **NO**

ARE THERE MAJOR ELEMENTS IN THE STATEMENT THAT ARE CONTRADICTED BY RELIABLE PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS (POLYGRAPH), PHYSICAL EVIDENCE, OR OTHER CONCRETE EVIDENCE?

12. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OFFENSE **YES** **NO**

IS THE DESCRIPTON OF THE ALLEGED OFFENSE LACKING IN THE NORMAL DETAILS AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THIS TYPE OF OFFENSE? DOES THE DESCRIPTION CONTAIN IMPORTANT ELEMENTS OR GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT ARE CONTRARY TO WHAT HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED IN THE PROFESSIONAL AND INVESTIGATIVE LITERATURE CONCERNING SUCH OFFENCES?