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THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Uh, this is State of Wisconsin vs. Brendan R. Dassey, 06 CF 88. Appearances, please.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The State continues in its appearance by Special Prosecutors Ken Kratz, Tom Fallon and Norm Gahn.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Attorney Mark Fremgen, Attorney Ray Edelstein appear with Brendan Dassey in person.

THE COURT: Are you set to proceed?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: Do so.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Call Dr. Robert Gordon.

## DR. ROBERT GORDON,

called as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.

THE WITNESS: Could I get prepared first, please?

THE CLERK: Sure.
THE WITNESS: My name is Robert H. Gordon, G-o-r-d-o-n.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY FREMGEN:
Q Doctor, do you -- can you describe what your, uh, educational background is?

A Sure. I have a Bachelor's Degree from Purdue University. That was obtained in 1972.

I received my Doctorate in clinical psychology from Washington University in 1976.

I completed a one-year internship at the University of Tennessee, School for Health Sciences.

And I subsequently audited two classes in the early 80's at the University of Wisconsin Law School.

I've, uh, attended a variety of workshops in the meantime and, likewise, have given oral presentations, seminars and training than I've gone to workshops.

Q Where do you -- where are you currently employed?
A Until, uh, Friday, I'm currently employed with Forensic Psych Associates. Its, uh, office -- main office is in Janesville. Uh, other offices are located in Chicago, Milwaukee and Rockford.

Q And you said until Friday. Are you changing positions as of Friday?

A $\quad I$ am.

Q And where are you -- where will you be working at that point?

A As of, uh, Tuesday, May 1, I will be the Director of Forensic Evaluation Services at St. Louis Behavioral Medicine Institute Health -- St. Louis Behavioral Health Institute, affiliated with St. Louis University.

Q What other work or, uh, employment history do you have involved with clinical or forensic psychology?

A Well, I began my career, primarily, as a clinical psychologist. I worked for the first two years out of -- after I completed my graduate degree, at the Janesville Counseling Center down -- that's what is currently known as -- it's a part of the Rock County Health Care Center System. Uh, county system. And I was a clinical supervisor there.

And, then, from 1978 until present, I have been in private practice, running my own office, employing some staff, and doing counseling, consulting to different agencies, probation and parole, counseling -- other counseling services, uh, Department of Human Services, etc.

And, then, over the past, uh, five
years, I've, uh, exclusively, uh, limited my practice to forensic work, except I do a few free counseling sessions and run a free group at a church, and I -- I will continue that on a one-time per week -- or one-time per month basis, uh, by phone, once I gets to St. Louis, but with everyone else in a church -- in a group.

Q Are you a member of any professional organizations or associations?

A I am.
Q Can you describe those organizations related to your field of expertise?

A Well, they're listed on my $C V$, and they include the American Psychological Association, of which I'm a member. I was designated, uh, oh, maybe 20 years ago, as being a Fellow of the Wisconsin Psychological Association.

I'm also a member of the Division of
Wisconsin Psychological Association called the Society of Clinical and Consulting Psychologists. Then, there's the Division of the American Psychological Association, of which I'm a member of the American Psychology Law Society.

I'm also, um, a member of three smaller organizations. The Association for the Treatment
of Sex Abusers, the Illinois Sex Offender Management Board, and the Milwaukee Area Psychological Association.

I'm sorry for reading, but $I$ want to make sure it's accurate.

Q You mentioned that this is on your CV?
A That's correct.
Q And CV, you mean by that, Curriculum Vitae?
A Precisely.
Q Another word for resumé?
A Yes, sir.
(Exhibit No. 226 marked for identification.)
Q I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit 226. Is that the Curriculum Vitae you're referencing?

A Yes.
Q Now, you had mentioned -- or I think you were going into discussing psych -- certain boards, and I think you mentioned, "up until recently." Can you describe, first of all, what boards, and what you mean by "up until recently?"

A Yes. I was on three boards and resigned due to my changing position. The, uh, boards include, uh, in the past, being on the advisory committee to the University Wisconsin-Whitewater, uh, Chancellor, the

Dean of, uh, Arts and Sciences.
I, also, was on the Circle of Friends for the court appointed special advocate in Rock County. Um, I also, in the past, was a -- on the board of directors for the Society of Clinical and Consulting Psychologists that I referred to already. There may have been one or two others. I didn't check my notes. I'm sure I omitted one.

Q Now, you've mentioned clinical psychology along with the term "forensic psychology." Can you describe what the difference is between the two?

A Sure. There are many components of Psychology, whether it's clinical psychology, um, experimental psychology, industrial psychology. There are different specific aspects of psychology.

But when you apply that body of knowledge to matters that come before the court, to assist the court or a jury in making decisions, that's when it becomes forensic in nature. So that you can have a forensic social psychologist or forensic engineer.

Forensic means, a body of knowledge that qualifies you by the court to be an expert, to offer any information to the court and to the jurors.

Q How long have you been involved in forensic psychology, for instance?

A I've been involved in forensic psychology since 1978. But it's been on a increasing basis since that time. I began by doing mental commitment evaluations and guardianship evaluations.

Q Have you ever testified in court before?
A Yes.
Q Do you -- can you recall how many times you've been in court as a -- testifying in this type of capacity?

A Uh, Mr. Fremgen, I -- I came to a better estimate of that, and it's an estimate, last night, uh, as I calculated it, and that would be roughly 2,500. But that number is inflated, because many of those have been done at the request of the Department of Probation and Parole, where I consult or I consulted up until this past Thursday.

And, also, they contain -- those numbers
are -- are higher because the significant portion also are mental commitment evaluations and guardianship evaluations.

So it's not necessarily jury trials, for instance?

A No, sir. Uh, the majority are not jury trials. The
majority are before the judge.
Q So, just a judge, is what you're saying?
A I wouldn't say, just the judge, I'd say before the judge.

Q Before the court.
A Yes.
Q Have you authored or co-authored any publications, or any articles, or any books?

A Yes.
Q You, again, briefly listed, described the topic of the -- the, uh, publication?

A Could you -- could I --
Q Briefly list, describe what that authored publication is?

A Uh, I co-authored one book called, Substance Abuse, Homicide and Violent Behavior. I have also, uh, self -- self-published a facilitator's guide and a learner's workbook regarding treatment of sex offenders.

Then, I have a number of articles that have been published. Some have been published in what's called peer reviewed journals where you submit it to psychologists and other mental health professionals. And they decide whether it's worthy of publication.

In other occasions, my, uh -- some of the 12 articles that I've written have been in more like trade journals, like put out by the different -- like a bar association or psychology association. And those would not be called peer reviews. Those are re -- reviewed by editors of the journals or -- or trade publications.

Q Have any of those peer review publications involved aspects of forensic psychology?

A One did, indirectly.
Q And what was that?
A Well, that was my dissertation. And I didn't foresee it as being forensically-related, but it is. And it's entitled, "Diagnostic Compliance in Rorschach Interpretation as a Function of Group Member Status." That was my dissertation to get my Ph. D. And, also, I summarized it better than I did the title, uh, to be published in a peer-related article.

Q How often do you spend time familiarizing yourself with the current research in the field of forensic psychology?

A Well, my wife thinks that $I$ do that quite often, and that she's right. Um, I receive journals, I review journals. I, uh, go to -- go to particular workshops and seminars. And I also, thanks to the modern-day
technology, um, probably spend an average of one to two hours in the evening, four days a week on the average, uh, seeing what current articles are published in a variety of areas regarding cases in -forensic cases in general or cases that I'm consulting on.

Q Why is it important to continue to follow the research or follow, um, trends in forensic psychology?

A Well, it's -- it's two reasons. One is, ethically required by the ethic code -- ethical codes that I subscribe to, or ascribe to, simply by my participation in these organizations I've mentioned.

The other reason is more important to
me. It's personal. When I am offering
information that may be helpful to judges or
juries that in -- affect, life, liberty, finances, um, people's rights, then, uh, that's something that I personally take very seriously.

Q Have you ever presented or trained -- you mentioned you've gone to training sessions. Have you ever trained others in your field of psychology?

A I have.
Q Can you briefly describe those presentations or
trainings?
A Well, they've been on a variety of forensic topics. I could enumerate those, if you like. But I can summarize by saying that $I$ counted them up, and there are 100 or -- give or take a couple hundred presentations that I've provided to either attorneys, and they've been continuing legal education approved for all, and I have also presented to probation officers, social workers, federal probation chiefs regarding a variety of forensic matters.

Uh, some of them have been small. Only 10, 15, 20 individuals at, uh, a bar association. Others have been large. When it's been, for example, uh -- most recently, I testified -- not testified, but spoke at, regarding sex off -sexual assault homicide in capital cases, in, uh -- in Texas at a -- a national conference. So, it -- it runs the gamut.

Q Previously, you indicated you've testified over, approximately, 2500 times in various, uh, types of proceedings. When you've testified in the past, do you testify solely for one side or the other?

A No, sir.
Q Do you have any percentage as to what -- how --
how often you're called by one side or other? Pardon me?

Q Do you have any percentage, that you're aware of, as -- as far as how often you're called by, let's say, for instance, the defense?

A That's a different question than you asked before. By the defense, probably 60 percent. By the prosecution, probably 40 percent. But that's still the minority of who request my services.

Q Now, let me just, uh, skip ahead. Are you familiar with the term, quote, false confession, unquote?

A Yes.
Q And how is this term fam -- familiar to you as a forensic psychologist?

A Well, it's familiar to me by cases I've been involved in, by my understanding of the literature and the tests available to evaluate them. And it's related to evaluating whether, um, or -- it's, uh, related to helping address, uh, false confessions, and -- which are admitting to wrongdoing when it didn't exist, uh, or overstating one's involvement in a crime and --

Q Is there another term that's used in this field?
A Well, beginning in 1908, there was Münsterberg, who wrote his first book on causes of false confession at
the turn of the century.
Also, not this century, Binet, uh, showed pictures, and then saw if there was a -- a change in responses when the pictures were shown again.

And, most recently, in the -- in the 1980's, uh, Gisli, and I've been -- I've been told it's Gudjonsson, uh, developed what's called "interrogative suggestibility." And that was in the $80^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$. And he has done extensive research, uh, and come up with a Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales to assess for two aspects of, uh, interrogative suggestibility.

Q Is Gudjonsson the foremost expert in this field?
A He's certainly one of the leading experts. Uh, he was originally a -- a detective in Iceland. He went over to London. He became a psychologist. He was asked to consult about confessions. He now is the Professor of Forensic Psychology at the Institute of Psychology at Kings College in London.

He's written a -- a -- I didn't bring it with me, a thick handbook, which, not to be blasphemous, but would be the bible of, uh, the psychology of false confessions and psychology of false confessions. I don't have the exact title
with me, but, uh, it's one that's heavily relied upon.

Q Is the Gudjonsson Scale of Suggestibility, what you've just recently described, the only tool that a forensic psychologist has available to him in determining whether a person has the psychiatric or psychological characteristics that may cause him to be vulnerable to give any false confession?

A No.
Q What -- what other tools do you believe, as a forensic psychologist, are important to consider in making a determination of suggestibility?

A Focusing on tools as your --
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I -- I'm sorry. If
I may interpose an objection? Perhaps Mr. Fremgen is doing this intentionally, but he's interposing the terms "suggestibility" and "false confession." If we're talking about false confession, I'd ask that he ask that question. If he's talking about suggestibility, I'd ask that he phrase it in those terms.

THE COURT: So, you're objecting to the form of the question as a compound question? ATTORNEY KRATZ: I am, Judge. They are
two, I think, distinct, uh, concepts, and I'd ask that those be, uh, referenced to any specific questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Fremgen?
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: I'll change -- I'll -THE COURT: Okay.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: -- rephrase.
Q (By Attorney Fremgen) Can you describe the other tools that you would consider important in making a determination whether a person, uh, has those personality or psychological characteristics that make them vulnerable to suggestion?

A Yes. Uh, generally speaking, there are tests regarding intellectual functioning, $I Q$, uh, they could be memory, they could be tests associated with assessing personality traits, characteristics associated with the likelihood of being suggestible. Uh, those are the main ones.

Q Now, are these --
A The main categories.
Q I'm sorry. Are these tests developed solely to determine whether a person may be suggestible?

A The, uh, only one that was solely developed that personal is the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales.

Q So the other tests that you were just talking
about in a -- more of a generic form, are they used in other, um, evaluations in forensic psychology, for instance?

A In forensic psychology and non-forensic psychology, true.

Q Why is it that, uh, these tests that have, potentially, nothing to do with suggestibility, are important tools to consider as a forensic psychologist in making that determination?

A Well, there are different psychological characteristics that an individual might exhibit or might possess that, in turn, would increase or decrease the likelihood that they would be suggestible. And those include, intellectual functioning, learning problems, memory problems, personality characteristics. Whether a person, for example, is passive, withdrawn, socially introverted, quiet, anxious, wanting to be ple -- desiring to please, uh, being in terms of social desirability, um -- I must be missing something, but I don't recall right now.

Q Now -- and -- and, again, is this something that, for instance, Gudjonsson recommends forensic psychologists to consider in addition to his suggestibility scale?

A Absolutely.
Q Have you performed these tests on actual subjects to determine whether a person may be susceptible or vulnerable to suggestion before?

A Yes.
Q And -- and do you -- can you tell us how often or how many times, that is, that you performed these tests to assist you in making determinations of whether a person is vulnerable to suggestion?

A I should keep better records, but the number is -compared to the 2,500 , is definitely lower. It's more like 5 to 10.

Q And have you ever testified in a court, such as this, in that regard?

A Yes.
Q And -- and how often have you done that?
A Three times. Well, three that I can recall.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I -- I'm sorry. Again, I interpose an objection as to vague. "In a court, such as this." Are we talking about a jury trial? Or are we talking about just before a judge? THE COURT: That's fair. ATTORNEY KRATZ: I ask that -- that be -THE COURT: Sure. It's a fair objection.

It's sustained. Why don't your rephrase the question, Counsel?

Q (By Attorney Fremgen) How often did you testify before a judge in regards to this type of topic?

A Before a judge, that $I$ can recall of those five to ten times, uh twice.

Q How often have you testified --
A Three -- three times. I'm sorry.
Q How often have you testified in this same regard in front of a jury?

A This is the first time.
Q Now, you had a -- a large number of cases that you've test -- you indicated you testified before a court in the past?

A That's true.
Q And this seems like a very small fraction; is that correct?

A That's true.
Q Why is it that you have such a smaller fraction in this type of, uh, evaluation, or forensic psychology versus the other types that you testified about?

A Well, it's just an expansion -- a gradual expansion of my practice. I mean, when $I$ first started doing this, as I indicated, $I$ only did mental commitment
evaluations and guardianship. And, then, I began to do maybe a -- a few custody evaluations, and, uh, fitness to stand trial or, uh, proceedings regarding disposition of cases regarding children or -- or sentencing.

And, then, it just -- with the seminars I -- I attended, with presentations I've given that required me to learn the material to present in a meaningful way to attorneys, then $I$ gradually expanded my areas of expertise. Not -not -- not to the point -- I'm not a neuropsychologist, for example, so I -- there's no way I'm going to expand to the point of talking about traumatic brain injury from a car accident, and get up here and try to help the Court. I mean, there's certain limitations.

Q When you began your practice in, um, psychology, uh, was there sex offender groups at that time that you were aware?

A Not that I was aware of.
Q And, now, you testified earlier that one, uh, function of your, um, employment is you are a facilitator in sex offender groups?

A I'm proud to say that I get to continue that by web cam on a weekly basis for the three groups I already
run once I get to St. Louis. So, yes.
Q So that's something that's kind of progressed throughout your career?

A Even that has progressed to web cam. That's true.
Q But the sex offender type of -- of involvement in your field?

A I started off with six individuals that were in a group, and, now, I've seen three thousand.

Q Your -- would it be fair to state that your involvement in suggestibility evaluations is similar? That is, it's begin -- it's just beginning, and it's beginning to progress?

A It's just beginning. Beginning to progress. But whether expands to the degree -- I doubt it will expand to the degree that my sex offender work has, because I'm 56 and don't have that many years to have it expand. You know.

Q Specifically, turning to Brendan Dassey, you're familiar with Brendan; correct?

A I am.
Q And how did you become familiar, first, with Brendan Dassey?

A You contacted my office.
Q Did you have an opportunity to review collateral materials in preparation for meeting with

Brendan?
A I did.
Q Can you describe what those materials were?
A Uh, it -- it was, uh, sheriff, uh, transcript regarding his, uh, being interrogated. And I also viewed the actual video of -- of those -- some individuals call them interviews when they're victims, interrogations when they're suspects. Uh, I viewed that as well. And I, subsequently, reviewed, after my report was prepared, uh, school records regarding, uh, Mr. Dassey, Brendan, that date back at least to fourth grade. If not, before.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, if I may, and I don't mean to -- I don't mean to interpose an objection, but when he indicates reviewing videotapes, if he could explain the dates of those interview videotapes so that we know what interview he was talking about, that might be helpful for us as well.

THE COURT: That's fair. If you're going to be alluding to materials that are dated, Dr. Gordon, why don't you, as part of your answer, reference the date.

A Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Do you want me to do that now?

THE COURT: Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: The, uh, written narrative was based on inter -- an interview that took place on February 27, 2006. I may have reviewed another one as well. I don't recall. But I know one was based on an interview of -- or interrogation of February 27, 2006 -- 2006.

Q Did you have an opportunity to review a DVD of a videotaped statement on March 1, 2006?

A Yes.
Q And you indicated you'd also reviewed a number of school records as well; correct?

A I sure did.
Q And at one point were you provided with tran -or a -- copies of a CD involving phone calls from the jail?

A I was.
Q Before you conducted any -- well, let me ask you this: Did you conduct any tests on Brendan Dassey?

A Yes.
Q Now, before you conducted those tests, did you also perform a mental status examination of

Brendan Dassey?
A I did.
Q Why is it important to do a mental status evaluation of $a, ~ u h, ~ i n d i v i d u a l ? ~$

A Well, it's important because it's -- it's important because it's advisable to obtain a variety of sources of clinical information, both collateral, as well as testing, as well as interview, in order to conduct a comprehensive evaluation to com -- in order to come up with the most reliable and valid conclusion as possible.

Q What observations, if any, did you have following your mental status evaluation of Brendan Dassey?

A Uh, Brendan Dassey's thought process was slow. He was -- there was, even in the interview, indication of mild to moderate mental impairment. He was slow to respond. His eye contact was poor. His affect was bland. To put that -- his affect was blah. To put it unprofessionally.

He, uh -- there wàs -- a mental status evaluation also often includes a -- a history. A social history. And he has a history of -- of, uh, learning problems, as I noted, per his report, confirmed by collateral data.
He also talked to me about feeling very
anxious and a loner in school, having few friends, and feeling anxious, for example, when getting up to talk before a class, uh, he felt very socially phobic and, uh, uncomfortable, and alienated from friends.

Q Is the information that you, um, obtained through the mental status examination important, uh, to consider, as a forensic psychologist, prior to or during the time that you perform additional tests?

A It's important to consider it prior to or during the administration of additional tests, because I have, at my office, for example, 150 tests, and you want to tailor-make the evaluation, to use tests that most directly address a given case.

I mean, there's some tests that I would always use in a suggestibility evaluation. Such as Gudjonsson, for example. But there might be others that I would include, depending on the interview and the initial results of the initial testing. And, then, I might add others as well.

Q So, would it be fair to state that, for instance, a person, um, uh -- if, after you interviewed the person, and they appeared to be of average or below average intelligence, you may not need to
use tests that want to examine them for profound mental retardation?

A Well, if they had average intelligence, I would -- I might confirm it with a -- I might have confirmed it with abbreviated IQ testing. If it was a person who was profoundly mentally retarded, they wouldn't have the capability of formulating attempt to commit a crime, and they would be in an institution, having their own personal daily needs taken care of. So, if --

Q So you're not going to have somebody who's profoundly mentally retarded, for instance, complete the evaluations or probably read at a significant level?

A Well, they won't -- they won't even be charged with a crime.

Q Uh, just in, Doctor -- in regards to your evaluation, Doctor, you wouldn't provide those type of tests that don't fit -- appear to fit the personality of the individual you're examining?

A True.
Q Okay. Can you briefly describe what tests you did conduct in regards to your evaluation of Brendan Dassey?

A Yes. The one, uh -- do you want me to talk about the

Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale?
Q However you wish to start. Did -- did -- do you want to go chronologically with the tests that you performed?

A I have a list of them right here. I'm going to go straight from the top to the bottom, if that's okay? That's fine.

A Uh, one is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, adolescent version. It's based on a der -- uh, derivation. It's -- it was altered and normed with thousands of subjects, uh, from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, which had originally came out in the 1930's by Starke and Hathaway, psychiatrists and psychologists, respectively, from the University of Minnesota.

It was subsequently revised as the MMPI-2, because they needed a more representative cross-section of individuals who, uh, represent the United States population, and they changed some, uh, given questions, and they re-normed it.

And, then, at the same time, uh, James Butcher, uh, who did -- was instrumental on that, as well as Robert Archer, two psychologists, uh, came up with the MMPI-A, which is the most widely used and researched objective
test of adolescent emotional problems. It has many specific scales on it that one can review to form conclusions.

Q Why did you choose this test, for instance, in your evaluation of Brendan Dassey?

A One is because it's so well-respected and wellresearched. Secondly, it -- it comes -- it has scales on it that relate to suggestibility. Such as, uh, passivity, social avoidance, social alienation, uh, anxiety. Uh -- or, in contrast, those that aren't indicative of suggestibility, which would be the absence of those, but, instead, it would be a person that's assertive, or aggressive, or even that would -- those factors could be evaluated from the MMPI.

Q How many questions are involved in the -- in the MMPI?

A I was supposed to look that up, wasn't I? I -- I believe 566 or 567 .

Q And -- and how do you assess the answers?
A But it might be -- I'm sorry to interrupt. It -- it might be shorter on the MMPI. I might be talking about the MMPI-2 with my prior answer.

Q Do -- do you recall how many questions you asked of Brendan when you performed the MMPI-A?

A I administered the entire test. So, it was at least, uh, 450 questions long or more.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I'll stipulate it's 478 questions.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: All right.
Q (By Attorney Fremgen) And how do you go about assessing the answers that the individual, for instance, in this case, Brendan, provided to you?

A Well, I used the true/false questions and see which items, per scale, were scored in a given direction which would cause a scale, such as depression, or anxiety or social introversion, to be lower or higher. And then I put it on a graph.

I also used the validity scale scores to, um, ascertain whether the profile is valid. Whether it's accurate in terms of prescript -- in terms of describing a person's personality.

Q In regards to assessing the test, then, would you base your opinion on, let's say, any one answer of the 478 questions or a small number of answers?

A Absolutely not.
Q Why not?
A Well, the test is constructed so that one looks at
scales, not at individual answers, because, taken out of context, a person's true or false answer to a given question could -- or provide, uh, confusing results, and it's just -- it's not proper protocol. It's not the way that -- that we're instructed to do that as psychologists, uh, to -- in order to render reliable conclusions.

Q I'm going to place on the screen Exhibit 229. In performing the MMPI, were you able to obtain results to the tests provided to Brendan?

A Yes.
Q And what were those results?
A Well, the results -- there are approx -- there are probably -- there are ten basic clinical scales, but there are probably 100 or 50 supplemental scales that can be interpreted. All were within the average range, including the validity scale, showing that the profile was valid.

All were in the average range except for four, and those were the ones that you see on that screen.

Q Can you, uh -- I believe you have a pointer.
A I don't want to blind anybody here. Okay.
Q And, so I'm clear, you were able to assess Brendan on a number of topics and found him to be
average in many of those -- those areas?
A I assessed him on a number of scales, and all of them were in the -- within the average range except for four.

Q And -- and these are the four here?
A Yes, sir.
Q Why were these four, in particular, um, important to note in regards to your evaluation of Brendan?

A Well, I'll point out the one that was not hypochontri -- hypochondriasis. That's not particularly related to suggestibility.

Q Why did you include that on this --
A I just wanted to be straight forward and honest and -- and say the scores that were high. I didn't want to leave any out. What -- what is hypochondriasis? It's, uh, either a person that has significant -- has a person's -- who has significant concern about bodily functioning, health, and, sometimes, it can be because they have bona fide, real health concerns. Cancer, migraine headaches, or whatever. Or it can be that they don't have physical symptoms, but they have a concern with their health anyway, or stress-related symptoms, and, then, that score would be elevated in those cases.

Q So even though this doesn't have any, uh, um, relevance to the issue of suggestibility, you included it, uh, because it was in the top four of the high scores?

A I present information that is un -- that's abnormal.
Q Okay. Can -- can you then go through the other three? I'm going -- going to -- I don't want to put words in your mouth, Doctor, but were these the three that you felt were important in consideration of the suggestibility issue?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Can you, uh, go through your results, first with, I guess, the top?

A The top one is social avoidance. The T-score was 72. It's easier to explain the percentile of one.

Q What -- first of all, if you can, can you describe what is per -- percentile and what is the significance of percentile?

A I can. Out of 100 individuals who would have taken that test, 99 out of a hundred would have scored in a more normal range than did Brendan.

Q And, so, for instance, on the social avoidance, 99 would have scored at a more normal range? And of social avoidance or of being --

A Social --

Q -- socially --
A -- avoidance.
Q Okay. What is the significance in -- in regards to that in your assess -- assessment of suggestibility?

A Individuals who have social problems, who are passive, who are withdrawn, have a greater likelihood of being suggestible.

Q What -- what's the next category that you looked at with the MMPI-A?

A Well, I'd like to skip down, if I could, please, to social introversion. Uh, the reason being, that social introversion is a separate scale from social avoidance, and you rely on different questions that go into those scales from the MMPI-A, but they're still, basically, evaluating the same thing. Social withdrawal, social avoidance. And on that particular one, for social introversion, his percentile was 2.3. In other words, uh, roughly, uh, 97 people -- 97 adolescents out of 100 would have scored in a norm -- more normal fashion. A lower fashion than he on that scale.

Q So he is more socially introverted than 97 others; is that correct?

A Accor -- according to this scale, yes.

Q And, then, there was one other scale that you looked at?

A Yes. And that's social alienation. And social alienation, his score was 1.5 percentile. Again, uh, $981 / 2$, if we could call half -- $981 / 2$ individuals would score on a more normal range on that scale than did Brendan.

Social alienation is different than the other two, because a person who is socially avoidant and socially introverted would tend to be socially alienated. They would be cut off from those with whom they interact and avoided by those with whom they interact, because they don't reach out, and they -- and so they're -- they're just alienated from -- from people who could be, otherwise, friends, or they -- they live, not psychotically, but they live in their own world, alienated from society, so to speak.

Q These scales, these terms, are these your terms or are these terms that you receive from the tests?

A They're straight from the MMPI manual, and the, uh, from the manual and scales from the MMPI.

Q The test preparers?
A The test preparers.

Q What -- what other tests did you, uh, administer for Brendan, or to Brendan?

A Well, I think I'll -- I'm sorry. I think I'll skip the suggestibility scale and I'll skip down to the 16-PF. The $16-\mathrm{PF}$ was developed 15 years ago at the University of Illinois by a psychologist by the name of Dr. Raymond Cattell.

He did what a -- what's known as factor analysis. He put down a number of normal questions that would -- that would measure normal traits of normal individuals, and then he did a statistical procedure to pull out similarities of those items. And he found 16 factors, um, and one global factor. So, one, the global factor, overall factors, the accommodation, independence.

The other two on the exhibit there, shy and deferential versus socially bold and dominant, are factors -- one of the -- two of the 16 factors contained on the instrument that measures normal personality traits.

Q How does this test assist you in, uh, developing an opinion or determining whether someone might be vulnerable to suggestion?

A Review of research shows that individuals who are accommodating, that is, dependent, shy, differential,
more passive, have a greater chance of being -substan -- depending on the degree that it's shown, is substantially greater chance of being suggestible.

And that comes from research, and, also, uh, my training, and the books that I've reviewed, and the research I've done online, suggest the very use of this test showed this, and to review the outcome on these three particular scales.

Q What, uh, results did you obtain from this test in regards to Brendan?

A Well, unfortunately, I don't have, and wasn't able to easily obtain, the percentile. So, all I can do is show to the jury that for accommodation, he's on the lower end of the scale. Not every one, but, still, the lower end of the scale on accommodation, the lower end of the scale on shy, and the over -- the lower end of the scale for being deferential, or passive, which are all consistent with each other and are consistent, by the way, with the MMPI results.

Q What other tests did you perform in regards to -to Brendan?

A I performed, also, the, uh, State Trait Expression, uh, beg your pardon. The State Trait Anger Expression Inventory, which is an objective test that
measures normal and abnormal ways of expressing anger.

Why did you choose that test to conduct in regards to -- to this evaluation of Brendan?

A Well, I wanted to see if he was angry. If a person is angry and dominant, then they tend to not be suggestible. If they -- if the score shows that they're passive, and deal with their anger by keeping it to themselves, or not really being angry very often, then that would, again, be related to -- to suggestibility.

Q What results, if any, did you determine in regards to this test as it applied to Brendan?

A The test scores showed that he is passive and, uh, subdued.

Q Before I go to the next test, you -- let me go back to the $16-\mathrm{PF}$, and, I suppose, possibly, in regards to the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory -- um, you -- at the end of your -- as you were finishing test -- testifying as to the 16-PF, you said that it's also important to consider this test as a way to validate the MMPI to see if it's consistent; is that correct?

A It's important to synthesize all of the different tests into one conclusion and consider all of them,
yes.
Q So, let me ask you this, hypothetically; if, for instance, you had performed four tests, and three seemed to be consistent, but one seemed to be well away from what you've seen thus far, would that offer you some concern in the tests -testing of the individual?

A It would not -- it would cause me concern on how to most accurately synth -- put together those results into a -- an opinion.

Q So it had an impact on your final opinion?
A It would. Absolutely.
Q Want to pull the mike a little closer?
A Absolutely.
Q Sorry for interrupting you. Let's go -- we'll go to the next set of tests that you performed?

A Yes.
Q And what was that?
A Well, I performed two, uh, IQ tests. One is the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence. And it originally came from David Wechsler, uh, in 1932, at the -- in a Bellevue clinic, and it was called the Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Test established in 1939.

> Um, since then, it's been revised and
abbreviated as well. And the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence, uh, reliably assesses intellectual functioning, IQ, of adults and children.

Q Now, I have on the screen Exhibit 228. Does that indicate, uh, results of those two intelligence quotient tests?

A I don't know if the jury can read it, so I -- I would need to read it, I believe, without blinding the court reporter.

Q How's that?
A That's good. Now, to explain the top part, if you'd like me to --

Q Please.
A It shows an average IQ is 100. That's why 50 people out of a hundred would score higher -- who obtain a score of higher of a hundred and 50 would score lower than a hundred.

Then, from 90 down to 70 , or, actually, from 90 down to 84 , is the low average range of intelligence. From 70 --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, if I may, on what scale is he referring to? That 90 to 84 is low average. If he's talking about Wechsler or Kaufman, I'd like him to -- to state that.

THE COURT: All right. Can you identify which of the -- the tests, uh, reflect those scores?

THE WITNESS: The Kaufman has an IQ score of 83 , which is not a test that I described yet, but it's comparable to the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence.

Q (By Attorney Fremgen) Doctor, I'm sorry to interrupt you. I think the question by the prosecutor, the objection, was, is the base used to evaluate the actual results the same on the Wechsler and Kaufman? That is, is the base of what is average 100, what is below average, what you've said was 90 to 84, and probably the other numbers on the scale, the same scale used in completing a base for the purposes of interpreting the results in both the Kaufman and the Wechsler?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Now, if you could continue -- I'm sorry to interrupt you -- in regards to what the, uh, actual results were with Brendan and how they compare to the base -- base scale?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, if -- if I may just sharpen my -- my point, I wanted to make sure that
this doctor was saying that, on the Wechsler Scale, 90 to 84 is considered below average. I think that's what he said. And I want to make sure that was, in fact, your testimony.

THE WITNESS: My testimony is, based on the diagnóstic and statistical manual of mental disorders, which shows that individuals who have IQ's of 84 -- 70 to 84 -- is one facet of diagnosing a mental -- uh, borderline mental intelligence. On the other hand, according to Wechsler norms, a score of 70 to 80 is in the borderline range.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I may, then, Judge, I am going to object as -- as irrelevant. If he's saying the Wechsler Scale goes all the way down to 80 for low average, doesn't go to 84, and that's what this chart says, that would, uh -- would -would be irrelevant. If he's using some other thing to score it with, like the DSM-4, which I now heard, uh, that's something other than this chart purports. And I would interpose an objection.

THE COURT: Mr. Fremgen?
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Well, I can ask the doctor some more foundation questions as to the chart, itself, that he created.

THE COURT: I -- I think we're going to have to do that. And I'll rule -- I'll -- I'll withhold ruling on the objection.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge.
Q (By Attorney Fremgen) Doctor, you -- you provided this, um -- a chart that was used to make the Exhibit 228; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you included both the Wechsler and the Kaufman intelligence quotient on results and the tests on the one chart; correct?

A Correct.
Q Why is it that they're both combined? Or why is it you felt necessary to combine both to one exhibit?

A To make it simpler to understand, and be -- and I used the Wechsler -- I mean, I used the DSM-4, uh, norms, simply because that's what's commonly used, and if $I$ would not use those, individuals would be asking me why I didn't use those, because in every mental status and psychiatric report under the, uh -that comes out for clinical and forensic reasons, they ask precisely what a person's diagnosis is on the DSM-4.

Q Well, again, if we can set aside DSM-4 for just a

```
    moment --
    A I'm sorry.
    Q -- specifically, regards to Wechsler and Kaufman,
    is there a base scale under the Kaufman
    Intelligence Test?
    A No.
    Q Is there a base scale from the Wechsler?
    A You mean base scale on how to divide it into
    categories?
    Q Correct.
    A Uh, yes.
    Q Okay. Under Kaufman?
    A No.
    Q Just on Wechsler?
    A Yes.
    Q So -- so this scale, then, is actually the
    Wechsler?
    A This -- the scores are from the Wechsler and Kaufman.
    Q No. I'm sorry, Doctor. The scale, not the
        score.
    A Oh, I'm sorry.
    Q It's this document, here, where it says IQ
        percentile, is this actually the Wechsler?
    A No.
                                ATTORNEY KRATZ: Renew my objection, Judge.
```

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Is it --
THE COURT: I understand. Hold on a second here. This is going to get terribly confusing unless the witness can segregate, one, what's on this test. What -- what -- what -- or, excuse me. What's on the exhibit in the graphic portion of the exhibit? What that reflects. And, two, if that's different than -- than Wechsler test as it appears to --

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: I understand, Judge. THE COURT: -- be, uh, that -- that he, then, explains that as well. Now, can he do that?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: I'm going to ask the doctor that.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
(By Attorney Fremgen) Doctor, can you
distinguish the two? The Wechsler versus the Kaufman?

A Yes.
Q And without using the exhibit, Doctor, did you have -- come to any conclusions with regards to the evaluation of Brendan pertaining to the Wechsler Intelligence Test?

A It's my conclusion that he is in the borderline range of intelligence.

What score did he -- do you recall what score he, um, you -- you calculated in regards to that test?

A Which one again?
Q Kaufman?
A Kaufman was 83.
Q And you indicated that's in the average or below average scale?

A That's in the borderline range.
Q Borderline.
A According to --
Q Can you describe what borderline means?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Again, Judge, borderline from what scale? I -- I have to ask.

ATTORNEY EREMGEN: The question was in regards to Wechsler. And if the prosecutor would listen to the answer, he would have heard him say that scale.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We'll -- we'll hear if it's the Wechsler Scale. Go ahead, Doctor.

THE WITNESS: I misspoke. According to the Wechsler Scale, it's in the low average range. The lower end of the low average range.

Q What significance does that have, being in the lower average range?

A It means -- well, since he's in the lower end of the low average range, the significance means that he has problems as shown in his school records with, uh -and his need for special education, his problems with, uh, learning, problems with concentration, problems with -- with functioning at an intellectual level that's -- that's in the average range.

Q What is the percentile? Is there -- or, should -- I should ask you, is there a percentile associated with the score Brendan received on the Wechsler test?

A There may be. I don't have it written down. I think it may have been on the chart that you took off the screen. I know it was there. I don't have that written down.

Q Do you have any, uh, notes with you as to those results?

A No. Well, I may. I may.
Q Doctor, did you --
A I -- I do.
Q Okay.
A I do. And that's at the, uh, 10th percentile.
Q What significance does the percentile have? Or how -- how can you -- can you describe what that significance is in regards to, uh, evaluating the
intelligence test results pertaining to Brendan?
A On the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale -- Scale of Intelligence, 90 people out of a hundred -- 90 adolescents in -- in his own age group -- would have performed intellectually better than he.

Q Now, I'm going to ask you in regards to the Kaufman test.

A Yes, sir.
Q And, again, these are both, for lack of a better term, an IQ test?

A True.
Q In regards to the Kaufman test, what, uh, results did you, uh, formulate, uh, when you provided the test to Brendan?

A He had a composite, an overall IQ compound score, overall IQ score, of 83, which is at the 13th percentile.

Q And, again, what significance does that percentile have in your, uh, evaluation of Brendan?

A It shows that, uh, he has intellectual shortcomings to the point that 87 adolescents his age would have performed better on that test than he did.

Q Why perform two intelligence tests on Brendan?
A I, uh -- this is an important case. I wanted to be
thorough. I wanted to do it right.
Q Were the two results consistent?
A Yes.
Q What I mean by that, I suppose, be more specific, consistent with each other?

A True.
Q And, previously, you mentioned you were
performing a number of tests in order to determine, for one, whether or not your results were consistent throughout the tests. Was this test results consistent with other observations you, um, uh, or the other observations from the other tests?

A Not necessarily. Uh, I could say that a individual with lower IQ might be more likely to be more passive, more uninvolved. But, sometimes, individuals with lower IQ don't want to be embarrassed about their low IQ and act out, uh, and cause trouble so that they -- their low IQ isn't seen to others, and so they're not exposed. So I really can't say it's related.

Q So, now, you're not saying, then, that a person with low IQ is necessarily suggestible; correct?

A Sometimes. Within extremely low IQ score, they -that could be a very significant factor. Uh, but
you're -- but, usually, uh, I -- a person would still administer an entire battery.

Q So one test, in and of itself, wouldn't be enough for you to make an opinion on whether a person is vulnerable to suggestion?

A It wouldn't be enough for me. And I don't think it would be enough for the majority of forensic psychologists who are experienced in assisting the court and juries.

Q Would the IQ test, in and of itself, be enough for you in making that determination?

A In this case?
Q Yes.
A No.
Q Did you perform any other tests in relation to your evaluation of Brendan Dassey?

A Yes, I did.
Q And what test was that?
A That was the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales. The reason it's plural is there are two scales -- two scales that haven't been normed to the degree that they're helpful in this particular kind of hearing. Two have been normed to the point where they're alternate forms. So you could give one form to a person one week, and another form to a
person another week, and -- and they -- they're just alternate forms and we'll get the same results.

Q Can you briefly describe this test?
A Yes. It was constructed, like I said, uh, by Gisli Gudjonsson in the early 80's to deal with interrogative suggestibility. Uh, rather than define that, which is a lot of words, and I don't think it would be that helpful, I -- I would just say that there are two aspects of interrogative suggestibility. Uh, suggestibility when a person is being interrogated. And that's what it assesses.

And there are two aspects. One is yield and one is shift.

Q Could you describe, or define, what is "yield" in the Gudjonsson Suggestible Scale?

A Yield is when a person answers in a -- provides a response to a leading question. Even respond -provides a response to a leading question which is not facts that have been presented to them. They haven't -- they don't know about that. Or they're -it's an incorrect statement.

Q What is "shift" under the Gudjonsson -Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale?

A Well, shift -- the -- the individual is -- is read
a -- is presented as a memory test, and they're read a crime scene. And, then, they're asked to repeat it.

Then, later on, it could be immediately or later on, up to half hour, 45 minutes, you ask the questions again. Or you ask questions based on that -- on the story. And you see whether they answer in a, yes, fashion to leading questions.

Then, after that is done, then you exert mild pressure, or mild criticism to them by saying -- I could pull out the exact --

Q No, that's okay. If you can just recall from your memory?

A But it's something to the point where, um, subject, uh, you have, uh, made a number of errors. I know you can do better. I need you to think about this more carefully. And I'm going to ask you the same questions and $I$ want you to do better this time.

And, then, the shift is the degree to -the number of times that a person changes their answer from the first question -- time they're questioned to the second time they're questioned with the very same questions.

Q Now, I have on the screen, Exhibit 230. Is this
the results that you received when you performed the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale on Brendan?

A Yes.
Q And if you could just -- you've already defined shift and yield. If you could indicate the significance of the other three, um, categories; "score", "percentile", and "average"?

A Sure. On the yield, which should be at the -- it's the first set of 25 questions that are asked. Five questions are related. They're just neutral questions. So they're -- on the -- but on the yield, 15 questions are yield questions. And he answered in a yielding fashion, in terms of leading questions, 7 times.

On the shift, he changed his answers 9 times out of 20 potential questions.

And, then, the average individual taking the test would shift -- would yield to leading questions 4 times out of 15 , and 2 times they would change their answers when they were read the questions again, 2 times out of 20 of the questions that are designed to measure that.

Uh, so the difference here is 2 and 9 and 4 and 7, resulting in a percentile score that individuals taking that test, only three out of

100 would shift their answers more than Brendan did. And only 20 out of 100 would yield their questions. To give in and go along with leading questions more than Brendan.

So, he had a greater tendency to shift his answers due to pressure than he did, simply, answer them when there were leading questions without pressure.

The way you get the total score, is you add up the shift and the yield to get a total score of 16. And, so, the average person would get a score of 7 , and the percentile for the total of these two, for the total score, would be 95. Five people out of one hundred would obtain more yielding and shifting responses than did he. Ninety-five would not.

Q Was this the last test that you performed or conducted on Brendan in regards to your evaluation as to whether he was vulnerable to suggestion?

A Yes.
Q And, based upon these results and the mental status, uh, examination, as well as other collateral information, were you able to reach, uh, an opinion as to whether or not Brendan is,
uh, a person who is vulnerable to suggestion?
A Yes.
Q Is that opinion to a reasonable degree of psychological certainty?

A Yes.
Q And what is that opinion you have?
A It's my opinion that -- that he's highly suggestible, uh, when being interrogated, in responding to leading questions or pressure, mild pressure, if that, in fact, is present.

Q Is that based -- your opinion based solely on the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale or a combination of the other tests, the series of tests, that you performed on Brendan?

A It's based on my knowledge of the research, based on the -- the, uh, collateral data that we've talked about. It's based on all of the personality tests that I used, and IQ tests that I used, and it's also based on the Gudjonsson Scale.

Q Would it be -- as a forensic psychologist, would it be appropriate to consider just one test that was performed in isolation from the others?

A It would not be recommended practice. Even if a person had a substantially low IQ. Like I said at the very beginning of my testimony, this is -- these
are important matters that I testify before, and forensic psychologists testify about, and -- and to not do a thorough job and not to do anything less than that wouldn't be -- wouldn't be right, both ethically and by my own standards.

Q You had indicated before that you've, uh, performed similar evaluations on approximately five -- in approximately five other instances?

A At least that, yes.
Q Did you perform the exact same tests in each circumstance?

A No.
Q So some of the tests performed on Brendan you may have not -- you may not have used on others?

A Either because I did not possess them or because I acquired further information from seminars and -- and from my review of the literature that indicated that other tests might be more helpful to use as well.

Q Is the Gudjon -- Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale consistent within your evaluations?

A I did not use it on one -- at least one that I can think of. I -- I didn't have it at that point. It -- it was difficult to obtain. You ord -- you have to order it through New York and submit your credentials, via internet, to the -- to London, and
it's -- it's a unwielding process. But, finally, I did succeed. It took me about a year to get the test once I decided I wanted it. It should be made much -- I shouldn't give an editorial.

Q In reaching your conclusion, your opinion, were there any other factors that you considered, um, more probative than other factors in assessing Brendan's vulnerability to suggestion?

A No.
Q What --
A Not in this case.
Q Let me clarify your answer as -- would it be consistent, then, that you consider all factors probative?

A Uh, yes. And I -- I wouldn't be able to assign a percentage.

Q Do you recall what factors that you considered when you, uh, um, reached your conclusion as to Brendan's, uh level of vulnerability to suggestion?

A I considered all that I testified to, plus it -- the way in which the police asked -- the detective asked the questions, and, uh that's pretty much it.

Q Now --
A The length of time he was in custody. The -- the
soft room that he was in that made him more relaxed and comfortable to talk. Uh --

Q Let me ask you this: Are those factors that, in the research by Gudjonsson, is something to consider when assessing a person's, uh, vulnerability to suggestion?

A Yes.
Q And you touched upon a few. In fact, when I asked you to elaborate, you touched upon what I believe Gudjonsson refers to as circumstances of custody. Do you recall that? Touched upon duration and --

A Sure.
Q Why did -- well, what significance does duration of custody have in assessing an individual's, uh, uh, level of susceptibility to suggestion?

A The longer they're in custody, the more anxious they probably become, the more fatigued they become, and the more susceptible they become to offering a confession, whether it be false or true. Just to offering a confession when they otherwise might not have.

Q Are you familiar with the length of custody in regards to Brendan in -- in -- in regards to the statement made on May -- March 1, 2006?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, if I may interpose an objection. I think "custody" is a legal term. If that could be expressed in some other way, I'd appreciate that.

THE COURT: Well --
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: That's fine. I'll rephrase -- I'll rephrase. That's fine, Judge.

Q (By Attorney Fremgen) The duration of the interview process, would that -- you understand what I'm asking you, Doctor?

A Yes.
Q How long he was there with the officers?
A I believe it was in the neighborhood of four hours on at least one occasion.

Q But, approximately, you believe it was around four hours?

A Yes.
Q Does the length of the police presence, and that I -- I shall try to define better. The length of time that the individual is with the police, is that a factor under Gudjonsson's research to consider in assessing a person's level of suggestibility?

A Yes.
Q And are you familiar with how long the police had
been involved with Brendan prior to making the March 1, 2006, statement?

A I don't know for sure, but $I$ think it was at least several days. That I don't have committed to memory.

Q Again, in regards to the Gudjonsson research, what other factors does the Gudjonsson, um, suggest to, for lack of a better term, that re -that forensic psychologists or person's performing evaluations consider as a factor in pertaining to their opinions about suggestibility?

A Uh, sleep deprivation, um --
Q Well, let's go through each one. Was that a consideration in this case?

A No.
Q Okay.
A Another is the way in which the interrogation was conducted.

Q Is that something that you considered, again, in reaching your conclusions in this case?

A Yes. I reviewed the, uh, written data, as well as reviewed the, uh, CDs.

Q And -- and in that regard, are you referring, specifically, to this issue of yield and shift from the scale?

A Yes.
Q And I'll get back to that. What other, uh, factors does Gudjonsson -- Gudjonsson recommend using by the evaluator?

A Well, considering whether promises were made, whether a person was told of -- that the case was an absolute certainty that they would be found guilty. Whether they were told that there were other in -- there was other information that showed their guilt when it did not -- was not present. When they appealed to different themes of -- such as, uh, we know you really didn't -- minimizing the serious, we know you really didn't mean to do this, or we know you're -you're -- weren't really an active participant, or we know you wouldn't have done this. Now, if you had it to do over again, or your family will be spared a lot.

Uh, there are all kinds of different themes that can be developed by an interrogator to increase the likelihood of that occurring. And, then, as the person generally weakens and -and get -- and becomes fatigued, there's a greater chance that they will then give a statement.

The likelihood of retraction is very
great in cases like this when this is a confession. That's why, uh, it's important to consider whether a written statement was derived from it. Um --

Q Let -- let me get back to -- I'll -- I'll -- I'll have some specific questions for you. But let me get back to -- you were talking about techniques or interrogation style. Um, now, again, I -- if I recall correctly, this has something to do with yield and shift; correct?

A That's true.
Q Now, did you note any of those specific, uh, if you recall, if $I$ might summarize it, as being, you said, leading questions, for instance, and praising or -- or, um, uh, feelings types of questions?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Let me ask you, again, you reviewed the March 1, 2007 -- or, sorry, 2006 statement; correct?

A Correct.
Q I'm going to show you what has been marked as 216. Do you recall also receiving that transcript of the March 1, 2006, video state -statement?

A Yes.
Q As an example, I'd like you to turn to page 615?
A I am -- I found the page.
Q Three down. I guess it would be three names down. I think it starts, "Fassbender." That's a large paragraph.

A I see that.
Q If you could, uh, begin reading from, "again --
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I'm going to -excuse me. I'd like to interpose an objection. Uh, and if we could approach or if I could be heard outside the presence of the jury, I'd appreciate it. We can probably do it by approaching.

THE COURT: All right. Approach.
(Discussion off the record)
(By Attorney Fremgen) I'm sorry. Doctor, do you have before you, now, that same transcript?

A I do.
Q Okay. You're at page 615?
A I am.
Q And starting with, um, that same line where it's, "Fassbender," begins, "again," or -- could you read -- and it's a long paragraph. I'm not going to ask you to read the whole paragraph, but if you can read through to, I believe it's the
fourth sentence, where it starts, "I just don't see that." If you can read that, please? I'm sorry, read it out loud if you could?

A I -- I had to find out where I was supposed to stop. Q okay.

A Sorry.
Q That's fine.
A (As read) "Again, er, whether Blaine saw it or not, the time periods aren't adding up. They're not equaling out. We know whether -- we know when Teresa got there."

In parenthesis, "Brendan nods yes." End parenthesis. "Um, and, I know -- I guarantee ya, Teren -- Teresa's not standing on a porch when you come home from school."

Q Okay. Then, if you could skip down to where it says, "Brendan" right after that paragraph? And what is his -- what is the response?

A "I got off the bus. I walked down the road, and when I got to that thing, uh, the other house, I just sit in there for nothing. I can see her jeep in the garage just sitting there, and I didn't see Steven and her on the porch."

Q The next line that starts with "Wiegert?"
A "You -- you did or you didn't?"

Q And then "Brendan?"
A "I didn't."
Q Okay. Is this an example, for instance, of the -- the two -- one of the two phenomenons, yield or shift?

A Yes.
Q And what is it?
A It's a phenomenon -- uh, I -- I -- it may be leading in terms of -- it -- it's likely both. And --

Q I'm -- I'm sorry. You said likely both?
A Both.
Q It -- it's -- and is that possible when you're doing, uh, an evaluation under Gudjonsson, that you might have something that is a kind of a hybrid of both?

A On the high -- on the Gudjonsson, it -- the -- only measures leading to keep it pure and shift. Uh, it doesn't have the two combined. But in real life, oftentimes questions contain both. There's mild pressure, as well, of some sort, or mild attempts to have a shift along with com -- combination with a leading question with a --

Q And in this example, was Brendan's answer a shift?

A It was both.

Q A response to leading -- to yield and to shift?
A Yes.
Q Back on 615, Doctor, the same paragraph, that large paragraph, where it begins "Fassbender?"

A Yes.
Q Near the very end of that paragraph, it -- it begins, "I can tell you, we don't believe." Can you read that line?

A (As read) "I can tell you, we don't believe you because there's some things that are wrong, but you got to tell the truth."

Q And, again, is that that factor you were discussing in consideration of yield and shift?

A That's in consideration of a shift.
Q That's the interrogation factor that you were talking about?

A True.
Q Let me ask you if you could skip to page 587?
A I'm there.
Q And if you could go eight lines down? Starts with -- the person speaking is -- it says, "Wiegert?"

A Yes.
Q If you could read from there until I ask you to stop?

A How many lines down?
Q Uh, eight. Starts with, "Wiegert." It starts, "So Steve stabs."

A Okay. (As read) "So Steve -- Steve stabs her first and then you cut her neck."
"Brendan" -- in parenthesis, "Brendan nods, uh, yes." End parenthesis.
"What else happens to her in her head?"
"Fassbender: It's extremely, extremely important you tell us this for us to believe you."
"Wiegert: Come on, Brendan, what else?"
"Pause."
"Fassbender: We know. We just know.
You need to tell us."
Q I'm sorry. Could you read that line again?
A "We know. We just need you to tell us."
"Brendan: That's all I can remember."
"Wiegert: "All right. I'm just going to come out and ask you, who shot her in the head?"

```
"Brendan: He did."
"Fassbender --
```

Q That's -- that's fine, Doctor, right there.
A I'm sorry.

Q And - and -- and, again, at that point, is -Uh, my question is, essentially, the same as before. Is this an example of the yield or shift that you were describing previously in the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale?

A Shift.
Q And -- and why is it shift?
A Because there's pressure to give a statement rather than merely elicit information.

Q And I'm going to ask just one last example. If you could skip to page 574?

A Yes, sir.
Q If you, uh, go seven lines down. Again, it starts with Officer Wiegert. And it says, "We know what happened." Start with that line?

A (As read) "Wiegert: We know what hap -- we know happened."
"Fassbender: It's hard to be truthful."
"Wiegert: We know what happened. It's okay. What did you do?"
"Brendan: I didn't do nothing."
"Brendan. Brendan. Brendan, come on, what did you do?"

That's what it says.
Q If you can go a little further?

A (As read) "Fassbender: What does Steven make you do?"
"Wiegert: It's not your fault. He makes you do it."
"Brendan: He told me to do her."
Q And at that point, again, are -- is this, again, an example of these lines, uh, the officers' questions, and the responses, example of the technique you were referring to in how one shifts their answers or yields?

A It's an example of using a theme of minimizing, uh, responsibility or culpability or seriousness of a crime, and being sympathetic in an attempt to have a person answer leading questions.

Q Okay. And that's the yield that you're describing on Gudjonsson?

A Yes.
Q I won't go through any further examples, but would it be fair to state that you did review both transcripts, as well as the tape and observed other examples?

A I certainly did.
Q I -- what I want to go back to is, uh, some additional factors that you considered in regards to, uh, your evaluation. Did you consider
character of the defendant? His age, for instance?

A Yes.
Q And what significance does his age have on your opinion that he is, uh, um, susceptible to suggestion?

A Individuals, who are minors, have a greater likelihood of being susceptible, especially, even when they're older minors, i.e., or, that is 15 or 16, uh, they have a much higher likelihood of being susceptibil -- susceptible, especially when they're -- when that's coupled with low intellectual functioning.

Q Does a lack of life experiences or maturity level also impact?

A It's --
Q On that decision?
A Yes.
Q Were you able to -- well, do you have any opinion in regards to Brendan, as far as lack of life experiences or maturity level?

A His life experiences are limited because of his social withdrawal and social alienation, and his living within -- within himself and within a -mostly relating to his family, not friends.

Q Does one's familiarity with the police, is that a factor to consider based on the research of -- in the Gudjonsson, um, research in formulating an opinion on one's susceptibility to suggestion?

A Based on Gudjonsson research and others, yes, that's true.

Q And was that a consideration with you when you spoke to -- when you rate -- uh, reached your conclusions about Brendan?

A Yes.
Q How so?
A Individuals, who have minimal or no contact -- with no criminal history, have a greater chance of -- or a greater susceptibility to being suggestible.

Q Does anxiety -- is that a factor to consider, uh, in the research or in the Gudjonsson research when reaching your conclusions as to susceptibility to suggestion?

A Yes.
Q And was that a factor in this case when you met with Brendan?

A Yes, because both state anxiety, anxiety at the time of an incident, of an interview, as well as trait anxiety, whether a person has a trait of being anxious, in general, during their life, is correlated
with increased suggestibility as well. In regards to, uh, learning disabilities, is that a factor that you would consider in reaching your conclusion?

A Yes.
Q And was that a factor in this case?
A Brendan told me that it was a factor during the interview, and I, subsequently, had an opportunity to review about two inches, uh, worth of, uh -- two inches of collateral data from the school system showing that he had been having substantial learning problems, and special programming, and individual education programs throughout his education.

Or, I should restate. At least that -back to fourth grade. Maybe earlier. And it was pointed out to me.

Q But -- but you only had the material back to fourth grade?

A I believe so.
Q Um, would you consider any one of these characteristics, or traits, individual? Away from the -- I guess the context of it in its totality when making your determination whether one is susceptible to suggestion?

A No.

Q Why not?
A It's essential to do a comprehensive evaluation to get the most accurate -- have the most accurate, valid conclusions to let this jury know what the status is of Brendan's suggestibility, or lack thereof. And to do that, I administered a variety of tests, as do other forensic psychologists, who do this type of work, to provide that information.

Q When you reached your conclusion that you've previously stated, did you consider all of these factors?

A I should answer out loud. Absolutely.
Q Is the factor -- is another factor to consider, memory or memory deficits?

A It is.
Q. Now, in that regard, did you actually perform any tests on Brendan to assess his memory?

A No.
Q Did you review any collateral information that might, uh, have, uh, assisted you in determining what level of -- or what type of memory he has?

A Yes.
Q And what were those records?
A Records were --
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, excuse me.

A -- school records.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm going to ask that that question be phrased before or after he's rendered his opinion in this case.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: That's fine.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: In other words, when they were -- when they were reviewed and -- and were they included in his opinion.

THE COURT: Go ahead. Rephrase it.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: That's fine.
Q (By Attorney Fremgen) And my question is, did you review any records that reflected upon Brendan's memory? Whether he has a deficit or not? And was -- did you review those before or after you performed your original evaluation of Brendan?

A That's two questions. I, uh reviewed documents regarding memory, but those documents were from the school, and they occurred after the time that I wrote a report summarizing my findings.

Q Did it impact -- did those additional records impact on your opinion?

A They reinforced, uh, and were consistent with my opinion.

Q In regard to your opinion, in case I may have
forgotten to ask, are all of your opinions today, in regards to Brendan, within a reasonable degree of psychological certainty?

A Yes.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, I have nothing else.

THE COURT: Uh, we'll break until 10:35. ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine.

THE COURT: Presumably you have some cross-examination questions?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I certainly do, Judge.
(Recess had at 10:15 a.m.)
(Reconvened at 10:38 a.m.)
THE COURT: Mr. Kratz.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY ATTORNEY KRATZ:
Q Good morning, Dr. Gordon. Thank you, once again, for -- for coming this morning.

A Good morning. My pleasure.
Q First of all, I want to talk about your profession, generally. That is, the profession of psychologist. Uh, it's not unusual for psychologists, whether clinical or forensic psychologists, to appear and testify in a court
proceeding; is that correct?
A No, it's not unusual.
Q Are there, however, rules of professional conduct for a practicing psychologist, similar to the rules of professional conduct that lawyers have to -- have to live by?

A I don't know if there -- whether there's rules. There are ethical standards and principles, yet, for both the American Psychological Association and, as promulgated by, uh, the, uh, forensic component that I referred to, of the APA.

Q All right. And I understood, at least from, uh, a last opportunity that you and I had to talk, uh, about this case, that, uh, you are vigilant in complying with those rules? In other words, and not to put too sharp a point on it, but, uh, you pride yourself in not just giving the answer that a client wants to hear, but, uh, in giving both sides, if, in fact, that is what the evidence points to; isn't that true?

A I try my best.
Q Do your, um, ethical rules, in fact, uh, prohibit or frown upon promising, um, what you might say in advance of being retained by a specific client?

A Yes.
Q Do they frown upon a prediction or an advanced, um, promise of what you might say in court or in a testimony kind of setting?

A They don't frown on saying whether the case seems like it's worthy of evaluation, but in terms of promising results in writing or at testimony, that's not proper.
Q. As an example, it's not proper to promise that you won't change your opinion, or you won't change your answer, as a result of what we're going to do now, which is cross-examination? That's true; isn't it?

A My opinion is my opinion. So, it -- it's not changing.

Q My question is, is it improper, uh, within your rules of professional, um, standards, to promise or predict that you will not change your opinion after being cross-examined in court?

A I can't answer that yes or no. It depends.
Q So, no matter what I might present to you, um, to the contrary, or what facts that I may, uh, present you, uh, do you still believe that you are open to revising the opinion that you have first, or during direct examination, furnished to
this jury?
A If I obtain additional research information or additional collateral data that I didn't have before, then that's true.

Q Okay. And I -- I think that's what I was -- that I -- that's what I was talking about. You talked about your qualifications on, uh, direct examination, and $u$, you have indicated that this is the first time, uh, that you've ever presented this suggestibility theory or the suggestibility findings before a jury; isn't that true?

A That is true.
Q And isn't it also true, Doctor, that, to your knowledge, since you're a forensic psychologist you may know this, this is the first time ever in Wisconsin that this kind of testimony's been offered to a jury?

ATTORNEY EREMGEN: I would object. I don't think that's necessarily accurate.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If he knows, Judge. If he doesn't know, I'll --

THE COURT: With that stipulation, go ahead, you can answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't honestly know.
Q (By Attorney Kratz) All right. The fact is,
though, Doctor, that when you talked about other psychologists that do this kind of work, and I -and that's a quote that I wrote down --

A Uh, uh, if I can go back to the prior question. I -I misstated.

Q Okay.
A I -- I did testify, on one occasion, up in Wausau, and it was before a jury regarding this very matter.

I for -- I forgot. I'm sorry.
Q Back to my original question. When you talked about others doing this kind of work, do you know of other psychologists, uh, in the state of Wisconsin, who are going around offering suggestibility testimony to juries?

A Going around and offering. I -- I don't know of other psychologists who are conducting such evaluations and providing information like this to the Court. Although, they may exist. I don't know. All right. Well, you -- you've told this jury about how well, um -- how well read you are, at least how you keep up on this particular area, uh, of, uh, forensic psychology. If that was something that was commonly done, or even in Wisconsin if it was something done, you'd likely know about it, wouldn't you?

A If was commonly done, that's true.
Q Let's talk about the specific tests that you did perform. Uh, I interposed some objections about the Wechsler, uh, test, and how it was scored or how it was scaled. Do you remember those objections?

A I do.
Q The, uh, original chart that was placed up there found Brendan to have a full scale Wechsler Intelligence, uh, score of 81. And at least your suggestion, uh, was that that fit within the borderline, um, intelligence category.

My question for you, Doctor, is, um, under the Wechsler, uh, scale itself, under the Wechsler, um, analysis of that particular IQ score, and I think you correct yourself, that he, in fact, fits in a category called low average; isn't that right?

A He's in the lower end of the low average, according to Wechsler's norms. True.

All right. Now, I'm going to be skipping pretty far ahead. But your eventual, um, opinion is going to be based, in large part, on something called the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale, which, as I understand, includes a consideration
of an individual's IQ level. Is that true?
A That's an in-- that's a mischaracterization of my testimony. It -- you said, in large part, it would be based on Gudjonsson. And I said I -- I couldn't assign a percentage. That it was relying on all the different tests, collateral data and interview. The term "vulnerability to suggestibility." Does that depend upon IQ levels? Or at least that's one of the factors that you have to consider?

A Yes.
Q To render that opinion, or to, um, have a particular subject fit within a category that is consistent with vulnerability to suggestibility, uh, is it a fair statement that, uh, that hypothesis is furthered -- or that hypothesis is supported if an individual has a borderline intellectual capability or borderline IQ rather than low average? Or am I overstating that -that, uh, distinction between Wechsler and your original testimony?

A I think you're overstating it. Uh --
Q All right.
A The -- the percentile is what's most important to consider. That -- that standard across the Wechsler norms and the DSM norms.

Q All right. In your, uh, performance of the IQ tests, you mentioned that that was, um, important to you. In other words, getting $a$, uh -- a relatively accurate read of Brendan's current IQ level was important?

A True.
Q Is that what you said? I think you mentioned that, because this was such an important case, and, um, because of the, uh, opinion that you wanted to give to this jury, uh, coming up with a, um -- a, uh -- an accurate value, or at least a, uh -- a range, uh, was important for you. That's fair, isn't it?

A It's fair.
Q All right. The Wechsler, uh, Intelligence Scale, even the abbreviated version that you give, how many sub-tests are included in that particular test?

A There are -- either two can be administered or four can be administered. I administered two.

Q What does that mean, either two or four can be administered? I assume one can be administered; isn't that true?

A That's not true.
Q Why did you administer two instead of the four
sub-tests of that?
A I wanted to obtain an overall IQ estimate and compare it to the Kaufman Brief -- it's Brief Intelligence Test, uh, to see if there was consistency. If there was no consistency, uh, then I would have found the need to go into more comprehensive intellectual testing. As I indicated before, the interviewing and the testing process determines what tests I administer to --

Q Was this anything that prevented you from administering all four of the sub-tests for this IQ test to Mr. Dassey?

A No.
Q You next talked about -- or at least in your report, you talked about the $16-\mathrm{PF}$, which I think you described as a -- called it a test, uh, that evaluates, quote, unquote, normal
characteristics, at least under general
circumstances. Is that a fair characterization?
A It's a --
Q As opposed to the MMPI, or something that looks at the more deviant or -- or problematic individuals?

A I would agree with what you said, except you said, under normal circumstances. I mean, I -- I -- I
get -- I guess I'm not understanding your question. I beg your pardon.

Q Well, I -- we can get right to the -- the conclusions of the 16-PF. Did you agree with the findings of your -- or of the results from the 16-PF test?

A I found them to be consistent with the other test results and the rest of the evaluation.

Q I assume you've been asked to bring your file and the results with you here to court; is that right?

A Yes, I have.
Q If you'd be so kind, Doctor, as to turn to your results of the $16-\mathrm{PF}$ test. And as you're doing that, or as you're looking for that, I'm sure you can, um, also answer this. How was this test scored? In other words, do you score it or do you send it away to be scored by somebody else?

A Uh, it's computer scored from my office. Um, and the scores are then interpreted into a report. Uh, bear with me, please.

Q I will.
A I'm looking. I'm looking. I'm sorry.
Q And so the jury understands what you're looking at, it is a -- a printout, a report, if you will,
of the results of the, uh, administration of the examination to Brendan; is that right?

A It's a computer-generated report of hypothesis regarding individuals who have scales that he obtained on this particular questionnaire.

Q Okay. If you'd be so kind as to turn to page, three, then, the very last category is called, uh, cognition and communication. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q Within this report, it suggests that, although not necessarily a measure of general intelligence, it does test one cognitive skill, namely, the ability to manipulate verbal concepts. I was curious as to what that meant. Maybe you can describe that for the jury? What is the ability to manipulate verbal concepts?

A Well, I can only tell you what the test -- it's a component of the test where there are analogies, uh, such as, uh, a -- a pear is to an apple as a dog is to, fill in the blank. And maybe there'd be cat, tree and whatever. Uh, that's an example. Uh, there are also, uh -- this is not on the test, but for sake of discussion, uh, please fill in what would be the proper number in
sequence. If you have the numbers one, three and five, and then they have six, seven, eight and nine, and you're supposed to pick the --

Q All right.
A -- correct answer. I mean -- and, so, it -- it does not yield an IQ score, it just yields a general idea of how they answered those questions. It's not -it's a personality test. It's not an IQ test.

Q But this report, if believed, suggests that Brendan does function adequately in his ability to manipulate verbal concepts. Isn't that what it says?

A Well, it was -- says, in its entirety, as well as scale, does not necessarily measure general intelligence. It does test one cognitive skill, namely, the manip -- ability to manip -- manipulate verbal concepts. In this area, appear -- he appears to function adequately on this particular scale, which is not an IQ test.

Q Okay. Do you agree with that statement?
A No.
Q Really?
A You act surprised.
Q Do you know what the term "cherry picking" means?
A I do.

Q And "cherry picking," at least in the concept of professionals who testify, is they present to juries what might support their client's position, but they keep from them, or they don't report, the things that don't, or that, uh, might undermine their opinion. That's a fair characterization of that term?

A That is true.
Q By the way, anywhere in your report or your conclusions, did you include the 16-PE conclusion that Brendan's ability to manipulate verbal concepts, uh, was of an adequate functioning level? Did you include that anywhere in your report?

A I did not include that computer-generated hypothesis in my report. That's correct.

Q Next test that you had Brendan perform, or the next one that you talked about, was something called the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory. You're familiar, I know, with that particular test. And, in fact, in your report, uh, dated November 15, 2006, you discuss how the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory factored into, or was considered by you, in your ultimate, uh, analysis and conclusion. That's true; isn't
it?
A That's true.
Q In your written report, that is, the report that you have provided to Counsel and to Court, you indicate the following: And I'll just read this to you. You're not going to have to -- to look at this. I'm sure you'll recognize this sentence.
(As read) "The State Trait Anger Expression Inventory was further used to assess for features of anger, passivity and anxiety." You remember writing that?

A Yes.
Q And, in fact, did you, uh, take the results of this particular instrument and apply it to the features that you suggest in your report? That is, anger, passivity and anxiety?

A I'm sorry. Um, I considered the results.
Q Now, the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory, first of all, is that a test? Is that something that psychologists normally call a test or not?

A No. We normally call it an inventory.
Q All right. The difference between inventory and tests are, uh, and -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but a test are something that have norms.

That is, it's something that can be objectively scored; isn't that true?

A No. Tests more are synonymous with tests of $I Q$, tests of achievement abilities, academic abilities. The personality inventories are more to do with assessing personality traits, emotional problems, that sort of thing, uh, as compared to the IQ part. Q All right. Let me just ask you, then, about the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory. Um, do the results of that particular test have norms to compare it to?

A Yes.
Q By the way, um, the term "anxiety," which you express in your report, was one characterasistic (phonetic) -- characteristic that you used this instrument to examine. Is there anything in this particular instrument that talks about anxiety at all?

A I might have been confused. As a State Trait -there -- there are two tests by Charles Spielberger, out of Florida. Uh, one primarily measures anxiety, one measures anger.

Q Correct.
A And I may have confused the two and thought that ang -- anger expression inventory also included
anxiety. But it doesn't, does it?

A I -- from the way you're looking at me, I don't think it probably does.

Q Why, if -- if anxiety was something that you thought was important to gauge with this young man, which I think your report indicates it is, why didn't you give the State Trait Anger -- or, excuse me, State Trait Anxiety Inventory instead of the Anger Inventory?

A Because I gave the -- another test that would measure that on a variety of anxiety scales, and that would be the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, slash, Adolescent version.

Q A perfect segue to my next questions, Doctor. The MMPI-A, or the adolescent version, I think you cautioned before that you can't really look at any specific answer to any specific question, that that might be somehow misleading, and I was confused as to why that would be. Can you explain that again?

A Uh, by reading one particular response, one can then conclude that that -- conclude that that can be used to draw definitive conclusions. And, uh, taking it out -- out of context is very likely to mislead a
jury. And I'm sure you wouldn't want the jury to be misled.

Q I'm sure I wouldn't either. And -- and that's why I'm going to ask you some of these, uh -some of these specific questions. Brendan, when provided these questions, or when asked questions on what's called the MMPI, uh, was asked series of 478 true/false questions. He could either say true or he could say false on the answers; isn't that right?

A That's right.
Q Now, as you told this jury, there -- after the results are obtained, there's various scales. In other words, how he answers questions on -particular answers or, I guess, more appropriately stated, uh, the combination of certain answers, uh, can, um, oftentimes, be, um, considered by trained professionals and some tendencies might be able to be developed regarding characteristics -- personality characteristics. That's fair, isn't it?

A True.
Q Did you assume that Brendan, when asked these 478 questions, gave truthful or accurate responses, at least as he believed them to be?

A It was my interpret -- my conclusion that they were accurate, because there are validity scales on the MMPI, and on most personality inventories, that show whether a person is answering in a straight forward fashion, minimizing or exaggerating.

Q All right.
A And if those are scores -- the validity scores are so abnormal to such a degree that it shows that person was extremely (inaudible) or exaggerating, then I -I can't interpret the pro -- I don't -- you can't interpret the profile because the -- the scores either over or underestimate emotional problems.

Q Now, in the interpretation of these answers or the profiles, um, this particular instrument allows trained psychologists to look at various scales. You talked about one that, uh, is, um -or included shyness or social anxiety, um, or social alienation, uh, is that -- is that correct?

A Shyness was on the $16-\mathrm{PF}$, social alienation was on the MMPI-A.
Q. All right. Social -- and social avoidance as well?

A That's true.
Q What -- what's that scale called, by the way,
when you test for those particular characteristics? Which scale are we looking at?

A Social avoidance.
Q Have any other name to it on the MMPI? Often referred to as the zero scale?

A No. No, not at all. Uh, that's a different scale. That's social introversion. But there are other supplementary scores. And, so, the -- social avoidance is -- comes from the social introversion scale. It's in parenthesis, SI-2. It's one component of the Social Introversion Clinical Scale.

Q All right. And so this jury understands, there were other things that you could have scored this test for? There are other, um, personality characteristics that you could have rendered opinions about in this case, but that you chose not to. Is that true?

A Although there are hundreds of scales that could be scored, I used the ones that are recommended by the University of Minnesota and the original test constructors in James Butcher and Doctors Archer and Doctors Ben-Porath, among others.

Q For what? I mean, you must have been looking for something.

A No.

Q You -- you were looking for suggestibility --
A No, I was just --
Q -- issues, weren't you?
A I'm sorry for not letting you --
Q Go ahead.
A Uh, I was not looking -- I was looking for information designed to address those questions, and there are a broad range of questions that are computer scored that come back -- or, actually, are done on my computer, electronically sent to Minnesota and back, and I could count the number of scales. There -- There's, $1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11$, $12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24$, $25,26,27,28,29,30,31--$

THE REPORTER: Please slow down.
THE COURT: Slow down. Just take your
time.
THE WITNESS: Sorry, sir.
Q There's lot of scales. That -- that's --
A I can go on. And I'm just -- so I would guess that 70 scales are -- are on what is called the -- from the MMPI, um, it's from the, uh, extended score report for the MMPI-A.

Q And of those over 70 scales, how many did you score for?

A All of them were scored.
Q Oh, good. Then I can ask you some questions about the ones we haven't heard about, I assume?

A Sure.
Q Good. By the way, um, you were asked to provide, and I assume you brought with you, the individual questions that Brendan was asked, and you have available for you individual answers that he gave. Isn't that true?
A. I have -- I have the individual answers he gave, but I gave the, um, test questions, even though it's a violation of my contract with the University of Minnesota, um, I provided that to my -- or to my, uh -- the attorney that retained -- retained me.

Q All right. But you've got the answers, then, with you at least?

A I -- I -- I -- yes, I do.
Q When was this test administered to Brendan?
A November 13, 2006.
Q Who was it administered by?
A $\quad \mathrm{Me}$.
Q Did you record the answers that Brendan gave when you asked him specific questions?

A At this point, uh, Counsel, I don't recall whether I -- whether I read the questions to him or if I had
him read the questions and answered them.
Q All right.
A If I -- I don't recall.
Q I'm going to ask you to refer to your answer sheet, and I'm going to ask a couple of specific questions and ask how Brendan answered them.

I'll first ask you, question number 265, Brendan was asked, (as read) "I think nearly anyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble." Two sixty-five. Tell the jury how Brendan answered that question, please?

A Well, again, saying that it's going to be misleading, and -- it -- it says, "True."

Q He said, "True." Anyone would lie to keep out of trouble.

Question number 391, Brendan was asked this question:
"When I am concerned, I tell that portion of the truth which is not likely to hurt me."

Tell us what Brendan's answer was to 391, please?

A Well, as I said on direct, this is a misuse of the test, but he said --

Q Doctor --

A He said, "True."
Q Is there a problem? You don't understand my question or you --

A Well, I can't -- well, then, I can't answer it when it mischaracterizes my testimony.

Q You can't answer true or false to what his answer was?

A Not when it's in a misleading --
Q Oh, I see. All right.
A I'm sorry.
Q Well, let's talk about misleading the jury, then. The MMPI could be scored for something called anti-social personality traits. In other words, to determine whether or not somebody lacks guilt about criminal exploits that they're involved in. That's true, isn't it?

A There are several such scales.
Q Did you score for any of those?
A Yes.
Q Now, anti-social or --
A Well --
Q Oh, I'm sorry. Because he's under 18, did you want to say something about that or not?

A No. You -- you're right. You can't make a diagnosis of anti-social personality disorder for an individual
under the age of 18 . But there is no scale, specifically, listed as anti-social traits or whatever you referred to. There are similar statements, but not that one.

Q All right. Suffice it to say, Doctor, uh, Gordon, that that scale and those results were not included in your official written report to the Court?

A Which scale?
Q Any scale that dealt with Mr. Dassey's, um, personality characteristics takes that might show a conduct disorder or anti-social personality disorder?

A That was --
Q It was not included; isn't that right?
A Because it wasn't, uh, indi -- so-indicated. Yes.
Q You interviewed Brendan, you said, on the 3rd and 10th of November?

A Yes.
Q Now, during your interview with Brendan, you described him as being sad, polite and passive. That's correct, isn't it?

A Yes.
Q Within your report to the Court, you noted that Brendan was nervous getting up in front of
people; is that right?
A That's what he told me.
Q Do you feel that that was significant to the ultimate conclusion that you rendered in this case as to vulnerability to suggestibility?

A It is a -- it's a factor that's related to it, yes.
Q Oh. Lot of people get nervous standing up in front of crowds or in front of people?

A Socialphobia is the number one, uh, fear there is.
Q All right. And death is number two; isn't that right?

A I -- I -- I -- I'm just told the number one, which --
Q People are more nervous about getting up in front of a crowd than they are about dying. That's the point?

A That's your point. I don't know that that's number two.

Q All right.
A They might be socially phobic about standing up and talking about death, for all I know.

Q Brendan also said that he was nervous when meeting new people; isn't that right?

A That's right.
Q Lots of people get nervous meeting new people; is that right?

A Some people do.
Q During your interview, you also mentioned, however, that Brendan exhibited no symptoms of depression, no appetite problems, or any of those kinds of -- of issues. Is that fair?

A That's what he told me. Except -- and the only thing that was indicative of sadness was the, uh -- the look on his face and the poor eye contact.

Q Poor eye con -- I'm sorry?
A And the poor eye contact.
Q All right. Now, contrary to what you saw, in other words your observations of Brendan, the MMPI suggests that Brendan has the type of personality that, uh, he might exhibit many, uh, of such or of those kinds of complaints. Is that what the MMPI report says?

A I'm sorry?
Q Isn't that what the MMPI report says?
A The -- do you want me to read from what --
Q No. What I want you to do is -- does the MMPI conclusion contradict, or is it different than what you personally observed of Brendan?

A It doesn't contradict.
Q Is it different then?
A No, uh, he -- he didn't exhibit -- he denied feeling
depressed and he denied having physical vegetative signs of depression like, sleep, appetite, headaches stomachache. He's denied that. Um, but it does say he seems generally un -- unhappy and pessimistic about life. My observation of him was consistent with that.

Q Were there any instances, whether it's in your report or not, Doctor, where the test results that you obtained from any of these instruments were in contrast to what you personally observed with Brendan?

A I'm sorry, Counsel, I --
Q I'll ask that again.
A I wasn't -- I was -- my mind went off in --
Q Were there any circumstances where the test results that you obtained, or the test result, um, conclusions, were in contrast or were different to what you personally observed from Brendan?
$A \quad$ On the MMPI?
Q On anything. Any of the test results. I'm just wondering if that phenomenon ever occurred?

A The only one, is there -- there -- he -- as I said before, he was elevated on a scale of hypochondriasis and also on other subscales measuring semantic
complaints. And that's -- he didn't report that to me.

Q All right. When that happens, when the test results differ from what you see with your own eyes, um, how do you reconcile that? Which of the two do you, um, adopt, if you will?

A Research has shown that testing -- actuarial testing, as well as objective testing, is usually a better -there's usually better reliability and validity of that than a person's conducting an interview.

Q All right. Doctor, uh, Gordon, when you interviewed Brendan, you said that he appeared polite and was responsive to all of your questions; is that right?

A He answered all of my questions. There's a slow reaction time. He was polite, yes.

Q He appear hostile at all to you?
A No, sir.
Q Have you ever had a interview in your many years of being either a clinical or forensic psychologist where, uh, the subject that you were interviewing had a dislike for either you, personally, or members of your profession?

A I'm sorry. Yes, I have.
Q All right.

A It's not funny, but it -- it definitely has happened. Q Tell us about when, uh -- when that happens, because I'm sure lawyers have that as well, um, what do you observe when an individual has a, uh, uh -- either a personal dislike or that of your profession?

A Well, they don't -- usually don't dislike only my profession. They dislike judges, uh, attorneys, guards. And they feel like they're the victim of a system, and they can be -- have histories of being aggressive and, uh, they can, uh, specialize in swearing and being vulgar. And, uh, I am -- I never needed to push the alarm button yet, but, uh, I am -I don't push things too hard when I'm trying to get information because $I$ value my personal safety.

Q Let's at least start or, uh, confine ourselves to the -- the -- the -- the lower end of that scale, that at least they're not physically, uh, assaultive towards you. It's fair that it's more difficult to obtain information from them? They aren't as free to provide you with answers or with information than you otherwise might like; isn't that true?

A If a guard -- person is guarded or hostile, it's much more difficult to obtain information.

Q They're certainly not predisposed to cooperate with you; right?

A No. No, sir.
Q Well, wouldn't the same be expected if somebody had a dislike, generally, for police officers? Wouldn't you expect them to be more guarded and less free to provide inculpatory information?

A In general, that would be true. In con -- if you don't -- if you're only considering that and not other factors.

Q If -- let's assume, for the sake of argument, that this young man, Brendan Dassey, uh, had a predisposition or a dislike of law enforcement or police officers, generally. Wouldn't you expect Brendan to be less forthcoming instead of more forthcoming with information in the course of an interview?

A If I only considered that factor alone, then that's probably true.

Q You talked about the concept of suggestibility, and I want this jury to understand my first series of, uh, objections earlier in your direct examination.

You talked about something -- about false confessions, and then you talked about
suggestibility. Do you agree that those are two distinct -- those are two separate concepts; isn't that right?

A Yes.
Q In fact, somebody who is suggestible, that is, somebody who is vulnerable to suggestibility, is just as likely to provide a true confession as they would be to provide a false confession; isn't that true?

A I don't know if just as likely, but -- but I can tell you that individuals who are suggestible certainly -increasingly suggestible -- certainly have a -- a greater chance of providing a confession, period. And it could either be true or false.

Q All right. So -- so this jury understands, you're not commenting on the, um, truthfulness or reliability or believability of an admission or a confession that might be provided by a suggestible person? Just that they may be more vulnerable to suggestibility?

A I'm not commenting on truthfulness and falseness. But I am here to talk about reliability and suggestibility. That I can comment on. That is different than being truthful. Reliable is different than being truthful or false. I can't tell this

Judge, or this jury, or anyone in here whether -That's not my job. I'm not here to do that.

Q Doctor Gordon, do you remember, the last time we had a chance to speak, me asking you the specific question that Brendan was just as likely to provide a true confession as a false confession? Remember me asking you that?

A Yes.
Q Remember --
A I mean --
Q -- what your answer was then?
A No, but you can tell me.
Q I'm asking you if you remember?
A No, I don't.
Q Your answer today, if I can -- if I could ask you that specific question again, is what?

A $\quad \mathrm{He}$--
Q Isn't Brendan just as likely to provide a true confession as a false confession?

A I don't know. Just -- he has -- he has a -- it's like -- it's -- it is possible that if he provides a confession, it could either be true or false. That -- that is what I would say.
Q Now, the concept of suggestibility is not a -- a discipline or an area that is just unique to
police interrogations. It's something that we see every day with marketing, or advertising, or, uh, fields like that. Isn't that true?

A That's true. But, uh, there are different -- the research regarding suggestibility in criminal matters cannot always be applicable to other kinds of suggestibility. For example, suggestibility scales for hypnotism and likelihood to be hypnotized are -are not correlated at all. I'm not asking what hypnotic suggestibility -My -- my question is whether somebody is suggestible? And this kind of goes to the true or false confession. The suggestibility doesn't remove somebody's ability to reason? In other words, to choose one, um, answer or another? That's true, isn't it?

A Suggestibility -- if they're more suggestible, it reduces the likelihood of that.

Q I'm sorry?
A What's your question again, please? Maybe --
Q Suggestibility doesn't remove somebody's decision-making ability? They still get to choose whether they're going to adopt that suggestion or not; isn't that right?

A They still get to choose, but their choosing can be
affected by their psychological characteristics and -- and the way they're being interrogated.

Q I'm not talking about interrogation. As an example, if somebody tells you to buy a Chevy over a Ford, they may be suggesting that you buy a Chevy, but you still get to make that decision --

A In that case, that's true.
Q If somebody tells you you should order a pizza, you get to decide if you're going to order a pizza; is that right?

A That's true. If my wife says, order a pizza, and I don't want it, I -- there might be a little bit of persuasion for me to get the pizza. You see?

Q I appreciate there's those other factors. By the way, the area of suggestibility is not a recognized specialty or even a sub-specialty in the area of psychology, whether forensic or otherwise; isn't that true?

A Sub-special -- it -- it -- fitness -- that's true. Fitness to stand trial, NGI, uh, those are not sub-specialties. Forensic psychology is a sub-specialty.
Q. I asked about suggestibility. Doesn't -- doesn't fall under those categories of specialty or
sub-specialty?
A No.
Q Now, you told this jury that you reviewed the videotaped interview of Brendan on the 1 st, and some written narrative or a transcript, I suppose, of an interview on the 27 th of February; is that right?

A True.
Q And that some time later you got some school records to, um, review in case you were asked about that here at trial? Or -- or -- let me ask it a different way. To, um, consider and determine whether or not it might affect your opinion of Brendan?

A That's true.
Q By the way, how did watching that interview, and this jury got to see that, uh, interview, they got to see about -- just under three hours of what you've called the four-hour interview, but how did watching the first three hours of that interview impact or affect your, um, report? You understand my question? Or would you like me to be more specific?

A I could try to answer, but if you could be more specific, that might be helpful.

Q Whether you watched that interview or not, would you have been able to render these same conclusions? That is, that Brendan was, uh, vulnerable to suggestibility? or did you need to watch that March 1 interrogation to come to that conclusion?

A It wasn't absolutely necessary, but it was helpful. You're telling the jury that it wasn't absolutely necessary to watch the interrogation that you were being asked to render an opinion about? To render an opinion about it?

A No.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: That wasn't the answer, Judge. It was -- I believe the answer was not necessary -- absolutely necessary, but helpful. So if you --

THE COURT: That's a correct statement. I'm sorry. That's a correct statement of the answer. Why don't you just recast the question. ATTORNEY KRATZ: Sure.
(By Attorney Kratz) You're telling this jury that it wasn't absolutely necessary to watch that interview to render this opinion about Brendan's suggestibility?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, again, that's not
the -- I believe the answer was, it's not absolutely necessary, but helpful. If that's -- if he wants to rephrase it that way.

THE COURT: The question was fairly asked.
Go ahead. You may answer.
THE WITNESS: Could you read back the question, please?

Q I can ask it again if you'd rather. Are you telling this jury that it wasn't absolutely necessary to watch the March 1 interview in order to render this opinion about Brendan's suggestibility?

A Not absolutely necessary, no. It was helpful.
Q Let's talk about what might have been helpful or omitted from your report. The report that you've rendered, that talks about Brendan's suggestibility, is devoid of any -- any examples where Brendan actually resisted attempts by officers to suggest answers; isn't that true?

A That's true.
Q In watching that video, Doctor Gordon, don't you remember several instances, in fact, over a dozen instances, where a specific suggestion was presented to Brendan, and Brendan actively resisted? In other words, Brendan said, that
didn't happen that way. Do you remember that?
A Uh, yes.
Q That's not in your report?
A No.
Q Did you think that was important to include in your report?

A Well, obviously, I didn't, or I would have included it.

Q Go back to the very first question about including things that help versus don't help your ultimate opinion. Is this one of those circumstances? In other words, when Brendan actively says, no, it didn't happen that way, that doesn't support your opinion about vulnerability to suggestion, does it?

A No.
Q You said that Brendan's school records weren't provided to you until after you rendered this opinion. Those school records, uh, correct me if I'm wrong, but they include behavioral records, and, um, progress notes, and what are called IEP reports; isn't that right?

A That's right.
Q Those are notes from school teachers, and school psychologists, and even, on occasion, a parent or
two, talking about some problems or some areas that Brendan needed to work on in a school setting; is that right?

A True.
Q One of the areas that the school record specifically addressed was Brendan's memory; is that true?

A True.
Q Now, what was the state, at least from the records that you received -- at least up through the fall of 2005 , what was the state of Brendan's memory? And are you able, in reviewing those school records, to differentiate between a short-term memory and his long-term memory?

I know it was a longer question, and I can break it up, if you need me to. I suspect that you'll be able to answer that.

A I could answer that if I -- I reviewed the records. I dog-eared the pages. I took a close look, but -but I didn't commit it to memory.

Q All right.
A So I -- I could look again if you'd like.
Q Brendan, at least from the school records, didn't have the greatest memory in the world; is that -is that fair?

A That's fair.
Q All right. And whether it was long-term or short-term memory, at least for Brendan, and from a school or a book learning, um, standpoint, Brendan had some challenges or deficits in that area; is that right?

A That's true.
Q Would you expect, by the way, somebody with a, um -- not only a fourth grade reading level, but somebody with Brendan's memory deficits, to be able to, um, in great detail, uh, remember a -let's say, facts or details of a novel that he read maybe four years ago?

A I can't really comment on that because I don't -- if it was a complicated novel, no. But that if -- I don't know the book.

Q How about a novel written for adults rather than for kids?

A Well, then, I doubt that.
Q That just wouldn't seem reasonable to you, would it?

A Uh, I don't know.
Q The school records don't mention anywhere about suggestibility, do they? In other words, did you see any notations in the records that Brendan
was, um, either highly suggestible or influenced by either classmates or other people?

A I didn't read the word "suggestible" in the school records.

Q Did you read the word "influence" anywhere?
A I don't recall.
Q That Brendan was easily influenced?
A I don't recall that.
Q If a school psychologist, Chris SchoenenbergerGross, who, um, the testimony established, uh, knew Brendan, administered tests directly to Brendan, and did review all of those records, uh, testified that there were no such entries, you wouldn't quarrel with that conclusion, would you?

A Uh, I de -- no, I depend on the -- the opinions of school psychologists.

Q And school psychologists and teachers and those that meet with Brendan on a more regular or daily basis, at least from a historical standpoint, are probably in a better position to gauge those kinds of things than you, after meeting with him twice; is that right?

A No, that's not right, because they didn't administer the same tests and review collateral data that I did. Um, although it's very helpful to have that kind of
collateral data from the teachers.
There (inaudible) --
Q So you don't -- I'm sorry you. You don't know --
A -- (inaudible) very important.
Q You don't know if those teachers administered IQ tests, do you?

A Teachers don't generally administer IQ tests, but they sometimes, uh --

Q I'm sorry. The school psychologists. Don't know if she administered IQ tests? I misspoke.

A I can look. I don't recall. I have to get them out. It will take me awhile.

Q Well, maybe -- I'm going to go on to -- to another question. It isn't -- do you know if the Mishicot School District characterized or categorized Brendan as having any cognitive disability?

A I do know that.
Q And do you know what that result was?
A It was.
Q That he did have a cognitive disability?
A Well, that he had learning problems. And I'm -and --

Q Why don't you look at his 2005 IEP report? There will be some boxes checked there about whether he
has a cognitive disability or not. That should be easy to find.

A Two thousand five. What date, please?
ATTORNEY EREMGEN: Are there, uh --
Q (By Attorney Kratz) Probably late --
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Are there exhibits that can actually be used and would --
(Attorney Kratz) While Mr. Fallon is looking for that, I can go on to a another series of questions. Did you ever talk to this school psychologist, Chris Schoenenberger-Gross?

A No.
Q Why not?
A I felt no need to.
Q I'm sorry?
A I -- I -- I didn't feel it was necessary.
Q Did you ever talk to any of Brendan's teachers?
A No. I reviewed their comments. There are some standard scores, now that I find them, if you would like me to go over them, Counsel.

Q No. I'm asking for whether or not the school believed Brendan to have a cognitive disability? That was my question.

A I can't find that. I just can find the standard scores of some --

Q You didn't talk to Chris -- I'm sorry to interrupt you. You didn't talk to Chris Schoenenberger-Gross, or any of his teachers, because you didn't think you needed to. Is that your answer?

A I thought this information was, uh, sufficient and helpful to me.

Q All right. How about Brendan's parent or parents? Did you talk to Brendan's mother?

A No.
Q How come?
A Uh, for -- I felt that I was able to form a conclusion without, uh, relying on her input. Without relying on her input.

Q All right. You didn't think you needed, uh, family opinions as to Brendan's suggestibility, or that -- whether or not he was easily
influenced, to render this opinion?
A No, I would place more value on opinions of individuals who are teachers and psychologists, because their opinions were made before this court case and more likely to be objective.

Q All right. Let's talk about other statements that Brendan made. You said that you reviewed the February 27 interview of officers. You
interviewed a May 1, uh, videotape to officers. Were you also made aware, several months before February 27, of statements Brendan made to other family members? Specifically, to one of his cousins, Kayla Avery?

A I was made aware of those, but -- but I don't recall it now. I'm sorry.

Q Were you aware that in late December, Brendan Dassey told one of his cousins that he saw Teresa pinned up in Steven Avery's house?

A I was aware of that, yes.
Q You were?
A Yes.
Q Did you consider that statement, and the fact that it's three months before the, uh, March 1 statement? The one where suggestibility is commented upon? The fact that that statement was made three months before, you find that significant or did you include that in your report?

A That was included in my report.
Q Did you find that significant as to your ultimate opinion as to Brendan's suggestibility?

A It could. But sometimes individuals make statements for sensational reasons, including even, uh, um,
admitting that they stole the Lindbergh baby, and there were hundreds of people that came forth acknowledging that, so -Okay. Well, setting Mr. Lindbergh aside, if you can talk about this case --

A That's good.
Q -- did you not think that Brendan Dassey's cousin, re -- telling a school counselor and telling the police that Brendan Dassey said that he saw Teresa tied up or pinned up in a house, was relevant as to the March 1 statement, wherein you commented as to his suggestibility? It's a yes or no question.

A It -- it's relevant, yes.
Q Did you believe that Brendan's statement to his cousin that he saw body parts in a fire at the same time was relevant as to your opinion as to suggestibility?

A It's relevant that he said it, yes.
Q The fact that Brendan Dassey said, in late December, that he heard Teresa screaming before he went into that house, you believe that's relevant to your opinion as to suggestibility of the March 1 statement?

A It's relevant, but $I$ can't make an -- a determination
regarding the accuracy of those statements and their reliability thereof, for all the questions you've been asking me in this series.

Q Those are statements that are several months -or at least they're alleged to have been made several months -- before this March 1 statement. Do you understand that?

A I do.
Q Are you also aware of, and did you include, statements that Brendan Dassey made, admissions that Brendan Dassey made, uh, a couple of months after the March 1 statement?

A Yes.
Q You were aware of statements he made to his mother about the confession? Uh, that is, um, "Why didn't you tell me?" Brendan answered, "I was scared." Do you remember, and did you review that statement made from Brendan to his --

A Yeah.
-- mother?
A I'm sorry. I thought you were finished. Yes. That Brendan's mother told him, "If you would have told me, Teresa would have still been alive." And Brendan said, "Yeah." Do you remember reviewing that particular telephone
cal1?

A I don't remember that telephone call. I'm sorry.
Q Do you remember Brendan being asked by his mother, "Did you do all of that stuff to her?" And Brendan replying, "Some of it." Do you remember reviewing that particular statement?

A I believe so.
Q By the way, are any of those statements, made months after the March 1 statement, do you believe to be relevant to your conclusion as to suggestibility, at least as it relates to the March 1 statement?

A It may -- it's relevant to consider. Whether it -It's relevant to consider.

Q It would be relevant if Brendan Dassey apologized to the victim's family, in his words, "for what I did to her." Would that be a relevant statement as to suggestibility of the March 1 statement?

A It would be something to consider.
Q Did you consider it?
A Yes.
Q And despite all of those statements, despite the statements months before and months after, consistent with what he told the police, you still believe that Brendan was vulnerable to
suggestibility; is that true?
A Absolutely.
Q Doctor, my client -- or my colleague --
Mr. Fallon's going to show you Exhibit 219.
First of all, tell us what that is and what the date on the top of that report is?

A What that is, it's evaluation report for Brendan Dassey, determination of eligibility for special education dated September 29, 2005.

Q Does that particular form have a check box or a place where the school can determine whether or not, in their opinion, Brendan has a cognitive disability?

A It has a place for that.
Q And is that box checked on Brendan's form?
A No. What is checked is specific order of disability.
Q Some speech and language issues --
A Specific learning disability. And the other one was speech or language impairment. Those are the two that were checked.

Q Now, Brendan's statement to his cousin about seeing Teresa tied up or pinned up in the house, seeing body parts in the fire, and hearing Teresa screaming, and Brendan's statements, uh, months afterwards to his mother, did those impact or did
you consider those statements when Brendan told you he was scared he was going to be arrested?

A I don't know, because $I$ don't know in what order I received that information or reviewed it, at which time I interviewed him. After the fact, um, it could be related.

Q Okay. Doctor Gordon, the concept of false confessions, we -- we -- we heard about that as -- as set aside or as different from suggestibility. I want to ask you just a couple of questions about that.

You're aware, in your, um, work in this area, of several studies that deal with false confessions; isn't that true?

A Yes.
Q A couple of the preeminent authors in this area are two individuals in California named, uh, Mr. -- is it Drezin or Drizin, and Leo; is that correct?

A That's right.
Q And another is a person by the name of Brett Trowbridge. You're familiar with their work?

A Yes.
Q Is it fair --
A Trowbridge, no. I -- I'm thinking of that name.

There must be someone else. Or the same -- I printed up, last night, regarding, uh, sexually violent person and sex offender commitment, uh, so --

Q I -- I'll limit my inquiry, then, to what you are familiar with. Would be the Drizin -- is it Drizin or Drezin?

A That I don't know.
Q Drizin and Leo. D-r-i-z-i-n. You understand?
A Yes.
Q You read that name at least? And in their study, which is, uh, in fact, one of the preeminent works in false confession, you'd agree with that, wouldn't you?

A They've conducted many studies, so I don't know which one you're referring to.

Q Mr. Drizin and Leo indicate, and do you agree with this statement, that most false Confessions -- now, we're getting into the area of false confessions versus suggestibility -- are the result of, um, tactics by police which are so impermissible, most of which include physical violence, like beatings, is that what you find?

A That's not my reading. Well, we need to back up. There are -- they are not the only authorities in the field.

Secondly, um, not only they -- are they not the only authorities in the field, but they do talk about extreme torture as a way to get false confessions. There are chapters that they've done and studies on that. But they've also published, extensively, like I said, even on things such as mild pressure, criticism, so -Q How about we do this, if you can't answer yes or no, then you can let me know, all right? If -if you can, Doctor, I'd appreciate it. Are you familiar with Mr. Drizin and Leo's proposition that most false confessions are the result of such extreme police conduct, impermissible conduct, that can, and often does, include physical violence or beatings of suspects?

A Yes.
Q Familiar that their studies indicate that most false confessions are the result of very long, sometimes, uh, interrogations that last into the days, rather than just, uh, an hour, two or even three hours. You're familiar with that?

A True.
Q Now, in our case, that is, in the March 1 , um, videotape of Mr., um, Dassey -- Mr. Fallon will take care of that for you.

A Thank you, sir.
Q Brendan's first admissions, that is, his first admissions of criminal involvement in this case, don't happen at the three-hour or the four-hour mark, but they happen, really, within and right around the one-hour mark. Is that a fair, uh, recollection of --

A Yes.
Q -- your review?
A Yes.
Q So that, at least as it relates to false confessions, is extremely inconsistent with Mr. Drizin and Leo's findings. Uh, that is, it being within an hour or two, rather than six, eight hours, twelve hours, days of confession. That's fair, isn't it?

A I can't answer that. Not the way it was phrased.
Q You told this jury that you were not familiar with the works of, uh, Brett Trowbridge when he deals with the three different types of false confessions?

A Oh. Um --
Q If I asked you questions about that, might that refresh your -- your -- your memory?

A I think others have characterized it in those three
categories as well. Uh, so --
Q Let me ask you about that. The first, um, area of false confessions, uh, at least Mr. Trowbridge calls a voluntary confession, these are the people that come off the street and confess to a notorious murder that they didn't do.

The JonBenet Ramsey fellow, who comes forward. That's the first category. You're familiar with that first category; is that right?

A Yes.
Q The second is something Mr. Trowbridge calls coerced compliant. That is, that an individual confesses to a crime for a perceived gain. Whether it's real or just perceived, that's why they confess to a crime that may not be true. You agree with that?

A Coerced compliant can be for more than just that reason. But it -- it's when it's coerced and they comply and give a false statement. All right. But they do it for a gain? That is, uh, something, um -- something that they perceive as of benefit to them? You'd agree with that second component, wouldn't you?

A Yep. Many -- there are many different things that they can benefit from.

Q And the third that Mr. Trowbridge, uh, talks about, and maybe Dr. Trowbridge, uh, is something called, coerced internalized. That is, that they are convinced, or they, in fact, convince themselves, that their memory is so bad, uh, that either due to intoxication, mental illness, or something else, uh, that they actually did it. They believe at the end of the interview that they did it?

A Or brainwashing. You could think of Patty Hearst, for example.

Q Okay. Now, with that backdrop, or with that understanding of the three kinds -- or recognized kinds of false confessions, are you familiar with any category of false confession where an individual confesses just to get themselves into trouble? Are you familiar with -- with that as a recognized area of false confession?

A Unless it would be voluntary, uh -- I mean, some people do things for notoriety, and knowing of the consequences they -- they -- they do that. It might be kind of hard to understand, but it's -- it's not -- it -- it's done.

Q Doctor, I'm going to try to -- actually, I'm going to skip over some things.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: And, Judge, with the indulgence of the Court, if I promise to be done by 12:15, then can I finish my -- my cross? Uh, promise, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you. Then I don't have to come back after -- after the lunch hour.

Q (By Attorney Kratz) You said, uh, Dr. Gordon, that the -- one of the areas that you considered in forming your opinion was the circumstances, themselves, that surrounded this interrogation; is that right?

A That's -- those are some of the factors. Yes.
Q Now, you're not an expert, and I think on a previous occasion you admitted you were not an expert, in interrogation strategy or, uh, in circumstances that surround the interrogative process; is that right?

A Uh, that is not my area of specialization, but I am knowledgeable, or I have some knowledge of it.

Q Well, that's good. Then, I can ask you, isn't it true that most confessions, at least when a confession is obtained, uh, has stages to it? In other words, uh, suspects typically, and almost universally, start with a denial? They start as
denying their involvement in any crime? That's true, isn't it?

A True.
Q They move towards some version of events that substantially minimize their involvement.

There's a minimization component, uh, at least as they move towards confession?

A That's common.
Q True? And third, then, there is details, or at least some, um, degree of detail, that is, ultimately, provided or given, again, assuming the truthfulness, uh, of the confession. We're not talking about false confessions. We're talking about those that actually happen. Is that all true?

A That's common.
Q You're aware, uh, Dr. Gordon, that in the interrogative process, it's important for law enforcement officers to not only consider the spoken word, that is, the, um, information or the amount of information that's obtained, um, but they've got a responsibility to look at the quality of the statement? That is, is it something that can be or ought to be believed? Would you agree with that statement?

A Yes.
Q Again, that process law enforcement officers often look at whether or not there's physical evidence that would corroborate what it is that the suspect is telling them? That you understand, don't you?

A Physical evidence displayed by the suspect during the interview?

Q That there's physical evidence available during the investigation that corroborates what the suspect is saying? That that's a factor that they consider when deciding the quality of what it is that the person says?

A True.
Q They also consider information that the general public doesn't know yet? That is, that's purposely withheld from the general public. That you agree with?

A Yes.
Q And, lastly, and, perhaps, most importantly, law enforcement officers consider what they don't even know yet? In other words, when a suspect tells them something, and that suspect gives sufficient detail that they can later corroborate, the fact that they -- that the cops
didn't even know it yet, goes a long way towards considering the quality of what they're being told. That's fair, isn't it?

A Yeah, that's true.
Q Let me talk about this Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale. You are going to need to pull out the, uh, Gudjonsson test, because I have some questions for you, which was developed, you said, by a gentleman by the name of Gudjonsson, who started in Iceland, moved to England, and, in fact, did most of his, uh, study and most of his work continuous to, as I understand, in Great Britain; is that right?

A London, precisely.
Q All right. Now the purpose of this test, as I understand, is, although you tell the suspect, in this case you told Brendan, it was a memory test, this isn't a memory test at all, is it?

A No. Well, it's not design -- designed to be a memory test. Although, you do ask them to respond with -by restating the -- the story. And, so, you can, to some degree, assess their -- informally, their -their memory. But it's not designed to be a memory test. That's true.

Q You've got the -- the test in front of you, as
well as the scoring sheet?
A Yes.
Q Thank you. So the jury understands the basic premise of this test, as you read them a story, you read Brendan a story, and you first asked if they can recall, something called immediate recall, if they can recall the facts that was read to them; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q The test, itself, was developed, uh, you said, by this person from Iceland, later going to England. Um, the test that you provided to us, that is, to the defense, was this, the very story, the very test that was administered to Brendan?

A Yes.
Q Was it on the 3 rd or the 10 th of November?
A I don't recall. I'm sorry.
Q That's fine. If you'd, uh, be so kind, uh, Doctor, to read -- I'm not going to have you read the whole story. But I want you to read the first sentence of that story to the jury so they can get a flavor for how, uh, Brendan was read this particular story. Think you'd be able to do that for us?

A Well, if that's a part of the court order for me to
do that, then I -- I understand it is? THE COURT: It is.

A (As read) "Anna Thompson of South Croydon was on holiday in Spain when she was held up outside her ho -- outside of her ho -- outside her hotel, and robbed of her handbag, which contained 50 pounds" -and I'd say 50 dollars -- "worth of traveler's checks, and her passport."

Q You say what? Fifty dollars?
A Yes.
Q What do you mean you say 50 dollars?
A When I read it. That -- there is a Engl -- there's American version of this, too, but it's not as well normed of the story.

Q Well, that -- my first series of questions, first of all, was whether or not Brendan even understood what it meant to be on holiday? Do you know if Brendan knew what being on holiday meant?

A I don't know, because that wasn't stated in the memory portion that he repeated back to me, um, immediately after I read him the story.

Q Now, the memory portion that he repeated back to you, are you reading from something?

A Yes, I am.

Q What is that?
A It's what I wrote down as -- to try to -- as my best to write as fast as I could to write down what he was telling me at the time.

Q Did you send that to -- to me? To the defense?
A No.
Q Wasn't that asked for, Doctor?
A Um, yes, it was. And I apologize.
Q So we asked for your file. You're reading from that now, and that's something you didn't provide the state.

A I might have provide -- I might have provided it to Mr., uh, Fremgen, and he may not have provided it to you. I don't know.

Q All right. I'll move on.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Uh, Judge, I would at least note I'd like to make a record at the end of this, but I'll move on at this point.

Q (By Attorney Kratz) Doctor, the -- the issues of "on holiday," uh, you said that, uh, you didn't know whether or not Brendan even understood that. When it indicates that this Anna Thompson woman from South Croydon -- by the way, where is South Croydon?

A I don't know. It's in -- I assume it's in England.

Q Do you think Brendan knows where South Croydon is?

A If I don't know, I'm sure he doesn't.
Q Doesn't say Cincinnati or it doesn't say something where somebody from the upper midwest might actually understand this? Doesn't say that, does it?

A It says --
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Objection, as to whether someone from the upper midwest might understand.

THE COURT: The objection is sustained.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'll -- I'll move on.
Q (By Attorney Kratz) When it says that "contained 50 pounds worth of traveler's checks," is it your testimony in this case that, kind of on your own, you just changed the, uh -- the story?

A I changed that one word.
Q Okay. Do you know how the changing of the -that one word, uh, affects the results or affects the norms that you're later going to ask this jury to believe?

A I don't believe that one word of, uh, seventy has any appreciable --

Q How do you know that?
A Uh, I said I believe. There's a difference. I don't
know that.
Q And isn't the whole point of norms and administration of these kind of tests, do it the same way every time and with every suspect?

A Yes.
Q After reading this story about this Anna Thompson woman from England, um, Brendan is then asked to recall the story and to provide you with, um, the details that he can remember; is that right?

A That's right.
Q Now, is there a -- a scoring system for that? In other words, is he given a particular score or is that available, even, in this test?

A I don't believe so.
Q The bottom of the first page where it says, immediate recall, on the test, it looks like a score. Memory recall, maximum of 40. Can you tell us what that means?

A I stand corrected. It -- it could be scored.
Q All right. So whether Brendan even knew what the heck you were talking about with this lady from England, could have been scored by you; is that right?

A That -- that could have been scored, but there are no norms for those.

All right. Could have been scored? You didn't do it?

A That's true.
Q After reading this story, Brendan is then provided what are called leading questions. That is, questions not only leading, but, also, have false information within them. That's true, isn't it?

A That's true.
Q In fact, the information is what's known as false alternatives. I'll give an example. It's not in here, but it's a good example. Uh, if this Anna Thompson woman wasn't wearing a hat, one of the questions might be, Brendan, was she wearing a red or a blue hat? That's what's called a false alternative question that presupposes false information. That's true, isn't it?

A True. True.
Q And, then, if Brendan says, she was wearing a red hat -- he guesses, if he says she was wearing a red hat -- he'd get a point or either a checkmark on something called "yield." That is that he would be yielding to that false suggestion; is that right?

A True.

Q I'm going to skip ahead. We're going to go back to -- to some examples here. But halfway through this test, you express disappointment. In other words, you fold your arms, or something to that a point, tell Brendan, I'm disappointed in your answers. You can do better this time. Uh, I'm going to ask you the same question.

Was she wearing a red or a blue hat? And this time, if Brendan, knowing he said red the first time, says she's wearing a blue hat, you give him a checkmark for shifting. That he shifted his answer. That's kind of accurate, isn't it?

A That's accurate for one of -- one type of question.
Q All right. Importantly, Doctor, tell this jury, if Brendan gives you the right answer the second time, the correct answer, if Brendan, the second question, when you say, I'm disappointed, you gave the wrong answer, and Brendan tells you, you know what, Doctor, she wasn't wearing a hat. How would you score that?

A As shift.
Q So you're telling this jury that even when Brendan corrects himself, even when he gives you the right answer the second time, he gets marked
off, or something as to your scale then gets added against him as a shift?

A Because it shows he's suggestible, yes.
Q What happens, by the way, and how is this scored if Brendan was provided with a true answer? In other words, if Brendan was asked, did the lady have a hat or not? And Brendan said, no, I didn't have a hat, are there questions like that in this test?

A Repeat it again, please?
Q If Brendan was asked a question that contained a true answer, something that was really part of this story, and asked a question like, did the woman have a hat on or not? How is that scored? How is that kind of question scored on -That is not -- I'm sorry. Was it -- you finished? Uh, it was -- it's not scored as a yield, but it's scored as a shift. If -- let me think of an example.

If a person has the question, uh, did you -- was anyone walking outside the building? And there someone was. And they said, yes, then it wouldn't be scored as a -- a leading question. Or -- or what -- or did you see anyone outside? But, then, if they later on change that answer, then, even though it was a correct, and not a
leading question to start with, it wouldn't be scored as a shift later on. You look puzzled.

Q I am puzzled, because if he answers it correctly, and you fold your arms and you tell this person to change his answer, and he does, how does that have anything to do with this jury as to whether or not he's suggestible?

A It shows that he responds to pressure and changes his answers, whether they be correct or not. It shows he responds to -- to, uh, pressure.

He responds to his psychologist folding his arms and saying, I'm disappointed in you, Brendan, you should change your answer. Wouldn't you expect Brendan to change his answers?

A I think I'd expect Brendan to because of all the other factors in this case. Uh, if I -- if he was -- if he had a advanced degree, had -- was a lawyer, had contact with the law, uh, he was independent, he was outgoing, he was, uh, risktaking, he had a high $I Q$, uh, he had no learn -history of learning problems, then it would surprise me.

Q But you didn't consider, during this interrogation, what this jury has to consider, that Brendan was able to resist suggestibility?

You used this test instead; isn't that true?
A I used this standardized test, which is --
Q Irrespective of whether he actually, in real
life, was able to resist suggestibility? Is that what you're telling this jury?

A I reviewed what he did in real life, and he was -- he changed his responses in response to both leading and pressure.

Q But in real life he wasn't provided false alternatives. He was asked, did you kill her or didn't you? And he said, yeah, I killed her. That's different than this Gudjonsson test, isn't it? Because this presupposes false alternatives.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: I would object to -Q Isn't that true, Doctor?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, I object to the form of question. I don't think that was a false alternative.

THE COURT: Uh, I'm going to overrule the objection. This is cross-examination. It's wide. It's broad. I think that's -- I think that question's, uh, within the realm of it. Go ahead. (By Attorney Kratz) When provided with a true answer, and Brendan given an opportunity to adopt that answer, isn't that different than the

Gudjonsson test? That's my question, Doctor.
A It's different than part of the Gudjonsson test because only a minority of the questions on the Gudjonsson test are false altern -- alternative questions.

Q Only a what?
A A sm -- a small percentage of them.
Q A small -- 15 out of 20 are false alternative questions.

A That's not correct, Your Honor. Uh, Counsel.
Q Okay. How many -- how many out of 20 are false alternatives?

A Um, I can count. One, two, three, four, five. Five out of twenty questions. One-fourth.

Q You said that this test -- or at least one of the things it tests for is memory; is that right?

A Well, it assesses memory, but it's not really a memory test. It's not -- that's not the purpose of it.

Q Now, Doctor, you're aware of different kinds of memory? Uh, that is, how individuals remember things? How they process and remember information?

A Sure.
Q You're aware of something that is called, uh,
semantic memory? Or what my teachers used to call book learning? Uh, that they can remember things that are read to them or things they see in a classroom?

A Okay.
Q And that's different than something called event memory or autobiographical memory? Things that people actually live through. You understand that people remember those things differently; isn't that right?

A I understand they're -- they're different.
Q Now, reading a story about some lady from England, what kind of memory is involved there? Is it the book learning kind of memory? Or something that Brendan actually lived through? A It's -- it's not experiential learn -- uh, memory.

Q All right. You're familiar, Doctor, with studies that show that individuals, especially, uh, with low average IQ's, do significantly better with event memory? That is, with things they've actually lived through, rather than parroting back or recalling things that are read to them? You're aware of that?

A I'm not aware of that, but that doesn't surprise me. I mean, if a person has learning problems, uh, it's
hard to understand more abstract things than things they experience.

Q Well, importantly, police interrogations have everything to do with event memory, things that people have actually lived through, when asked about, uh, whether or not they were involved in something. Uh, they can use that kind of memory; isn't that true?

A True.
Q Event memory? And people with -- or at least that are asked to call upon their event memory of higher accuracy, less tendency to acquiesce, which is called yield, uh, and are more resistive to suggestion, less chance of shifting, you'd agree with those propositions, wouldn't you?

A That question went by too fast for me to agree or disagree, Counsel.

Q I'm sorry?
A You went -- You went too fast for me.
Q People with low -- Brendan would be better at event memory than with semantic or book learning kinds of memory. Would you agree with that?

A For that particular factor, yes.
Q Since I have two minutes I have to complete my examination with this doctor, would you agree
that the norms, that is, uh, who the Gudjonsson test is compared against, um, do not necessarily reflect the population of -- of people like Brendan Dassey? In other words, uh, they aren't compared against other people who are currently being charged with homicide; is that true?

A They're not being -- yes.
Q And, so, whether these are some students in England at Oxford, or something, who took this particular test, uh, they -- when told to change their answers, they may be more reluctant to do that, than somebody whose expert, whose doctor told him, Brendan, I want you to change your answer, that's fair, isn't it?

A I don't know.
Q Finally, the more suggestible a person is, the less detail they're able to provide? That is, the less, um, recall they may have about a particular event; is that true?

A Yes.
Q Conversely, then, the amount or the quality of information, the quality of detail that Brendan could provide, in fact, doesn't support the proposition that this statement was the product of suggestibility, does it?

A Read that back, please. Or repeat it.
Q Sure. The quality, that is, the detail, that Brendan was able to provide, in fact, does not support your conclusion. Is inconsistent with your conclusion as to suggestibility; isn't that true?

A If that is considered in isolation, that's -- that's true. But there are other factors, obviously, involved. I appreciate it very much. Thank you.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
THE COURT: All right. We're going to adjourn until 1:30. Um, you may step down. I'll remind the jury, don't talk about this or anything related to this.
(Jurors out at 12:15 p.m.)
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, could I just put that one thing on the record that I wanted to -THE COURT: Oh, go ahead. All right.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: As we know, Dr., uh, Gordon referred to some of his notes that I had specifically --

THE COURT: You can -- you can step down.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: -- I had specifically asked for and were not provided to me. I would ask that during the break, perhaps Mr. Fremgen go through with Dr. Gordon, his file to make sure that was the only thing that wasn't provided to me as ordered and as requested.

I'll tell the Court, if that's the only thing I didn't get, I'm not asking for any sanction order. I'm sure it was an oversight.

But, uh, at least Mr. Fremgen probably should go through that file and make sure I got the rest of that information.

THE COURT: Mr. Fremgen? Do that.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: All right.
THE COURT: All right? Uh, five minutes
in chambers, please.
(Recess had at 12:18 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 1:30 p.m. Jury in)
THE COURT: Mr. Fremgen, you may proceed.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Thank you, Judge.
THE COURT: You're welcome.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY FREMGEN:
Q The, um, prosecutor asked you a couple of questions I want to follow up on from before.

Uh, Doctor, one question was asked of you whether you're familiar with any other psychologists in Wisconsin who have, uh, performed similar evaluations and testified similarly. You indicated, no?

A That's correct.
Q Are you aware of any other jurisdictions where that might have occurred?

A Yes. And other states.
Q In other states. Your report, would it be fair to call it a summary of all of your observations, evaluation and tests?

A Yes.
Q Did you include in that summary report -- and, again, I believe it's a five-page report? Do you recall that?

A I --
Q And, actually, you know what I'll do? I'll mark that as an exhibit if the State has no objection. ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, I think it's appropriate, Judge.
(Exhibit 231 marked for identification) THE COURT: All right. Is that Exhibit 230 then? THE CLERK: Two thirty-one.

THE COURT: Two thirty-one?
Q (By Attorney Fremgen) I'm going to show you what has been marked Exhibit 231. Is this the report that was what you were talking about -- or, do you believe this is the report that was discussed on cross-examination?

A Yes.
Q Now, one question of you, Doctor, was whether or not you included all of the, uh, questions and answers from the $16-\mathrm{PF}$ in that summary report; correct?

A Did it include all of the responses to all the questions?

Q Correct.
A No.
Q Why not?
A It would not have helped with the interpretation and, secondly, it would have been very unwieldy to include all reports. I mean, all questions and responses. And it would have been a violation of my ethics.

Q Well, what do you mean by "unwieldy?" Do you mean that it would have been a 50 - or 60 -page report?

A Oh, at least that, if I would have included an interpretation of -- of each question for each item
on all of the personality tests.
Q And, again, that would -- you know, if I would go further and ask you the same with the MMPI, if you included all 478 questions and responses, how would that have affected or impacted on the -the summary report in and of itself?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Judge, I'm going to interpose an objection. I think my question was are those items that were contrary or contradictory to his opinion, why they weren't included. I didn't ask this doctor whether he included every answer to every test.

THE COURT: That's my recollection of the question, Counsel.

Q (By Attorney Fremgen) Doctor, is it normal procedure by a forensic, or, for that matter, clinical, psychologist to include the actual question and answers of tests in a summary report?

A Absolutely not.
Q Why not?
A Well, like I -- I said, it's a -- I -- I -- when you purchase these tests, you -- you agree that you have a certain level of training, and I document that for -- so you even can buy it. And, then, there's
contractually, you agree that you won't disseminate this to anyone other than psychologists.

Uh, secondly, by extracting individual questions, it -- it -- it would not -- it would be misleading. It would not provide for a solid report.

Q How do you view a summary report?
A I do my best to summarize all of the objective data that's relevant to a given case so that the conclusions, uh, in my report could be understood, based on what precedes it in the report.

Q Do you believe that Exhibit 231, essentially, complies with your understanding of what should be in a summary report?

A Yes.
Q Upon cross-examination, an issue was brought up about, um, anxiety; correct?

A Correct.
Q Uh, observations of anxiety and, um, whether there was -- may have been -- I -- I believe it was the $16-\mathrm{PF}$, or could have been the, uh -- I'm sorry, I believe it was the $16-\mathrm{PF}$, some observation on a question that deals with anxiety; correct?

A Correct.

Q Did you, in your mental status evaluation, ever observe what you believed, based upon your, uh, training and experience as a clinical, as well as forensic psychologist, anxiety when you spoke with Brendan Dassey?

A Yes.
Q So even if it's not in a test, could you still discern whether someone might be exhibiting anxiety?

A Even if it's not in a test, uh, I could form some conclusions regarding anxiety, uh, just from a interview.

Q The, uh, MMPI-A that you testified about, uh, you indicated you weren't sure, or can't recall, if you actually asked the questions and circled the answers, or whether Brendan actually circled the answers on the score sheet; correct?

A Correct.
Q That's the 478 questions you had talked about?
A True.
Q Are the results interpreted by you?
A They're interpreted by me and hypothesis come from a computer, initially.

Q Let me ask you this, Doctor: When you -- after you complete the test, where do you send it? Or
do you send it somewhere?
A I, or one of my assistants, hand enter the responses into a computer, and it electronically is sent to, uh, Minnesota, and a report is immediately generated, including the scores, and sent back to my --

Q And you -- when you receive that, you receive, basically, the -- the scores, and I believe it was Exhibit, uh -- I'm showing you what's been marked as Exhibit 229? And, again, this is what the results would show from the MMPI-A?

A Those are four scales contained on the MMPI-A.
Q So four of the 70 scales you had discussed on cross-examination were on this exhibit; correct?

A Correct.
Q But what you receive is the number, where it says score; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q And percentile, you receive that also from the manufacturer who -- who tallies up the answers and provides you with a computer-generated score?

A No, I -- I personally know from charts and books and how to look up what particular $T$ scores -- the, uh, 72, for example, and I know how to convert that into the percentile. So I do that on my own.

Q So the score, itself, is generated by the
computer and you provided perc -- a percentile to that?

A True.
Q Are all 70 scales that you testified about on cross-examination pertinent, in your opinion, as to the issue of suggestibility?

A No.
Q Are the scales on Exhibit 229 that you've included from the MMPI, in your opinion, pertinent in reaching your conclusion as to suggestibility?

A Are the -- what -- what's Exhibit 229?
Q I'm sorry. The one on the screen. The MMPI?
A Three of four are pertinent. I -- I listed the high scores from the -- high -- high scores from the clinical scales, and the basic clinical profile, and the high scores from the additional scales beyond the basic ten.

Q Why are these three pertinent, where the other 70 are not pertinent, in your opinion, in reaching the conclusions about suggestibility?

A My review of the other scales sh -- was -- shows that those scores were either not consistent with, or consistent with, uh -- they weren't related to whether a person was suggestible or not. So I -- I
didn't include them.
Q Is that information that you incorporate from your research, uh -- or from the research from Gudjonsson?

A Gudjonsson and others.
Q In totality, the -- all the tests and inventories that you've used, are these considered objective inventories and tests or subjective?

A Objective.
Q Why is it that you want objective tests in addition to your clinical judgment?

A Objective tests are based on research from a variety of institutions with thousands of subjects and result in reliable scores that are the same scores obtained over and over. And by obtaining the same score over and over on a given scale, then you can see if they're valid. That is, if those scores are connected to other variables, such as, uh, depression, such as, whatever the case might be. And that's how those scales are obtained, based on -- on, uh, well-accepted research that's been taught to me in 197 -- early '70's, and for that as well, up until now.

Q And getting back to the objective nature of these tests, they're actually -- would you -- well, do
you actually make the test yourself or does somebody else make them?

A I don't make the tests. That's -- someone else take -- has made the test.

Q And you've testified previously that you've, uh, performed thousands of evaluations before?

Clinical as well as forensic?
A True.
Q And you use objective tests in those types of evaluations as well?

A I only use objective tests, uh, since 1978. I -I -- my review of the literature suggests that, uh, projective tests are not useful.

Q So you use objective tests along with your own clinical analysis and judgment?

A Yes.
Q And, at times in the past, when you've done evaluations, um, using objective tests, have the results always been consistent?

A No.
Q Were your results in this case consistent?
A All of the personality tests were consistent, as were the IQ tests, which were consistent with my conclusion -- my conclusion.

Q What significance would you place on the
consistency of the objective tests with your conclusion?

A It's highly unusual that that occurs and it provided me with more competence in the interpretation and conclusions that I reached regards -- regarding the present case.

Q On cross-examination, the prosecutor asked you about the March 1, 2006, video; correct?

A Correct.
Q You indicated that was not absolutely necessary, but was helpful, in your determination of suggestibility; correct?

A True.
Q Why was it that you feel it was not absolutely necessary in making that determination?

A Because one can rely on interview and objective tests that I use to assess whether a person has psychological characteristics that cause them to be susceptible to suggestibility and giving confessions when, uh, there's pressure applied.
Q What -- what was helpful then, about the video once you made your initial opinion about suggestibility?
A It confirmed that, in various cases, uh, yield and shift-type of questions, uh, and different ways to
obtain a confession were -- were evident.
Q Well, and let me just follow up on the yield and shift, um, answer. The -- the prosecutor, in cross-examination, mentioned that you left out of your report examples of times Brendan resisted suggestion; correct?

A Correct.
Q And you said you did?
A I did.
Q And -- and you -- I think you also confirmed that you noted times on the tape that he resisted suggestion; correct?

A True.
Q Did you also note times or examples of Brendan, initially, resisted, but later changed, based upon questioning?

A True.
Q So both occurred on that video; correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q Is this an example of that shift or yield that you were discussing in regards to the Gudjonsson Suscept -- Suggestibility Scale?

A The Gudjonsson shift and suggestive shift, in, excuse me, response to yield are similar to which -- that which was found in the, uh, in -- in -- in
interviewer interrogation, depending on what you choose to call it.

Q When you did review the school records, you reviewed those after your, uh, initial opinion; correct?

A That's right.
Q Did you note anything in the records that indicated that the school had ever tested Brendan for his level of -- or whether there was a lack of suggestibility?

A I didn't note that that was done.
Q In your psych -- in your experience, is that an -- uh, normal for schools to make determinations of suggestibility or lack of suggestibility?

A No.
Q So it wasn't unusual not to see that in the records; correct?

A Absolutely.
Q In the, uh, actual example, the Gudjonsson Suggestibility, uh, test that you performed on Brendan, and I believe that Mr. Kratz pointed out and had you read portions of, um, you indicated that you had changed the word "pound" to "dollar"; correct?

A Correct.
Q Essentially, changing the English monetary system, den -- denoting money, to what -- the American -- the Americanized monetary dollar; correct?

A Correct.
Q Was that -- in reviewing the test, itself, did that affect results of yield or shift? Changing that one word?

A No, because no questions were based on pound versus dollar.

Q On cross-examination, you indicated that shift and yield is not necessarily indicative of whether someone answers true or false; is that correct?

A That's correct.
Q On -- Mr. Kratz asked you a few follow-up questions, and questioned you on the significance of Brendan's shifting to a true answer based on mild pressures; correct?

A That's correct.
Q What significance does that have, based -- in regards to your opinion on, uh, susceptibility to suggestion?

A None.

Q Is the test -- the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale test -- designed to determine if the answers are true or false?

A No.
Q What is the -- the design of the test?
A It's designed to assess whether a person is suggestible. Interrogative suggestibility, to use the entire word.

Q So, if someone would shift from a true answer to a false answer, would -- well, what indicate -how -- what, uh, impact would that have on your opinion?

A It would simply show that they shift their answers in response to pressure or criticism of their prior response, and would show that they are susceptible to change if they repeatedly did that.

Q Is that the point of the test?
A Yes, sir.
Q One point that, uh -- during questioning on cross, Mr. Kratz asked, or commented, that Brendan had shifted or changed his answer when you, quote, his psychologist, asked him; correct?

A He shifted his answer when I didn't -- I didn't ask him -- I -- I told him that I wanted him to do better and --

Q Doctor, actually, my question is, simply, he shifted -- the question was asked on cross whether -- Mr. Kratz asked you, did he shift or did he change -- excuse me, not shift. Did he change his answer to you, his psychologist?

A He changed it to me, psychologist, as respon -- in response to what $I$ said to him. True.

Q This is when you were you there meeting with Brendan; correct?

A Correct.
Q And you observed the March 1, 2006, video?
A True.
Q At times, do you recall, if you do recall, examples of when the officers referred to him as "buddy?"

A Yes.
Q Touched his knee?
A Yes.
Q Essentially, befriending themselves with Brendan?
A On some occasions.
Q And do you note -- did you note, again, similar changes in answers to these officers who were befriending him?

A True.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Nothing else, Judge.

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY KRATZ:
Q Just one -- one question, Dr. Gordon.
Mr. Fremgen asked you about yield and shift, and gave you an example of Brendan being questioned by officers, um, and then changing his answer. If that was an example of what, uh, Mr. Fremgen called yield and shift. Do you remember that question?

A I do.
Isn't that also an example of an interrogative process where a suspect denies involvement in a crime, is confronted with evidence against him, and then admits to the crime? It's just as consistent with that, isn't it?

A It's consistent with getting a confession.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: All right. That's all I've got of Dr. Gordon. Thank you, very much, again.

THE COURT: All right. You may step down.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, I would move Exhibits, with the same conditions as we've placed before, 226, 227, 229 and 230 and 231.

THE COURT: Any objection to that?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I may have a objection to later use, but to complete the record, I have no objection, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Fremgen, any additional witnesses?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: No, Judge.
THE COURT: Uh, I think we now have some matters to -- to take up. I'm going to excuse the jury for a few moments.
(Jury out at 1:54 p.m.)
THE COURT: All right. You may be seated. Mr. Kratz, it's my understanding that the prosecution proposes introducing some rebuttal testimony this afternoon; is that correct?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yes.
THE COURT: And I -- we have discussed this briefly in chambers before coming here, all counsel, uh, together with the Court, uh, and I said to you that before rebuttal testimony would be permitted, I would have to hear from you an offer of proof as to who was going to testify and, uh, specifically, on what particular issues was he or she going to testify.

The general rule is that rebuttal may
meet only new material, or new testimony, new facts, put in by the defendant. Uh, essentially, it's -- the Court has a fair amount of discretion in permitting or rejecting rebuttal testimony. Uh, with that said, Mr. Kratz, are you prepared to make an offer of proof?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I can either do that orally or I can do that by question and answer, Judge. I think if I do it orally, that would, uh -- that would suffice. But, uh, if you want a more detailed version, we can do that. How about I try it orally first, and then --

THE COURT: Please.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: -- then we'll see. We do intend to call, uh, James Armentrout, clinical, uh, psychologist. Uh, that $C V$ was provided to Mr. Fremgen this morning. It was sent over the evening hours to the D.A's Office here, and I provided it, as the Court, uh, wished.

Dr. Armentrout has brought with him, uh, his original CV, and I believe he will be, um, recognized as a -- an expert, given his clinical psychology background, as well as the number of times he's been accepted in, uh, this and other states as an expert.

The new testimony, Judge, that's been presented by Dr. Gordon, are on the issues of suggestibility. Uh, and, specifically, uh, whether or not, uh, psychologists, whether forensic or clinical, uh, psychologists, um, render opinions in an expert capacity in that area. Uh, specifically, the issue of whether, uh, suggestibility is a specialty or sub-specialty, uh, is of issue in this case, and I believe Dr. Armentrout can testify about that. More importantly, however, Dr. Armentrout is familiar, because of the discovery provided by Mr. Fremgen, with the tests, reports and opinions, uh, which have been completed by Dr., uh, Gordon. Uh, Dr. Armentrout is prepared to comment as to, uh, those reports, as to each of the specific tests, how they were administered, uh, and, again, perhaps, most importantly, the opinions that, uh, may be drawn, uh, therefrom.

Uh, Dr. Armentrout, specifically, and finally, uh, will give, um, uh, an opinion, uh, regarding the, uh, ultimate opinion rendered by, uh, Dr., uh, Gordon, uh, and may, in fact, disagree that the test results, um, at least from
his review of those same materials that Dr. Gordon has provided, uh, may lead to that result.

I anticipate the rebuttal testimony, uh, to be a half an hour or less. Uh, will, in a very strict sense, be rebuttal. That is only what Dr. Gordon, uh, has testified about, and we are prepared to proceed in that fashion.

THE COURT: Before I -- I get to Mr. Fremgen, I'm just reviewing my notes, haphazard as they are, but, uh, it was my recollection that Dr. Gordon claimed that, uh, false confessions and suggestibility was neither a specialty nor a sub-specialty. Did I miss that?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That it -- it remains, uh -- it remains an issue, Judge. Uh, whether, uh, this -- whether Dr. Gordon, um, believes he, or any other psychologist, is, um, qualified or capable to render an opinion as to suggestibility, uh, is very much at issue. Dr. Armentrout has an opinion about that and I intend to ask him about that.

Uh, he will describe, specifically, what suggestibility is, and is familiar not only with the practice of, uh, clinical and forensic, uh, psychology, um, but also, uh, trial or courtroom,
uh, testimony. Uh, and that the, uh, opinions, um, reached by Dr., uh, Gordon, uh, he, I believe, will opine, uh, is, uh, nothing more, uh, than a combination or culmination of descriptive terms, and do not, in fact, uh, rise to the level of, uh, an expert opinion that can, in fact, be reached by a psychologist, whether forensic or clinical.

THE COURT: That's a good answer, but it wasn't to the question that I asked of you. Namely, that, uh, it was my understanding, based on Dr. Gordon's testimony, that he did -- was unclaiming either sub-specialty or specialty status for, uh, the suggestibility. I -- and I'm asking, did I -- did I misunderstand?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No. It's -- it's -- it's as to whether or not an expert opinion that is within the field of forensic or clinical psychology, uh, whether this is a recognized, uh, area of expert opinion. He will say, no. And this jury, uh, who has, uh, been led to believe that, uh, it is, uh, by Dr., uh, Gordon, and I understand that might be a question of fact, but $I$ guess that's the point, Judge, it's as to whether or not, uh, this jury should be, uh, left with the unchallenged, uh,
position that, uh, in fact, this is somehow sanctioned by the psychological community. The fact of the matter is, it is not, and $I$ should be able to, uh, go into that line of questioning.

THE COURT: Mr. Fremgen.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Well, I -- I think that line of question should have been addressed to Dr. Gordon, first, before he brings in rebuttal. And I al -- also agree with the Court. My recollection is, specifically, the doctor said that the suggestibility is not a sub-specialty. In fact, I think he said forensic and clinical are sub-specialties of general psychology.

I don't understand how that's even an issue. Um, it seems, also, to be somewhat more directed towards the ad -- admissibility issue that we've already addressed previously.

Um, I -- at this point, I guess I don't have any problems if Dr . Armentrout testifies about tests, his opinions about these tests. Uh, but as to rebutting his -- the conclusions, and, suppose, we'd have to hear more, I recall when I offered my proof -- the offer of proof to the Court, we offered, also, as much detail, as you possibly could, into Dr. Gordon's, um,
understanding of the issue of suggestibility and the research in that field.

Dr. Armentrout's, um, Curriculum Vitae essentially indicates he has a Ph. D in child psychology. Many of his, uh -- in fact, almost all but possibly three or four of his papers or publications deal with, primarily, families, parents and children. And his current, uh, position with the Department of Community -- or Human Services in Calumet County, and vocational rehabilitation, SSI -- or excuse me -- social security determination, um, none of it shows any significant or any -- or, actually, none of it shows any, uh, involvement in any sort of forensic type of, uh, uh, expertise.

So, I -- I -- I question whether he even has the ability to -- to answer, directly, other than to simply say whatever the State asks him to say.

THE COURT: Response?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Uh, Dr. Gordon's published, uh, papers are on Rorschach tests and abortion. That because -- and I think it points out, Judge, because this is the first time, at least that we've seen, that this area, uh, is being
ventured into, I wouldn't expect there to be a lot of publications or a lot of testimony on this issue.

I think it's recognized, at least in this area, certainly before this Court, and the first time that, uh, myself or Mr. Fremgen have addressed this, that this area has been allowed in trial testimony.

Uh, as far as Walstad goes, this doctor, uh, I believe to be, uh, able to render relevant, rebuttal testimony as to the last.

THE COURT: Mr. Fremgen, anything else?
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: No, Judge.
THE COURT: Uh, the Court is going to permit Dr. Armentrout to testify as a rebuttal witness. I'm going to limit the testimony to the tests, the interpretation of those tests, and, assuming that a foundation is -- sufficient foundation is laid, and, again, I haven't seen his CV , nor have I seen a written proffer of what it is he's going to say, but assuming a sufficient foundation has been laid, he can give testimony as to the opinions of Dr. Gordon.

Uh, I'm not interested in hearing whether he believes, uh, suggestibility or the GSS is a specialty or sub-specialty of -- of, uh,
psychology or forensic psychology. Now, with that said, uh --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The GSS is a test. I assume he can talk about that?

THE COURT: Assuming he -- assuming he can lay a foundation, yeah. The Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scales.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Yeah.
THE COURT: As long as there's a foundation, he can talk about it, yeah. Because that's -- that is one of the tests, apparently, that you wish him to comment on.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I do.
THE COURT: All right. Are you prepared to -- what --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: If I could have 30
seconds to -- to -- to frame -- or at least to talk to Dr. Armentrout about that --

THE COURT: That's fair. But, before you
do, uh, prior -- one item -- minor item of
unfinished business, uh, Mr. Fremgen, over the lunch hour, was going to review his file to determine whether or not there were any -- any other pieces of information that you were entitled to under the discovery order, under nine seventy-one
twenty-three, and if there weren't, uh, we would let the matter pass. Has he done that?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: He has. Uh, Mr. Fremgen has explained why I didn't get the, uh, information that Dr. Gordon, um --

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: It was my fault, Judge, not Dr. Gordon.

ATT'ORNEY KRATZ: Correct. Correct. If I can finish.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Actually, it was Ray's fault.

THE COURT: Let -- let's -- let Mr. Kratz finish, please.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: He explained why it was that the discovery order was not complied with. I find that to be, uh, a reasonable explanation and I have no further, um, uh, comment to make to the Court. I'm satisfied with Mr. Fremgen's representation.

THE COURT: All right. The matter --
ATTORNEY KRATZ: And I don't blame Ray, like Mr. Fremgen.

THE COURT: Matter is dropped, then. How much time do you need, Mr. Kratz?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Just a minute, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay.
(Recess had)
THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Kratz.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Don't we need the jury?
THE COURT: Oh, that's true. We could use them.
(Reconvened at 2:10 p.m. Jury in)
THE COURT: Be seated. Before we proceed, uh, Mr. Fremgen, I take it you've rested at this point?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Yes.
THE COURT: On the record?
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. You may now proceed.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: Thank you, Judge. The
State will call James Armentrout to the stand.
THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
JAMES ARMENTROUT,
called as a witness herein, having been first duly
sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please state your name and spell your last name for the record. THE WITNESS: James Armentrout, $A-r-m-e-n-t-r-o-u-t$.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY KRATZ:
Q Tell us, please, how you're employed?
A I am a licensed psychologist.
Q And, Dr. Armentrout, uh, start, if you will, explaining for the jury what educational background you have?

A Well, I received an Undergraduate Degree in Mathematics and a Master's Degree in Psychology from the University of Kansas in the 1960 's. And, um, a Doctorate in Clinical Psychology from the University of Minnesota in 1968.

Q Do you enjoy any areas of specialization? In other words, at the current time, how is it that you are involved in the practice of psychology? A Um, would you like me to review employment and -Q Sure, why don't you do that?

A Now, from 1968 until 1972, I held faculty rank as assistant professor in the Department of Neurology and Psychiatry at St. Louis University. In that position, I had a joint appointment as assistant professor in Psychology.

In 1972, um, I moved to McMaster University in Ontario in a position of associate professor in the Department of Psychiatry of the medical school there.

In that position, I was chief psychologist of one of the four clinical teaching settings of the medical school, and, um, had a variety of activities.

In 1976, I came to Wisconsin in the position of chief psychologist at Winnebago Mental Health Institute. I continued in that position for seven years, and then left the administrative position but continued to work as a staff psychologist at Winnebago until 1998, a total of 22 years.

Um, I have always been either certified registered or licensed for the independent practice of psychology since, I believe, 1969, and I've been licensed in Wisconsin since early in 1977, shortly after I came to this state.

Q You're currently involved in the private practice of psychology?

A Yes, I -- I have done that on a part-time basis all the way through, but since leaving state employment in 1998, I have been doing that primarily.

Q You mentioned briefly, but could you talk more, specifically, about what any professional affiliations you may enjoy?

A Well, I have belonged to the American Psychological

Association since the 1960's. Uh, have been a member of the, um, National Register of Health Service Providers in Psychology since that organization was founded, which would have been sometime in the, I believe, early, um -- early 1970's. But those are the only organizations I belong to. Have you ever been an author or co-author of any papers or publications?

A Well, I did that during the, um, eight years in which I held university faculty appointment. It was an expectation in that line of work that one would, um, produce scholarly, um, papers, and I -- I produced 20-some, all in referee journals, um, during that period of time.

But once I came to Wisconsin, um, I did very little of that work because it was not something that was encouraged in state employment at Winnebago Mental Health Institute. Simply is not the mission of the state facilities as it had been universities.

Prior to today, have you ever been asked to testify in a court proceeding? Specifically, in a jury trial? And have you, in the state of Wisconsin, been accepted, and recognized, as an expert witness in the field of psychology?

A Yes, very many times. Pardon me. I believe I began testifying in court hearings, um, back in the early 1970's, and have, um, been involved in quite a variety of different, um -- different proceedings, different types of proceedings. I have never failed to be recognized as qualified to provide an expert opinion in the field of psychology.

Q Dr. Armentrout, let me ask you about this case, specifically. Uh, did you receive, uh, some time within the last several weeks, a call from, uh, me, uh, asking to provide consultation services, uh, regarding some information that we had been provided?

A Yes, I did.
Q And could you tell the jury, please, how you, uh, responded, and how you've become involved in this case?

A Um, I received the call from you asking if I would be willing to review the information, $u m$, in this case. Um, and I agreed that I would do so. That was approximately two weeks ago. There was a very short time period.

And after I agreed to do that, um, I did call your office and indicated to one of the staff that I hoped I had not agreed to testify,
because I did not know if I would have an opinion, um, that would be needed at the -- at the hearing, and, um, I said -- but I said I would be happy to talk.

You and I spoke on a Tuesday afternoon, I believe, about a week -- perhaps two weeks ago now, and at that time, um, as you pointed out, our relationship was simply one of consultation, to talk over the information that had been submitted for this hearing, and that it was an open question whether we would proceed beyond that.

Um, I did receive some information from you at that time, and I received, um, copies of what I believe were Dr. Gordon's files, when those became available. That was approximately a week or so ago.

Um, we then spoke again on this past Sunday morning to review my opinion of that information, and I think, as a result of that, I'm here today.

Q Dr. Armentrout were you able, then, after receiving, uh, Dr. Gordon's file, that is, the test results, uh, collateral, or at least a very small portion of the collateral information, and
most, specifically, Dr. Gordon's, uh, written report, um, able to review that information and able to form some, uh, opinions about?

A Uh, yes, I did.
Q Let me first, uh, ask about some of the testing that Dr. Gordon, uh, performed, and I'm going to be, specifically, asking you about the administration, and, uh, perhaps, at the conclusion of, uh, these series of questions, asking, uh, you to comment on whatever opinions might be drawn therefrom.

Let's first start with, uh, something that is called Wechsler, uh, Abbreviated Intelligence Scale. First of all, in the course of your, uh, experience as a licensed psychologist in the state of Wisconsin, are you familiar with this test?

A Well, I am familiar in that $I$ have seen it used on occasions. Um, as you mentioned, it is a short form of the Standard Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, uh, which is most popularly now in its third edition, although a fourth edition has been published, but it is not widely used quite yet.

But the third edition of that test is out. That consists of 11 sub-tests. Um, the
abbreviated scale of intelligence that you mentioned, um, is composed of four sub-tests. Two primarily verbal, two primarily nonverbal in character. And, um, the results of that test are used in an attempt to predict what one might have been, or what score one might have obtained, had the whole scale been, um, administered.

So that we do have the possibility of predicting verbal, nonverbal and full scale IQ scores based on only four, rather than the full 11, sub-tests.

Q But even of the four sub-tests in the abbreviated version that was available, uh, are you familiar in the review of, uh, Dr. Gordon's file how many sub-tests were actually administered in this case?

A Yes. I think I pointed out to you that two of the four sub-tests were administered. One verbal and one nonverbal. At the same time, I was aware from other information that the question of Mr. Dassey's general intelligence level is of importance in this matter, because some other claims made about him, um, are said to vary with levels of intelligence.

It seemed to me important to get as good a measure of intelligence as one can under the
circumstances. Now, there may have been circumstances under which no more than 10 or 15 minutes was available for the administration of that test. And, therefore, only half of it was done.

But, um, again, it's -- makes what was already an abbreviated estimate an even more sketchy estimate. If we attempt to, um, estimate the average height of ten people, we'll do better if we measure eight of them than if we measure one or two. The more information, the better estimate.

And I think because, uh, the results reported on that test, as well as the other one done by Dr. Gordon, do differ somewhat from what I understood were results reported by Mr. Dassey's school, in which he had been scoring five to ten points lower on intelligence tests in school, uh, I felt that, um, perhaps a better measure of intelligence or more comprehensive measure would have been helpful.

Q Dr. Gordon's result of 81 , uh, as a full scale, uh, intelligence score, are you familiar with where that, uh, ranks, if you will, or at least from the wechsler scale, uh, how that's
categorized?
A Within the manuals for the Wechsler Intelligence Scales, that score would be near the end of what's labeled the low average range of intelligence. But it is true that within the -- what we call DSM-4, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, Edition 4, of the American Psychiatric Association, there is a diagnosis of borderline intellectual functioning, which can be used when IQ scores vary from approximately 71 to 84.

So, um, again, that score is right on the borderline of sorts, between the -- the borderline intelligence level and the low average level.

Q Just so that the jury doesn't have any, uh, confusion, you don't, um, quarrel or quibble with, uh, Dr. Gordon's, um, assignment or assessment of that particular score as being, uh, towards the low average range?

A Well, I believe the score speaks for itself and needs, um, you know, little interpretation. Um --

Q All right.
A Again, I don't quibble, no.
Q By the way, before we -- we go any further, uh, sitting up by your witness stand is Exhibit No.
232. Tell the jury what that is, please?

A Um, well, this is the copy of the Curriculum Vitae I provided to you.

Q And what is a Curriculum Vitae, please?
A Um, it is the academic equivalent of a resumé. It should summarize a person's background, their educational training, their, um, occupational, um, jobs, sorts of things they've done. There is no standard format.

Some people will include detailed information about specific activities they have done. Other people are, um, less talkative about that, I guess. But it should show where a person has been working, the types of work they have done, and any notable accomplishments, whether those be professional publications, awards or things of that sort.

Q And this is, in fact, a true and accurate, at least as far as, uh, the information for your qualifications to provide an expert opinion; is that -- is that correct?

A Well, it is accurate with one exception. I -- I noted that it does not, um, include reference to the fact that, within the past several years, I have twice served as a, um, temporary, part-time employee
at the Kettle Moraine Correctional Institution.
Um, I served there to help them while they were attempting to recruit staff. There is something of a manpower shortage within the correctional system. So I spent two to three days per week, um, over the last two-and-a-half years, up until last October. And I believe that, um, does not appear on the -- on the document.

Q The next, uh, test or, uh, instrument that Dr. Gordon commented about was something called the $16-\mathrm{PF}$. Let me first ask you if you are familiar with that instrument?

A I have some familiarity with it. It is not a test that I have, um, used routinely, nor, in fact, at all within probably quite a number of years. Um, the intent of the test is to assess personality dimensions of, um, nonclinical, or so-called normal personality.

We do have tests which assess elements of mental illness, maladjustment, interpersonal difficulties, mood states, and things of that sort. But these are more clinical tests used for people who are in crises or, um, having significant problems.

The 16-PF was intended to mention -- or pardon me -- to measure dimensions relevant to more normal personality.

Q Now, were you also asked -- and were you provided with the, um, summary of the test results for each of these instruments?

A I did say -- see a computer-generated, um, printout of those results. Um, yes, I did.

Q And on page three of the summary of the $16-\mathrm{PF}$ report, uh, Dr. Armentrout, did you make specific note, uh, of Mr. Dassey's ability to manipulate verbal concepts? In other words, uh, that particular finding in that report?

A Yes, I did. But, um, that statement, to me, underlines a major shortcoming of virtually all of the mail-order computerized test scoring services. They simply are not specific enough for the individual and the circumstances in which the test was used.

As I pointed out to you, if we go through that report, we can find a great deal of inconsistent and, at times, diametrically opposed information saying that a person tends to do this, but he tends to do something else. He is similar to some people who have this, and less
similar in other ways. I felt those statements were so general that they offered little assistance in understanding what an individual did on one particular day. As an example, there is a statement, despite having said the young gentleman involved is a shy, withdrawn person who avoids crowds and is uncomfortable around people, we could pull out statements that say, and I quote here from page three, "He appears to be about average on warmth, discretion and group orientation. He shows about as much concern for others as the average person." And a little bit later, "He is about as much a team player as his peers."

I find this, um, pattern of offering one side, and then offering a diametrically opposed side, leaves one unable to make any conclusion.

Um, I have, for myself, a small test I use that I do recommend people apply, and that is, when you read descriptive statements about people, I ask myself, so what? He is shy. He is withdrawn. Well, so what? What does that tell us?

I look for a statement that says, therefore, he did this. He did not do that. He
might do -- But to simply describe a person and say, he tends to be this, or he tends to be that, is not very helpful in my opinion.

Q Doctor, I've handed you what's been received as Exhibit No. 231. Have you seen that document before?

A Yes, I have. This appears to be the report of Dr. Gordon's evaluation. It's addressed to Mr. Fremgen.

Q Specifically, um, I -- I should say, first, have you reviewed, and have you had an ability to, um, digest, for lack of a better term, the conclusions and opinions that Dr. Gordon draws within that report?

A Yes, I have.
Q Do you find anywhere, within Dr. Gordon's report, mention of these, um, conflicting, uh, results or these conflicting summary statements that, uh, at least as we're discussing at this moment, are found in the $16-\mathrm{PF}$ report?

A The difficulty $I$ have is that most of the information offered is phrased as probabilistic vague descriptive terms. This person tends to do this. Is prone to do that. Sometimes does something else. And when I ask, well, so what? What can I then conclude or
predict on the basis of those? I find very little. Um, I did not find in that report that any specific allegations or formulations or connections were drawn between these descriptive terms applied to Mr . Dassey, and the behavior patterns, the specific things which have been alleged in this, um, case.

Q All right. We'll get, uh, more specific as to, uh -- as to those opinions. But let me move to the next instrument. That being the State Trait, uh -- just get that a second -- Anger Expression Inventory. First of all, are you familiar with this instrument?

A It is not something that I have ever used. Um, I am aware of it. It was devised by a psychologist named Charles Spielberger, who $I$ believe is at the University of Florida, and is a name recognized by most psychologists, although certainly not in a clinical or forensic context. Um, but I am aware of that.

Um, I am more familiar with a similar document called the Straight -- pardon me. The State Trait Anxiety Inventory, in which the, um -- the items are directed more specifically toward the experience of anxiety, either as a
continuing trait or as a short-term state. But, uh, I'm not surprised there is an anger inventory. I had not seen it before this matter.

Q Exhibit 231, uh, Dr. Gordon's, uh, summary report, are you familiar that within that report Dr. Gordon attributes the, um, behavior or the, um, characteristic of anxiety as something that can be judged or, uh, gleaned out of the Anger Expression Inventory instrument?

A I did see that. Um, apparently, at some point, you know, Dr. Gordon did reach the conclusion that, um, the young man has significant problems with anxiety. I did not see that reflected in any of the tests you've mentioned so far, nor any of the others. Specifically, I don't believe an Anger Expression Inventory is intended to assess anxiety, particularly since we have many more effective, more widely accepted tests, which also would assess anxiety, such as the MMPI.

Q And let's go to that, uh, next. You understand that Dr. Gordon administered something called the MMPI-A? That being the adolescent version, uh, of that instrument. First of all, are you aware of that test instrument?

A Yes, I'm quite aware of the MMPI-A. During my
training many years ago, I was literally steeped in the MMPI. Um, brainwashed, um, as a young psychologist. But, um, I'm quite aware of it. I have been to specific training with, uh, Robert Archer, the gentleman that devised that offshoot of the traditional MMPI. So I am quite familiar with it.

Q Dr. Gordon talked about various, um, scales or conclusions being developed as the, uh, instrument as examined -- 478 answers are examined -- Can you tell the jury, generally, how that process works?

A How was -- the instrument was originally developed?
Q How the instrument is scored or how these scales have been developed, uh, based upon those answers or test answer results?

A Well, the MMPI, itself, was developed back in the 1940's at the University of Minnesota Hospital, specifically, by, um, a psychiatrist and psychologist who wanted to develop a paper and pencil self-administered inventory, which might give a mental health worker some direction as to the nature of mental or emotional problems a person was, um, experiencing.

So, through a method, that I won't take
the time to describe, but they were able to identify short statements which seemed to separate groups of people who did have serious depression problems from those who did not. People who had serious health concerns or serious problems with impulsivity, suspiciousness, mistrust, anxiety, worry, just a variety of things.

And out of that came the MMPI. At that time 566, now 567, items, each of which is answered true or false and can be scored either by hand or by machine to produce what we call a test profile, which simply links together on a graph the extreme -- the extreme nature of the scores on those different sets of items.

Now, the original MMPI was intended to be used in a clinical setting where a person goes to talk to a doctor or therapist in a confidential manner. There were questions included in that, um, test which would not be appropriate for friendly conversation. Questions about religious beliefs, or whether one's stools are black and tarry, or whether, um, one has done things too bad to talk about. There are a number of items there that were felt inappropriate
outside of a psychiatric or psychological setting.

Um, there were tests devised, such as the California Psychological Inventory to drop out those objectionable items. When the MMPI was revised, um, to the second edition by, uh, Dr. Butcher, who, someone, again, I'm well familiar with, because he was on my dissertation committee and preliminary exam committee, but I, again, um, know quite a bit about the way that was done.

However, the MMPI, itself, included virtually no items pertaining to areas of adjustment very relevant for teenagers. The extent of conflicts within one's family, um, general well-being, um, items pertaining to specific difficulties within the school setting. And so the MMPI-A, A being for adolescent, was devised to try to add some assessment of those other areas of adolescent experience to some of the clinical areas of the MMPI which had been used forever.

Um, during my training in the $1960^{\prime}$ s, um, the MMPI was completed by anyone entering the University of Minnesota hospitals, age 12 or
over, even though we knew many of those items were not appropriate. I mean, an item such as, my sex life is satisfactory, is not something I would typically ask a 12-year-old. But when they completed that test, they could either answer true or false or leave it blank because we didn't look at it.

But the MMPI-A was really an attempt to modify the methodology of the MMPI to a form that would be, um, with more broadly applicable for adolescents.

Q And are you aware that this was administered to Brendan Dassey and was, thereafter, scored? That is, that a profile was developed?

A Yes, I am.
Q How many, if I can use the word "primary," scales are there in an MMPI adolescent version?

A Well, it depends if one is talking about the validity scales, the typical clinical scales, the content scales. And, then, of course, the scales, themselves, have been broken down, through factor analysis, into sub-scales, and there is also usually a split between what are called subtle scales as opposed to obvious scales. So it goes on and on. In the original MMPI, which had 566
items, there were more developed scales to be scored from that test than there were items in the test. In other words, that test had been used for virtually any purpose involving people that you could think of. Somebody, somewhere, had devised a scale to try to measure it.

So, typically, a person only uses a part of it. The clinical scales are the most frequently used.

Q All right. The last test, uh, Dr. Armentrout, that I'd like to speak with you about, is something called the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale.

First of all, have you received Dr. Gordon's materials regarding this particular scale, uh, and have you, uh, at least in review of its administration in this case, drawn any conclusions or opinions about its use?

A The information that $I$ received in the packet, um, that I picked up from your office, included four pages labeled the GSS-1. I noted the first page had some writing on it. Name, birth date, age, things of that sort. The following three pages were, essentially, unmarked by any handwriting at all. Nothing recorded. Um, nothing at all. The only
writing was on the cover page.
I was surprised, having seen the report in this matter, that, um, quite a bit is made of Mr. Dassey's performance on that. And, yet, we had no information about it. The other tests had been filled out. We do have handwritten responses recorded right on the test instruments. But we have nothing on the GSS-1. And, so, I raised the question of, it's impossible to really know what happened when that test was administered. Um, that was all I knew.

Q Let me ask about the test itself, though. Since that time, have you done some further examination and have you, um, formed an opinion as to the validity or applicability of this particular test, uh, especially as it pertains to rendering an opinion as to suggestibility?

A Well, it -- it is my opinion that the --
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Judge, I object to the opinion at this time. I don't think the appropriate foundation has been laid. The one question that was asked prior to this question by the prosecutor was, are you familiar with this test, and the answer wasn't given. Just the discussed reading and looking at the front page and reading all the, uh,
copies. There hasn't been any foundation that he's familiar with this test or any background on this test. Before he can offer an opinion on the test, I think there should be something along those lines. THE COURT: Objection is sustained. (By Attorney Kratz) Can you give any further background as to what you've learned about this test since you first received copies from our office?

A Certainly. Um, I had not heard of this instrument prior to my first conversation with you. I had never heard of it. So, after learning of it, I did look on the internet, um, I did read some information there. I did read, for example, that Dr. Gudjonsson was born in Iceland, received some of his training there, went from there to the Institute of Psychiatry in London.

Apparently, he has been a practitioner in England. I don't know if he has ever done any direct clinic work in the United States. But I did attempt to find information and found some on the internet, specifically, about Dr. Gudjonsson and the suggestibility scale.

Now, my familiarity with this instrument
is based upon the four pages that I received.
And I am familiar with what was placed before me
and that is what I describe. But as for the instrument, itself, I had never heard of it, so, prior to two -- two weeks ago, I would say.

Q The instrument, itself, and the pages that you did receive, are you able, as a licensed psychologist, to comment on the, um -- the administration of the test? That is, the, uh, cultural bias, if any, that is suggested on the face, itself, of this instrument?

A Yes, I believe I can.
Q And can you offer that opinion for us, please?
A In looking at the test, first, I -- I had some concerns about what seems to be the way the test was administered. In Dr. Gordon's report, um, as he described this test, um, and that is on page five, he mentioned that, um, after 45 minutes of time has elapsed, they are then requested to answer a series of leading questions.

When I looked at the first page of this document, when it says immediate recall start time, it's a minute and 15 seconds after. But the questioning start time is 35 minutes after. My question was, did he begin his questioning 35 rather than 45 minutes after? If so, on what basis? Why is he modifying the test? I had
questions at that point. When I --
Q Let me do this form by question and answer, Doctor, if $I$ can, because $I$ think that will, um -- will help with the, uh, uh, the presentation. Are you familiar with the term "cross-validation?"

A Yes, I am.
Q Can you describe what that is for the jury, please?

A It, typically, means taking the results of one experiment or one application and applying it to a new sample or a new situation to find out whether the relationships or results obtained the first time will also be obtained the second time. Um, it is not at all unusual for a test to initially have very hopeful, positive results, but on cross-validation, meaning, application in another setting with a different group of people or even with a similar group of people, um, it is not, um, found to be as accurate or helpful as it was initially.

It's necessary to repeatedly demonstrate a relationship that you claim has validity. Reliability, meaning the -- the ability to find the same thing each time, is a prerequisite for validity, meaning that you're measuring what you
think you're measuring, because I have serious questions whether this scale measures suggestibility at all.

Q All right. We'll get into the -- the reasons for those questions. But, um, are you familiar with whether this test is meant to be what is called a standardized test?

A As I said, I had no knowledge of it before two weeks ago. Um, I have no -- no knowledge of that. I did look at some of the current textbooks in forensic psychology, such as one by Thomas Grisso, another well-known psychologist, and I did find that he mentioned in passing in one small paragraph that this test exists, but he said nothing more about it. So --

Q All right. Um, I interrupted you when you were talking about some of the cultural concerns, or at least, uh, uh, cultural flavor to this particular, uh, instrument. Uh, could you expound on that, please? And I apologize for interrupting.

A When I looked at this paragraph, um, I noticed its similarity to a paragraph used in another widely used psychological test, called the Wechsler Memory Scale. That, for example, is the test that the Social Security Administration uses to evaluate, um,
people's claims of serious memory defects, which interfere with employment. That is the test that is used.

It has one section called logical memory, in which a person is asked to remember a paragraph. The paragraph begins, "Anna Thompson, of South Boston, employed as a cleaning woman, reported at the police station she had been held up on State Street."

This paragraph seems an offshoot of that. Um, and yet, I could not understand what the meaning of this paragraph would be for an adolescent who grew up in a relatively small town in -- in Wisconsin. To say that somebody was on holiday in Spain, um, and was advised to contact the British Embassy, seems to have little meaning.

Now, once that paragraph is read and a period of time elapses, apparently the individual is asked a series of questions. And it's important to know whether the person remembers the story or not.

But we do not know whether Mr. Dassey remembered anything of that story 30 seconds after it was read to him because there's no
recorded memory score on the sheet that I received. He might not have even known what the story was about. And to say that hearing a paragraph read for a minute and 15 seconds about a crime involving a woman from England on holiday in Spain with her husband, that seems so far afield from an individual who is alleged to have participated in a truly heinous crime, I don't see the connection there at all, and I don't see why anyone would attempt to try very hard to remember all of that story.

But as I mentioned to Mr. Kratz, if we assume the individual recalls nothing of that story, 35 minutes later he's given a choice, this or that. Now, I could ask someone, guess three or five. If they guess, three, and I tell them, that's not very good, you can do better, try again, they're going to guess five. I mean, most people would not repeat answers they have just been told are wrong.

And, so, we don't know why a person would change answers when asked a set of questions twice. Maybe they're trying to do well and get the right answer, and maybe they have not the foggiest notion about what that story was
that was read for a minute and 15 seconds more than a half hour ago.

So, I think to take a person's response to those questions, um, and attach a meaning to it in terms of suggestibility, seem far afield to me. It seemed unjustified.

THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, we seem to be going into sort of a narrative mode here.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: I'm going --
THE COURT: Can we -- can we become a question and answer mode instead?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Certainly can, Judge.
THE COURT: All right.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: In fact, I'm going to wrap up this question with, uh -- or excuse me, this examination with this doctor.

Q (By Attorney Kratz) Um, reviewing Dr. Gordon's written report, considering the testing that he did, the intelligence test, the personality test, the inventories and the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale, together with the consideration of the other collateral information listed in that report, are you familiar with Dr. Gordon's stated opinion that this man, Brendan Dassey, was significantly vulnerable to suggestibility?

A Yes. I noted at the end of his report he mentioned he is very susceptible to suggestibility.

Q Based upon your review of the same materials, uh, would you draw the same expert opinion?

A I would not draw that opinion. But even given that statement, I would revert to the question of, so what? What does it tell us? And my answer is, not very much.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's all I have of Dr. Armentrout, Judge. Thank you, very much. THE COURT: Cross?

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY ATTORNEY FREMGEN:
Q Doctor, you indicated, uh, I believe it might
be -- is it Exhibit two thirty -- is it 231 or 232 before you? The -- your Curriculum Vitae?

A Yes. Um-hmm.
Q Which number is it?
A Two thirty-two.
Q Two thirty-two? Now, you're not affiliated with -- you have no forensic affiliations; correct? Listed on that document?

A You mean memberships in organizations? No, I do not.
Q Correct. Nothing like the American Board of Forensic Psychology?

A No. I've been to many of their, um, continuing education things, but I see no reason to seek their certification.

Q No scholarly work since 1978; is that correct?
A That's right. My positions have not been such where that was part of the job duties.

Q Despite your position since 1978, you haven't provided any articles or publications for peer review or otherwise non-peer review?

A Well, again, whatever would be on the CV, that's it.
Q So if I -- if I ask you to read it, or -- or would you believe me if I said I don't see any publications dated after 1978?

A Oh, certainly.
Q Okay. So you'd agree with that last statement that you haven't had any publications, articles, research, peer review or otherwise, since 1978?

A Yes.
Q Now, you indicated you were brought into this case after receiving the call from Mr. Kratz; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you're currently employed with Calumet County Department of Human Services in some regard?

A No, I'm not. Um, I had a contract with them to
provide psychological evaluations. But, um, we let that contract lapse, I believe, in January of 2006.

I had done that for several years until then.
Q So, a -- again, we'll look back at your Curriculum Vitae, Exhibit 232 before you. If you could take a look at that?

A Certainly.
Q So I ask you to look at page two?
A Um-hmm.
Q Where it indicates, employment, consultant psychologist Calumet County Department of Human Services, Chilton, Wisconsin. You see that?

A Yes, I do.
Q And it says 1997 to blank.
A That's right. I probably forgot to put '06 on the CV.

Q So just an error?
A I'm sorry. What?
Q You made an error?
A Yes, I made an error.
Q So up until 2006, you had a consulting position with Calumet County?

A Yes, I did.
Q And at that same county Mr. Kratz works in; correct?

A Yes.
Q You primarily practice in Oshkosh?
A No, I would say, by far, the greater part of the work I do now is in Brown County. Specifically, in Green Bay. Although, in recent months, I've been involved in Door County, Kewaunee County, Shawano County, Oconto County, Washington County, uh, so not in any one locale.

Q According to your Curriculum Vitae, your office is in Oshkosh, though?

A Yes. My office has always been in Oshkosh for 20-some years.

Q And that's Winnebago County; right?
A Yes, it is.
Q Are you on any lists in regards to Winnebago County to offer independent medi -- mental health examinations in clinical or forensic psychology?

A Yes, I will. I'm -- I'm not sure if they maintain, um, lists, but -- for example, within the fact -past year, I have seen juveniles from Winnebago County who were detained, um, in Appleton in secure detention.

I have given opinions to the juvenile
courts. Um, I have done a number of, um, forensic evaluations in Winnebago County.

I believe it's been about -- little more than a year ago, there was, um, a homicide case there, in which I provided an opinion of a man who had, um, inflicted fatal injuries with a baseball bat.

Um, I was involved in Winnebago County in a case, I believe, perhaps, two years ago, of a high school student who had, um, shot another man with a shotgun.

Um, I -- I've been involved in a number of cases in Winnebago County.

Q What collateral information did you receive and did you review in making your opinion today?

A Today?
Q Right.
A In this case?
Q At any time, prior to today, did you review any collateral information provided to you by Mr. Kratz or someone from his office?

A Yes, I did.
Q And what collateral information did you review?
A I received a copy of the, um, motion to permit testimony on suggestibility in this matter. I received copies of the brief in support of that motion, as well as a copy of the brief opposed to
that motion.
I received a letter from a gentleman named Mr. Buckley. Um, I had a chance to review, um, that letter.

And I received a copy of an article entitled, Suggestibility and Confessions by a Dr. Trowbridge.

And, then, again, the -- the records that we have discussed earlier.

Q And the other records would be Dr. Gordon's report; correct?

A Yes. I received copies of his test materials, his report, his handwritten notes. Again, whatever had been in his file and was to be provided, um, that's what I received.

Q Okay. And nothing else?
A I don't recall receiving anything else, no. I did, on my own, look up some information. For example, in test -- um, psychological test -- textbooks, looking at, um, the state Trait tests, and looking for information on the Gudjonsson and the 16-PF. Um, I did photocopy for myself some information out of those textbooks.

Q You indicated you were also aware of school records reflecting intelligence scores?

A It was my understanding that at some point, yes, that a -- a school counselor had provided some information like that.

Q So the intelligence score, in Dr. Gordon's, um, documents, were provided to you in regards to the Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence, as well as the Kaufman --

A Brief Intelligence Test, yes.
Q Correct.
A Um-hmm.
Q Your testimony, if I understand it correctly, was that the actual school records reflect a lower intelligence score; correct?

A Well, my source there was a letter by Mr. Buckley of the John Reid, um, Company who had done a summary, and that was provided to me along with the other records. In there, I noted his comment that a school counselor had either given testimony or a deposition in which it was noted that Mr. Dassey had been tested at three-year intervals three times and had IQ scores in the 70's.
$Q \quad$ So Dr. Gordon's evaluation reflected, actually, a higher $I Q$ than the school did?

A A little higher, yes. Whether it's a significant or stable difference, I don't know.

Q Don't recall asking you that. Did I ask you if it was significantly higher? Or -- I think it was just -- it was higher; correct?

A Numerically it's higher, yes.
Q Thank you. You indicated that the 16-PF -- you had some concerns with it because it's a mail-order test?

A It's not a mail-order test. It's a test which is administered, apparently, by Dr. Gordon or somebody under his direction, but the results are then sent off to a scoring service, which scores the answer sheet and returns, um, a computer-generated test report.

Q On direct, when asked to comment about the 16-PF, you commented that one concern with these types of tests, these mail-order tests, are simply not specific enough?

A Yes, that's true.
Q So when I referred to it a mail-order test a minute ago and you corrected me, I was just repeating what you called it; correct?

A Okay. I don't recall if I used the term
"mail-order." If I did, I misspoke, because the situation is as $I$ just explained -- explained it. Q And is the $16-\mathrm{PF}$ a test that only Dr. Gordon has access to?

A Oh, certainly not. I think any qualified licensed or other psychologist in practice would have access to it.

Q So other members of your profession; correct?
A Certainly, the publisher of the test would have requirements for a person to qualify as a user. But I think, um, you know, again, any practicing psychologist would meet those standards.

Q And would you -- if you have an opinion, would you agree with me that there's probably likely a few more forensic or clinical psychologists, who are qualified, probably have access to and use that type of test?

A Oh, I'm sure other ones do.
Q You're -- you seem to be critical of the use of the $16-\mathrm{PF}$ by Dr. Gordon in formulating his opinion. Yet, you would agree with me that other psychologists probably use those tests as well; correct?

A Um, yes, that's correct.
Q So all those other psychologists using the 16-PF, they just must be wrong using that --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Objection, argumentative. THE WITNESS: I don't believe I said
that.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: I'll withdraw it.
Q (By Attorney Fremgen) You indicated that you're not familiar with the State Trait Anger Expression Inventory?

A No, it's not something that I routinely either use myself or encounter in the clinical work I do.

Q But you've offered an opinion critical of Dr. Gordon's opinion based upon his use of that test; correct?

A No, I tried not to offer any opinion critical of Dr. Gordon. I'm not acquainted with him and I mean no disrespect or discourtesy to him. It is his opinion that my opinion may disagree with. But I would certainly, um, tender full respect and courtesy to Dr. Gordon. I mean no disrespect.

If I implied that you were criticizing Dr. Gordon, I apologize. I think I was referring to the report. And so to make it clear, I'll just refer to it as Exhibit 231. I think it -Correct? Is it 231?

A That's fine.
Q Okay. The, uh, MMPI, you actually have some professional or scholarly, um, experience with the MMPI?

A I have considerable experience with the MMPI, although more in my first 20 years than, perhaps, in the last five or ten. I do not use it, um, frequently anymore.

Q Does the MMPI have some utility in the field of forensic or clinical psychology?

A Oh, I believe it does. There are a number of books that have been written on the forensic applications of the MMPI.

Q That, too, is a -- a test that is provided -- I won't -- I won't call it a mail-order test, but something provided by a manufacturer, in which you have to send back the, uh, uh, answer sheet and receive, then, their interpretation of the results; correct?

A No, that's not entirely correct. The test can be scored by a series of templates by an individual. Um, laying the template over the answer sheet, counting up the numerical scores and the various, um, scales of that test.

That can be done. It can be done as a clerical task by a trained secretary, just as the profile of those scores can be drawn.

If a person feels competent or qualified or comfortable interpreting the test, the person
may go ahead and do that, based upon experience, training, reference books, whatever.

There are interpretation services available on a mail basis. In other words, one can either fax or send off the answer sheet to the service of Dr. Butcher and Dr. Williams, or, for example, to another one by a psychologist named Alex Caldwell, who has a very widely respected MMPI interpretation program.

But there must be at least eight or ten of those available by mail order. And, um, again, one can mail off the, um, answer sheet and receive back a printed report.

Q So it's not unusual to use one of those, as you pointed out, well-respected interpretation, uh, individuals or psychologists who can interpret the results?

A Again, some people do it, some people don't. It depends upon one's perceived need for that. If people want to do it, they do it. It's not a standard practice one way or the other.

Q Are you familiar with the, uh, studies done by person by the name of Ayling, A-y-l-i-n-g, 1984, pertaining to false confessions?

A No, I'm not.

Q Any studies by an individual by the name ofshe, O-f-s-h-e, from 1989, in regards to suggestibility and false confessions?

A No, I'm not.
Q Have you reviewed any of the Gudjonsson, uh, reports dating back from ' 83 through 2001 pertaining to this issue of suggestibility?

A I have not made any effort to review that literature, no.

Q Any of the Loftus studies from 1979, 1990? Into the $90^{\prime} \mathrm{s}$ ?

A No.
Q The Kasson or McNall test -- uh, studies in 1991? Are you familiar with those?

A No, I'm not.
Q So you're not familiar with any of these tests, or, excuse me, studies that deal with the issue of suggestibility or false confessions?

A That's what I said. I'm not. Yes.
Q Well, you have performed some internet research into the topic?

A I did briefly, yes. Um-hmm.
Q And I think you said you ran across the term "suggestibility" in one of those articles or some study you -- you referenced on the internet?

A Yes, I did find some references to it, as well as to Dr. Gudjonsson.

Q Did you have a handbook to interpret how to administer the Gudjonsson Suggestibility Scale?

A No, I did not. I've never administered it.
Q You've never administered it. And you don't know how to administer the test? Would that be fair to state?

A Um, yes, that would be fair.
Q Did you actually interview Brendan Dassey?
A No, I've had no contact with Mr. Dassey at all. Would you agree that, as a psychologist, whether it be clinical or forensic, in order to draw a conclusion about an individual, it's usually best to meet the individual?

A I'm -- well, I'm not sure of the meaning of "best." In this case, I was not asked to provide an opinion about Mr. Dassey, specifically, and I was not offered any, um, access to him. So it simply was not the way in which I became involved.

I will agree that in most of the work I do, I would provide an evaluation, and my opinion might stand in contrast to someone else's opinion, and those two opinions can then be compared and evaluated by someone. But in this
case, um, I was not asked to do that. I was asked to offer opinions regarding the information submitted to the Court.

Q Would you agree that then it would be a normal or a standard practice in your field to evaluate an individual before offering a -- an opinion about that person?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Objection. Asked and answered, Your Honor.

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Actually, I don't believe I asked that exact question.

THE COURT: Overruled. You may answer. THE WITNESS: No, it would not be a standard of practice for me to do something that I had not been, specifically, asked to do. That is not a standard of practice.

Q That -- that wasn't the question I asked you. I understand that you weren't asked to do that and I'll grant you that. But is it a standard practice in your field, if the person is offering -- if the psychologist is offering an -an opinion as to a particular person, that they would actually provide an individual or personal interview or evaluation of that?

A On that, I would agree with you. It is expected that
if I were to offer an opinion, specifically, about Mr. Dassey, it would be unethical for me to do that without at least attempting to personally evaluate or examine him in developing that opinion.

And I would be justified in not meeting with him only if he refused to participate.

But, um, that is not the case here. I have not been asked to provide any specific opinion or evaluation of Mr. Dassey. The focus of my attention has been on Dr. Gordon's report and the information that Dr . Gordon submitted to the Court.

Q You -- you've agreed or indicated that you have no familiarity with the research in regards to suggestibility other than having ran across the term during the inter -- internet research prior to testifying today?

A Yes, I believe I've said that.
Q And despite that, your conclusion is Dr. Gordon's conclusions are incorrect?

A Uh, my opinion responding that information is different than the conclusion he reached, it is not for me to say whether he is correct or incorrect. Um, but the conclusions I would reach on the basis of that information might be different than the
conclusion that he reached. I'm not saying he's wrong.

Q And, hypothetically, if he has reviewed the standard or typical research in the area of suggestibility, he would have more information to base his opinion on than you?

A I don't agree with that at all.
Q You don't agree that you have no familiarity with any of the research in the area of suggestibility at --

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Objection, Judge, that wasn't the question.

THE COURT: No, he's asking the question. Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Would you repeat the question, sir?

Q Sure. I'll do the best I can.
A Uh-huh.
Q You have no familiarity in the research of suggestibility. Yet, you've been able to provide an opinion as to what Dr . Gordon's conclusions -or your opinion of Dr. Gordon's conclusions; correct?

A Um, yes, I think that's true. But the focus of my opinion was on the basis -- and the -- the problems
that I recognized in the Gudjonsson methodology, would not justify me in reaching the conclusion he reached.

Q The Gudjonsson methodology or the Gudjonsson example that was provided to you?

A Well --
Q Test example. I'm sorry.
A The scale, as I see it, which was supposed to originate in his file, for the reasons that $I$ pointed out, I would not have, um, confidence, myself, in concluding that that methodology relates to suggestibility.

Just because someone titles a test a suggestibility test, does not make it a suggestibility test.

Q Oh, I agree with you entirely.
A It might well be a memory test, or a concentration test, or something else. So, I'm just saying I would not have reached the conclusion he reached.

Q I -- I understand you entirely, Doctor. And -and will you agree with me, then, with this, if you haven't reviewed Gudjonsson, for instance, and you don't know the research and the methodology behind the test, how can you say that the methodology and the test isn't correct?

A We're not talking about correctness. I -- I will stand on the comments I made earlier about the methodology used. About not assessing the memory and not understanding why a person's changing answers to a response after being told he's wrong, why that relates to suggestibility. It -- it simply is not a connection I, myself, would make, personally or professionally.

Q And, granted, coming from a person that has no familiarity with the research into that area; correct?

A Yes, that's true.
ATTORNEY EREMGEN: Thank you. Nothing else, Judge.

THE COURT: Any redirect?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: I don't think so, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. You may step down, Doctor.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Ask the Court receive his CV.

THE COURT: Oh. Okay. Any objection to the CV?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: Same conditions as before, Judge.

THE COURT: Sure.
ATTORNEY FREMGEN: No.
THE COURT: Two thirty-two, then, is offered and received.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: Did the Court anticipate an afternoon break? If it did --

THE COURT: Right now.
ATTORNEY KRATZ: If it did, uh, we'd ask for an opportunity to meet with the Court briefly in chambers. And this, uh, is a good time for an afternoon break. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. We'll, uh -we'll recess until 20 to 4 .
(Recess had at 3:20 p.m.)
(Reconvened at 3:46 p.m. Jury in)
THE COURT: Mr. Kratz, do you have any further witnesses this afternoon?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: We have no further rebuttal, Judge.

THE COURT: No further witnesses at all?
ATTORNEY KRATZ: No.
THE COURT: All right. So, the State is then resting?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: The State is, uh, resting its rebuttal, yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Uh, any surrebuttal being offered by the defense?

ATTORNEY FREMGEN: No, Judge.
THE COURT: All right. Uh, that concludes, then, the presentation of testimony in the case. Uh, ladies and gentlemen, we're going to adjourn this afternoon. We are going to -- we, counsel and the Court, uh, uh, will prepare a set of jury instructions for you, and tomorrow you will hear the jury instructions and you will hear closing argument from counsel.

Uh, I ask that you be back here by 10:00 tomorrow morning. All right? And, again, don't talk about the case among yourselves or anything having to do with the case.
(Jury out at 3:45 p.m.)
THE COURT: Any further matters this afternoon, gentlemen?

ATTORNEY KRATZ: No, Judge. I assume we'll have an informal, uh, jury instruction conference in chambers at about, uh, 8:00. Sometime thereafter, I assume we will have the formal jury conference, uh, on the record, and move to closings thereafter?

THE COURT: We'll -- we'll meet at 8:00 in chambers to review and see if the -- the jury
instructions are -- are ones that all can agree upon. And, if they can't, we'll, uh -- we'll go on the record and the court will make whatever decisions are necessary. Uh, and if there are any motions, we'll hear them at that time.

ATTORNEY KRATZ: That's fine. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. We're adjourned. (Court stands adjourned at 3:47 p.m.)
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| anyone [8] 97/9 97/14 | 175/14 178/14 180/5 183/16 184/4 184/13 | assistant [2] 178/18 178/20 |
| 154/2 196/24 205/10 | 184/22 185/23 187/12 188/12 188/23 188/24 | assistants [1] 156/2 |
| anything [11] 57/3 84/10 | 189/17 191/19 192/12 192/24 193/5 193/23 | assisted [2] 74/20 229/10 |
| 143/6 149/15 162/7 174/11 204/24 212/17 | 194/10 195/23 195/24 197/12 197/17 197/23 | assisting [1] 51/8 |
| 227/15 | 198/8 199/23 201/5 201/17 202/5 203/5 | associate [1] 178/23 |
| anyway [1] 33/23 | 205/20 206/23 210/15 214/10 214/16 215/13 | associated [3] 18/15 18/17 48/10 |
| anywhere [5] 88/9 88/13 115/23 116/5 | 217/7 218/3 218/22 219/14 222/20 227/7 | Associates [1] 5/20 |
| 191/16 | 228/1 228/1 228/4 228/4 | association [12] 7/14 7/17 7/19 7/22 7/258/3 |
| APA [1] | ar | 2/4 12/5 14/12 77/9 180/1 186/7 |
| apologize [3] 137/8 | 10 | ociations [1] 779 |
| apologized [1] 123/15 | 130/18 131/19 169/7 171/19 173/25 174/4 | assume [11] 83/22 85/9 92/23 96/3 96/6 |
| apparently [5] 175/11 193/10 200/17 204/19 | 174/6 223/4 223/9 225/10 | 105/11 137/25 175/4 205/13 227/19 227/22 |
| 214/9 | areas [10] 13/4 22/10 33/1 | assuming [5] 132/11 174/17 174/20 175/5 |
| appealed [1] 62/10 | 131/9 178/12 196/13 196/20 196/21 | $75 / 5$ |
| appear [6] 4/9 28/19 76/25 87/17 103/17 | aren't [4] 30/11 65/9 104/21 148/4 | attach [1] 206/4 |
| 188/8 | argument [2] 105/11 227/10 | attempt [7] 28/7 70/13 184/5 185/8 197/8 |
| appearance [1] 4/6 | argumentative [1] 215/24 | 200/20 205/10 |
| APPEARANCES [2] 1 | ARMENTROUT [20] 3/10 168/15 168/20 | attempting [2] 188/3 222/3 |
| appeared [3] 1/24 27/24 103/12 | 169/10 169/12 169/15 169/21 170/20 172/19 | attempts [2] 66/20 112/18 |
| appears [4] 46/8 87/17 190/10 191/7 | 174/14 175/18 177/16 177/18 177/23 178/4 | attended [2] 5/14 22/7 |
| appetite [2] 101/4 102/2 | 181/8 182/22 189/10 198/10 207/10 | attention [1] 222/10 |
| apple [1] 86/20 | Armentrout's [1] 173/3 | attorney [59] 1/20 1/22 3/4 3/5 3/6 3/7 3/11 |
| Appleton [1] 210/21 | arms [3] 141/4 143/4 143/11 | 3/12 4/8 4/8 4/9 18/7 18/8 20/23 21/3 3 |
| applicability [1] 199/15 | around [5] 60/15 80/13 80/15 128/6 190/8 | 31/7 42/844/5 46/16 60/8 64/16 75/2 75/11 |
| applicable [2] 108/6 197/10 | arrested [1] 125/2 | 79/25 96/14 111/20 111/21 118/4 118/5 |


| 1 H | 27/12 29/17 30/6 32/1 33/20 34/3 36/9 36/13 | [ueiving [4] rowio belonged [1] 179/25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| attorney... [29] 118/8 131/1 131/8 137/16 | 44/18 44/20 57/15 57/15 67/10 69/8 71/22 | below [4] 27/25 42/13 43/2 47/7 |
| 137/19 138/13 144/16 144/23 149/11 149/18 | 72/22 83/8 83/9 91/11 93/2 93/11 98/22 | Ben [1] 94/22 |
| 149/21 150/1 150/14 150/23 152/2 153/15 | 99/16 104/3 104/15 115/14 116/23 119/4 | Ben-Porath [1] 94/22 |
| 165/25 166/22 168/7 175/8 175/16 176/10 | 119/21 125/3 134/7 136/20 142/3 143/3 | benefit [2] 129/22 129/25 |
| 200/6 206/14 206/17 207/9 207/13 216/3 | 143/15 144/13 145/3 160/16 163/10 169/12 | best [7] 77/21 137/2 154/8 220/14 220/16 |
| 226/8 | 173/23 173/24 175/10 180/16 182/1 184/22 | 223/17 $229 / 13$ |
| attorneys [3] 14/6 22/9 104/8 | 185/13 196/8 197/6 202/3 203/1 204/25 | better [22] 10/12 12/17 20/10 49/5 49/9 |
| attributes [1] 193/6 | 214/6 214/23 224/13 | 49/23 53/17 53/19 60/19 61/7 103/8 103/9 |
| audited [1] 5/11 | become [6] 23/21 59/18 59/18 59/19 181/16 | 116/20 141/6 146/19 147/20 164/24 185/9 |
| auther [2] 180/7 180/7 | 206/10 | 185/11 185/19 191/12 205/17 |
| authored [4] 11/7 11/7 11/13 1 | becomes [2] 9/19 62/22 | between [7] 9/11 82/19 89/23 114/13 186/1 |
| authorities [2] 126/2 | been [103] 4/16 6/19 8/13 9/7 10/1 | 192/4 197/23 |
| authors [1] 125/1 | 10/10 10/16 11/21 11/21 12 | beyond [2] 157/17 182/11 |
| autobiographical [1] 146/7 | 14/11 14/13 14/13 15/16 16/7 16/7 40/2 | bias [1] $201 / 8$ |
| available [10] 15/18 17/5 96/8 133/9 139 | 48/13 51/21 51/23 52/20 61/1 63/22 73/11 | bible [1] 16/23 |
| 182/16 184/13 185/3 218/4 218/11 | 79/16 85/9 90/19 94/23 111/2 112/14 122/3 | Binet [1] 16/2 |
| average [36] 13/1 13/3 27/24 27/25 28/3 | 122/5 122/23 139/22 139/24 140/1 152/3 | birth [1] 198/22 |
| 32/16 32/19 33/1 33/3 41/15 41/20 41/24 | 152/18 152/20 152/22 154/20 154/21 156/8 | bit [4] 109/13 190/13 196/10 199/3 |
| 42/13 42/13 43/2 43/16 47/7 47/8 47/22 | 158/21 159/19 168/24 169/1 169/14 171/21 | black [1] 195/23 |
| 47/23 47/25 48/2 48/7 54/7 54/17 55/11 | 172/7 174/6 174/21 177/19 179/12 179/15 | blah [1] $26 / 18$ |
| 81/17 81/19 82/18 146/19 185/9 186/4 | 179/21 180/1 180/4 180/7 180/20 180/21 | Blaine [1] 65/8 |
| 186/13 186/19 190/10 190/12 | 180/24 181/3 181/12 182/9 183/22 184/6 | blame [1] 176/21 |
| Avery [1] 120/5 | 184/7 185/1 185/17 185/21 187/14 191/4 | bland [1] 26/18 |
| Avery's [1] 120/10 | 192/6 194/4 194/15 196/21 197/21 198/3 | blank [3] 86/21 197/6 209/14 |
| avoidance [10] 30/9 3 | 199/6 199/21 200/1 200/17 204/8 205/20 | blasphemous [1] 16/23 |
| 35/14 35/17 93/22 94/3 | 208/1 208/5 210/5 210/11 211/1 211/10 | blind [1] 32/23 |
| avoidant [1] 36/10 | 212/14 213/19 217/8 221/15 222/8 222/1 | blinding [1] 41/9 |
| avoided [1] 36/12 | 223/20 229/8 | blue [3] 140/15 141/8 141/10 |
| avoids [1] 190/7 | before [56] 1/11 9/17 10/7 11/1 11/3 11/5 | board [3] 8/2 9/5 207/24 |
| awards [1] 187/16 | 15/6 20/4 20/21 21/4 21/5 21/13 24/12 25/20 | boards [4] 8/18 8/20 8/22 8/23 |
| a ware [24] 15/3 22/19 | 25/24 27/3 39/16 57/1 57/6 64/17 69/3 75/3 | bodily [1] 33/19 |
| 120/8 120/11 122/9 122/14 125/12 132/17 | 75/14 79/3 79/11 80/8 84/7 91/17 102/24 | body [4] 9/16 9/22 121/16 124/23 |
| 145/20 145/25 146/23 146/24 151/7 184/19 | 119/21 120/2 120/15 120/18 121/21 $122 / 6$ | bold [1] 37/17 |
| 192/15 192/19 193/23 193/25 194/3 197/12 | 123/23 150/25 159/6 166/24 167/18 167/20 | bena [1] 33/20 |
| 212/24 | 170/9 172/8 174/4 175/19 177/8 186/24 | book [7] 11/15 15/25 115/4 115/16 146/2 |
| away [3] 4055 73/21 85/18 | 191/6 193/3 200/3 200/25 203/8 207/16 | 146/14 147/21 |
| awhile [1] 117/12 | 209/5 221/6 225/25 | books [6] 11/838/5 156/21 203/10 217/7 |
| Ayling [11 218/23 | befriending [2] 165/19 165/23 | 218/2 |
| B | beg [2] 38/24 85/2 | borderline [13] 43/9 43/12 46/24 47/9 |
| baby [1] 121/1 | begin [3] 23/11 64/8 201/23 | 186/13 |
| Bachelor's [1] 5/4 | beginning [6] 15/24 23/12 23/12 23/13 23/13 | born [1] 200/14 |
| back [31] 24/11 39/17 62/2 63/5 63/7 67/3 | 56 | Boston [1] 204/7 |
| 70/23 73/15 73/17 80/4 80/10 95/9 95/11 | begins [4] 64/22 $67 / 467 / 7$ 204/6 | both [19] 26/7 42/17 44/9 44/13 44/14 49/9 |
| 112/6 113/9 126/23 131/7 136/21 136/23 | behalf [5] 1/14 1/16 1/18 1/20 1/22 | 57/4 66/9 66/10 66/11 66/15 66/19 66/25 |
| 141/1 146/22 149/1 156/5 158/24 181/2 | behavior [3] 11/16 192/5 193/6 | 0/20 72/22 77/9 77/19 144/7 161/18 |
| 194/17 209/4 217/13 218/13 219/6 227/12 | behavioral [3] 6/4 6/5 113/20 | bottom [2] $29 / 6139 / 15$ |
| backdrop [1] 130/12 | behind [1] 224/24 | box [2] 124/10 124/15 |
| background [6] 5/3 168/23 178/6 187/6 | being [48] 7/16 8/24 12/13 18/17 19/19 24/5 | boxes [1] 117125 |
| 200/2 200/7 | 34/24 35/8 35/12 38/1 38/3 38/18 39/9 47/24 | brain [1] 22/14 |
| bad [2] 130/5 195/2 | 52/12 56/8 63/13 70/13 71/8 71/10 72/14 | brainwashed [1] 194/2 |
| bar [2] 12/4 14/12 | 72/24 77/24 78/19 99/21 103/20 104/10 | brainwashing [1] 130/10 |
| base [10] 31/20 42/10 42/12 42/16 42/23 | 104/12 106/24 106/25 109/2 111/10 123/3 | BRANCH [2] 1/1 $229 / 5$ |
| 42/23 45/4 45/7 45/8 223/6 | 128/13 134/2 136/18 148/6 148/7 166/6 | break [5] 76/7 114/16 150/3 226/6 226/11 |
| baseball [1] 211/5 | 173/25 186/18 192/10 193/22 194/9 196/16 | BRENDAN [177] 1/7 1/23 4/3 4/10 23/18 |
| based [31] 25/5 25/8 29/9 43/5 53/6 55/22 | 196/18 225/5 227/2 | 23/19 23/22 24/1 24/11 25/21 26/1 26/13 |
| 56/11 56/11 56/15 56/15 56/17 56/19 72/2 | beliefs [1] 195/22 | 26/14 28/24 30/5 30/25 31/9 32/10 32/25 |
| 72/5 81/23 82/4 154/11 155/2 158/12 158/20 | believability [1] 106/17 | 33/8 34/21 36/7 37/2 37/2 38/11 38/22 39/4 |
| 161/15 163/10 163/19 163/22 171/11 184/10 | believe [56] 17/11 30/19 32/22 41/9 59/10 | 39/13 42/22 46/22 48/10 49/1 49/14 49/20 |
| 194/15 200/24 207/3 216/9 218/1 | 60/13 60/15 64/25 67/7 67/9 68/10 73/19 | 49/24 51/16 54/2 55/1 55/4 55/18 55/25 |
| basic [4] 32/14 135/3 157/16 157/18 | 78/23 111/14 112/1 121/15 121/22 123/7 | 56/14 57/13 59/24 61/1 65/12 65/17 66/1 |
| basically [2] 35/16 156/7 | 123/10 123/25 130/8 138/21 138/22 138/25 | 68/6 68/6 68/12 68/18 68/22 69/21 69/22 |
| basis [10] $7 / 5$ 10/4 22/25 116/19 179/19 | 139/14 151/15 152/5 154/12 154/20 154/22 | 69/22 69/22 70/5 71/20 72/9 72/21 73/7 |
| 192/1 201/25 218/4 222/24 223/25 | 156/7 162/22 168/21 169/10 171/3 171/21 | 74/17 75/16 76/2 81/9 86/2 87/10 88/17 92/5 |
| bat [1] 211/5 | 174/9 179/14 180/5 181/1 182/6 182/15 | 92/23 96/7 96/18 96/22 97/6 97/8 97/10 |
| battery [1] 51/2 | 186/20 188/7 192/16 193/15 201/10 207/14 | 97/16 99/17 99/20 99/25 100/21 101/3 |
| Bay [1] $210 / 5$ | 208/12 209/2 211/1 211/7 215/25 217/7 | 101/12 101/13 101/22 102/11 102/19 103/12 |
| be [238] | 221/11 222/18 | 105/12 105/15 107/5 107/18 110/4 110/14 |
| bear [1] 85/20 | believed [5] 87/9 92/25 118/22 132/24 155/2 | 111/3 112/18 112/24 112/24 112/25 113/12 |
| beatings [2] $126 / 22127 / 15$ | believes [2] 170/17 174/24 | 114/2 114/23 115/3 115/5 115/25 116/7 |
| became [3] 16/17 182/16 220/20 | Bellevue [2] 40/22 40/23 | 116/11 116/12 116/18 117/16118/22 119/24 |


| D | 139/9 139/17 141/6 145/13 146/2 147/7 | 19/16 73/21 84/18 92/20 92/21 94/2 94/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BRENDAN... [64] 120/3 120/8 121/7 121/9 | 149/24 149/24 153/25 158/16 160/16 168/7 | 99/11 109/1 160/18 |
| 21/20 122/10 122/11 122/16 122/18 122/24 | 168/8 168/11 169/10 171/6 174/21 175/4 | acterization [2] 84/19 88/7 |
| 123/3 123/5 123/15 123/25 124/7 124/12 | 175/5 175/10 176/9 184/25 186/9 189/21 | characterized [2] 117/15 128/25 |
| 125/1 134/17 135/5 135/14 135/22 136/16 | 191/25 193/8 194/11 195/11 197/16 200/3 | harged [2] 28/15 148/6 |
| 136/18 137/21 138/1 139/7 139/20 140/4 | 200/6 201/10 201/11 202/3 202/8 205/17 | Charles [2] 90/20 192/16 |
| 140/14 140/19 141/5 141/9 141/16 141/17 | 206/10 206/10 206/12 217/16 217/21 217/21 | chart [7] 43/17 43/20 43/25 44/6 44/11 |
| 141/19 141/24 142/5 142/6 142/7 142/11 | 217/23 218/5 218/12 218/16 220/24 223/17 | 48/13 81/8 |
| 143/12 143/14 143/15 143/25 144/24 146/15 | 224/24 228/1 | ts [1] 156/21 |
| 147/20 148/4 148/13 148/22 149/3 155/5 | can't [17] 50/21 78/20 91/17 93/10 93/10 | check [2] 9/8 124/10 |
| 155/16 161/5 161/14 162/8 162/22 164/21 | 98/4 98/4 98/6 98/24 106/25 115/14 118/24 | checked [4] 117/25 124/15 124/16 124/20 |
| 165/9 165/19 166/6 197/13 206/24 220/10 | 121/25 127/8 128/17 155/14 228/2 | checkmark [2] 140/21 141/11 |
| Brendan's [27] 58/8 58/19 66/23 74/5 75/13 | Cancer [1] 33/21 | checks [2] 136/8 138/14 |
| 83/4 88/11 97/21 111/23 112/11 112/16 | cannot [1] 108/6 | cherry [2] 87/24 88/1 |
| 113/17 114/6 114/11 115/10 118/17 119/8 | capability [2] 28/7 82/17 | Chevy [2] 109/4 109/6 |
| 119/9 119/16 120/23 121/15 122/22 124/15 | capable [1] 170/18 | Chicago [1] 5/22 |
| 124/21 124/24 128/2 163/19 | capacity [2] 10/11 169/6 | chief [2] 179/1 $179 / 6$ |
| Brett [2] 125/21 128/19 | capital [1] 14/16 | chiefs [1] 14/9 |
| brief [5] 84/3 84/3 211/24 211/25 213/8 | car [1] 22/14 | child [1] 173/4 |
| briefly [9] 11/10 11/13 13/25 28/22 52/4 | care [3] 6/16 28/9 127/25 | children [3] 22/4 41/4 173/8 |
| 167/18 179/22 219/22 226/9 | career [2] 6/11 23/3 | Chilton [1] 209/12 |
| bring [2] 16/21 85/9 | carefully [2] 53/18 229/8 | choice [1] 205/14 |
| brings [1] 172/8 | case [48] 1/6 27/15 31/9 49/25 51/12 58/11 | choose [6] 30/4 39/3 108/15 108/23 108/25 |
| Britain [1] 134/13 | 61/14 61/20 62/6 72/20 73/6 75/4 75/25 | 162/2 |
| British [1] 204/16 | 77/14 78/5 83/8 94/16 100/5 109/8 110/10 | choosing [1] 108/25 |
| broad [2] 95/8 144/21 | $119 / 22$ 121/5 127/23 128/3 134/17 138/15 | chose [1] 94/16 |
| broadly [1] 197/10 | 143/16 154/9 158/19 159/21 160/6 169/9 | Chris [4] 116/9 118/11 119/1 119/2 |
| broken [1] 197/21 | 181/8 181/17 181/19 184/16 192/7 198/17 | chronologically [1] 29/3 |
| brought [4] 96/6 154/16 168/20 208/19 | 208/20 211/2 211/7 211/16 220/17 221/1 | church [2] $7147 / 7$ |
| Brown [1] 210/4 | 222/7 227/5 227/14 227/15 | Cincinnati [1] 138/4 |
| Buckley [2] 212/3 213/14 | cases [11] 13/4 13/5 13/5 14/16 15/16 21/12 | Circle [1] 9/2 |
| buddy [1] 165/15 | 22/4 33/25 63/1 160/24 211/11 | circled [2] 155/15 155/16 |
| building [1] 142/20 | cat [1] 86/21 | CIRCUIT [3] 1/11/11229/5 |
| bus [1] 65/19 | categories [5] 18/20 45/9 54/6 109/25 129/1 | circumstance [1] 57/11 |
| business [1] 175/21 | categorized [2] 117/16 186/1 | circumstances [10] 59/10 84/19 84/25 |
| Butcher [4] 29/22 94/21 196/7 218/6 | category [8] 35/9 81/12 81/17 82/12 86/7 | 102/15 113/12 131/10 131/17 185/1 185 |
| button [1] 104/13 | 129/8 129/9 130/15 | 189/18 |
| buy [3] 109/4 109/5 153/25 | Cattell [1] 37/7 | claim [1] 202/22 |
| C | cause [5] 17/8 31/12 40/8 50/19 160/18 causes [1] 15/25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { claimed [1] 170/12 } \\ & \text { claims [2] 184/22 204/1 } \end{aligned}$ |
| calculated [2] 10/14 47/2 | cautioned [1] 91/17 | clarify [1] 58/12 |
| Caldwell [1] $218 / 8$ | CD [1] 25/17 | class [1] 27/3 |
| California [2] 125/17 196/4 | CDs [1] 61/22 | classes [1] 5/11 |
| call [20] 4/14 24/7 36/5 89/21 89/22 123/1 | Center [2] 6/14 6/16 | classmates [1] 116/2 |
| 123/2 146/2 147/11 151/11 162/2 168/15 | century [2] 16/1 16/2 | classroom [1] $146 / 4$ |
| 177/16 181/10 181/18 181/24 186/5 195/12 | certain [4] 8/18 22/16 92/17 153/24 | cleaning [1] 204/7 |
| 208/20 217/11 | certainly [15] 16/15 70/22 76/11 105/1 | clear [2] 32/24 216/19 |
| called [41] 4/16 7/19 11/15 11/22 12/5 15/1 | 106/11 106/12 174/4 192/18 200/10 206/12 | clerical [1] $217 / 22$ |
| 15/4 16/8 40/22 81/17 81/24 84/16 86/7 | 208/14 209/7 215/2 215/6216/15 | CLERK [1] 151/25 |
| 88/19 92/7 93/25 95/21 98/12 110/19 113/21 | certainty [3] 56/4 62/7 76/3 | client [3] 77/18 77/25 124/3 |
| 130/3 135/6 140/5 140/15 140/22 145/25 | certification [1] 208/3 | client's [1] 88/3 |
| 146/6 147/13 166/9 177/19 183/13 188/11 | certified [1] 179/12 | clinic [2] 40/22 200/19 |
| 188/18 192/22 193/21 197/23 198/12 203/6 | certify [1] $229 / 6$ | clinical [41] 5/6 6/9 6/11 6/17 7/20 9/5 9/9 |
| 203/23 204/4 214/21 | CF [2] 1/6 4/4 | 9/13 26/7 32/14 44/22 76/24 94/11 103/20 |
| calls [3] 25/17 129/4 129/11 | challenges [1] 115/5 | 153/17 155/3 157/16 157/16 158/11 159/7 |
| Calumet [4] 173/10 208/23 209/11 209/22 | chambers [5] 150/16 167/18 226/10 227/21 | 159/15 168/15 168/22 169/5 170/24 171/8 |
| came [9] 10/12 29/13 29/24 40/21 121/2 | chance [8] 38/1 38/3 62/23 72/13 106/13 | 195/17 196/21 197/19 198/8 210/17 215/12 |
| 179/5 179/16 180/15 195/9 | 107/4 147/14 212/3 | 216/7 217/6 $220 / 13$ |
| can [145] 5/2 7/11 8/20 9/10 9/20 10/9 13/25 | Chancellor [1] 8/25 | close [1] 114/19 |
| 14/3 18/8 20/6 20/17 21/5 24/3 28/22 30/2 | change [16] 16/4 18/5 54/20 78/10 78/11 | closer [1] 40/13 |
| 32/16 32/22 33/19 33/21 34/6 34/6 34/12 | 78/18 142/24 143/5 143/13 143/14 148/10 | closing [1] $227 / 10$ |
| 34/16 34/16 34/19 38/13 41/8 42/1 43/23 | 148/13 164/16 165/4 165/5 205/22 | closings [1] 227/23 |
| 44/25 46/4 46/12 46/16 47/12 48/24 48/24 | changed [9] 29/19 54/15 138/16 138/17 | co [3] 11/7 11/15 180/7 |
| 52/4 53/13 53/17 57/21 62/19 64/13 64/25 | 144/7 161/15 162/24 164/21 165/6 | co-author [1] 180/7 |
| 65/2 65/21 67/767/767/9 68/18 69/25 79/23 | changes [3] 53/21 143/8 165/22 | co-authored [2] 11/7 11/15 |
| 80/4 83/19 83/20 83/21 83/22 85/3 85/16 | changing [8] 5/23 8/23 78/15 138/18 163/2 | code [1] 13/11 |
| 86/16 86/18 90/1 91/20 91/22 91/23 92/17 | 163/8 166/7 225/4 | codes [1] 13/11 |
| 95/20 96/2 104/10 104/11 106/10 106/23 | chapters [1] $127 / 4$ | coerced [4] 129/12 129/17 129/18 130/3 |
| 107/12 107/15 108/25 112/8 114/16 117/11 | character [2] 71/1 184/4 | cognition [1] $86 / 8$ |
| 118/7 118/9 118/24 121/5 124/11 127/9 <br> 127/10 127/14 129/17 129/25 131/3 131/21 | characterasistic [1] 90/14 characteristic [2] 90/15 193/ | cognitive [7] $86 / 13$ 87/15 117/16 117/21 118/1 118/22 124/12 |
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123/14 123/19 123/20 125/1 132/19 133/12
133/15 133/21 143/23 143/24
considerable [1] 217/1
consideration [7] 34/10 61/14 67/13 67/14
72/7 81/25 206/21
considered [13] 43/2 58/6 58/17 58/21 61/19
70/24 88/24 89/18 92/18 105/18 131/9 149/7
158/7
considering [4] $62 / 5$ 105/9 134/2 206/18
consistency [3] 84/4 84/5 160/1
consistent [23] 38/19 38/20 39/23 40/4 50/2
50/5 50/10 50/11 57/20 58/13 75/23 82/13
85/7 102/5 123/24 157/23 157/24 159/19
159/21 159/22 159/23 166/16 166/17
consists [1] 183/25
constructed [2] 31/25 52/5
constructors [1] 94/21
consult [2] 10/17 16/18
consultant [1] 209/10
consultation [2] 181/11 182/8
consulted [1] 10/17
consulting [5] 6/21 7/20 9/6 13/6 209/21
contact [7] 26/17 72/12 101/8 101/10 143/18

204/15 220/11
contacted [1] 23/23
contain [2] 10/19 66/19
contained [5] 37/19 136/6 138/13 142/11
156/11
content [1] 197/19
context [4] 32/2 73/22 91/25 192/19
continue [4] 7/4 13/7 22/24 42/20
continued [2] 179/7 179/9
continues [1] $4 / 5$
continuing [3] 14/7 193/1 208/1
continuous [1] 134/12
contract [3] 96/12 208/25 209/2
contractually [1] 154/1
contradict [2] 101/21 101/23
contradictory [1] 153/9
contrary [3] 78/22 101/11 153/9
contrast [4] 30/10 102/10 102/17 220/23
conversation [2] 195/21 200/11
Conversely [1] 148/21
convert [1] 156/23
convince [1] 130/4
convinced [1] 130/4
cooperate [1] 105/1
copies [6] 25/17 182/14 200/1 200/8 211/24 212/12
cops [1] 133/25
copy [4] 187/2 211/22 211/25 212/5
correct [91] 8/7 21/17 23/19 25/14 35/24
39/23 44/7 44/11 44/12 45/10 50/23 63/10
63/20 63/21 77/1 81/16 87/5 88/16 89/24
90/23 93/19 99/22 111/17 111/18 113/19
125/19 135/8 135/9 141/17 142/25 143/9
145/10 151/6 152/11 152/14 154/17 154/18
154/24 154/25 155/17 155/18 156/13 156/14
156/16 156/17 160/8 160/9 160/12 161/6
161/7 161/12 161/18 $162 / 5$ 162/18 162/25
163/1 163/5 163/6 163/15 163/16 163/20
163/21 164/22 165/9 165/10 167/15 176/8
176/8 187/21 207/22 207/24 208/4 208/21
209/25 212/11 213/9 213/13 214/3 214/21
215/5 215/20 215/21 216/10216/21 217/15
217/16 222/23 223/23 224/25 225/11 229/12
corrected [2] 139/19 214/20
correctional [2] 188/1 188/5
correctly [3] 63/9 143/3 213/11
correctness [1] 225/1
corrects [1] 141/24
correlated [2] 72/25 108/9
corroborate [2] 133/4 133/25
corroborates [1] 133/10
could [74] 4/20 11/12 11/12 14/3 18/15
18/15 24/16 30/14 32/3 35/11 36/5 36/15
42/20 50/14 50/25 51/24 52/15 53/4 53/12
54/4 54/5 60/3 64/8 64/11 64/11 64/22 65/3 65/16 67/18 67/20 67/24 68/16 69/11 92/8 92/9 94/13 94/15 94/18 95/11 98/12 106/14 107/15 107/22 110/24 110/24 112/6 114/18
114/22 120/24 125/5 130/10 137/3 139/19
139/22 139/24 140/1148/23 149/18 154/10 154/21 155/7 155/10 172/25 175/16 177/5 179/22 181/15 190/8 $197 / 5$ 198/5 203/18 204/11 205/15 209/6
couldn't [1] 82/4
counsel [12] 4/2 21/2 89/4 96/24 102/12
118/20 145/10 147/17 153/14 167/18 227/7 $227 / 11$
counseling [5] 6/14 6/21 6/22 6/23 7/3
counselor [3] 121/8 213/2 213/18
count [2] 95/11 145/13
counted [1] 14/4
counting [1] 217/19
county [22] 1/1 6/15 6/169/4 173/10 208/23

| C | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} 192 / 5 & 197 / 13 & 204 / 23 \\ 220 / 11 & 2206 / 24 & 213 / 19 \\ 220 / 10 & 222 / 2 & 222 / 9 \end{array}\right.$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 164/6 } \\ & \text { desirability [1] } 19 / 19 \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| county... [16] 209/11 209/22 209/24 210/4 | Dassey's [7] 26/14 99/10 121/7 184/20 | desiring [1] $19 / 18$ |
| 210/6 210/6 210/6 210/7 210/7 210 | 185/17 189/11 199/4 | despite [5] 123/22 123/22 190/6 208/7 |
| 210/16 210/21 210/25 211/6211/11 229/n | data [9] 26/24 56/16 61/21 73/10 79/3 | 22219 |
| couple [6] 14/5 97/5 122/11 125/10 125/16 | 116/24 117/1 154/8 | detail [7] 115/11 132/10 133/24 148/17 |
| 150/2 | date [6] 1/10 24/11 |  |
| coupled [1] |  | datiled [2] 16 |
| course [3] 105/16 183/14 197/20 | dated [5] 24/21 88/22 124/9 208/13 229/1 | details [3] 115/12 132/9 139 |
| court [69] 1/1 1/11 2/4 9/3 9/179/18 | dates [1] 24/16 | detained [1] 210 |
| 9/24 10/7 10/10 11/5 17/23 18/6 20/13 20/20 | dating [1] 219/6 | detective [2] 16/16 58/22 |
| 20/22 21/14 22/16 41/10 42/1 43/22 44/1 | David [1] 40/21 | detention [1] $210 / 22$ |
| 51/9 76/25 78/3 78/19 79/22 80/18 85/10 | day [5] 1/5 12/25 10 | determination [10] 17/13 |
| 89/4 95/16 99/8 99/24 119/21 131/2 135/25 | days [5] 13/2 61/4 127/20 128/15 188 | 73/23 121/25 124/8 160/1 |
| 149/20 149/24 150/7 150/13 150/15 167/11 | de [1] 116115 | determinations [2] 20/8 162/14 |
| 167/19 168/3 168/19 172/9 172/24 174/4 | deal [6] 39/8 52/6 125/13 173/7 189/2 | determine [9] 18/22 20/3 39/12 50/9 98/14 |
| 174/13 175/9 176/18 180/22 181/2 206/13 | 219/17 | 110/13 124/11 164/2 175/22 |
| 221/3 222/12 223/13 225/18 225/20 226/5 | deals [2] 128 | determines [1] 84/8 |
| 226/9 226/12 226/16 227/8 228/3 228 | dealt [1] 99/10 | determining [3] 17/6 37/22 74/20 |
| 22 | Dean [1] 9/1 | develop [1] 194/20 |
| courtesy [1] | death [2] 100/10 | developed [14] 16/8 18/21 18/23 37/5 |
| courtroom [1] 170/2 | December [2] 120/8 121/2 | 92/19 134/8 135/10 194/9 194/13 194/15 |
| courts [1] 210/24 | decide [2] 11/24 109/10 | 194/17 |
| cousin [3] 121/8 12 | decided [1] 58/3 | developing [2] 37/21 222 |
| cousins [2] $120 / 5120 / 9$ | deciding [1] 133 | deviant [1] 84/22 |
| cover [1] 199/1 | decision [3] 71/17 108/22 109 | devised [5] 192/15 194/5 196/3 196/19 198/6 |
| created [1] | decision-making [1] 108 | devoid [1] 112 |
| credentials [1] 57/25 | decisions [2] 9/19 228/4 | diagnosing [1] 43/9 |
| crime [12] 15/22 28/8 28/16 53/2 70/13 | decrease [1] 19/13 | diagnosis [3] 44/23 98/24 186/8 |
| 129/13 129/15 132/1 166/14 166/15 205 | defects [1] 204/1 | diagnostic [3] 12/14 43/6 186/6 |
| $205 / 8$ | defendant [ $6101 / 81 / 201 / 221 / 24$ 71/1 168/2 | diametrically [2] 189/22 190/16 |
| criminal [4] 72/13 98/15 108/5 128/3 | defense [5] $15 / 5$ 15/7 135/13 137/5 227/2 | did [173] 12/10 12/17 21/3 21/25 2 |
| crises [1] | deferential [2] 37/17 38/18 | 23/24 24/2 25/10 25/15 25/21 25/2 |
| critical [3] 215/16 | deficit [1] 75/13 | 26/12 28/23 29/2 29/2 29/22 30/4 33/1 |
| criticism [3] 53/11 127/7 164/14 | deficits [3] 74/14 | 34/21 36/7 37/1 37/8 37/11 38/10 |
| criticizing [1] 216117 | define [3] 52/7 52/15 60/19 | 39/12 46/20 47/1 48/19 49/13 4 |
| cross [22] 3/5 3/12 29/18 | defined [1] 54/4 | 51/17 55/2 55/6 55/15 57/10 57/15 57/21 |
| 78/19 131/3 144/20 152/6 154/16 156/13 | definitely [2] 20/11 | 58/2 59/14 62/9 63/12 65/25 68/2 |
| 157/5 160/7 161/4 163/12 164/20 165/2 | definitive [1] 91/24 | 69/23 70/19 70/22 70/25 74/10 74/16 74/19 |
| 202/6 202/16 207/11 207/12 | degree [15] 5/4 6/13 23/14 23/15 38/2 51/21 | 75/11 75/14 75/21 75/21 80/7 81/2 83/25 |
| cross-examination [14] 3/5 3/12 76/10 76/16 | 53/20 56/3 76/2 93/8 132/10 134/22 143/17 | 85/4 88/10 88/13 88/15 89/14 92/23 9 |
| 78/12 144/20 152/6 154/16 156/13 157/ | 178/7 178/8 | 96/22 98/18 98/22 110/16 110/20 111/4 |
| 160/7 161/4 163/12 207/12 | demonstrate [1] 202/21 | 113/5 115/24 116/5 116/12 116/24 117/2 |
| cross-examined [1] 78/19 | den [1] 163/3 | 118/10 118/17 119/9 120/14 120/19 120/2 |
| cross-section [1] 29/18 | denial [1] 131/2 | 121/7 121/15 122/9 122/17 123/4 123/17 |
| cross-validation [2] 202/6 | denied [3] 101/25 102/1 102 | 123/20 124/25 124/25 130/7 130/9 134/11 |
| crowd [1] 100/14 | denies [1] 166/13 | 137/5 142/6 142/13 142/19 142/23 144/6 |
| crowds [2] 100/8 190/7 | denoting [1] 163/3 | 144/10 151/14 152/12 155/1 161/8 161/9 |
| Croydon [4] 136/3 137/2 | denying [1] 132/1 | 161/14 162/3 162/7 163/7 164/16 165/3 |
| culmination [1] 171/4 | Department [7] 6/23 10/16 173/9 178/18 | 165/4 165/4 165/21 170/14 171/12 171/15 |
| culpability [1] 70/12 | 178/24 208/24 209/11 | 171/15 180/9 180/15 181/9 181/14 181/23 |
| cultural [3] 201/8 203/16 | depend [2] 82/8 116/15 | 2/1 182/13 183/4 189/7 189/8 189/10 |
| curious [1] 86/15 | dependent [1] 37/25 | 189/14 190/4 190/25 190/25 192/2 193/10 |
| current [6] 12/20 13/3 83/4 173/8 178/13 | depending [3] $27 / 1938$ | 193/11 193/13 195/3 195/4 200/12 200/1 |
| 203/10 | depends [3] 78/20 197/18 218/1 | 00/14 200/20 201/5 201/23 203/9 203/1 |
| currently [6] 5/18 5/ | deposition [1] 213/18 | 206/19 209 |
| 208/23 | depressed [1] 102/1 | 211/21 212/17 212/22 213/23 214/1 214/23 |
| Curriculum [8] 8/8 8/14 173/3 187/2 187/4 207/16 209/5 210/9 | depression [5] 31/12 101/4 102/2 $158 / 19$ 195/4 | 219/22 220/1 220/3 220/5 220/10 226/5 <br> 226/6 226/8 |
| custody [7] 22/2 58/25 59/11 59/15 59/17 |  | didn't [46] 9/8 12/12 15/21 16/21 33/14 |
| 59/23 60/2 | der [1] 29/10 | 44/20 57/22 62/12 62/13 65/22 65/25 66 |
| cut [2] 36/11 68/5 | derivation [1] 29/1 | 69/21 79/3 91/8 101/25 103/1 113/1 113 |
| CV [10] 7/13 8/68/8 168/16 168/21 174/19 | derived [1] 63/3 | 113/13 114/20 114/23 116/3 116/23 118/1 |
| 208/10 209/16 225/21 225/23 | describe [20] 5/2 7/11 8/20 9/11 11/13 13/25 | 119 |
| D | 18/8 24/3 28/22 34/17 47/12 48/24 52/4 | 134/1 137/10 137/20 140/1 142/8 143/23 |
|  | 52/15 86/16 170/22 191/1 195/1 201/1 202/8 | 144/11 150/8 153/10 158/1 162/11 164/23 |
|  | described [6] 11/10 17/4 4 |  |
| daily [2] 28/9 116/18 |  |  |
| DASSEY [35] 1/7 1/23 4/3 4/10 23/18 23/22 | descriptive [4] 171/5 190/20 191/2 | 21 |
| 24/11 25/22 26/1 26/13 28/24 30/5 51/16 | design [2] 134/19 164/5 | ent [37] 6/21 9/15 |
| 84/12 105/12 120/9 121/9 121/20 122/10 122/11 123/15 124/8 127/24 148/4 155/5 | designated [1] 7/15 | 35/14 36/8 39/24 46/8 62/11 62/18 82/6 94/6 |

## ${ }^{1}$

different... [18] 110/12 125/9 128/20 129/24 144/12 144/25 145/2 145/20 146/6 146/11 160/25 181/4 181/4 181/5 195/15 202/18 222/22 222/25
differential [1] $37 / 25$
differentiate [1] 114/13
differently [1] $146 / 9$
difficult [3] 57/23 104/20 104/25
difficulties [2] 188/22 196/17
difficulty [1] 191/21
digest [1] 191/12
dimensions [2] 188/18 189/2
direct [10] 3/4 3/11 4/25 78/25 79/7 97/23
105/22 177/25 200/19 214/14
directed [2] 172/16 192/24
direction [3] 31/11 194/22 214/10
directly [3] 27/15 116/11 173/17
Director [1] 6/3
directors [1] $9 / 5$
disabilities [1] 73/2
disability [7] $117 / 17117 / 21$ 118/1 118/22
124/13 124/16 124/18
disagree [3] 147/17 169/25 216/14
disappointed [3] 141/5 141/18 143/12
disappointment [1] 141/3
discern [1] 155/8
discipline [1] 107/25
discourtesy [1] 216/13
discovery [3] 169/13 175/25 176/15
discretion [2] 168/3 190/11
discuss [1] 88/22
discussed [5] 152/5 156/12 167/17 199/24 212/9
discussing [4] 8/18 67/13 161/21 191/19 discussion [2] 64/15 86/24
dislike [6] 103/22 104/5 104/7 104/8 105/5 105/13
disorder [3] 98/25 99/12 99/13
disorders [1] 43/7
displayed [1] 133/7
disposition [1] 22/4
disrespect [2] 216/13 216/16
disseminate [1] 154/1
dissertation [3] 12/12 12/16 196/8
distinct [2] 18/1 106/2
distinction [1] 82/19
distinguish [1] 46/17
District [1] 117/15
divide [1] 45/8
Division [2] 7/18 7/21
do [191] 4/13 5/2 5/18 6/8 7/2 10/9 12/19 12/22 14/22 14/25 15/3 17/11 19/7 20/6 22/2 25/1 25/1 26/3 28/25 29/2 30/20 30/24 30/24 31/7 32/5 38/13 44/2 46/12 47/1 48/16 48/20
48/22 50/1 53/17 53/19 57/3 57/3 58/17 59/11 62/13 62/16 63/9 63/23 64/13 64/16 64/18 69/20 69/21 69/23 70/2 70/4 70/5 71/19 74/2 74/6 74/774/7 76/11 77/22 78/2 78/12 78/23 80/2 80/11 81/5 81/7 85/17 85/17 86/8 87/20 87/24 87/25 90/5 90/9 96/17 100/3 101/1 101/19 101/20 103/5 103/6 104/4 106/1 107/2 $107 / 3$ 113/1 115/24 $117 / 6$ 117/14 $117 / 18117 / 19$ 122/7 122/8 122/17 122/24 123/3 123/4 123/5 123/9 126/16 127/3 127/8 129/6 129/20 130/20 130/21 134/20 135/23 136/1 136/11 136/17 138/1 138/18 138/24 139/3 140/2 141/6 143/6 146/19 147/4 148/2 148/11 150/13 151/15 151/18 152/4 152/21 152/21 154/7 154/8 154/12 155/25 156/1 156/24 158/25 164/24 165/13 165/13 165/21 166/9 166/11

168/7 168/8 168/9 168/11 168/14 171/5 175/13 175/20 176/24 178/12 178/16 181/20 181/23 184/8 185/9 185/15 188/20 189/23 189/24 190/19 190/25 191/1 191/16 191/23 191/23 199/6 202/2 204/23 205/17 205/23 207/23 209/13 210/4 215/15 216/7 217/3 218/1 218/18 218/20 218/20 220/22 221/1 221/14 221/15 221/18 222/2 223/17 226/16 227/15 229/6
doctor [59] 5/2 28/17 28/18 34/8 42/8 43/1 43/24 44/5 45/19 46/14 46/16 46/20 47/20 48/19 60/10 64/16 67/3 68/24 79/13 80/1 81/13 85/13 91/15 97/25 99/5 102/8 103/11 107/3 112/21 124/3 125/7 127/10 130/24 135/19 137/7 137/19 141/15 141/20 144/15 145/1 145/20 146/17 147/25 148/12 151/1 152/8 153/11 153/15 155/24 165/11 172/10 174/8 191/4 195/18 202/3 206/16 207/14 224/20 225/19
Doctorate [2] 5/6 178/10
Doctors [2] 94/21 94/22
document [7] 45/22 153/24 188/9 191/5 192/22 201/20 207/22
documents [3] 75/17 75/18 213/5
does [43] 37/21 41/5 47/24 48/23 49/18
59/14 60/18 61/6 62/3 70/1 71/4 71/14 72/1 72/15 82/7 83/21 86/13 87/5 87/10 87/14 87/15 91/2 91/4 101/20 102/3 113/15 124/10 127/14 138/7 143/5 143/5 148/25 $149 / 3$ 159/1 163/22 187/23 188/8 190/22 191/24 207/7 217/5 217/7 224/14
doesn't [19] 34/1 43/16 66/18 79/21 91/2 101/23 108/13 108/21 109/24 109/24 113/14 133/16 138/3 138/4 138/4 $138 / 6146 / 24$ 148/23 186/15
$\operatorname{dog}[2] 86 / 20114 / 19$
dog-eared [1] 114/19
doing [8] 6/20 10/5 17/17 21/24 66/13 80/11

## 85/14 179/21

dollar [3] 162/25 163/4 163/11
dollars [3] 136/7 136/9 136/11
dominant [2] 37/18 39/6
don't [113] 16/25 19/20 21/1 23/16 24/14
24/14 24/22 25/7 28/19 32/23 33/22 34/7
36/13 38/12 41/8 48/12 48/14 50/17 51/6
52/8 52/21 61/3 61/4 65/1 67/7 67/9 77/7
78/5 79/18 79/24 80/15 80/18 88/4 88/5 91/3 93/10 96/24 97/3 98/2 100/16 104/7 104/7
104/14 105/9 106/10 107/14 107/20 109/13
111/19 112/21 113/10 115/14 115/16 115/22
115/23 116/6 116/8 $117 / 3117 / 3117 / 5117 / 7$
$117 / 9117 / 11117 / 24120 / 6$ 123/2 125/3
125/3 126/7 126/14 128/4 131/6 133/6
133/21 135/17 136/20 137/14 137/25 138/3
138/22 138/25 139/14 144/17 148/15 149/15 159/3 172/14 172/18 176/21 177/4 178/16 186/16 186/23 193/15 199/20 200/18 205/8 205/9 205/21 208/12 212/17 213/25 214/1 214/22 215/25 218/18 220/6 221/10 223/7 223/8 224/23 225/16 227/14
done [32] 10/16 16/10 20/16 38/6 53/10 62/15 80/23 80/24 81/1 95/10 127/5 130/23 131/2 159/17 162/11 176/2 179/19 185/5 185/15 187/8 187/12 187/15 195/23 196/11 199/13 200/18 209/3 210/24 213/15 $217 / 21$ 217/21 218/22
Door [1] 210/6
doubt [2] 23/14 115/19
down [26] 6/14 35/11 37/4 37/9 41/19 41/20 43/15 48/12 48/15 64/4 64/5 65/16 65/19 67/20 68/1 69/13 80/3 95/15 95/16 137/2 137/3 149/14 149/25 166/21 197/21 225/19 dozen [1] 112/22

DR [17] 3/3 3/10 4/15 149/21 150/4 166/19 169/15 169/24 171/2 171/22 174/22 182/15 206/17 207/10 222/10 222/11 223/22 Dr. [72] 4/14 24/22 37/7 76/18 130/2 131/8 132/17 166/4 168/20 169/2 169/10 169/12 169/15 169/21 170/2 170/7 170/12 170/17 170/20 171/12 172/8 172/19 172/25 173/3 173/21 174/14 175/18 176/5 176/7 178/4 181/8 182/22 182/23 183/1 183/6 184/14 185/15 185/22 186/17 188/11 189/10 191/8 191/13 191/16 193/4 193/6 193/11 193/21 194/8 196/7 198/10 198/15 200/14 200/21 201/14 206/23 212/7 212/10 213/4 213/22 214/9 214/25 215/17 $216 / 9216 / 12$ 216/16 216/18 218/6 218/6 220/2 222/19 223/21 Dr. Armentrout [14] 168/20 169/10 169/12 169/15 169/21 170/20 172/19 174/14 175/18 178/4 181/8 182/22 189/10 198/10
Dr. Armentrout's [1] 173/3
Dr. Butcher [2] 196/7 218/6
Dr. Gordon [27] 24/22 76/18 131/8 132/17 166/4 169/2 170/2 170/7 170/12 170/17 172/8 176/5 176/7 183/6 185/15 188/11 191/13 193/6 193/11 193/21 194/8 214/9 214/25 215/17 216/12 216/16 216/18 Dr. Gordon's [20] 171/12 172/25 173/21 182/23 183/1 184/14 185/22 186/17 191/8 191/16 193/4 198/15 201/14 206/23 212/10 213/4 213/22 216/9 222/19 223/21
Dr. Gudjonsson [3] 200/14 200/21 220/2
Dr. Raymond [1] 37/7
Dr. Robert [1] 4/14
Dr. Trowbridge [2] 130/2 212/7
Dr. Williams [1] 218/6
draw [4] 91/24 $207 / 4207 / 5$ 220/13
drawn [5] 169/19 183/11 192/4 198/17 217/23
draws [1] 191/13
Drezin [2] 125/18 126/6
Drizin [7] $125 / 18126 / 5126 / 6126 / 8126 / 16$ 127/11 $128 / 13$
drop [1] 196/4
dropped [1] 176/23
DSM [6] 43/19 44/17 44/24 44/25 82/25 $186 / 5$
DSM-4 [5] 43/19 44/17 44/24 44/25 186/5 due [3] 8/22 55/6 130/6
duly [2] 4/16 $177 / 19$
duration [3] 59/12 59/14 60/8
during [17] $27 / 9$ 27/11 72/25 73/7 78/25 99/20 101/2 133/7 133/9 143/23 150/3 164/19 180/9 180/13 193/25 196/23 222/16 duties [1] 208/6
DVD [1] 25/10
dying [1] 100/14

## E

each [10] 38/19 50/5 57/10 61/13 152/25
152/25 169/17 189/6 195/10 202/24
eared [1] 114/19
earlier [5] 22/21 73/15 105/22 212/9 225/2 early [7] 5/12 52/6 158/22 179/15 180/5 180/5 181/2
easier [1] 34/15
easily [3] 38/13 116/7 119/17
easy [1] 118/2
EDELSTEIN [2] 1/21 4/9
edition [5] 183/21 183/22 $183 / 24186 / 6$
196/6
editorial [1] 58/4
editors [1] 12/6
education [6] 14/7 48/4 73/13 73/13 124/9
208/2

| $\underline{L}$ | $1 \mathrm{ev}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| educational [3] 5/3 178/5 187/7 | evaluating [3] 15/19 35/16 48/25 |  |
| -fretive [1] | evaluation [31] 6/4 21/20 $26 / 426 / 9$ 26/1 | tion [1] 180/11 |
| effort [1] 219/8 | $26 / 21$ 27/14 27/17 28/18 28/23 30/5 33/8 | expected [2] 105/4 221/25 |
| eight [7] 67/20 68/2 87/2 128/14 180/9 | 39/4 46/22 49/19 51/16 55/19 66/13 70/2 | experience [9] 147/2 155/3 162/12 183/15 |
| 85/10 218/10 | 74/2 75/15 78/6 85/8 124/7 | 192/25 196/20 216/24 217/1 218/1 |
| ther [27] 14/6 33/17 57/15 83/19 83/21 | 191/8 213/22 220/22 221/24 222/9 | ex |
| 2/3 92/8 93/12 103/20 103/22 104/5 106/14 | evaluations [19] 10/5 10/6 10/21 10/22 19/2 | experiences [3] 71/14 71/21 71/22 |
| 107/22 116/1 116/2 130/6 140/21 157/23 | 22/1 22/2 23/10 28/13 57/7 57/20 61/9 80/17 | experiencing [1] 194/24 |
| 168/7 171/13 179/12 192/25 195/11 197 | 151/4 159/6 159/10 159/18 209/1 210/25 | experiential [1] 146/16 |
| 213/18 216/6 218/5 | evaluator [1] 62/4 | experiment [1] 202/11 |
| elaborate [1] 59/9 | even [36] 23/4 26/15 28/15 30/13 34/1 52/18 | experimental [1] 9/13 |
| elapsed [1] 201/17 | 56/23 71/8 80/23 83/16 96/11 109/17 113/25 | expert [15] 9/23 16/14 131/14 131/16 148/12 |
| elapses [1] 204/19 | 120/25 127/6 127/20 133/22 134/1 136/16 | 168/22 168/25 169/6 171/6 171/17 17 |
| electronically [2] 95/10 156/3 | 137/21 139/13 139/20 141/23 141/24 142/25 | 180/25 181/6 187/20 20 |
| elements [1] 188/20 | 153/25 155/7 155/10 172/14 173/16 184/12 | expertise [3] 7/12 22/10 173/15 |
| elevated [2] 33/25 102/2 | 185/7 197/1 202/18 205/2 20 | experts [1] 16/15 |
| elicit [1] $69 / 9$ | evening [2] 13/2 168/18 | explain [4] 24/16 34/15 41/12 91/21 |
| eligibility [1] 124/8 | event [7] 146/6 146/20 147/4 147/10 147/11 | explained [4] 176/4 176/14 214/24 214/24 |
| else [17] 7/7 68/8 68/12 76/6 85/18 126/1 | 147/21 148/19 | explaining [1] 178/5 |
| 130/7 159/2 159/3 165/25 174/11 189/24 | events [1] 132/4 | explains [1] $46 / 12$ |
| 191/24 212/16 212/17 224/18 225/14 | eventual [1] 81/22 | explanation [1] 176/16 |
| else's [1] 220/23 | ever [16] 10/7 13/20 13/22 20/13 79/9 79/15 | exploits [1] 98/15 |
| embarrassed [1] 50/18 | 102/22 103/19 118/10 118/17 155/1 162/8 | exposed [1] 50/20 |
| Embassy [1] 204/16 | 180/7 180/21 192/14 200/18 | expound [1] 203/19 |
| emotional [4] 30/1 90/6 93/12 194/23 | every [7] 38/15 44/20 108/2 139/4 $139 / 4$ | express [2] 90/14 141/3 |
| employed [5] 5/18 5/19 178/2 204/7 208/2 | 153/11 153/12 | expressed [1] 60/3 |
| employee [1] $187 / 25$ | everyone [1] 7/7 | expressing [1] 39/1 |
| employing [1] 6/20 | everything [1] 147/ | expression [13] 38/23 38/25 39/18 88/19 |
| employment [7] 6/8 22/22 178/15 179/20 180/17 204/2 209/10 | evidence [5] 77/20 133/4 133/7 133/9 166/14 evident [1] 161/1 | 88/23 89/10 89/19 90/9 90/25 192/11 193/9 193/16 216/5 |
| encounter [1] 216/7 | exact [4] 16/25 53/12 57/10 221 | extended [1] 95/22 |
| encouraged [1] | exaggerating [2] 93/5 93/9 | extensive [1] 16/10 |
| end [16] 38/15 38/1638/17 | exam [1] 196/9 | extensively [1] 127/6 |
| 47/23 48/1 65/12 67/6 68/7 81/19 104/17 | examination [32] 3/4 3/5 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/12 | extent [1] 196/15 |
| 130/8 137/17 186/3 207 | 4/25 25/25 27/7 55/23 76/10 76/16 78/12 | extracting [1] 154/3 |
| enforcement [4] 105/13 132/19 133/2 | 78/25 79/8 86/2 105/23 144/20 147/25 | extreme [4] 127/3 127/13 195/14 195/14 |
| 133/21 | 150/22 152/6 154/16 156/13 157/5 16 | extremely [5] 50/24 68/9 68/9 93/9 128/12 |
| engineer [1] 9/21 | 161/4 163/12 166/2 177/25 199/13 206/16 | eye [4] 26/17 101/8 101/9 101/10 |
| Engl [1] 136/12 | $207 / 12$ | eyes [1] 103/5 |
| England [9] 134/10 135/11 137/25 139/7 | examinations [1] 210/17 | F |
| 139/22 146/13 148/9 200/18 205/5 | examine [3] 28/1 90/16 222/4 |  |
| English [1] 163/2 | examined [5] 4/17 78/19 177/20 194/10 | face [2] 101/8 201/9 facet [1] $43 / 8$ |
|  |  |  |
| 214/17 | example [36] 14/14 19/17 22/12 27/2 27/13 | litator's [1] 11/17 |
| enter [1] 156/2 | 27/18 64/2 66/3 66/23 69/3 69/10 70/7 70/8 | facilites [1] 180/19 |
| entering [1] 196/24 | 70/11 78/9 86/22 108/7 109/4 130/11 140/11 | fact [35] 43/4 56/10 59/8 77/19 77/22 79/25 |
| entire [3] 31/1 51/2 164/8 | 140/12 142/18 156/23 161/20 162/20 166/6 | 81/17 88/21 89/14 106/5 112/22 |
| entirely [3] 217/16 224/16 224/20 | 166/8 166/12 190/5 200/14 203/24 210/19 | 120/17 121/20 125/5 126/11 130/4 133/2 |
| entirety [1] 87/13 | 212/18 218/7 224/5 224/7 | 134/11 140/10 148/23 149/3 169/24 171/5 |
| entitled [3] 12/14 175/24 212/6 entries [1] 116/13 | examples [7] 70/18 70/21 112/17 141/2 161/5 161/14 165/14 | 171/7 171/23 172/1 172/2 172/11 173/5 187/18 187/24 188/15 206/14 210/19 |
| $\text { enumerate [1] } 14 / 3$ | $\text { except [5] } 7 / 232 / 193$ | factor [21] 37/8 37/14 37/14 50/25 60/21 |
| equaling [1] 65/10 | $\text { exception [1] } 187 / 22$ | 61/9 67/12 67/15 72/2 72/15 72/20 73/3 73/6 |
| equivalent [1] 187/5 | exclusively [1] 7/1 | 73/7 74/13 74/13 100/6 105/18 133/11 |
| er [1] 65/8 | excuse [10] 46/5 64/10 74/25 91/9 161/23 | 147/23 197/21 |
| error [3] 209/17 209/19 209/20 | 165/4 167/8 173/11 206/15 219/17 | factored [1] 88 |
| errors [1] 53/16 | exert [1] 53/10 | factors [20] 30/14 37/13 37/15 37/18 37/19 |
| especially [4] 71/8 71/11 146/18 199/16 | exhibit [31] 8/12 8/14 19/11 32/8 37/16 41/5 | 58/6 58/7 58/13 58/17 59/3 61/6 62/3 70/24 |
| essential [1] 74/2 | 44/7 44/15 46/6 46/7 46/20 53/25 101/14 | 74/11 82/9 105/10 109/15 131/13 1 |
| essentially [7] 69/2 154/12 163/2 165/19 | 101/25 124/4 151/19 151/22 151/23 152/3 | 149/8 |
| 168/2 173/4 198/24 | 154/12 156/8 156/9 156/13 157/8 157/12 | facts [5] 52/20 78/22 115/12 135/7 168/2 |
| established [2] 40/23 116/10 | 186/25 191/5 193/4 207/15 209/5 216/20 | culty [2] 178/17 180/10 |
| estimate [7] 10/12 10/13 84/2 185/7 185/8 | exhibited [1] 1 | failed [1] 181/5 |
| 185/8 185/12 | exhibiting [1] 155/8 | fair [26] 20/22 20/25 23/9 24/20 27/22 70/19 |
| ett [1] 6/24 | exhibits [3] 3/15 118/6 166/23 | 82/14 83/13 83/14 84/19 88/6 92/21 101/5 |
| ethic [1] 13/11 | exist [2] 15/21 80/18 | 104/19 114/25 115/1 125/24 128/6 128/16 |
| ethical [3] 13/11 77/8 77/22 | exists [1] 203/14 | 134/3 148/14 151/10 168/3 175/19 |
| ethically [2] 13/10 57/5 |  | $220 / 9$ |
| ethics [1] 152/20 | expanded [1] 22/10 | fairly [1] 112/4 |
| evaluate [5] 15/18 42/11 203/25 221/5 222/3 |  | fall [2] 109/25 114/11 |


| r | [inaings [4] 75/20 79/11 85/5 128/13 <br> fine [11] 29/7 60/6 60/7 65/7 68/24 75/5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FALLON [4] 1/15 4/7 118/8 127/24 | 75/10 76/8 135/18 216/22 228/6 | 184/18 198/20 200/24 |
| Fallon's [1] 124/4 | finish [3] 131/3 176/9 176/13 | four-hour [2] 110/19 128/4 |
| false [58] 15/11 15/20 15/25 16/24 16/25 | finished [2] 122/21 142/16 | fourth [7] 24/12 65/1 73/15 73/18 115/9 |
| 17/8 17/18 17/19 31/10 32/2 59/20 92/8 92/9 | finishing [1] 39/20 | 145/14 183/22 |
| 98/6 105/25 106/8 106/14 106/25 107/6 | fire [2] 121/16 124/23 | FOX [1] 1/11 |
| 107/19 107/22 108/13 125/7 125/13 126/12 | first [54] 4/16 4/20 6/12 8/20 15/25 21/11 | fraction [2] 21/16 21/19 |
| 126/17 126/19 127/4 127/12 127/18 128/11 | 21/24 23/21 34/13 34/16 53/22 54/9 68/4 | frame [1] 175/17 |
| 128/20 129/3 129/19 130/14 130/15 130/18 | 76/21 78/25 79/9 79/15 89/20 97/7 105/21 | free [4] $7 / 27 / 3$ 104/21 105/7 |
| 132/13 140/7 140/10 140/15 140/16 140/23 | 110/20 113/9 124/5 128/2 128/2 129/2 129/8 | FREMGEN [50] 1/19 3/4 3/6 3/12 4/8 4/9 |
| 144/9 144/13 144/18 145/4 145/8 145/11 | 129/9 135/5 135/21 136/15 136/15 139/15 | 10/12 17/16 18/4 18/7 18/8 21/3 31/7 42/8 |
| 163/14 164/3 164/10 170/12 195/11 197/6 | 141/10 168/12 172/8 173/24 174/5 177/19 | 43/22 44/5 46/16 60/8 64/16 75/11 118/4 |
| 218/24 219/3 219/18 | 183/5 183/12 183/14 188/12 191/10 192/12 | 137/13 144/16 150/3 150/10 150/13 150/14 |
| falseness [1] 106/21 | 193/23 198/14 198/21 200/8 200/11 201/12 | 150/19 150/23 152/2 153/15 165/25 166/5 |
| fam [1] 15/14 | 201/19 202/13 217/2 | 166/8 166/22 167/4 168/17 169/13 170/10 |
| familiar [41] 15/11 15/14 15/16 23/19 23/21 | fit [4] 28/19 28/19 81/11 82/12 | 172/5 174/5 174/11 175/21 176/3 176/10 |
| 59/23 60/25 88/20 125/22 $126 / 5127 / 11$ | fitness [3] 22/3 109/20 109/21 | 176/22 177/9 191/9 207/13 216/3 |
| 127/17127/21 128/18 $129 / 9130 / 14130 / 17$ | fits [1] 81/17 | Fremgen's [1] 176/18 |
| 146/17 151/2 169/12 170/23 183/17 183/18 | five [19] 6/25 21/5 54/9 55/14 55/16 57/8 | frequently [2] 198/9 217/4 |
| 184/13 185/23 188/13 192/12 192/21 193/5 | 57/8 87/2 97/10 118/3 145/13 145/13 150/15 | Friday [3] 5/19 5/23 5/24 |
| 194/6 196/8 199/23 200/2 200/25 $202 / 5$ | 151/15 185/18 201/15 205/16 205/18 $217 / 3$ | friendly [1] 195/21 |
| 203/5 206/23 216/4 218/22 219/14 219/16 | five-page [1] 151/15 | friends [5] 9/2 27/2 27/5 36/16 71/25 |
| familiarity [7] 72/1 188/14 200/23 222/14 | flavor [2] 135/22 203/17 | front [7] 21/10 99/25 100/8 100/8 100/13 |
| 223/8 223/19 225/10 | Florida [2] 90/21 192/17 | 134/25 199/25 |
| familiarizing [1] 12/19 | focus [2] 222/9 223/24 | frown [3] 77/23 78/2 78/5 |
| families [1] 173/7 | Focusing [1] $17 / 14$ | full [5] 81/9 184/9 184/10 185/22 216/15 |
| family [6] 62/16 71/25 119/16 120/4 123/16 | foggiest [1] 205/25 | function [4] 12/15 22/22 87/10 87/18 |
| 196/15 | fold [2] 141/4 143/4 | functioning [8] 18/14 19/15 33/19 41/3 48/6 |
| far [10] 15/4 40/5 71/20 81/22 174/8 187/19 | folding [1] 143/11 | 71/13 88/12 186/8 |
| 193/14 205/6 206/5 210/3 | follow [5] 13/7 13/8 150/25 161/2 163/17 | funny [1] 104/1 |
| fashion [6] 35/21 35/22 53/8 54/13 93/5 | follow-up [1] 163/17 | furnished [1] 78/25 |
| 170/8 | following [3] 26/12 89/5 198/23 | further [13] 57/16 69/25 70/18 89/10 153/3 |
| Fassbender [8] 64/5 64/22 67/4 68/9 68/14 | follows [2] 4/17 177/20 | 176/17 186/24 199/13 200/6 226/17 226/18 |
| 68/23 69/18 70/1 | Ford [1] $109 / 5$ | 226/20 2 |
| fast [3] 137/3 147/16 147/19 | foregoing [2] 229/7 229/7 | furthered [1] 82/15 |
| fatal [1] 211/4 | foremost [1] 16/14 | G |
| fatigued [2] 59/18 62/22 | forensic [61] 5/20 6/4 6/9 7/2 9/10 9/19 9/20 | G |
| fault [3] 70/3 176/6 176/11 | 9/21 9/22 10/1 10/3 12/9 12/21 13/5 13/8 | G-0-r-d-0-n [1] 4/24 |
| fax [1] $218 / 5$ | 14/2 14/10 15/15 16/19 17/5 17/12 19/2 19/4 | GAHN [2] 1/17 4/7 |
| fear [1] 100/9 | 19/4 19/8 19/23 21/20 27/8 44/22 51/7 56/20 | gain [2] 129/13 129/20 |
| features [2] 89/11 89/16 | 57/2 61/8 74/7 76/24 77/10 79/14 80/22 | gamut [1] 14/18 |
| February [5] 25/6 25/9 110/6 119/25 120/3 | 103/20 109/18 109/22 153/16 155/4 159/7 | garage [1] 65/22 |
| February 27 [4] 25/6 25/9 119/25 120/3 | 169/5 170/24 171/8 171/18 172/12 173/15 | gauge [2] 91/6 116/20 |
| federal [1] 14/9 | 175/1 192/19 203/10 207/21 207/25 210/17 | gave [8] 91/11 92/24 96/9 96/10 96/11 96/22 |
| feel [4] 100/3 104/9 118/16 160/14 | 210/25 215/12 217/6 217/8 220/13 | 141/19 166/6 |
| feeling [3] 26/25 27/2 101/25 | forensically [1] 12/13 | general [14] 13/5 72/25 84/18 86/12 87/6 |
| feelings [1] 63/15 | forensically-related [1] 12/13 | 87/14 105/8 133/15 133/17 167/25 172/13 |
| feels [1] 217/24 | foresee [1] 12/12 | 184/20 190/2 196/16 |
| fellow [2] 7/16 129/7 | forever [1] 196/22 | generally [8] 18/13 62/21 76/22 102/4 105/5 |
| felt [8] 27/3 34/9 44/14 118/14 119/12 | forgot [2] 80/9 209/15 | 105/14 117/7 194/11 |
| 185/19 190/1 195/25 | forgotten [1] 76/1 | generated [7] 86/3 88/15 156/4 156/20 |
| few [7] 7/2 22/2 27/1 59/8 163/17 167/9 | form [14] $17 / 24$ 19/1 30/3 51/25 51/25 | 156/25 189/7 214/12 |
| 215/12 | 119/12 124/10 124/15 144/17 155/10 183/3 | generic [1] 19/1 |
| fide [1] 33/20 | 183/19 197/9 202/2 | gentleman [4] 134/9 190/6 194/5 212/2 |
| field [15] 7/12 12/20 13/22 15/23 16/14 23/6 | formal [1] $227 / 22$ | gentlemen [2] 227/6 227/18 |
| 126/25 127/2 171/18 173/2 180/25 181/7 | format [1] 187/9 | get [39] 4/20 12/16 22/15 22/24 23/1 46/3 |
| 217/5 221/5 221/20 | formed [1] 199/14 | 52/2 55/9 55/10 55/12 58/2 62/2 62/22 63/5 |
| fields [1] 108/3 | forming [1] 131/10 | 63/7 74/3 85/1 85/3 100/7 100/24 104/14 |
| Fifty [1] 136/9 | forms [2] 51/24 52/2 | 108/22 108/25 109/6 109/10 109/14 117/11 |
| file [9] 85/9 137/9 150/4 150/11 175/22 | formulate [1] $49 / 13$ | 127/3 130/16 135/22 140/21 150/8 170/9 |
| 182/23 184/14 212/14 224/9 | formulating [3] 28/7 72/3 215/17 | 176/4 184/24 192/8 192/11 203/4 205/24 |
| files [1] 182/15 | formulations [1] 192/3 | gets [3] 7/6 141/25 142/1 |
| fill [2] 86/21 86/25 | forth [1] 121/2 | getting [7] 27/3 83/3 99/25 100/13 126/18 |
| filled [1] 199/6 | forthcoming [2] 105/15 105/16 | 158/24 166/17 |
| final [1] 40/11 | forward [3] 33/13 93/4 $129 / 8$ | Gisli [2] 16/7 52/5 |
| finally [3] 58/1 148/16 169/22 | found [11] 32/25 37/13 62/7 64/3 81/9 84/5 | give [17] 14/5 17/8 51/24 55/3 58/4 62/23 |
| finances [1] 13/18 | 85/7 161/25 191/20 200/20 202/19 | 69/8 83/10 83/16 91/8 129/19 140/11 141/11 |
| find [19] 65/4 118/2 118/19 118/24 118/24 | foundation [8] 43/24 174/17 174/18 174/21 | 169/22 174/21 194/21 200/6 |
| 120/18 120/22 126/22 176/16 189/21 190/15 | 175/6 175/10 199/21 $200 / 1$ | given [17] 5/16 22/7 27/15 29/20 31/11 32/3 |
| 191/16 192/1 192/2 200/20 202/12 202/23 | founded [1] 180/4 | 132/11 139/12 144/24 154/9 158/16 168/22 |
| 203/12 220/1 | four [28] 13/2 32/20 33/4 33/5 33/7 34/3 | 199/24 205/14 207/5 210/23 213/18 |
| finding [1] $189 / 13$ | 40/3 60/13 60/16 83/19 83/21 83/25 84/11 | gives [3] 133/23 141/16 141/24 |


| G | $49 / 5$ |  <br> $37 / 837 / 937 / 1137 / 1339 / 539 / 1441 / 2343 / 3$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| giving [3] 77/17 77/18 160/19 | 70/16 72/3 72/5 72/1681/24 82/4 134/5 | 43/25 46/11 46/12 46/24 47/1 47/1 47/17 |
| gleaned [1] 193/8 | 134/7 134/9 144/12 145/1 145/2 145/4 148/1 | 48/2 49/5 49/15 49/21 49/23 54/12 54/15 |
| global [2] 37/14 37/14 | 158/4 158/5 161/21 161/23 162/20 164/1 | 55/5 55/6 55/15 55/19 58/25 59/11 60/12 |
| go [47] 12/24 12/24 25/3 29/3 29/5 31/7 34/6 | 175/6 198/12 200/14 200/21 206/20 212/21 | 68/22 70/3 70/5 71/5 73/11 74/21 75/13 |
| 34/12 35/15 39/16 39/16 40/15 40/15 43/16 | 219/5 220/2 220/4 224/1 224/4 224/4 224/22 | 79/20 79/20 81/16 86/4 87/17 92/8 92/9 |
| 46/15 47/20 55/3 61/13 67/20 69/13 69/25 | Gudjonsson's [1] 60/21 | 92/14 92/25 96/8 96/10 97/14 97/24 98/1 |
| 70/18 70/23 75/9 79/22 80/4 84/6 95/5 95/20 | guess [12] 34/13 64/4 73/22 85/1 92/15 | 100/2 100/21 101/6 101/14 101/25 101/25 |
| 112/5 113/9 117/13 118/9 118/20 131/5 | 95/20 171/23 172/18 187/13 205/15 205/16 | 101/25 102/1 102/4 102/23 102/24 103/1 |
| 141/1 144/22 149/20 150/3 150/11 153/2 | 205/18 | 103/12 103/15 103/16 103/17 107/17 107/20 |
| 172/4 186/24 189/20 193/20 218/1 228/2 | guesses [1] 140/20 | 107/20 107/21 112/2 115/12 117/21 117/22 |
| goes [6] 43/15 108/12 134/1 174/8 195/17 | guide [1] 11/17 | 117/25 119/17 120/9 121/10 121/16 121/19 |
| 197/24 | guilt [2] 62/998/14 | 121/21 121/22 122/14 123/24 125/2 125/2 |
| going [63] 8/13 8/18 22/13 24/20 28/11 29/5 | quilty [1] 62/7 | 128/19 136/21 136/23 137/3 137/13 138/3 |
| 32/8 34/7 34/7 43/14 44/1 46/3 46/13 49/6 | H | $139 / 9$ 139/12 140/20 140/20 140/22 141/9 |
| 53/18 63/22 64/9 64/23 68/19 69/10 75/2 | 1 | 141/11 141/24 141/25 143/3 143/5 143/8 |
| 78/12 80/13 80/15 81/21 81/23 89/6 92/4 | H. [1] 4/23 | 143/9 143/11 143/16 143/17 143/18 143/19 |
| 97/4 97/5 97/12 108/23 109/10 117/13 124/4 | H. Gordon [1] 4/23 | 143/19 143/20 143/20 144/3 144/6 144/6 |
| 125/2 130/24 130/25 134/6 135/11 135/19 | had [85] 8/17 21/12 28/3 29/13 40/3 40/11 | 144/6 144/9 144/10 144/11 153/11 161/11 |
| 138/20 141/1 141/1 141/7 144/19 149/13 | 49/15 55/5 56/24 57/6 60/25 62/15 65/4 73/8 | 164/23 165/1 165/3 165/4 165/4 165/6 |
| 152/2 153/7 167/8 167/22 167/23 174/13 | 73/11 73/17 76/12 77/13 88/17 96/25 103/19 | 167/23 168/21 170/17 170/22 171/2 171/12 |
| 174/15 174/20 175/22 183/6 205/18 206/7 | 103/22 105/5 105/12 107/4 115/5 117/22 | 171/20 172/8 172/12 173/4 173/16 174/21 |
| 206/9 206/14 227/6 $227 / 7$ | 143/17 143/17 143/18 143/20 143/20 149/22 | 174/24 175/4 175/5 175/5 175/10 176/2 |
| gone [2] 5/17 13/21 | 150/1 150/17 155/19 156/12 162/8 162/23 | 176/3 176/14 185/17 189/24 189/24 190/10 |
| good [13] 4/2 41/12 76/18 76/20 96/2 96/5 | 162/24 164/21 177/2 178/20 179/3 180/19 | 190/11 190/13 190/21 190/21 190/25 190/25 |
| 121/6 131/21 140/12 171/9 184/24 205/17 | 181/12 181/25 182/9 184/6 185/17 191/11 | 190/25 191/2 191/2 196/8 200/3 200/17 |
| 226/10 | 193/3 195/5 196/21 197/25 198/3 198/6 | 200/18 201/14 201/15 201/23 201/25 203/12 |
| GORDON [45] 3/3 4/14 4/15 4/23 24/22 | 198/21 199/5 199/5 200/10 200/11 201/2 | 203/14 205/2 206/18 207/1 207/2 222/6 |
| 76/18 99/6 103/11 107/3 112/21 125/7 131/8 | 201/12 201/25 203/8 204/8 208/16 208/25 | 222/22 222/23 223/1 223/3 223/5 224/2 |
| 132/17 149/22 150/4 166/4 166/19 169/2 | 209/3 209/21 211/4 211/8 212/3 212/13 | 224/19 |
| 169/15 169/24 170/2 170/7 170/12 170/17 | 213/2 213/15 213/18 213/19 213/20 214/6 | he'd [1] 140/21 |
| 171/2 171/22 172/8 174/22 176/5 $176 / 7$ | 220/11 221/15 226/14 229/13 | he's [23] 16/15 16/21 17/17 17/20 38/14 |
| 183/6 185/15 188/11 191/13 193/6 193/11 | half [6] 36/5 53/5 170/5 185/4 188/6 206/2 | 41/24 43/14 43/18 48/1 56/7 75/3 81/19 |
| 193/21 194/8 214/9 214/25 215/17 216/12 | halfway [1] 141/2 | 98/22 102/3 142/3 143/7 168/24 174/20 |
| 216/16 216/18 222/11 | hand [4] 43/10 156/2 177/17 195/12 | 200/1 205/14 223/1 223/13 225/5 |
| Gordon's [24] 171/12 172/25 173/21 182/15 | handbag [1] $136 / 6$ | head [2] 68/8 68/21 |
| 182/23 183/1 184/14 185/22 186/17 | handbook [2] 16/22 | headaches [2] 33/21 102/2 |
| 191/16 193/4 198/15 201/14 206/17 206/23 | handed [1] 191/4 | health [14] 5/9 6/5 6/6 6/16 11/24 33/19 |
| 212/10 213/4 213/22 216/9 222/10 222/19 | handwriting [1] 198/2 | 33/20 33/23 179/7 180/2 180/18 194/22 |
| 223/21 223/22 | handwritten [2] 199/6 212/13 | $15210 / 16$ |
| got [12] 65/11 65/19 65/20 67/11 96/15 | hap [1] 69/16 | hear [7] 47/19 77/18 167/21 172/22 $227 / 9$ |
| 110/9 110/17 110/18 132/22 134/25 150/11 | haphazard [1] 170/10 | 227/10 228/5 |
| $166 / 19$ | happen [5] 113/1 113/13 128/4 128/5 132/14 | heard [9] 43/19 47/17 64/11 96/3 121/21 |
|  | happened [5] 6 | 125/8 200/10 200/12 201 |
| gradual [1] 21/23 | 1 | hearing [6] 51/22 124/23 174/23 182/3 |
| gradually [1] 22/10 | happens [4] 68/8 103/3 104/2 142/4 | 2/10 205/3 |
| graduate [1] 6/13 | happy [1] 182/4 | hearings [1] 181/2 |
| grant [1] 221/19 | hard [5] 69/18 104/14 130/22 147/1 205/10 | Hearst [1] 130/10 |
| granted [1] 225/9 | has [69] 16/10 17/5 17/6 18/10 23/4 23/15 | heavily [1] 17/1 |
| graph [2] 31/14 195/14 | $26 / 22$ 30/1 30/7 33/17 33/17 33/18 42/4 48/2 | heck [1] 139/21 |
| graphic [1] $46 / 6$ | 49/21 63/9 63/22 72/24 74/21 75/13 82/16 | height [1] 185/9 |
| great [4] 63/1 115/11 134/12 189/21 | 101/13 103/7 104/1 104/4 107/20 107/20 | heinous [1] 205/8 |
| greater [10] 35/7 38/1 38/3 55/5 62/23 71/7 | 118/1 124/12 124/14 131/23 138/22 142/19 | held [4] 136/4 178/17 180/10 204/8 |
| 72/13 72/14 106/13 210/3 | 143/24 146/25 151/19 152/3 159/4 160/17 | help [5] 22/15 113/10 113/10 188/2 202/4 |
| greatest [1] 114/24 | 168/3 168/20 170/2 170/7 170/20 171/21 | helped [1] 152/17 |
| Green [1] 210/4 | 173/4 173/17 174/6 174/21 176/2 176/3 | helpful [18] 13/16 24/18 51/22 52/9 57/18 |
| grew [1] 204/13 | 176/4 183/22 187/14 193/12 195/23 199/21 | 110/25 111/7 111/15 112/2 112/13 112/14 |
| Grisso [1] 203/11 | 200/17 200/18 201/16 202/22 204/4 210/11 | 116/25 119/7 160/11 160/21 185/21 191/3 |
| Gross [3] 116/10 118/11 119/3 | 214/25 218/8 222/10 223/3 225/9 229/8 | 202/20 |
| group [8] $7 / 3$ 7/7 12/15 23/8 49/4 190/11 | hasn't [1] 200/1 | helping [1] 15/20 |
| 202/18 202/19 | hat [10] 140/13 140/15 140/20 140/21 141/8 | her [20] 65/21 65/23 68/4 68/5 68/8 68/8 |
| groups [4] 22/18 22/23 22/25 195/3 | 141/10 141/20 142/7 142/8 142/14 | 68/20 70/5 119/13 119/14 123/4 123/17 |
| GSS [4] 174/25 175/3 198/21 199/8 | Hathaway [1] 29/14 | $136 / 4136 / 5136 / 5136 / 6136 / 8144 / 10$ |
| GSS-1 [2] 198/21 199/8 | Hau [3] 2/3 229/4 229/18 | 144/11 205/6 |
| guarantee [1] 65/13 | have [278] | here [21] 22/15 29/5 32/23 33/5 45/22 46/3 |
| guard [1] 104/24 | haven't [7] 51/21 52/21 96/3 174/18 208/7 | 54/23 85/10 106/22 107/1 107/2 110/11 |
| guarded [2] 104/24 105/6 | 208/16 224/22 | 140/12 141/2 167/18 168/18 182/21 190/9 |
| guardianship [3] 10/6 10/22 22/1 guards [1] 104/9 | having [12] 4/16 27/1 28/8 73/11 102/1 117/16 177/19 188/24 190/6 199/2 222/15 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 206 / 8 \text { 222/7 227/12 } \\ & \text { hereby [1] 229/6 } \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| Gudjon [1] 57/19 | 227/15 | herein [2] 4/16 $177 / 19$ |
| Gudjonsson [59] 16/8 16/1116/14 17/3 18/24 19/23 27/18 29/1 51/19 52/6 52/16 | he [202] 16/10 16/15 16/16 16/17 16/17 16/18 17/20 17/21 24/15 24/16 24/18 26/14 | high [9] 33/14 34/4 66/16 143/20 157/14 157/15 157/15 157/17 211/8 |

higher [11] 10/20 31/14 41/16 41/17 71/10 147/12 213/23 213/24 214/2 214/3 214/4 highly [3] 56/7 116/1 160/3
him [38] $17 / 5$ 17/8 32/25 33/2 41/25 47/17
59/196/2396/25 97/1 99/21 102/5 116/21
122/22 125/5 136/22 141/11 142/2 148/13
164/22 164/24 164/24 164/24 165/7165/14 165/23 166/14 168/20 170/21 173/18 175/12 184/22 204/25 216/12 216/13 220/19 222/4 $222 / 6$
himself [2] 71/24 141/24
his [91] 15/25 19/24 24/5 26/17 26/17 $26 / 18$
26/23 35/18 36/4 48/3 48/4 48/4 49/4 49/22
54/15 55/6 65/18 71/1 71/4 71/22 71/22
71/23 71/25 73/13 74/17 75/4 75/8 87/10
98/6 101/8 114/14 117/24 119/3 120/4 120/9 121/12 121/15 $122 / 14122 / 18$ 123/3 123/16 124/21 124/25 128/2 134/11 134/11 141/12 143/5 143/8 143/11 143/11 143/14 144/7
149/22 150/4 153/10 162/9 164/21 164/22 164/23 165/5 165/5 165/17 166/7 168/2I 168/22 170/1 172/20 172/21 173/5 173/6 173/8 174/18 175/22 190/14 200/15 201/23 207/1 211/19 212/12 212/12 212/13 212/14 213/17 214/10 215/17 216/9 216/13 223/6 224/9 225/20
historical [1] 116/19
histories [1] 104/10
history [6] 6/8 $26 / 21$ 26/22 26/22 72/13 143/21
hmm [4] 207/17 209/9 213/10 219/22 ho [2] 136/5 $136 / 5$
Hold [1] 46/2
holiday [6] $136 / 4$ 136/17 $136 / 18137 / 20$
$204 / 15205 / 5$
home [1] 65/15
homicide [4] 11/16 14/16 148/6 211/2
HON [1] 1/11
honest [1] 33/13
honestly [1] 79/24
Honor [2] 145/10 221/9
hoped [1] 181/25
hopeful [1] 202/16
Hospital [1] 194/18
hospitals [1] 196/25
hostile [2] 103/17 104/24
hotel [1] $136 / 5$
hour [11] 53/5 110/19 127/20 128/4 128/4 128/6 128/14 131/7 170/5 175/22 206/2 hours [9] 13/2 60/13 60/16 110/18 110/20 127/21 128/15 128/15 168/18 house [5] 65/20 120/10 121/10 121/22 124/22
how [85] 10/1 10/9 12/19 14/25 15/1 15/4 15/14 20/6 20/7 20/16 21/3 21/7 21/9 23/21 30/16 30/20 30/24 31/7 37/21 40/8 42/22
45/8 48/24 48/24 60/12 60/25 68/1 70/9
72/11 80/20 80/20 80/21 81/4 81/5 83/16 85/16 87/7 88/22 92/14 95/24 97/6 97/10 103/5 110/16 110/20 115/17 119/8 119/11 127/8 135/22 138/18 138/24 141/20 142/4 142/14 142/15 143/5 145/11 145/11 145/21
145/22 153/4 154/7 156/22 156/23 158/20 164/11 168/11 169/17 172/14 176/23 178/2 178/13 181/15 181/16 184/14 185/25 194/11 194/13 194/14 194/14 197/16 220/3 220/7 224/24
How's [1] 41/11
however [5] 29/2 77/3 101/3 169/11 196/12 huh [1] 223/18
Human [4] 6/23 173/10 208/24 209/11

Hunticu $/$ /] 14/D $34 / 20$ 41/1041/1/41/10
49/3 55/14
hundreds [2] 94/18 121/2
hurt [1] $97 / 19$
husband [1] 205/6
hybrid [1] 66/15
hypnotic [1] 108/10
hypnotism [1] 108/8
hypnotized [1] 108/8
hypochondriasis [3] 33/10 33/16 102/24
hypochontri [1] 33/10
hypothesis [5] 82/15 82/15 86/3 88/15
155/22
hypothetically [2] 40/2 223/3

## I

I al [1] 172/9
I'd [15] 11/3 17/19 17/21 18/1 35/11 41/25
60/3 64/2 64/10 64/12 127/10 136/7 $137 / 17$

## 143/15 198/11

I'll [34] 18/5 18/5 31/3 33/9 37/3 37/3 $37 / 4$
44/2 44/2 44/2 60/6 60/7 62/2 63/5 63/5 63/5
79/21 89/5 97/7 102/13 126/4 137/15 137/18
138/12 138/12 140/11 149/14 150/7 151/18
151/18 216/2 216/19 221/19 223/17
I'm [141] 5/19 7/14 7/18 7/22 7/24 8/4 8/13
9/8 13/5 17/15 18/21 20/18 21/8 22/11 22/13
22/24 23/16 29/5 30/21 32/8 32/24 34/737/3 $42 / 842 / 2045 / 245 / 1945 / 2146 / 1349 / 6$
53/18 60/10 63/22 64/9 64/16 64/23 65/2 66/10 66/10 67/19 68/16 68/19 68/25 69/10 75/2 80/9 81/21 85/1 85/15 85/23 85/23
85/23 89/7 89/18 89/24 92/1 92/3 92/4 95/4 95/20 97/4 97/5 98/10 98/22 100/12 101/9
101/17 102/12 102/21 103/24 104/3 104/14
106/21 107/2 107/13 108/10 108/19 109/3
111/18 113/20 117/3 117/9 117/13 117/22 118/15 118/21 119/1 120/7 122/21 123/2 125/25 130/24 130/24 135/17 135/19 138/3 141/1 141/5 141/6 141/18 142/16 143/12 144/19 146/24 147/18 150/8 150/9 152/2 153/7 154/21 156/8 157/13 167/8 170/10 171/14 174/15 174/23 176/18 182/21 183/6 193/2 193/25 194/3 196/7 206/9 206/14
208/25 209/18 210/18 210/18 215/15 216/12 218/25 219/4 219/15 219/19 220/16 220/16 223/1 224/7 224/18
I've [23] 5/14 5/17 7/1 10/3 12/2 13/13 14/6
15/16 16/7 16/7 22/7 23/8 38/5 38/6 166/19
179/15 191/4 208/1 210/5 211/10 220/5
220/11 222/18
i.e [1] 71/9

Iceland [4] 16/16 134/10 135/11 200/15
idea [1] $87 / 6$
identification [2] 8/12 151/22
identify [2] $42 / 1195 / 2$
IEP [2] 113/21 117/24
Illinois [2] 8/1 37/6
illness [2] 130/6 188/21
immediate [3] 135/6 139/16 201/20
immediately [3] 53/4 136/22 156/4
impact [7] 40/11 71/15 75/21 75/22 110/21
124/25 164/11
impacted [1] 153/5
impairment [2] 26/16 124/19
impermissible [2] 126/21 $127 / 13$
implied [1] $216 / 17$
importance [1] 184/21
important [29] 13/7 13/14 17/12 18/9 19/8 $26 / 326 / 526 / 527 / 727 / 11$ 33/7 34/9 39/21 $39 / 24$ 49/25 57/1 63/2 68/10 82/23 83/2 83/5 83/8 83/12 91/6 113/5 117/4 132/18 184/24 204/21
mporcanny |S| 133/20 141/15 147/3 109/1 169/19
impossible [1] 19999
improper [1] 78/16
impulsivity [1] 195/6
inappropriate [1] 195/25
inaudible [3] 93/9 117/2 117/4
inches [2] 73/9 73/10
incident [1] 72/23
include [21] 7/13 8/23 19/14 27/19 33/12
88/10 88/13 88/15 113/5 113/20 120/19
122/9 126/21 127/14 151/14 152/12 152/18
153/17 158/1 187/10 187/23
included [19] 34/3 44/9 75/8 83/17 90/25
93/17 99/7 99/15 113/7 120/21 152/9 152/24 153/4 153/10 153/11 157/9 195/20 196/12 198/20
includes [2] 26/21 81/25
including [4] 32/17 113/10 120/25 156/5
inconsistent [3] 128/12 149/4 189/22
incorporate [1] 158/2
incorrect [3] 52/22 222/20 222/23
increase [2] 19/12 62/20
increased [1] 73/1
increasing [1] $10 / 4$
increasingly [1] 106/12
inculpatory [1] 105/7
independence [1] 37/15
independent [3] 143/19 179/13 210/16
indi [1] 99/16
indicate [6] 41/6 54/5 89/5 126/16 127/17 164/10
indicated [23] 14/19 21/13 21/25 25/13 47/7 57/6 57/17 79/8 84/7 99/16 151/5 155/14 160/10 162/8 162/23 163/12 181/24 207/14 208/19 212/24 214/5 216/3 222/13
indicates [5] 24/15 91/7 137/22 173/4 209/10 indication [1] 26/15
indicative [3] 30/11 101/7 163/13
indirectly [1] $12 / 10$
individual [32] 19/11 26/4 28/20 31/8 32/1
40/7 50/14 52/25 54/17 60/20 73/12 73/21
82/16 96/6 96/8 96/10 98/25 104/4 129/12
130/16 154/3 189/18 190/3 204/19 205/7
205/13 217/17 219/1 220/14 220/15 221/6 221/23
individual's [2] 59/15 82/1
individuals [24] 14/12 23/7 24/7 29/18 34/19
35/6 36/5 37/11 37/24 43/7 44/19 50/17
$54 / 25$ 71/7 72/12 84/23 86/4 106/11 119/20
120/24 125/17 145/21 146/18 218/16
indulgence [1] 131/2
industrial [1] $9 / 14$
inflated [1] $10 / 15$
inflicted [1] 211/4
influence [1] $116 / 5$
influenced [3] $116 / 1$ 116/7 $119 / 18$
informal [1] 227/20
informally [1] 134/22
information [64] 9/24 13/16 26/7 27/6 34/5
55/24 57/16 62/9 69/9 74/8 74/19 79/2 80/17
95/7 104/15 104/20 104/22 104/25 105/7
105/16 119/6 125/4 132/20 132/21 133/15
140/7 140/10 140/17 145/23 148/22 150/12
158/2 175/24 176/4 181/12 181/19 182/9
182/13 182/20 182/25 183/2 184/20 185/11
187/11 187/19 189/23 191/21 198/19 199/5
200/13 200/20 206/22 211/12 211/18 211/21
212/18 212/21 212/22 213/2 221/2 222/11
222/21 222/25 223/5
initial [4] 27/20 27/20 160/22 162/4
initially [4] 155/23 161/15 202/15 202/20
injuries [1] 211/4

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| injury [1] 22/14 <br> input [2] 11913 119/14 <br> inquiry [1] 126/4 <br> instance [15] 10/2 10/24 15/5 19/3 19/23 <br> $27 / 22$ 28/12 30/4 31/9 34/22 40/3 63/14 66/3 <br> $71 / 2224 / 22$ | interviewed [5] 27/23 99/17 103/12 120 | 204/20 211/1 213/24 214/4 214/6 214/8 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | (item [4] 152/25 175/20 175/20 197/2 |
|  |  | 196/13 196/16 197/1 |
|  |  | 198/2 |
| instances [4] 57/8 102/7 112/22 112/23 instead [6] 30/12 83/25 91/9 105/15 144/1 | introducing [1] $167 / 13$ | 45 |
|  | introversion [7] 31/13 35/12 | 198/18 203/21 226/25 <br> itself [15] 43/25 51/3 51/10 81/14 135/10 |
| 206/11 Institute [6] $6 / 56 / 616 / 19179 / 7180 / 18$ | introverted [3] 19/17 35/23 36/10 | /20 194/17 196/12 |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { 200/16 } \\ & \text { institution [2] } 28 / 8 \\ & 188 / 1 \end{aligned}\right.$ | inventories [5] 90/5 93/3 15 | 199/12 201/2 201/4 201/9 |
|  | inventory [23] 29/9 29/12 38/25 39/19 88 88/23 89/10 89/19 89/22 89/23 90/9 90/25 | J |
| [1] | 91/9 91/10 91/13 192/12 192/23 193/3 193 | jail [1] 25/18 |
| truction [1] 227/20 | 3/16 194/21 196/4 | JAMES [7] 3/10 29/22 94/21 168/15 17 |
| instructions [3] 227/9 |  | 177/18 177/23 |
| instrument [21] 37/19 89/15 90/16 90/17 | [20] 6/9 10/1 10/3 12/9 15/16 30/16 | Janesville [2] 5/21 |
| /14 188/10 188/13 192/10 192/13 193/9 | 61/1 98/15 146/13 147/6 149/9 178/14 | January [1] 209/2 |
| 193/23 193/24 194/10 194/13 194/14 200/10 | 179/17 181/3 | 1] 65/21 |
| O23 201/2 201/4 201/9 203/18 | 211/10 220/2 | Jennifer [3] 2/3 229/4 229 |
| instrumental [1] 29/22 | involvement [8] 15/22 23/5 23/10 128 | JEROME [1] 1/11 |
| instruments [3] 102/9 |  | job [3] 57/3 107/2 2 |
| intellectual [9] 18/14 19/14 41/348 |  | jobs [1] 18778 |
| 1/12 82/17 84/6 186/8 | IQ [41] 18/14 28/5 40/19 41/3 41/15 | John [1] 213/15 |
| intellectually [1] 4975 | 45/22 49/10 49/15 49/16 50/15 50/17 50/18 | joint [1] 178/20 |
| intelligence [40] 27/25 28/3 40/20 $40 / 23$ | 50/19 50/23 50/24 51/10 56/18 56/24 81/15 | JonBenet [1] 129/7 |
| 41/2 41/6 41/21 42/7 43/10 44/10 45/5 46/23 | 82/1 82/8 82/17 83/1 83/4 84/2 84/12 87/6 | journals [6] 11/22 12/3 12/7 12/23 12/24 |
| 46/25 49/1 49/3 49/24 81/1081/12 83/15 | 87/887/19 90/3 90/7 $11715117 / 7117 / 10$ | 180/13 |
| 84/3 86/13 87/15 183/14 183/20 184/1 | 143/20 159/23 184/9 186/9 213/20 213/2 | judge [66] 1/11 4/12 11/1 11/2 11/3 11/4 |
| 184/21 184/23 184/25 185/18 185/20 185/2 | IQ's [2] 43/8 146/19 | 17/15 17/25 20/18 20/21 21/4 21/5 24/13 |
| 186/2 186/4 186/13 | irrelevant [2] 43/14 43 | 31/341/22 42/2 |
| 13/6 213/8 213/13 | Irr | 47/13 60/1 60/7 64/9 74/25 76/5 76/117 |
| intend [2] 168/15 170/21 | is [497] | 79/20 107/1 111/14 111/25 131/1 131/4 |
| intended [3] 189/1 193/16 195/16 | isn't [52] 50/19 77/20 78/13 79/11 79/13 | 15 |
| intent [1] 188/17 | 81/18 83/13 83/23 87/11 88/25 90/2 92/9 | 153/7 165/25 166/22 167/3 167/6 168 |
| intentionally [1] 17/17 | 92/21 96/9 98/16 99/15 99/22 100/10 100/2 | 169/1 170/16 171/24 173/24 174/12 176/6 |
| inter [2] 25/5 222/16 | 101/18 104/23 106/3 106/9 107/18 108/3 | 176/25 177/15 199/19 206/12 $207 / 10223$ |
| interact [2] 36/12 36/1 | 108/16 108/24 109/19 112/19 113/22 117/14 | 225/14 225/16 225/25 226/19 226/25 227/3 |
| interested [1] 174/23 | 125/14 128/16 131/21 132/2 134/3 134/18 | 227/19 228/7 |
| interfere [1] 204/2 | 140/8 140 | judged [1] 193/8 |
| internalized [1] 130/3 | 144/15 144/25 146/10 147/8 148/14 149/5 | judges [2] 13/16 104 |
| internet [6] $57 / 25$ 200/13 200/21 219/2 | 16 | judgment [2] 158/11 159/15 |
| 222/16 | isolation [2] 56/22 149/7 issue [15] 34/234/10 / | juries [4] 13/1751/9 80/14 8 |
| internship [1] 5/8 interpersonal [1] 188/21 |  |  |
| interpose [7] 17/16 20/19 24/14 43/21 60/1 | 17 | jury [63] 1/4 9/18 10/23 |
| 64/10 153/8 | issues [6] 95/3 101/5 124/17 137/19 167/23 | 38/14 41/8 64/12 74/4 |
| interposed [1] 81/3 | 169/2 | 80/19 83/10 85/24 86/16 92/1 92/1 92/12 |
| interposing [1] 17/17 | it [471] | 94/12 97/10 98/11 105/21 106/15 107/1 |
| interpret [5] 93/11 93/1093/11 218/16 22 | it's [172] 6/15 8/5 9/13 10/4 10/13 10/23 | 110/3 110/17 111/8 111/21 112/9 128/18 |
| interpretation [11] 12/15 93/13 152/17 | 11/25 12/14 13/10 13/10 13/15 14/13 15/1 | 135/3 135/21 138/21 141/15 141/23 143/6 |
| 152/25 160/4 174/16 186/21 217/14 218/3 | 15/18 15/19 16/8 17/1 20/11 20/25 21/1 | 143/24 144/5 149/15 150/18 167/9 167/10 |
| 218/9 218/15 | 21/23 23/11 23/11 23/12 23/13 26/5 26/5 | 171/20 171/24 177/4 177/7 178/5 180/23 |
| interpreted [4] 32/16 85/20 155/21 155/22 | 26/5 26/6 27/11 29/9 29/10 30/6 31/4 31/17 | 181/15 186/15 187/1 194/11 202/8 226/1 |
| interpreting [2] 42/17 217/25 | 32/4 32/4 32/5 33/17 34/15 38/2 39/21 39/23 | 227/8 227/10 227/16 227/20 227/22 227/25 |
| interrogated [4] 24/5 52/12 56/8 109/2 | 39/24 40/25 42/6 45/22 46/24 47/20 47/22 | just [78] 11/2 11/3 15/10 17/4 18/25 20/21 |
| interragation [11] 25/9 61/17 63/8 67/15 | 50/21 51/20 52/22 53/15 54/8 56/7 56/15 | 21/23 22/6 23/11 23/13 28/17 32/4 33/13 |
| 109/3 111/5 111/9 131/11 131/16 143/24 | 56/17 56/18 58/1 58/1 63/2 64/21 64/23 | 36/15 42/24 44/25 45/14 52/2 52/9 53/13 |
| 162/1 | 64/25 66/8 66/9 66/12 68/9 69/18 69/19 70/3 | 54/4 54/10 56/21 59/20 65/1 65/20 65/22 |
| interrogations [4] 24/8 108/1 127/19 14 | 70/11 71/16 74/2 76/23 77/2 78/6 78/9 78/14 | 68/14 68/17 68/19 69/10 77/17 87/689/5 |
| interrogative [8] 16/9 16/13 52/7 52/10 | 83/14 84/3 84/20 85/19 86/3 86/18 87/7878 | 90/8 95/2 95/16 95/20 100/12 102/21 106/7 |
| 131/17 132/18 164/7 166/12 | 87/8 90/1 94/10 94/10 95/22 96/11 97/12 | 6/10 106/19 107/5 107/18 107/20 107/25 |
| interrogator [1] 62/19 | 98/8 100/6 102/7 104/1 104/19 104/19 | 110/18 111/19 115/20 118/24 125/10 127/20 |
| interrupt [4] 30/21 42/9 42/21 119/2 | 104/24 107/20 107/21 108/1 112/1 116/25 | 29/14 129/17 130/16 138/16 149/18 155/11 |
| interrupted [1] 203/15 | 120/15 121/12 121/14 121/19 121/25 123/1 | 161/2 166/4 166/15 170/10 176/25 186/15 |
| interrupting [2] 40/15 203/20 | 123/14 124/7 129/14 129/18 129/18 130/22 | 192/11 195/7 199/24 205/19 209/17 214/3 |
| intervals [1] 213/20 | 130/22 130/23 132/18 134/19 134/23 136/13 | 214/20 214/24 215/23 216/20 217/22 22 |
| interview [32] 24/17 24/17 25/5 25/8 26/8 | 137/2 137/25 137/25 140/11 140/12 142/17 |  |
| 26/15 27/20 60/9 72/23 73/8 82/6 99/20 | 142/17 144/20 144/21 145/2 145/17 145/18 | justified [1] 222/5 |
| 101/2 103/10 103/19 105/17 110/4 | 14 | justify [1] 224/2 |
| 11 | (3 164/6 166/15 16611 | juvenile [1] 210/23 |


| $J$ | late [3] $118 / 5$ 120/8 121/20 | limitations [1] 22/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| juveniles [1] 210/20 | later [12] 53/4 53/5 110/9 133/24 135/11 | limited [2] 7/1 71/22 |
| K | 138/20 142/24 143/2 161/15 167/2 190/13 | Lindbergh [2] 121/1 121/4 |
| Kansas [1] 178/9 | law [9] $1 / 201 / 225 / 13$ 7/23 105/13 132/18 | 172/7 180/11 |
| Kasson [1] 219/13 | 133/2 133/20 143/18 | lines [5] 67/20 68/1 69/13 70/7 200/4 |
| Kaufman [16] 41/24 42/4 42/12 42/17 44/10 | lawyer [1] 143/18 | links [1] 195/13 |
| 45/3 45/4 45/12 45/18 46/18 47/5 47/6 49/7 | lawyers [2] 77/5 104/3 | list [2] 11/13 29/5 |
| 49/12 84/3 213/7 | $\text { lay [1] } 175 / 6$ | listed [6] 7/13 11/10 99/2 157/14 206/22 |
| Kayla [1] $120 / 5$ | laying [1] 217/18 | 207/22 |
| keep [6] 20/10 66/17 80/21 88/4 97/9 97/14 | lead [1] 170/2 | listen [1] $47 / 17$ |
| keeping [1] 39/8 | leading [21] 16/15 52/18 52/19 53/8 54/13 | lists [2] 210/15 210/19 |
| $\text { Ken }[1] 4 / 6$ | 54/18 55/3 55/7 56/8 63/14 66/8 66/17 66/2 | literally [1] 194/1 |
| KENNETH [1] 1/13 | 67/1 70/14 140/5 140/6 142/22 143/1 144/7 | Literature [4] 15/17 57/17 159/12 219/8 |
| Kettle [1] 188/1 | 201/18 | little [11] 40/13 69/25 109/13 180/16 186/21 |
| Kewaunee [1] 21 | learn [3] 22/8 143/20 146/16 | 190/2 190/13 192/1 204/16 |
| kids [1] 115/18 | learned [1] 200/7 | live [4] 36/16 36/17 77/6 146/8 |
| kill [1] 144/10 | learner's [1] 11/18 | lived [3] 146/15 146/21 $147 / 5$ |
| killed [1] 144/11 | learning [14] 19/15 $26 / 23$ 48/5 73/2 73/11 | living [1] 71/24 |
| kind [20] 23/2 51/22 66/14 78/4 79/16 80/2 | 115/4 117/22 124/18 143/21 146/2 146/14 | locale [1] 210/8 |
| 80/11 85/13 86/6 108/12 116/25 130/22 | 146/25 147/21 200/12 | located [1] 5/22 |
| 135/18 138/15 139/3 141/12 142/15 146/13 | least [49] 24/12 31/1 57/9 57/21 60/14 61/3 | Loftus [1] 219/10 |
| 146/14 147/7 | 73/14 77/12 80/21 81/10 82/8 83/11 84/14 | logical [1] 204/4 |
| kinds [9] 62/18 101/5 101/15 108/6 116/21 | 84/18 88/1 92/25 96/16 104/16 104/18 114/9 | London [5] 16/17 16/20 57/25 134/14 |
| 130/13 130/14 145/20 147/22 | 114/10 114/23 115/3 116/19 122/5 123/11 | 200/16 |
| Kings [1] 16/20 | 126/10 128/11 129/3 131/22 132/6 132/10 | loner [1] 27/1 |
| knee [1] 165/17 | $137 / 17$ 145/15 147/10 150/10 152/24 169/25 | long [10] 10/1 31/2 60/12 60/25 64/23 |
| knew [5] 116/11 136/18 139/20 197/1 | 173/24 174/3 175/17 182/24 185/24 187/19 | 114/14 115/2 127/18 134/1 175/9 |
| 199/11 | 191/19 198/16 203/17 218/10 222/3 | long-term [2] 114/14 115/2 |
| know [83] 23/17 | leave [2] 33/15 $197 / 6$ | longer [2] 59/17 114/15 |
| 52/21 53/16 61/3 62/11 62/12 62/13 62/15 | leaves [1] 190/17 | look [21] 30/18 89/6 91/17 93/15 101/8 |
| 65/10 65/10 65/13 68/14 68/14 68/17 69/15 | leaving [1] 179/20 | 114/19 114/22 117/11 117/24 132/22 133/3 |
| 69/16 69/16 69/19 74/4 77/77 79/15 79/21 | led [1] 171/21 | 143/2 156/22 190/24 197/7 200/12 203/10 |
| 79/24 80/11 80/15 80/18 80/25 87/24 88/20 | left [3] 161/4 171/25 179/8 | 209/4 209/6 209/8 212/18 |
| 100/16 100/20 106/10 107/20 114/15 115/16 | legal [2] 14/7 60/2 | looked [4] 35/9 36/2 201/19 203/21 |
| 115/22 1173 117/5 117/9 117/14 117/18 | length [4] 58/25 59/23 60/18 | looking [15] 85/15 85/23 85/23 85/24 91/3 |
| $117 / 19$ 125/3 125/3 126/7 126/14 127/9 | Leo [3] 125/18 126/8 126/16 | 94/2 94/23 95/1 95/6 95/6 118/8 199/25 |
| 133/16 133/22 134/1 136/18 136/20 137/14 | Leo's [2] 127/11 128/13 | 201/12 212/19 212/20 |
| 137/21 137/25 138/3 138/18 138/24 139/1 | less [10] 57/3 105/7 105/15 147/12 147/14 | looks [3] 31/25 84/21 139/16 |
| 141/20 148/15 149/21 151/18 153/2 156/21 | 148/17 148/18 170/5 187/12 189/25 | lot [6] 52/8 62/17 95/19 100/7 174/1 174/2 |
| 156/23 182/1 186/21 193/11 196/10 199/10 | let [30] 15/10 25/20 39/16 40/2 58/12 59/3 | Lots [1] 100/24 |
| 200/18 204/21 204/23 205/21 213/25 215/8 | 63/5 63/5 63/6 63/18 67/18 74/4 90/8 110/11 | loud [2] 65/3 74/12 |
| 220/6 224/23 | 127/9 129/2 134/5 142/18 155/24 161/2 | Louis [6] 6/46/5 6/6 7/6 23/1 178/19 |
| knowing [2] 130/2 | 176/1 176/12 176/12 181/8 183/5 188/12 | low [20] 41/20 41/23 43/16 47/22 47/23 48/2 |
| knowledge [8] 9/17 9/22 56/15 79/14 131/20 | 192/9 199/12 202/2 209/1 | 50/18 50/19 50/23 50/24 56/24 71/12 81/17 |
| 203/8 203/9 229/14 | let's [14] 15/431/20 40/15 61/13 81/2 98/11 | 81/19 82/18 146/19 147/20 186/4 186/13 |
| knowledgeable [1] 131 | 104/16 105/11 112/14 115/12 119/23 176/12 | 186/19 |
| known [5] 6/15 37/8 140/10 203/12 205/2 | 183/12 193/20 | lower [17] 20/11 31/13 35/21 38/15 38/16 |
| knows [2] 79/20 138/1 | letter [3] 212/2 212/4 21 | 38/17 38/18 41/17 47/23 47/25 48/1 50/15 |
| KRATZ [47] 1/13 3/5 3/7 3/11 | letting [1] 95/4 | 50/17 81/19 104/17 185/18 213/12 |
| 31/3 75/2 76/14 79/25 111/20 111/21 118/5 | level [18] 28/14 48/7 58/19 59/16 60/22 | lunch [2] 131/7 175/21 |
| 31/1 131 | 71/14 71/21 74/21 82/1 83/5 88/13 115/9 | M |
|  | 153/24 162/9 171/6184/21 186/13 186/14 |  |
|  | [2] 82/8184 |  |
| 175/8 175/16 176/12 176/24 177/3 200/6 | liberty [1] 13/17 | ade [25] 53/16 58/3 59/1 59/25 62/5 |
| 205/12 206/7 206/14 206/17 207/9 208/20 209/24 211/19 226/8 226/16 | licensed [6] 178/3 179/13 179/15 183/15 | 119/21 119/24 120/2 120/3 120/6 120/18 |
|  | lie [2] 97/9 97/1 | 160/22 184/22 199/3 209/19 209/20 |
|  |  |  |
| labele | 72/25 102/5 | mail [10] 189/16 214/7 214/8 214/16 214/ |
| lack [8] 49/9 61/7 71/14 71/20 74/5 162/9 | like [38] 12/3 12/3 12/4 14/3 20/12 21/16 | 214/23 217/11 218/4 218/11 218/12 |
| 162/14 191/12 | 35/11 41/13 41/25 43/19 52/5 56/24 63/1 | mail-order [7] 189/16 214/7 214/8 214/16 |
| lacks [1] 98/14 | 64/2 64/10 78/6 80/17 102/2 104/9 104/2 | 214/19 214/23 217/11 |
| ladies [1] $227 / 6$ | 107/21 108/3 110/22 114/22 118/20 126/22 | main [3] 5/20 18/18 18/20 |
| lady [3] 139/21 142/6 146/12 | 127/6 137/17 139/16 142/8 142/13 148/3 | maintain [1] 210/18 |
| laid [3] 174/18 174/21 199/21 | 153/22 176/22 178/15 198/11 207/24 213/3 | major [1] 189/15 |
| language [2] 124/17 124/19 |  | majority [3] 10/25 11/1 51/7 |
| lapse [1] 209/2 | 71/8 71/10 108/8 108/18 | make [28] 8/5 18/12 27/14 42/25 43/3 44/7 |
| large [6] 14/13 21/12 64/6 67/4 81/23 82/3 | likely [12] 50/15 66/9 66/10 80/24 91/25 | 44/16 51/4 70/1 98/24 109/6 120/24 121/25 |
| last [17] 4/19 10/13 55/17 69/10 77/13 86/7 | 97/19 106/7 106/10 107/5 107/18 119/22 | 137/17 150/4 150/11 159/1 159/2 159/3 |
| 107/3 126/2 127/19 174/10 177/22 181/10 | 21 | 162/13 168/6 176/17 189/10 190/17 $216 / 19$ |
| 188/6 188/7 198/10 208/15 $217 / 3$ | likewise [1] 5/15 | 224/14 225/7 228/3 |

188/12 189/2 189/14 192/9 192/22 199/12 200/25 202/2 206/6 206/15 208/12 213/16 214/20 215/11 215/18 219/17 221/14 222/2 222/23 224/2 224/21 229/8 229/9
mean [27] 8/8 8/21 21/24 22/16 24/14 24/14 27/16 44/17 45/8 50/4 62/13 83/21 84/25 87/5 94/23 107/10 130/19 136/11 146/25 152/19 152/21 152/22 197/2 205/18 207/23 216/12 $216 / 16$
meaning [7] 202/17 202/23 202/25 204/12 204/17 206/4 220/16
meaningful [1] 22/9
means [7] 9/22 47/12 48/1 48/2 87/24 139/18 202/10
meant [4] 86/15 136/17 136/19 203/6 meantime [1] $5 / 15$
measure [12] 37/10 54/22 86/12 87/14 91/11
184/25 185/10 185/10 185/20 185/21 189/2 198/6
measures [6] 37/20 39/1 66/17 90/21 90/22 203/2
measuring [3] 102/25 202/25 203/1
medi [1] 210/16
medical [2] 178/25 179/3
Medicine [1] $6 / 5$
meet [6] 116/18 168/1 215/9 220/15 226/9 227/24
meeting [6] 23/25 100/22 100/24 116/21 165/8 222/5
member [7] 7/8 7/15 7/18 7/22 7/24 12/15 180/1
members [3] 103/23 120/4 215/5
memberships [1] 207/23
memory [52] 18/15 19/15 53/1 53/14 61/4
74/14 74/14 74/17 74/21 75/13 75/18 114/6
114/12 114/14 114/14 114/20 114/24 115/3
115/10 128/24 130/5 134/17 134/18 134/19
134/23 134/23 136/21 136/23 139/17 145/16
145/17 145/18 145/21 146/1 146/7 146/7
146/13 146/14 146/16 146/20 147/4 147/7
147/10 147/11 147/21 147/22 203/23 204/1
204/5 205/1 224/17 225/3
mental [24] 10/5 10/21 11/23 21/25 25/25
26/3 26/13 26/16 26/20 27/7 28/2 43/6 43/9 43/9 44/21 55/22 130/6 155/1 179/7 180/18 188/21 194/22 194/23 210/16
mentally [2] 28/6 28/12
mention [3] 115/23 189/1 191/17
mentioned [19] 8/6 8/17 8/19 9/9 13/13
13/21 50/7 83/2 83/7 101/2 161/4 179/22
183/19 184/2 193/14 201/16 203/13 205/12
207/1
merely [1] $69 / 9$
met [1] 72/20
method [1] 194/25
methodology [7] 197/9 224/1 224/4 224/11
224/24 224/25 225/3
midwest [2] 138/5 138/10
might [55] 19/11 19/12 24/18 27/18 27/21
28/4 28/4 30/21 30/22 30/22 37/22 50/15 57/18 59/21 63/13 66/14 74/20 77/23 78/3 78/21 88/3 88/5 90/19 91/19 92/19 99/11 100/19 101/14 104/22 106/18 109/13 110/13 110/25 112/14 128/23 130/21 137/12 137/12 138/6 138/10 140/14 151/8 155/8 158/19 171/22 183/11 184/5 184/6 191/1 194/21 205/2 207/14 220/23 222/25 224/17 migraine [1] 33/21
mike [1] 40/13
mild [8] 26/16 53/11 53/11 56/9 66/19 66/20 127/7 163/20
Milwaukee [2] 5/22 8/2
mind [1] 102/14
minimal [1] 72/12
minimization [1] 132/6
minimize [1] $132 / 5$
minimizing [3] 62/12 70/11 93/5
Minnesota [11] 29/8 29/12 29/15 91/13
94/20 95/10 96/13 156/4 178/11 194/18
$196 / 25$
minor [1] 175/20
minority [2] $15 / 9145 / 3$
minors [2] 71/7 71/9
minute [5] 176/25 201/21 205/4 206/1
214/20
minutes [8] 53/5 147/24 150/15 185/3
201/16 201/22 201/24 205/14
mischaracterization [1] 82/2
mischaracterizes [1] $98 / 5$
Mishicot [1] $117 / 15$
mislead [1] 91/25
misleading [5] 91/19 97/12 98/8 98/11 154/5
misled [1] 92/2
miss [1] 170/14
missing [1] 19/20
mission [1] 180/19
misspoke [3] 47/21 117/10 214/23
misstated [1] $80 / 5$
mistrust [1] 195/7
misunderstand [1] 171/15
misuse [1] 97/23
MMPI [57] 29/17 29/24 30/15 30/17 30/22 30/23 30/25 32/9 35/10 35/15 36/22 36/23
38/20 39/22 84/21 91/16 92/7 93/3 93/21
94/4 95/22 95/23 98/12 101/13 101/16
101/18 101/20 102/20 153/3 155/13 156/10
156/11 157/9 157/13 193/19 193/22 193/25
194/2 194/6 194/17 195/9 195/16 $196 / 5$
196/12 196/18 196/21 196/24 197/8 $197 / 9$
197/17 197/25 216/23 216/25 217/1 $217 / 5$
217/9 218/9
MMPI-2 [2] 29/17 30/23
MMPI-A [14] 29/24 30/25 35/1035/15
91/16 93/21 95/23 155/13 156/10 156/11
193/22 193/25 196/18 197/8
mode [2] 206/8 206/11
moderate [1] $26 / 16$
modern [1] $12 / 25$
modern-day [1] 12/25
modify [1] 197/9
modifying [1] 201/25
moment [2] 45/1 191/19
moments [1] 167/9
monetary [2] 163/2 163/4
money [1] 163/3
month [1] $7 / 5$
months [11] 120/2 120/15 120/18 122/4
122/6 122/11 123/9 123/23 123/23 124/24 $210 / 5$
mood [1] 188/22
Moraine [1] 188/1
more [75] 12/3 13/14 19/1 20/12 29/17 31/2
34/21 34/23 35/21 35/23 36/6 38/1 43/24
50/4 50/15 50/15 50/16 53/18 55/1 55/4
55/15 57/18 58/7 59/1 59/17 59/18 59/19
84/6 84/22 90/3 90/5 92/15 100/13 104/19
104/25 105/6 105/15 106/19 108/17 110/23
110/24 116/18 119/19 119/22 129/17 147/1
147/13 148/11 148/16 160/4 168/11 169/11
171/3 172/15 172/22 179/22 185/2 185/7
185/11 185/20 188/23 189/3 192/8 192/21
192/24 193/17 193/18 197/10 198/1 203/14
206/1 211/1 215/12 217/2 $223 / 5$
morning [7] 4/2 76/18 76/19 76/20 168/17
182/19 227/13
most [26] 14/14 16/6 26/10 27/14 29/25 40/9
most... [20] 74/3 74/3 82/23 93/3 126/17
126/21 127/12 127/17 131/22 133/20 134/11 134/11 169/18 183/1 183/21 191/21 192/18 198/8 205/18 $220 / 21$
mostly [1] 71/25
mother [6] 119/9 122/15 122/20 122/22 123/4 124/25
motion [3] 211/22 211/25 212/1
motions [1] $228 / 5$
mouth [1] 34/8
move [8] 132/4 132/7 137/15 137/18 138/12 166/22 192/9 227/23
moved [3] 3/15 134/10 178/22
Mr [10] 125/18 $127 / 24128 / 12129 / 11$ 137/13 150/3 150/10 150/13 175/21 226/16 Mr. [58] 10/12 17/16 18/4 24/11 43/22 76/14 84/12 99/10 118/8 121/4 $124 / 4126 / 16$ 127/11 127/24 129/3 130/1 150/19 162/22 163/17 164/20 165/3 166/5 166/8 $167 / 4$ $167 / 12168 / 5168 / 17169 / 13170 / 10172 / 5$ 174/5 174/11 176/3 176/12 176/18 176/22 176/24 $177 / 3177 / 9$ 184/20 185/17 189/11 191/9 192/5 199/4 204/23 205/12 206/7 208/20 209/24 211/19 212/3 213/14 213/19 220/11 220/18 222/2 222/9
Mr. Buckley [2] 212/3 213/14
Mr. Dassey [9] 24/11 84/12 192/5 204/23
213/19 220/11 220/18 222/2 222/9
Mr. Dassey's [5] 99/10 184/20 185/17 189/11 199/4
Mr. Drizin [2] 126/16 $127 / 11$
Mr. Fallon [2] 118/8 127/24
Mr. Fallon's [1] 124/4
Mr. Fremgen [18] 10/12 17/16 18/4 43/22
150/19 166/5 $166 / 8167 / 4$ 168/17 169/13 170/10 172/5 $174 / 5$ 174/11 176/3 176/22 177/9 191/9
Mr. Fremgen's [1] 176/18
Mr. Krate [15] 76/14 162/22 163/17 164/20
165/3 167/12 168/5 176/12 176/24 177/3
205/12 206/7 208/20 209/24 211/19
Mr. Lindbergh [1] 121/4
Mr. Trowbridge [2] 129/3 130/1
much [13] 58/4 58/23 71/10 104/24 149/10
166/19 170/20 172/24 176/24 190/12 190/14 207/8 207/10
Multiphasic [3] 29/8 29/12 91/13
murder [1] $129 / 6$
must [5] 19/20 94/23 126/1 215/23 218/10
my [127] 4/23 5/6 6/11 6/13 6/19 7/1 7/13
8/22 9/8 12/1 12/12 12/16 12/16 12/22 13/12
15/9 15/17 21/24 22/10 23/15 23/23 24/10
27/13 30/23 38/5 42/25 42/25 43/5 45/25 46/24 56/7 56/15 56/25 57/5 57/17 69/2 75/11 75/20 75/23 76/20 77/21 78/14 78/14 78/16 80/10 81/13 82/2 85/19 88/16 91/15 93/1 93/1 95/10 96/12 96/13 96/13 98/2 98/5 102/5 102/14 103/15 104/7 104/15 105/21 107/2 108/11 108/11 109/12 110/22 118/23 120/21 124/3 124/3 126/4 126/23 131/3 131/3 131/19 136/15 137/2 145/1 146/1 147/24 152/20 153/8 153/13 154/8 154/10 156/2 156/5 156/24 157/22 159/12 159/23 159/24 165/1 167/12 170/10 170/11 171/11 172/9 172/23 176/6 182/19 191/3 193/25 $196 / 8196 / 23197 / 3199 / 18200 / 11200 / 23$ 201/23 207/7 208/5 210/11 212/18 213/1 213/14 216/14 217/2 220/22 222/10 222/21 223/24 229/9 229/13 myself [7] 174/5 190/18 190/21 212/22 216/7 224/10 225/7
name [15] 4/19 4/19 4/23 37/6 94/4 125/21 125/25 126/10 134/9 177/22 177/22 192/17 198/22 218/23 219/1
named [4] 125/17 192/15 212/3 218/8
namely [3] 86/14 87/16 171/10
names [1] 64/4
narrative [3] 25/4 110/5 206/8
national [2] 14/17 180/2
nature [4] 9/20 158/24 194/22 195/14
near [2] 67/6186/3
nearly [1] $97 / 8$
necessarily [8] 10/23 50/14 50/23 79/19
86/12 87/14 148/2 163/13
necessary [14] $44 / 14$ 111/7 111/9 111/15
111/15 111/22 112/2 112/10 112/13 118/16
160/10 160/15 202/21 228/4
neck [1] 68/5
need [15] 27/25 41/9 48/4 53/17 68/15 68/17
84/6 111/4 114/16 118/14 126/23 134/6
176/24 177/4 218/19
needed [6] $29 / 17104 / 13114 / 2119 / 4119 / 15$ 182/2
needs [2] 28/9 186/21
neighborhood [1] 60/13
neither [1] 170/13
nervous [5] 99/25 100/7 100/13 100/21 100/24
Neurology [1] 178/18
neuropsychologist [1] 22/12
neutral [1] 54/10
never [6] 104/12 181/5 200/11 201/2 $220 / 5$ 220/6
new [9] 57/24 100/22 100/24 168/1 168/1
168/1 169/1 202/12 202/12
next [11] 35/9 39/16 40/16 65/24 84/14
88/17 88/18 91/15 188/10 192/10 193/20
NGI [1] 109/21
night [2] 10/13 126/2
nine [2] 87/3 175/25
Ninety [1] 55/16
Ninety-five [1] 55/16
no [129] $1 / 68 / 1210 / 2514 / 2417 / 1022 / 13$
45/6 45/13 45/19 45/24 48/18 51/14 53/13
57/12 58/9 61/15 72/12 72/13 73/25 74/18 77/2 78/20 78/21 84/5 84/13 87/21 89/22 90/3 94/6 94/6 94/25 95/2 98/24 99/1 101/3 101/4 101/20 101/25 103/18 105/3 105/3 107/12 107/14 110/2 111/12 112/13 113/4
113/13 113/16 115/15 116/13 116/15 116/23 118/12 118/14 118/18 118/21 119/10 119/19 121/13 124/16 125/25 127/9 134/19 137/6 139/24 142/7 143/20 151/5 151/19 151/20 152/15 156/21 157/7 159/20 162/16 163/10 163/10 164/4 167/2 167/6 171/16 171/20 174/12 176/17 185/2 186/23 186/25 187/8 191/5 196/13 199/5 203/8 203/9 203/9 204/25 207/21 207/23 208/1 208/2 208/4 208/25 210/3 212/17 216/6 216/11 $216 / 13$ 216/16 217/16 218/25 219/4 219/9 219/12 $219 / 15$ 220/5 220/11 220/11 221/13 222/14 223/8 223/13 223/19 225/9 226/2 226/18 226/20 226/21 227/3 227/19
nods [2] 65/12 68/7
non [2] 19/4 208/9
non-forensic [1] 19/4
non-peer [1] $208 / 9$
nonclinical [1] 188/18
none [3] 163/25 173/12 173/13
nonverbal [3] 184/3 184/9 184/19
norm [2] 4/735/21
fnormal [10] $54 / 21$ 34/2s 35/21 36/6 37/9
37/1037/11 37/20 39/1 84/17 84/25 153/15
162/13 188/18 189/3 221/4
normally [2] 89/21 89/22
NORMAN [1] 1/17
normed [5] 29/11 29/20 51/21 51/23 136/14
norms [11] 43/11 44/18 81/20 82/25 82/25
89/25 90/10 138/20 139/2 139/25 148/1
not [266]
notabie [1] $187 / 15$
notations [1] 115/25
note [9] 33/8 63/12 137/17 161/14 162/7 162/11 165/21 165/21 189/11
noted [8] $26 / 23$ 99/24 161/11187/23 198/21
207/1 213/17 213/19
notes [8] 9/8 48/16 113/21 113/24 149/22
$170 / 10212 / 13229 / 9$
nothing [14] 19/7 65/21 69/21 76/5 165/25
171/3 198/25 198/25 199/8 203/14 205/13
207/24 212/16225/13
noticed [1] 203/21
notion [1] 205/25
notoriety [1] 130/20
notorious [1] $129 / 6$
novel [3] 115/12 115/15 115/17
November [4] 88/22 96/19 99/18 135/16
November 13 [1] $96 / 19$
November 15 [1] 88/22
now [69] 8/179/915/10 16/18 18/19 19/21
19/22 21/12 22/21 23/8 25/2 25/24 41/5
$41 / 1242 / 2043 / 1946 / 1249 / 650 / 22$ 53/25 58/24 62/15 63/8 63/12 64/17 74/1678/12 81/21 89/19 92/12 93/13 98/20 99/20 101/11 $107 / 24110 / 3114 / 9118 / 19120 / 7124 / 21$ 126/18 127/23 130/12 131/14 134/15 136/23 137/10 139/11 145/20 146/12 152/8 158/23 167/7 175/1 177/14 178/17 182/7183/21 185/1 189/4 195/10 195/16 200/23 204/18 205/15 207/20 208/19 210/4 226/7
number [28] 10/15 11/20 20/10 21/12 25/13 $31 / 2132 / 2533 / 237 / 950 / 853 / 1653 / 21$ $86 / 2595 / 1197 / 797 / 16100 / 9100 / 10100 / 12$ $100 / 16156 / 15168 / 23188 / 16195 / 24207 / 18$ $210 / 24211 / 10217 / 7$
numbers [3] 10/19 42/15 87/1
numerical [1] $217 / 19$
Numerically [1] 214/4

## 0

O-f-s-h-e [1] 219/2
object [5] 43/14 79/18 144/14 144/16 199/19
objecting [1] 17/23
objection [23] $17 / 1620 / 1920 / 25$ 24/15
42/10 43/21 44/3 45/25 60/2 64/10 138/9
138/11 144/20 151/19 153/8 166/25 167/1
167/3 200/5 215/24 221/8 223/11 225/22
objectionable [1] $196 / 5$
objections [3] 81/3 81/6 105/22
objective [16] 29/25 38/25 103/8 $119 / 22$
154/8 158/7 158/9 158/10 158/12 158/24
159/9 159/11 159/14 159/18 160/1 160/16
objectively [1] 90/1
observation [2] 102/5 154/23
observations [6] 26/12 50/11 50/12 101/12 151/11 154/19
observe [2] 104/4 155/2
observed [5] 70/21 101/22 102/10 102/18 165/11
obtain [12] 26/6 32/9 38/10 38/13 41/16 55/14 57/23 79/2 84/2 104/20 104/25 161/1 obtained [13] 5/5 27/6 86/5 92/13 102/9 102/16 131/23 132/21 158/14 158/20 184/6 202/13 202/14

## $U$

obtaining [1] $158 / 15$
obvious [1] 197/24
obviously [2] 113/7 149/8
occasion [4] $60 / 14$ 80/7 113/25 131/15
occasions [3] 12/1 165/20 183/19
occupational [1] 187/7
occurred [4] 75/19 102/22 151/8 161/18
occurring [1] 62/20
occurs [1] 160/3
Oconto [1] 210/7
October [1] 188/7
off [12] 14/15 23/7 36/11 48/13 64/15 65/19
102/14 129/5 142/1 214/11 218/5 218/12
offender [6] 8/1 22/18 22/23 $23 / 5$ 23/15 126/3
offenders [1] 11/19
offer [11] 9/24 40/6 167/21 168/6 172/23
200/3 201/11 210/16 216/11 221/2 222/1
offered [9] 79/17 172/23 172/24 190/2
191/22 216/8 220/18 $226 / 4227 / 2$
offering [10] $13 / 15$ 59/19 59/21 80/13 80/15
190/15 190/16 221/6 221/21 221/21
office [13] 5/20 5/21 6/20 23/23 27/13 85/19
168/18 181/24 198/20 200/9 210/9 210/11 211/19
Officer [1] 69/14
officers [13] 14/9 60/12 105/5 105/14 112/19
119/25 120/1 132/19 133/2 133/21 165/14
165/22 166/7
officers' [1] 70/7
offices [1] 5/21
official [4] 2/4 99/7 229/4 229/18
offshoet [2] 194/5 204/10
Ofshe [1] 219/1
often [14] $12 / 1912 / 22$ 15/1 15/4 20/6 20/16
21/3 21/7 21/9 26/21 39/10 94/4 127/14 133/3
oftentimes [2] 66/19 92/17
oh [16] 7/15 45/21 96/2 98/9 98/22 100/7
128/22 149/20 152/24 177/5 208/14 215/2 215/15 217/7 224/16 225/22
okay [38] 18/6 24/25 28/22 29/6 32/23 34/6
34/12 35/3 42/20 45/12 48/21 53/13 61/16 63/18 64/19 65/5 65/16 66/3 68/4 69/20 70/15 79/5 80/6 86/6 87/20 121/4 125/7 130/12 138/18 145/11 146/5 177/1 177/14 208/15 212/16 214/22 216/23 225/22 old [1] $197 / 4$
older [1] 71/9
omitted [2] 9/8 112/15
once [7] 7/6 23/1 58/3 76/18 160/22 180/15 204/18
one [142] 5/8 7/5 7/5 9/7 9/8 11/15 12/10 13/1 13/10 14/22 15/1 16/15 17/1 18/23 22/21 25/7 25/8 25/16 28/25 29/8 30/2 30/6 31/2031/25 33/9 34/14 34/15 35/18 36/1 37/14 37/14 37/18 38/15 39/25 40/4 40/19 43/8 44/11 44/14 46/4 47/4 50/9 51/3 51/24 51/25 52/13 52/14 55/14 56/21 57/21 57/21 60/14 61/13 66/4 69/10 70/9 73/20 73/24 80/7 82/9 83/22 86/13 87/1 87/15 88/18 90/14 90/21 90/22 91/22 91/22 93/16 94/10 99/4 100/9 100/12 102/23 108/15 113/11 114/5 120/4 120/9 120/16 124/18 126/11 126/15 128/6 131/9 138/17 138/19 138/22 140/13 141/14 141/14 145/13 145/14 145/15 149/19 151/1 151/25 152/1 152/8 156/2 157/13 160/16 163/9 164/19 166/4 166/4 175/11 175/20 175/25 179/2 180/11 181/24 182/8 184/5 184/6 184/18 184/18 184/25 185/11 185/14 187/22 190/4 190/15 $190 / 17$

195/23 197/18 199/21 202/10 202/11 203/11 203/13 204/4 210/8 214/15 218/4 218/7 218/12 218/14 218/21 $219 / 24$
one's [6] 15/22 72/1 72/4 195/22 196/15 218/19
One-fourth [1] 145/14
one-hour [1] 128/6
one-time [2] $7 / 57 / 5$
one-year [1] 5/8
ones [6] 18/18 32/20 94/19 96/3 215/15 228/1
online [1] $38 / 6$
only [35] 14/11 $17 / 4$ 18/23 21/25 54/25 55/2 66/16 73/17 86/18 101/6 102/23 104/7 105/9 105/18 115/9 126/24 127/1 127/2 132/19 140/6 145/3 145/6 150/5 150/7 159/11 168/1 170/6 170/23 180/6 184/10 185/4 198/7
198/25 214/25 $222 / 6$
Ontario [1] 178/23
open [2] 78/24 182/11
opine [1] 171/3
opinion [93] 31/20 37/22 40/10 40/11 51/4
55/25 56/3 56/6 56/7 56/11 58/5 71/5 71/19
72/4 75/4 75/8 75/22 75/24 75/25 78/10
78/14 78/14 78/18 78/24 81/22 82/11 83/9
88/6 110/14 111/10 111/11 111/23 112/11
113/11 113/14 113/19 119/18 120/23 121/17
121/23 124/12 131/10 153/10 $157 / 5157 / 9$
157/20 160/22 162/4 163/23 164/12 169/22 169/23 170/19 170/20 171/6 171/17 171/20
181/7 182/2 182/19 187/20 191/3 199/14
199/17 199/18 199/20 200/3 201/11 206/24 207/4 207/5 211/3 211/13 215/10 215/18 216/8 216/9 216/11 216/14 216/14 220/17 220/22 220/24 221/6 221/22 222/1 222/4 222/9 222/21 223/6 223/21 223/22 223/25 opinions [21] 61/10 76/1 94/16 116/15 119/16 119/19 119/21 169/6 169/14 $169 / 19$ 171/1 172/20 174/22 183/3 183/10 191/13 192/9 198/18 210/23 220/24 221/2
opportunity [6] 23/24 25/10 73/8 77/13 144/24 226/9
opposed [5] 84/21 189/22 190/16 197/24 211/25
oral [1] 5/16
orally [3] 168/8 $168 / 9168 / 12$
ord [1] 57/23
order [24] $26 / 826 / 932 / 650 / 857 / 24109 / 9$ 109/10 109/12 112/10 124/16 125/3 135/25 150/9 175/25 176/15 189/16 214/7 214/8
214/16 214/19 214/23 217/11 218/11 220/13
ordered [1] 150/6
organization [1] 180/3
organizations [6] 7/9 7/11 7/25 13/13 180/6 207/23
orientation [1] 190/11
original [8] 75/15 80/10 81/8 82/20 94/20
168/21 195/16 197/25
originally [4] 16/16 29/13 40/21 194/13
originate [1] 224/9
Oshkosh [3] 210/2 210/10 210/11
other [114] $5 / 216 / 86 / 22$ 11/23 12/1 13/14
14/23 15/1 17/11 18/8 18/25 19/2 21/21 34/6 35/19 36/1 36/9 37/1 37/16 38/19 38/21
42/14 43/10 43/18 43/20 50/5 50/11 50/12 50/13 51/15 54/6 55/23 56/13 57/8 57/18 58/6 58/7 60/3 61/6 62/2 62/8 62/9 65/20 70/21 74/7 75/6 77/15 80/1 80/12 80/16 83/3 85/7 85/17 92/14 94/4 94/7 94/13 94/14 98/13 101/12 102/25 105/10 108/6 108/14 109/15 112/25 113/12 115/24 116/2 119/23 120/3 124/18 131/24 133/22 139/12 141/3 142/6 143/16 148/4 148/5 149/8 151/2 151/7

151/9 151/10 154/2 157/19 157/22 158/18 168/24 170/18 173/17 175/23 178/13 184/19 184/22 185/14 187/12 189/12 190/1 196/20 198/3 199/5 206/22 212/10 213/16 215/3 215/5 215/15 215/18 215/22 218/4 218/21 222/15
others [16] 9/7 13/22 14/13 27/19 27/21
35/24 50/20 56/22 57/14 72/5 80/11 94/22 128/25 158/5 190/12 193/14 otherwise [6] 36/16 59/21 104/22 109/19 208/9 208/17
ought [1] 132/24
our [3] 127/23 182/8 200/8
ourselves [1] 104/16
out [57] 6/12 12/3 29/13 32/1 33/9 33/15 34/19 34/20 35/20 36/14 37/12 41/16 44/22 49/3 50/18 53/12 54/16 54/19 54/21 54/25 55/2 55/14 65/3 65/4 65/10 68/20 73/16 74/12 90/21 91/25 91/25 97/9 97/14 117/11 134/6 145/8 145/11 145/14 149/17 161/4 162/22 167/10 173/24 182/7 183/25 184/17 189/20 190/8 193/8 195/9 196/5 $199 / 6$ 202/12 212/22 218/15 224/10 227/16 outcome [1] 38/8
outgoing [1] 143/19
outside [7] 64/12 $136 / 4136 / 5136 / 5142 / 20$ 142/23 196/1
over [21] 6/25 14/19 16/17 38/17 62/16
93/12 95/24 109/5 112/22 118/20 130/25
158/15 158/15 158/15 158/16 168/17 175/21
182/9 188/6 197/1 $217 / 18$
overall [4] 37/15 49/15 49/16 84/2
overrule [1] 144/19
Overruled [2] 221/12 223/14
oversight [1] $150 / 9$
overstating [3] 15/22 82/18 82/21
own [10] 6/19 28/9 36/17 49/4 57/5 103/4 138/15 156/24 159/14 $212 / 18$
Oxford ILI 148/9
$\mathbf{P}$
p.m [9] 149/17150/17150/18 167/10 177/7 226/14 226/15 227/16 $228 / 9$
packet [1] 198/19
page [18] 3/2 64/2 64/3 64/19 67/18 69/11 86/6 139/15 151/15 152/22 189/9 190/9 198/21 199/1 199/25 201/15 201/19 209/8 pages [5] 114/19 198/21 198/23 200/24 201/4
paper [1] 194/20
papers [4] 173/6 173/22 180/8 180/12
paragraph [16] 64/6 64/23 64/24 65/17 67/3 67/4 67/6 203/13 203/21 203/22 204/6 204/6 204/10 204/12 204/18 205/4 pardon [6] 15/2 38/24 85/2 181/1 189/2 192/22
parent [2] 113/25 119/8
parenthesis [5] 65/12 65/13 68/6 68/7 94/10
parents [2] 119/9 173/8
parole [2] 6/22 10/17
parroting [1] $146 / 21$
part [14] 6/15 24/22 41/12 81/23 82/3 90/7 135/25 142/12 145/2 179/19 187/25 198/7 208/6 210/3
part-time [2] 179/19 187/25
participant [1] 62/14
participate [1] 222/6
participated [1] 205/8
participation [1] 13/13
particular [36] 12/24 33/7 35/17 38/9 51/22
80/21 81/15 82/12 83/17 86/5 87/18 88/21
89/15 90/10 90/17 91/22 92/15 93/14 94/1
122/25 123/6 124/10 135/23 139/12 147/23


1
problem [1] 98/2
problematic [1] 84/22
problems [24] 19/15 19/15 26/23 30/1 35/6 $48 / 3$ 48/4 48/5 48/6 73/12 90/6 93/12 101/4
114/1 117/22 143/21 146/25 172/19 188/25
193/12 194/23 195/4 195/6 223/25
procedure [2] $37 / 12$ 153/16
proceed [7] $4 / 11150 / 19170 / 8177 / 3177 / 8$
177/14 182/11
proceeding [2] 77/1 180/22
proceedings [6] 2/2 14/21 22/3 181/4 181/5 229/13
process [10] 26/14 58/1 60/9 84/8 131/18
132/18 133/2 145/22 166/13 194/12
produce [2] 180/12 195/12
produced [1] 180/12
product [1] 148/24
profession [6] 76/22 76/22 103/23 104/6
104/8 215/5
professional [7] 7/8 77/3 77/5 78/17 179/23
187/16 216/24
professionally [1] 225/8
professionals [3] 11/24 88/2 92/18
professor [4] 16/19 178/18 178/21 178/24
proffer [1] 174/19
profile [7] 31/16 32/18 93/11 157/16 195/13
197/14 217/23
profiles [1] 93/14
profound [1] 28/1
profoundly [2] 28/6 28/12
program [1] 218/9
programming [1] 73/12
programs [1] 73/13
progress [3] 23/12 23/13 113/21
progressed [2] 23/2 23/4
prohibit [1] 77/22
projective [1] 159/13
promise [5] 78/3 78/9 78/17 131/2 131/4
promises [1] $62 / 5$
promising [2] 77/23 78/7
promulgated [1] 77/10
prone [1] 191/23
proof [4] 167/21 168/6 172/23 172/23
proper [4] 32/4 78/8 78/9 86/25
proposes [1] $167 / 13$
proposition [2] 127/11 148/24
propositions [1] $147 / 15$
prosecution [2] 15/8 167/13
prosecutor [9] 1/14 1/16 1/18 42/10 47/16
150/24 160/7 161/3 199/22
Prosecutors [1] 4/6
protocol [1] 32/4
proud [1] 22/24
provide [26] 28/18 32/3 74/8 96/5 104/21
105/7 106/7 106/8 107/6 107/18 $137 / 10$
$137 / 12139 / 8$ 148/17 148/23 149/3 154/5
181/6 181/11 187/20 209/1 220/17 220/22
221/23 222/8 223/20
provided [40] 14/6 25/16 31/9 32/10 44/6
49/13 89/4 92/6 96/13 106/18 $113 / 18$ 132/11 135/12 137/12 $137 / 13140 / 5142 / 5$ 144/9 144/23 150/2 150/5 157/1 160/3 168/16 168/19 169/13 170/2 181/13 187/3 189/4 208/8 211/3 211/18 212/14 213/2 213/5 213/16 217/10 217/12 224/5
Providers [1] 180/3
provides [4] 52/17 52/19 107/21 156/20
providing [2] 80/17 106/13
psych [3] 5/208/18 162/12
psychiatric [4] 17/7 44/21 186/7 196/1
psychiatrist [1] 194/19

Psychiatry [3] 178/19 178/24 200/16 psychological [20] 7/14 7/16 7/19 7/22 8/3 $17 / 7$ 18/11 19/1056/4 76/3 77/9 109/1 $160 / 18$ 172/2 179/25 196/1 196/4 203/23 209/1 212/19
psychologist [41] 6/12 9/21 15/15 16/17 $17 / 5$ 17/12 19/9 $27 / 837 / 656 / 2076 / 2377 / 479 / 14$ 103/21 116/9 118/11 143/11 153/17 155/4 164/22 165/5 165/6 168/16 170/18 171/7 178/3 179/2 179/6 179/10 183/16 192/15 194/3 194/19 201/6 203/12 209/11 215/3 215/9 218/7 220/12 221/21
psychologists [32] 7/20 9/6 11/23 19/24 29/14 29/24 32/6 51/8 57/2 61/8 74/7 76/24 76/25 80/2 80/12 80/16 89/21 93/15 113/25 116/16 116/17 $117 / 9$ 119/20 151/2 154/2 169/4 169/5 192/18 215/12 215/19 215/22 218/16
psychology [49] 5/7 6/10 7/23 9/9 9/10 9/12 9/13 9/14 9/14 9/15 10/2 10/3 12/4 12/9 12/21 13/9 13/23 16/19 16/20 16/24 16/24 19/3 19/4 19/4 21/21 22/17 80/22 109/18 109/22 168/23 170/25 171/18 172/13 173/5 175/1 175/1 178/8 178/10 178/14 178/21 179/14 179/18 180/3 180/25 181/7 203/11 207/25 210/17217/6
psychotically [1] 36/17
public [2] 133/16 133/17
publication [3] 11/11 11/14 11/25
publications [10] 11/8 12/7 12/8 173/7 174/2
180/8 187/16 208/8 208/13 208/16
published [8] 11/17 11/21 11/21 12/18 13/4
127/6 173/22 183/22
publisher [1] 215/6
pull [5] 37/12 40/13 53/12 134/6 190/8
purchase [1] 153/23
Purdue [1] $5 / 4$
pure [1] 66/17
purports [1] 43/20
purpose [3] 134/15 145/18 198/4
purposely [1] 133/17
purposes [1] 42/16
push [2] 104/13 104/14
put [11] 12/3 26/18 26/19 31/14 34/8 37/9
40/9 77/16 149/18 168/2 209/15
puzzled [2] 143/2 143/3
Q
qualifications [2] 79/7 187/20
qualified [5] 170/18 181/6 215/2 215/13 217/24
qualifies [1] 9/23
qualify [1] 215/7
quality [6] 132/23 133/12 134/2 148/21
148/22 149/2
quarrel [2] 116/14 186/16
question [83] 15/6 17/20 17/24 17/24 21/2
32/3 42/9 47/15 52/18 52/19 53/22 66/22
69/2 75/3 75/11 78/16 80/4 80/10 81/13 85/1
91/18 97/7 97/11 97/16 97/1798/3 107/5
107/16 108/11 108/20 110/22 111/19 112/4 112/7 113/9 114/15 117/14 118/23 121/13
140/16 141/7 141/14 141/18 142/11 142/13
142/15 142/19 142/22 143/1 144/17 145/1
147/16 151/1 152/8 152/25 153/8 153/14
153/18 154/23 165/1 165/2 166/4 166/10
168/8 171/10 171/23 172/7 173/16 182/11
184/20 199/9 199/21 199/22 201/23 202/2
206/11 206/15 207/6 221/11 221/17 223/12
223/14 223/16
question's [1] 144/22
questioned [4] 53/23 53/23 163/18 166/6

201/23
questionnaire [1] $86 / 5$
questions [ 93 ] 18/3 29/20 30/16 30/24 31/2
31/4 31/10 31/21 35/14 37/10 43/24 53/6
53/6 53/9 53/19 53/24 54/9 54/10 54/11
54/12 54/12 54/13 54/16 54/19 54/21 54/22
55/3 55/4 55/7 56/9 58/23 63/6 63/14 63/16
66/19 70/8 70/14 75/17 76/10 87/7 91/15
92/5 92/6 92/6 92/8 92/14 92/24 95/7 95/8
96/2 96/7 96/11 96/23 96/25 97/1 97/6
103/14 103/15 118/10 122/2 125/11 128/23
134/8 136/15 140/5 140/6 140/14 142/8
145/3 145/5 145/9 145/14 150/25 152/9
152/13 152/19 153/4 154/4 155/15 155/19
160/25 163/10 163/18 183/9 195/19 195/21
201/18 202/1 203/2 203/5 204/20 205/23
206/4
quibble [2] 186/16 186/23
quiet [1] 19/18
quite [9] 12/22 181/3 183/23 188/16 193/25
194/3 194/6 196/10 199/3
quote [5] 15/11 80/3 84/17 164/22 190/9
quotient [2] 41/7 44/10
$\mathbf{R}$
raise [1] 177/17
raised [1] 199/9
Ramsey [1] 129/7
ran [2] 219/23 222/15
range [19] 32/17 32/19 33/3 34/21 34/23
36/6 41/20 43/12 46/24 47/9 47/23 47/23
47/25 48/2 48/7 83/12 95/8 186/4 186/19
rank [1] 178/17
ranks [1] 185/24
rate [1] 72/8
rather [10] 52/7 69/8 82/17 112/8 115/17
127/20 128/14 146/21 184/10 201/24
Ray [2] 4/9 176/21
Ray's [1] 176/11
RAYMOND [2] 1/2137/7
re [4] 12/6 29/20 61/7 121/8
re-normed [1] 29/20
reach [4] 36/14 55/24 193/11 222/24
reached [11] 58/18 72/8 74/9 160/5 171/2
171/7 222/22 223/1 224/3 224/19 224/19
reaching [7] 58/5 61/20 72/17 73/3 157/10 157/20 224/2
reaction [1] 103/16
read [54] 28/13 41/8 41/9 52/25 53/1 54/20 64/23 64/24 64/25 65/2 65/3 65/8 67/8 67/9 67/24 68/4 68/16 69/16 70/1 80/20 83/4 89/5 89/9 96/25 97/1 97/8 101/19 112/6 115/13 $116 / 3116 / 5$ 126/10 135/4 135/5 135/8 135/19 135/19 135/20 135/22 136/3 136/12 136/22 146/3 146/22 149/1 162/23 190/20
200/13 200/14 204/18 204/25 205/4 206/1 208/11
reading [12] 8/4 64/8 91/22 115/9 126/23 136/24 137/9 139/6 140/4 146/12 199/24 199/25
real [6] 33/20 66/18 129/14 144/3 144/6 144/9
really [13] 39/9 50/20 62/12 62/13 62/14 87/22 91/17 115/14 128/5 142/12 145/17 197/8 199/9
realm [1] 144/22
reason [6] 13/14 35/12 51/20 108/14 129/18 208/2
reasonable [4] 56/3 76/2 115/20 176/16 reasons [5] 13/10 44/22 120/25 203/4 224/9
rebuttal [12] 3/9 167/14 167/20 167/25
168/4 170/4 170/6 172/8 174/10 174/14

## K

rebuttal... [2] 226/19 226/25
rebutting [1] 172/21
recall [36] 10/9 19/20 20/17 21/5 25/7 30/24
47/1 53/13 58/17 59/11 63/9 63/13 63/23
96/24 97/3 116/6 116/8 $117 / 11120 / 6135 / 6$ 135/7 135/7 135/17 $139 / 8$ 139/16 $139 / 17$ 148/18 151/16 155/14 165/13 165/13 172/22 201/20 212/17 214/1 214/22
recalling [1] 146/22
recalls [1] 205/13
recast [1] 111/19
receive [13] 12/23 36/20 156/6 156/6 156/15
156/18 181/9 182/13 201/5 211/12 217/14 218/13 225/20
received [22] 5/6 48/10 54/1 114/10 125/4
178/7 181/18 182/14 191/4 198/14 198/19
200/8 200/15 200/24 205/2 211/22 211/24
212/2 212/5 212/12 212/15 226/4
receiving [4] 63/23 182/23 208/20 212/17
recent [1] 210/5
recently [5] 8/19 8/21 14/14 16/6 17/4
recess [5] 76/12 150/17 177/2 226/13 226/14
recognize [1] 89/7
recognized [10] 109/17 130/13 130/18
168/22 171/19 174/3 180/24 181/6 192/17 224/1
recollection [4] 128/7 153/13 170/11 172/10
recommend [2] 62/3 190/19
recommended [2] 56/23 94/19
recommends [1] 19/23
reconcile [1] 103/5
Reconvened [5] 4/1 76/13 150/18 177/7 226/15
record [11] 4/19 64/15 96/22 114/5 $137 / 17$ 149/19 167/2 177/12 177/22 227/23 228/3
recorded [3] 198/25 199/7 205/1
records [29] 20/10 24/10 25/14 48/3 74/23
74/24 75/1 75/12 75/21 110/10 113/17
113/19 113/20 114/10 114/13 114/18 114/23
115/23 115/25 116/4 116/12 162/3 162/7
162/18 212/8 212/10 212/25 213/12 213/17 recross [3] 3/7 166/1 166/2
Recross-Examination [2] 3/7 166/2
recruit [1] 188/3
red [5] 140/15 140/19 140/21 141/8 141/9
redirect [3] 3/6 150/22 225/15
reduces [1] 108/18
refer [2] 97/4 216/20
referee [1] 180/13
reference [3] 24/23 187/23 218/2
referenced [2] 18/2 219/25
references [1] 220/1
referencing [1] 8/15
referred [7] 9/6 77/11 94/5 99/3 149/22
165/14 214/19
referring [5] 41/23 61/23 70/9 126/15 216/18
refers [1] 59/10
reflect [3] 42/2 148/3 213/12
reflected [3] 75/12 193/13 213/22
reflecting [1] 212/25
reflects [1] $46 / 7$
refresh [1] 128/24
refused [1] 222/6
regard [6] 20/14 21/9 61/23 74/16 75/25 208/24
regarding [22] $11 / 18$ 13/4 14/10 14/15 $18 / 14$
22/3 22/4 24/5 24/11 75/18 80/8 86/4 92/20
108/5 122/1 126/2 155/11 160/5 169/23
181/12 198/15 221/2
regards [34] 21/4 28/17 28/23 31/19 33/8

3015 $30 / 11$ 38/L1 59/4 39/13 $39 / 1842 / 21$
45/3 46/21 47/2 47/16 48/25 49/6 49/12
55/18 59/24 59/24 61/5 70/24 71/20 73/2
76/2 160/5 161/21 163/23 210/15 213/5
219/2 222/14
Register [1] 180/2
registered [1] $179 / 13$
regular [1] 116/18
rehabilitation [1] 173/11
Reid [1] 213/15
reinforced [1] 75/23
rejecting [1] 168/4
relate [1] 30/8
related [14] 7/11 12/13 12/18 15/18 15/19
33/11 33/24 39/10 50/21 54/10 100/6 125/6
149/16 157/24
relates [4] 123/11 128/11 224/11 225/6
relating [1] 71/25
relation [1] 51/15
relationship [2] 182/8 202/22
relationships [1] 202/13
relatively [2] 83/4 204/13
relaxed [1] $59 / 1$
relevance [1] 34/2
relevant [15] 121/11 121/14 121/17 121/19
121/23 121/25 123/10 123/13 123/14 123/15
123/17 154/9 174/9 189/2 196/14
reliability [5] 103/9 106/17 106/22 122/2
202/23
reliable [4] 26/10 32/7 106/24 158/14
reliably [1] 41/2
relied [1] 17/1
religious [1] 195/22
reluctant [1] 148/11
rely [2] 35/14 160/16
relying [3] 82/5 119/13 $119 / 14$
remains [2] 170/15 170/16
remember [23] 68/18 81/5 89/12 107/3
107/7 107/9 107/13 112/22 113/1 115/11
122/17 122/25 123/2 123/3 123/6 139/9
145/21 145/22 146/2 146/9 166/9 204/5
205/11
remembered [1] 204/24
remembers [1] 204/21
remind [1] 149/15
remove [2] 108/14 108/21
render [11] 32/6 82/11 111/2 111/10 111/11 111/23 112/11 119/18 169/6 170/19 174/9 rendered [6] 75/4 94/15 100/4 112/16 113/18 169/23
rendering [1] $199 / 16$
Renew [1] 45/25
repeat [5] 53/2 142/10 149/1 205/19 223/15
repeated [2] 136/21 136/23
repeatedly [2] 164/16 202/21
repeating [1] 214/21
rephrase [6] 18/7 21/1 60/7 60/7 75/9 112/3 replying [1] 123/5
report [75] 24/10 26/24 44/21 75/20 84/15
85/20 85/25 86/3 86/11 87/9 88/5 88/9 88/14
88/16 88/21 89/3 89/3 89/16 90/14 91/7
95/23 99/7 99/24 101/16 101/18 102/8 103/1
110/21 112/15 112/15 113/3 113/6 117/24
120/20 120/21 124/6 124/7 151/10 151/14
151/15 152/3 152/5 152/10 152/23 153/6
153/19 154/6 154/7 154/10 154/11 154/14
156/4 161/5 183/2 189/10 189/13 189/21
191/7 191/14 191/16 191/20 192/2 193/5
193/5 199/2 201/14 206/18 206/23 207/1
212/11 212/13 214/13 216/19 218/13 222/10
reported [5] 2/3 185/14 185/16 204/8 229/6
reporter [5] 2/4 41/10 95/15 229/5 229/18
reports [5] 113/22 152/19 169/14 169/16
$219 / 6$
represent [1] 29/18
representation [1] 176/19
representative [1] 29/17
request [2] 10/16 15/9
requested [2] 150/6 201/17
required [2] 13/11 22/8
requirements [1] 215/7
research [32] 12/20 13/8 16/10 37/24 38/4
38/6 56/15 59/4 60/21 61/5 72/2 72/3 72/5
72/16 72/16 79/2 103/7 108/5 158/3 158/3
158/12 158/21 173/2 208/17 219/20 222/14
222/16 223/4 223/9 223/19 224/23 225/10
researched [2] 29/25 30/7
resigned [1] 8/22
resist [2] 143/25 144/4
resisted [5] 112/18 112/25 161/5 161/11
161/15
resistive [1] 147/13
respect [1] $216 / 15$
respected [3] 30/6 218/9 218/15
respectively [1] $29 / 15$
respon [1] 165/6
respond [3] 26/17 52/18 134/20
responded [1] 181/16
responding [2] 56/8 222/21
responds [3] 143/8 143/10 143/11
response [13] 52/18 52/19 65/18 67/1 91/22
144/7 161/24 164/14 164/15 165/7 173/20 206/3 225/5
responses [10] $16 / 4$ 55/15 70/8 92/24 144/7
152/12 152/19 153/4 156/2 199/7
responsibility [2] 70/12 132/22
responsive [1] 103/13
rest [2] 85/8 150/12
restate [1] 73/14
restating [1] 134/21
rested [1] 177/9
resting [2] 226/23 226/24
result [10] 78/11 102/16 117/19 126/20 127/12 127/18 158/13 170/3 182/20 185/22 resulting [1] 54/24
results [60] 27/20 32/4 32/10 32/12 32/13
34/12 38/10 38/20 39/12 40/9 41/6 42/11
42/17 42/22 44/10 48/17 49/1 49/12 50/2
50/9 50/11 52/3 54/1 55/22 78/7 85/5 85/8 85/10 85/14 86/1 89/14 89/18 90/10 92/13 99/6 102/8 102/16 102/21 103/4 138/19 155/21 156/10 159/19 159/21 163/8 169/25 182/24 184/4 185/13 185/16 189/5 189/8
191/17 194/16 202/10 202/13 202/16 214/10 217/15 218/17
resumé [2] 8/10 $187 / 5$
retained [3] 77/24 96/14 96/14
retardation [1] 28/2
retarded [2] 28/6 28/12
retraction [1] $62 / 25$
returns [1] 214/12
revert [1] $207 / 6$
review [39] 12/8 12/23 23/24 25/10 30/2
37/24 38/8 57/17 70/19 73/9 74/19 75/12
75/14 110/10 116/12 116/24 122/17 128/9
157/22 159/12 162/3 170/1 175/22 178/15 181/19 182/19 183/2 184/14 198/16 207/3 208/9 208/9 208/17 211/13 211/17 211/21 212/3 $219 / 8227125$
reviewed [22] 11/22 12/6 24/9 25/6 25/13 38/6 61/21 61/22 63/18 75/7 75/17 110/3 114/18 118/18 119/24 125/4 144/6 162/4 191/11 219/5 223/3 224/22
reviewing [7] 24/15 114/12 122/25 123/6 163/7 170/10 206/17 reviews [1] 12/6

|  | 136/11 138/4 138/4 138/6 141/18 171/20 | seated [4] 4/18 $167 / 12177 / 8177 / 21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| revised [3] 29/16 40/25 196/6 | 173/18 173/19 174/20 189/7 190/9 191/2 | second [10] 46/2 53/23 129/11 129/23 |
| revising [1] 78/24 | 191/10 201/3 204/14 205/3 210/3 222/23 | 141/16 141/17 141/25 192/11 196/6 202/14 |
| right [123] 12/23 19/21 29/5 31/6 42/1 46/15 | 224/24 | secondly [4] 30/7 127/1 152/18 154/3 |
| 50/1 57/4 64/14 65/1768/19 68/24 77/12 | saying [13] 11/2 14/4 43/1 43/15 50/22 53/12 | seconds [5] 175/17 201/21 204/24 205/4 |
| 79/25 80/19 81/18 81/21 82/22 83/1 83/15 | 78/5 97/12 133/11 143/12 189/23 223/1 | 206/1 |
| 85/3 85/11 86/2 87/4 89/23 90/8 92/10 92/11 | 224/18 | secretary [1] $217 / 22$ |
| 93/6 93/22 94/12 96/15 97/2 98/9 98/24 99/5 | says [24] 43/17 45/22 65/1767/21 69/14 | section [2] 29/18 204/4 |
| 99/15 100/1 100/10 100/11 100/18 100/22 | 69/24 87/12 87/13 97/13 101/16 101/18 | secure [1] $210 / 21$ |
| 100/23 100/25 101/11 103/3 103/11 103/14 | 109/12 113/13 133/13 138/8 138/13 139/15 | security [2] 173/12 203/25 |
| 103/25 105/2 106/3 106/15 108/24 109/11 | 140/19 140/20 141/10 156/15 190/24 201/20 | see [33] 31/10 32/20 39/5 39/23 53/7 64/7 |
| 110/7 113/22 113/23 114/3 114/21 115/2 | 209/14 | 65/2 65/21 65/22 84/4 86/8 98/9 103/4 108/2 |
| 115/6 116/22 116/23 119/8 119/15 119/23 | scale [86] 17/3 19/25 29/1 31/11 31/12 31/15 | 109/14 110/17 110/18 115/25 142/23 146/3 |
| 125/20 127/9 128/5 129/9 129/20 131/5 | 32/17 35/13 35/22 35/25 36/1 36/6 37/4 | 158/16 162/17 168/14 189/7 193/10 193/13 |
| 131/12 131/18 134/13 134/15 137/15 139/9 | 38/15 38/16 38/17 38/18 40/20 41/2 41/23 | 205/9 205/9 208/2 208/12 209/12 224/8 |
| 139/10 139/20 139/23 140/1 140/24 141/15 | 42/7 42/15 42/15 42/23 43/1 43/15 45/4 45/7 | 227/25 |
| 141/16 141/25 145/16 146/10 146/17 149/13 | 45/8 45/16 45/19 47/8 47/14 47/18 47/20 | seeing [3] 13/3 124/22 124/23 |
| 149/20 150/14 150/15 151/23 162/6 166/18 | 47/22 49/2 49/2 52/16 52/24 54/2 56/12 | seek [1] 208/2 |
| 166/21 167/4 167/11 175/14 176/20 177/17 | 56/19 57/19 61/25 69/5 81/9 81/14 81/24 | seem [4] 115/20 206/5 206/7 215/16 |
| 186/11 186/22 192/8 198/10 199/7 203/4 | 83/15 87/14 87/18 93/25 94/2 94/5 94/6 | seemed [5] 40/4 40/4 184/24 195/2 206/6 |
| 203/15 205/24 206/13 208/5 209/15 210/13 | 94/10 94/11 99/1 99/6 99/9 99/10 102/24 | seems [8] 21/16 78/5 102/4 172/15 201/13 |
| 211/15 225/18 226/7 226/12 226/22 227/1 | 104/17 134/6 142/1 158/16 161/22 164/2 | 204/10 204/16 205/6 |
| 227/4 227/13 228/8 | 183/14 183/20 184/1 184/7 184/9 185/22 | seen [11] 23/8 40/5 50/19 173/25 174/18 |
| rights [1] 13/18 | 185/25 198/6 198/13 198/16 200/22 203/2 | 174/19 183/18 191/5 193/3 199/2 210/20 |
| rise [1] 171/5 | 203/23 206/21 213/6 220/4 224/8 | segregate [1] $46 / 4$ |
| risk [1] 143/19 | scaled [1] 81/5 | segue [1] 91/15 |
| road [1] 65/19 | scales [50] 16/12 18/24 30/2 30/8 32/1 32/14 | self [3] 11/17 11/17 194/2 |
| robbed [1] 136/6 | 32/15 33/2 35/15 36/19 36/23 38/9 51/19 | self-administered [1] 194/21 |
| ROBERT [6] 3/3 4/14 4/15 4/23 29/23 194/4 | 51/20 51/21 86/4 91/12 92/13 93/2 93/16 | self-published [1] 11/17 |
| Rock [2] 6/15 9/3 | 94/18 95/11 95/19 95/21 95/24 98/17 108/7 | semantic [3] 102/25 146/1 147/21 |
| Rockford [1] 5/22 | 156/11 156/12 $157 / 4157 / 8157 / 16157 / 17$ | seminars [4] 5/16 12/25 22/6 57/16 |
| room [1] 59/1 | 157/22 158/20 175/7 186/3 194/8 194/14 | send [6] 85/18 $137 / 5$ 155/25 156/1 217/13 |
| Rorschach [2] 1 | 197/16 197/19 197/19 197/20 197/20 197/22 | 218/5 |
| roughly [2] | 197/23 197/24 198/1 198/81 | sensational [1] |
| routinely [2] 188/15 $216 / 6$ | scared [2] 122/17 125/2 | sense [1] 170/6 |
| RPR [2] 2/3 229 | scene [1] 53/2 | sent [5] 95/10 156/3 156/5 168/17 214/10 |
| rule [2] 44/2 167/25 | Schoenenberger [3] 116/9 118/11 1193 | sentence [3] 65/1 89/8 135/21 |
| rules [6] 77/3 77/5 77/7 77/15 77/22 78/17 | Schoenenberger-Gross [2] 118/11 119/3 | sentencing [1] $22 / 5$ |
| ruling [1] 44/3 | scholarly [3] 180/12 208/4 $216 / 24$ | separate [3] 35/13 106/2 195/3 |
| run [2] 7/3 23/1 | school [44] 5/9 5/13 24/10 25/14 27/1 48/3 | September [1] 124/9 |
| running [1] 6/19 | 65/15 73/10 75/1 75/19 110/9 113/17 113/19 | September 29 [1] 124/9 |
| runs [1] $14 / 18$ | 113/24 114/2 114/5 114/13 114/23 | sequence [1] 87/1 |
| S | 115/4 115/23 116/3 116/9 116/16 116/2 | series [10] 56/13 92/7 105/22 118/9 122/3 |
| sad [1] 99/21 | 162/3 162/8 178/25 179/3 18 | serious [6] 62/12 195/3 195/5 195/5 203/1 |
| sadness [1] 101/7 | 196/17 211/8 212/24 213/2 213/12 213/17 | $204 / 1$ |
| safety [1] 104/15 | 213/23 | seriously [1] 13/19 |
| said [59] 5/23 39/21 42/14 43/3 52/5 56/24 | schools [1] 162/13 | seriousness [1] 70/12 |
| 63/14 66/10 82/3 82/4 83/7 84/24 84/24 | Sciences [2] 5/109/1 | served [2] 187/25 188/2 |
| 97/14 97/23 97/24 98/1 99/17 100/21 102/23 | score [48] 33/24 34/14 36/4 36/6 39/7 41/16 | service [3] 180/2 214/11 218/6 |
| 103/12 112/25 113/17 119/24 121/9 121/19 | 41/17 41/17 42/5 43/11 43/19 45/20 47/1 | services [10] 6/4 6/23 6/24 15/9 173/10 |
| 121/20 122/24 127/6 131/8 134/8 135/10 | 47/1 48/10 49/15 49/16 50/24 54/7 54/24 | 181/11 189/16 208/24 209/12 218/3 |
| 137/20 138/25 141/9 142/7 142/21 144/11 | 55/9 55/11 55/12 55/13 81/10 81/16 85/17 | sessions [2] 7/3 13/2 |
| 145/15 153/22 161/8 165/7 167/19 168/5 | 87/6 95/22 95/25 98/18 139/12 139/17 | set [7] 4/11 40/16 44/25 54/9 125/9 205/22 |
| 172/10 172/12 175/2 182/3 182/3 184/23 | 141/21 155/17 156/16 156/20 156/25 158/15 | $227 / 8$ |
| 190/6 203/8 203/14 208/12 215/25 219/19 | 184/6 185/23 186/3 186/11 186/18 186/20 | sets [1] 195/15 |
| 219/23 222/18 229/13 | 205/1 213/4 213/13 | setting [7] 78/4 114/3 121/4 195/17 196/2 |
| sake [2] 86/24 105/11 | scored [30] 31/11 34/20 34/23 35/21 81/4 | 196/17 202/17 |
| same [31] 21/9 29/21 35/16 42/11 42/15 52/2 | 85/17 85/18 85/19 90/2 94/13 94/19 95/9 | settings [1] |
| 53/18 53/24 57/10 64/17 64/21 67/3 69/2 | 96/1 98/12 139/19 139/22 139/24 140/1 | seven [3] 69/13 87/2 179/8 |
| 105/4 111/2 116/24 121/17 126/1 139/4 | 142/4 142/14 142/15 142/17 142/18 142/22 | seventy [2] 138/22 175/25 |
| 141/7 153/3 158/14 158/15 166/23 170/1 | 143/2 194/14 195/11 197/13 198/2 $217 / 17$ | seventy-one [1] 175/25 |
| 184/19 202/24 207/3 207/4 209/24 225/24 | scores [31] 31/15 33/14 34/4 39/14 42/3 | several [10] 61/4 98/17 112/22 120/2 122/4 |
| sample [1] 202/12 | 45/18 85/20 93/7 93/7 93/11 94/8 118/19 | 122/6 125/13 181/10 187/24 209/3 |
| sanction [1] 150/9 | 118/25 156/5 156/7 156/22 157/15 157/15 | sex [10] 8/1 8/1 11/18 14/15 22/18 22/23 |
| sanctioned [1] 172/2 | 157/17 157/23 158/14 158/14 158/17 184/10 | 23/5 23/15 126/3 197/3 |
| satisfactory [1] 197/3 | 186/9 195/15 212/25 213/20 214/11 $217 / 19$ | sexual [1] 14/16 |
| satisfied [1] $176 / 18$ | $217 / 23$ | sexually [1] 126/2 |
| saw [6] 16/3 65/8 101/11 120/9 121/10 | scoring [5] 135/1 139/11 185/17 189/16 | sh [1] 157/22 |
| 121/16 | $214 / 11$ | shall [1] $60 / 19$ |
| say [40] 11/3 11/3 15/5 22/24 31/20 33/14 | screaming [2] 121/21 124/24 | sharp [1] 77/16 |
| 47/17 50/14 50/21 52/9 77/23 78/3 92/8 92/9 | screen [6] 32/8 32/21 41/5 48/14 53/25 | sharpen [1] 42/25 |

Shawano [1] 210/6
she [9] 117/10 136/4 140/14 140/19 140/20 141/8 141/20 167/23 204/8
she's [2] 12/23 141/10
sheet [9] 97/5 135/1 155/17 205/1 214/12
217/13 217/18 218/5 218/12
sheriff [1] 24/4
shift [39] 52/14 52/23 52/25 53/20 54/5
54/15 54/18 55/1 55/5 55/10 61/24 63/10
66/5 66/17 66/21 66/24 67/1 67/13 67/14
69/3 69/6 69/7 141/22 142/2 142/18 143/2
160/25 161/3 161/20 161/23 161/23 163/8
163/12 164/9 164/13 165/3 165/4 166/5
166/9
shift-type [1] 160/25
shifted [4] 141/12 164/21 164/23 165/2
shifting [4] 55/15 141/11 147/14 163/19
shifts [1] 70/9
short [6] 114/14 115/3 181/21 183/19 193/1 195/2
short-term [3] 114/14 115/3 193/1
shortage [1] $188 / 4$
shortcoming [1] $189 / 15$
shortcomings [1] 49/21
shorter [1] 30/22
shorthand [1] $229 / 10$
shortly [1] 179/16
shot [2] 68/20 211/8
shotgun [1] 211/9
should [19] 20/10 48/9 48/9 54/8 58/3 73/14
74/12 109/9 118/1 143/13 150/11 154/13
171/25 172/3 172/7 187/6 187/13 191/10 200/4
shouldn't [1] 58/4
show [12] 8/13 38/14 63/22 93/3 99/11 124/4 146/18 152/2 156/10 164/13 164/15 187/13
showed [4] 16/3 38/7 39/14 62/9
showing [3] 32/17 73/11 156/8
shown [4] 16/4 38/2 48/3 103/7
shows [13] 37/24 39/7 41/15 43/7 49/21 93/8 142/3 143/8 143/9 157/22 173/12 173/14 $190 / 11$
shy [5] 37/16 37/25 38/17 190/7 190/21 shyness [2] 93/17 93/20
SI [1] 94/10
SI-2 [1] 94/10
side [4] 14/22 15/1 190/16 190/17
sides [1] $77 / 19$
significance [13] 34/18 35/3 47/24 48/2
48/23 48/25 49/18 54/6 59/14 71/4 159/25 163/18 163/22
significant [12] 10/20 28/14 33/17 33/18 50/25 100/3 120/19 120/22 173/13 188/25 193/12 213/24
significantly [3] 146/19 206/25 214/2
signs [1] 102/2
similar [11] 23/11 57/7 77/4 99/3 151/3
161/24 165/21 189/25 190/1 192/21 202/18
similarities [1] 37/12
similarity [1] 203/22
similarly [1] 151/4
simpler [1] 44/16
simply [14] 13/12 44/18 55/6 164/13 165/1 173/18 180/18 182/8 189/17 191/1 195/13 214/16 220/19 225/6
since [18] 10/3 10/4 40/25 48/1 79/14 147/24 159/11 179/14 179/15 179/20 180/1 180/3 193/17 199/12 200/8 208/4 208/7 208/17 sir [15] 8/11 10/25 14/24 24/24 31/5 33/6 49/8 69/12 95/18 103/18 105/3 128/1 161/19 164/18 223/16
sitting [2] 65/22 186/25
situation [2] 202/12 214/24
six [3] 23/787/2 128/14
sixty [1] $97 / 10$
sixty-five [1] $97 / 10$
sketchy [1] 185/8
skill [2] 86/13 87/15
skip [9] 15/10 35/11 37/3 37/4 65/16 67/18
69/11 130/25 141/1
skipping [1] 81/21
slash [1] 91/14
sleep [2] 61/12 102/2
slow [5] 26/14 26/16 95/15 95/16 103/15 sm [1] 145/7
small [9] 14/11 21/16 31/21 145/7 145/8
182/25 190/18 203/13 204/13
smaller [2] 7/24 21/19
so [136] 4/13 9/20 10/23 11/2 14/18 17/23 18/25 22/12 23/1 23/2 24/17 27/22 28/9 28/11 30/6 31/1 31/25 32/24 34/1 34/22 35/23 36/14 36/18 37/14 38/13 40/2 40/11 41/8 45/16 45/16 50/19 50/20 50/20 50/22 51/3 51/24 54/11 54/23 55/5 55/11 57/13 68/3 68/4 72/11 73/19 78/14 78/21 85/13 85/24 86/6 87/5 93/7 94/8 94/12 95/20 99/16 106/15 106/15 111/15 114/22 117/3 121/3 123/7 126/3 126/14 126/20 127/7 128/11 $129 / 1130 / 5134 / 21135 / 3135 / 18135 / 21$ $137 / 9$ 139/14 139/20 141/23 148/8 153/25 154/9 155/7 156/12 156/24 156/25 157/25 159/14 161/18 162/17 164/9 173/16 181/20 182/17 184/8 186/11 186/15 188/5 188/18 190/2 190/21 190/22 191/25 193/14 194/6 194/25 196/18 197/24 198/7 199/8 200/12
201/2 201/24 203/14 205/6 205/21 206/3
207/6 208/11 208/15 209/4 209/8 209/17 209/21 210/7 213/4 213/22 214/19 215/5 215/22 216/19 218/14 219/16 220/19 224/18 225/16 226/22
so-called [1] 188/18
so-indicated [1] 99/16
social [40] 9/20 14/9 19/19 $26 / 2230 / 930 / 9$
31/13 34/14 34/22 34/24 34/25 35/6 35/12
35/13 35/13 35/16 35/17 35/18 36/3 36/3
36/8 71/23 71/23 93/17 93/18 93/20 93/22
93/22 94/3 94/7 94/8 94/9 94/11 98/13 98/20
98/25 99/2 99/12 173/11 203/24
socially [9] 19/17 27/4 35/1 35/23 36/9 36/10
36/11 37/17 100/19
Socialphobia [1] 100/9
society [4] 7/207/23 9/5 36/18
soft [1] 59/1
solely [4] 14/22 18/21 18/23 56/11
solid [1] 154/5
some [87] 6/20 11/21 12/1 14/11 24/6 27/16
29/20 40/6 43/18 $43 / 2457 / 1360 / 363 / 6$
66/20 67/10 70/23 76/9 81/3 92/4 92/5 92/18
96/2 101/1 110/5 110/9 110/9 114/1 114/1
115/5 117/25 118/18 118/25 123/5 124/17
130/19 130/25 131/13 131/20 132/4 132/10
134/7 134/22 141/2 146/12 148/8 149/22
154/22 155/10 165/20 167/7 167/13 180/13
181/9 181/12 182/13 183/3 183/5 184/22
187/10 188/14 189/25 193/10 194/22 196/19
196/20 198/22 199/13 200/13 200/15 200/20
201/12 203/10 203/16 208/24 210/12 212/18
212/22 213/1 213/2 214/6 216/23 217/5
218/18 218/18 219/20 219/24 220/1 somebody [17] 28/11 85/18 98/14 105/4 106/5 106/6 108/11 109/4 109/9 115/8 115/10 138/5 148/12 159/2 198/5 204/14 214/9

somehow [2] 91/19 172/1
someone [14] 37/22 126/1 138/10 142/21
155/8 159/3 163/14 164/9 196/7 205/15
211/19 220/23 220/25 224/13
something [61] 13/19 19/20 19/22 23/2
43/20 53/15 59/4 61/19 63/9 66/14 80/23
80/24 81/23 84/21 88/18 89/20 89/25 90/1 91/5 94/24 98/12 98/23 105/24 108/1 123/19
129/11 129/21 129/21 130/2 130/7 132/24
133/23 135/6 136/24 137/10 138/5 140/22
141/4 142/1 142/12 145/25 146/6 146/15
147/7 148/9 180/17 183/12 188/4 188/11
189/24 191/24 192/14 193/7 193/21 197/3
198/12 200/4 216/6 217/12 221/14 224/18
sometime [2] 180/4 $227 / 21$
sometimes [7] 33/19 50/16 50/24 117/8
120/24 127/19 191/24
somewhat [2] 172/15 185/15
somewhere [2] 156/1 198/5
sorry [47] 8/4 17/15 18/21 20/18 21/8 30/21
37/3 40/15 42/8 42/20 45/2 45/19 45/21
63/19 64/16 65/3 65/6 66/10 68/16 68/25
80/9 85/23 89/18 95/4 95/18 98/10 98/22
101/9 101/17 102/12 103/24 108/19 111/18
117/3 117/9 118/15 119/1 120/7 122/21
123/2 135/17 142/16 147/18 154/22 157/13 209/18 224/7
sort [7] 66/20 90/7 173/14 187/17 188/23
198/23 206/8
sorts [2] 186/12 $187 / 8$
source [1] 213/14
sources [1] $26 / 6$
South [5] $136 / 3137 / 23137 / 23138 / 1204 / 7$
Spain [3] 136/4 204/15 205/6
spared [1] 62/16
speak [3] 36/18 107/4 198/11
speaking [2] 18/13 67/21
speaks [1] 186/20
special [9] $1 / 14$ 1/16 1/18 4/6 9/3 48/4 73/12 109/20 124/8
specialization [2] 131/19 178/12
specialize [1] 104/11
specialties [2] 109/22 172/13
specialty [14] 109/17 109/17 109/23 109/25
110/1 169/8 169/9 170/13 170/14 171/13
171/13 172/11 174/25 174/25
specific [31] 9/15 18/2 30/2 50/4 63/6 63/12
77/24 81/2 91/18 91/18 92/5 96/23 97/5
$107 / 4$ 107/16 110/23 110/25 112/23 124/16
124/18 169/17 187/11 189/10 189/17 192/3
192/6 192/8 194/4 196/17 214/17 222/8
specifically [28] 23/18 45/3 61/24 99/2 114/6
120/4 149/23 150/1 167/22 169/3 169/7
169/21 170/22 172/10 179/23 180/22 181/9
183/1 183/7 191/10 192/24 193/15 194/19
200/21 210/4 220/18 221/15 222/1
speech [2] 124/17 124/19
spell [2] 4/19 177/22
spend [2] 12/19 13/1
spent [1] $188 / 5$
Spielberger [2] 90/20 192/16
split [1] 197/23
spoke [5] 14/15 72/8 155/4 182/5 182/18
spoken [1] 132/20
SS [1] 229/1
SSI [1] 173/11
St [6] 6/4 6/5 6/6 7/6 23/1 178/19
stable [1] 213/25
stabs [2] 68/3 68/4
staff [4] 6/20 179/10 181/25 188/3
stages [1] 131/23
stand [7] 22/3 109/21 139/19 177/16 186/25


| 1 | testify [13] 14/22 21/3 57/1 57/2 76/25 80/7 | $7 / 16$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| technique [1] 70/9 | 88/2 167/22 167/24 169/10 174/14 180/22 | 219/19 223/24 225/12 228/6 |
| techniques [1] 63/7 | 181/25 | ir [40] $28 / 933 / 2336 / 1739 / 8$ 50/18 50/19 |
| technology [1] 13/1 | testifying [4] 10/10 39/20 181/2 222/17 | 53/21 54/20 55/1 55/2 61/10 62/9 70/10 |
| eenagers [1] 196/14 | testimony [28] 43/4 43/5 56/25 78/4 78/7 | 72/25 88/3 88/6 108/25 109/1 118/18 119/21 |
| telephone [2] 122/25 123/2 | 80/14 82/3 82/20 98/5 116/10 138/15 167/14 | 122/1 124/12 125/22 126/10 127/17 130/5 |
| tell [31] 20/6 67/7 67/9 67/11 68/10 68/15 | 167/20 168/1 168/4 169/1 170/4 171/1 | 132/1 132/5 134/22 134/22 134/23 147/11 |
| 68/17 86/18 97/9 97/10 97/18 97/21 104/2 | 171/12 174/2 174/7 174/10 174/15 174/21 | 148/11 164/13 164/14 187/6 187/7 208/1 |
| 106/10 106/25 107/12 122/16 124/5 134/16 | 211/23 213/11 213/18 $227 / 5$ | 208/2 $217 / 14$ |
| 139/18 141/5 141/15 143/4 150/7 178/2 | testimony's [1] 79/16 | them [43] 14/4 14/11 15/18 18/12 24/7 28/1 |
| 181/15 187/1 190/22 194/11 205/16 207/7 | testing [11] 26/8 27/21 28/5 40/7 84/7 84/3 | 29/5 33/2 39/25 52/20 53/11 55/7 57/15 85/7 |
| telling [9] 111/8 $1111 / 21112 / 9121 / 8121 / 9$ | 103/7 103/7 103/8 183/5 206/18 | 88/4 92/25 96/1 97/1 97/6 104/20 105/6 |
| 133/5 137/4 141/23 144/5 | tests [109] 15/18 18/13 18/15 18/21 18/25 | 117/11 118/19 118/20 129/22 133/5 133/23 |
| tells [4] 109/4 109/9 133/23 | 19/6 20/2 20/8 25/21 25/24 27/10 27/12 | 134/20 135/4 135/8 140/7 145/7 146/3 |
| template [1] $217 / 18$ | 27/13 27/14 27/16 28/1 28/19 28/22 29/3 | 146/22 158/1 159/2 160/18 177/6 185/10 |
| templates [1] 217/17 | 32/10 36/21 37/1 38/21 39/25 40/3 40/6 | 188/2 205/16 208/25 22 |
| temporary [1] 187/25 | 40/16 40/19 41/742/2 44/11 49/24 50/8 | theme [1] 70/11 |
| ten [7] 21/6 32/14 157/18 185/9 185/18 | 50/10 50/13 51/15 56/13 56/13 56/17 56/18 | themes [2] 62/11 62/19 |
| 217/3 218/10 | 57/10 57/13 57/18 74/7 74/1781/2 82/6 83/2 | themselves [6] $39 / 9$ 130/5 130/16 131/11 |
| tend [2] 36/103 | 83/17 84/1 84/8 84/11 89/24 90/3 90/3 90/4 | 165/19 197/21 |
| tendencies [1] 92 | 90/20 116/11 116/24 117/6 117/7 117/10 | then [96] 6/18 6/25 7/21 11/20 13/18 16/3 |
| tendency [2] 55/5 14 | 139/3 145/16 151/12 153/1 153/18 153/23 | 22/1 22/6 22/9 27/21 29/21 31/14 31/19 |
| tender [1] 216/15 | 158/6 158/8 158/10 158/12 158/25 159/3 | 33/24 34/6 36/1 37/11 39/6 39/10 40/25 |
| tends [5] 189/23 189/24 191/2 191/2 191/23 | $159 / 9159 / 11159 / 13159 / 14159 / 18159 / 22$ | 41/19 43/13 45/16 46/12 50/22 53/2 53/4 |
| Tennessee [1] 5/9 | 159/23 160/1 160/16 169/14 169/17 172/20 | 53/10 53/10 53/20 54/17 58/13 62/21 62/23 |
| Teren [1] 65/14 | 172/20 173/22 174/16 174/16 175/11 183/25 | 65/16 66/1 68/5 79/4 84/5 85/20 86/7 87/2 |
| Teresa [7] 65/10 120/9 | 184/2 184/11 184/12 184/15 184/18 185/18 | 90/8 91/22 93/9 96/2 96/15 98/4 98/11 |
| 122/23 124/22 124/23 | 188/20 188/23 193/13 193/18 196/3 199/5 | 101/24 105/18 105/25 107/11 115/19 126/4 |
| Teresa's [1] 65/14 | 212/20 214/16 214/16 215/19 219/16 | $127 / 9$ 131/3 131/6 131/21 132/9 136/1 139/7 |
| term [21] 9/10 15/11 15/14 15/23 49/10 60/2 | Texas [1] 14/17 | 140/4 140/19 142/1 142/21 142/24 142/25 |
| 61/7 82/7 87/24 88/7 90/13 114/14 114/14 | text [1] 203/10 | 143/21 148/21 151/24 153/25 158/16 160/21 |
| 115/2 115/3 191/12 193/1 202/5 214/22 | textbooks [2] 212/19 212/23 | 166/7 166/15 168/12 168/14 176/23 179/8 |
| $219 / 23$ 222/16 | than [58] 5/17 12/17 15/6 34/21 35/22 35/23 | 182/18 182/22 190/16 191/25 197/20 201/17 |
| terms [15] 17/18 17/22 19/19 31/1731/18 | $36 / 636 / 841 / 1843 / 2046 / 846 / 849 / 549 / 23$ | 209/3 212/8 214/10 217/14 220/24 221/4 |
| 36/19 36/19 36/20 54/13 66/9 78/6 171/5 | 52/7 55/1 55/4 55/6 55/15 57/4 58/7 69/9 | 224/21 226/3 226/23 227/5 |
| 191/23 192/5 $206 / 5$ | 82/18 100/14 101/21 103/10 104/22 106/24 | theory [1] 79/10 |
| terribly [1] 46/3 | 106/25 115/17 116/21 127/20 128/14 129/17 | therapist [1] 195/18 |
| test [191] 21/13 30/1 30/4 31/1 31/19 31/25 | 144/12 144/25 145/2 146/6 146/21 147/1 | there [129] 6/17 9/7 9/12 9/14 14/4 15/23 |
| 34/20 36/24 36/25 37/21 38/7 38/10 38/25 | 147/21 148/12 154/2 171/4 173/18 184/10 | 15/24 16/3 18/13 19/10 22/18 26/15 26/20 |
| 39/3 39/13 39/14 39/16 39/20 39/22 40/23 | 185/2 185/10 198/2 201/24 206/2 211/2 | 27/18 32/13 32/13 32/14 32/15 36/1 37/16 |
| $42 / 545 / 546 / 546 / 846 / 2347 / 3$ 48/11 49/1 | 213/23 217/2 222/15 222/22 222/25 223/6 | 45/4 45/7 48/8 48/9 48/12 48/14 51/20 52/10 |
| 49/7 49/10 49/12 49/14 49/23 50/11 51/3 | Thank [20] 18/3 31/5 44/4 76/15 76/18 | 52/13 55/7 58/6 60/12 62/8 62/8 62/18 65/11 |
| 51/10 51/18 52/4 53/1 54/18 54/25 55/17 | 128/1 131/6 135/3 149/10 149/11 150/20 | 65/21 65/22 67/19 67/24 68/24 77/3 77/7 |
| 56/21 58/2 81/4 83/18 84/4 84/12 84/16 85/6 | $166 / 19167 / 3177 / 15$ 207/10 214/5 225/13 | 77/8 81/8 83/19 84/4 84/4 86/19 86/23 90/16 |
| 85/7 85/14 85/16 86/13 86/18 86/19 86/24 | 225/17226/11 228/6 | 90/20 90/20 92/12 93/2 94/7 94/12 94/14 |
| 87/8 87/8 87/15 87/19 88/17 88/21 89/20 | thanks [1] 12/25 | 94/18 95/8 95/12 98/2 98/17 99/1 99/3 100/9 |
| 89/21 89/25 90/10 91/11 94/1 94/14 94/20 | that [1238] | 102/7 102/15 102/23 102/23 108/4 109/13 |
| 96/11 96/18 97/24 102/8 102/15 102/16 | that's [182] 6/14 8/7 9/19 13/18 15/6 15/8 | 116/13 117/2 117/24 117/25 118/4118/6 |
| 102/21 103/3 134/7 134/15 134/17 134/18 | 15/23 17/1 20/22 21/15 21/18 23/2 23/2 23/4 | 118/18 121/2 126/1 126/24 127/4 129/24 |
| 134/20 134/24 134/25 135/4 135/10 135/12 | 24/20 29/6 29/7 30/13 33/10 34/5 36/3 41/12 | 132/9 136/12 139/11 139/24 142/8 142/21 |
| 135/14 139/13 139/16 141/3 142/9 144/1 | $41 / 15$ 43/3 43/16 43/20 44/18 46/7 47/7 47/9 | 146/13 149/8 154/20 162/9 165/8 174/1 |
| 144/2 144/12 145/1 145/2 145/4 145/15 | 48/7 48/7 48/22 52/12 53/13 58/23 60/6 60/7 | 175/23 176/1 178/25 181/21 185/1 186/7 |
| 145/18 148/2 148/10 153/12 155/7 155/10 | 63/2 63/11 64/5 65/7 67/14 67/15 68/18 | 187/8 188/2 188/3 190/5 193/2 195/19 |
| 155/25 159/1 159/4 162/21 163/7 164/1 | 68/24 68/24 69/24 70/15 71/12 72/5 75/5 | 195/24 195/25 196/3 197/17 197/22 198/1 |
| 164/2 164/5 164/17 169/25 175/3 182/24 | 75/10 75/17 76/8 78/7 78/13 79/4 79/5 79/6 | 198/2 200/1 200/4 200/13 200/15 200/16 |
| 183/17 183/24 184/4 185/4 185/14 188/10 | 79/19 80/3 81/1 82/2 82/2 82/8 83/13 83/24 | 205/9 211/2 211/3 213/14 213/17 217/7 |
| 188/14 188/17 189/5 189/16 189/18 190/18 | 86/22 88/688/16 88/25 89/2 92/3 92/11 | 218/3 218/10 228/4 |
| 193/24 194/16 195/13 195/20 197/5 198/2 | 92/21 93/24 94/6 94/7 95/19 98/16 99/22 | there'd [1] 86/21 |
| 198/3 198/3 198/10 199/7 199/10 199/12 | 100/2 100/6 100/14 100/16 100/16 100/23 | there's [25] 7/21 22/12 22/16 27/16 62/22 |
| 199/16 199/23 200/2 200/3 200/3 $200 / 8$ | 101/6 103/1 105/18 107/2 108/4 108/16 | 66/19 67/10 69/8 77/7 92/13 95/12 95/19 |
| 201/7 201/12 201/13 201/15 201/25 202/15 | 109/8 109/12 109/20 110/15 111/17 111/18 | 103/9 103/15 109/15 132/6 133/3 133/9 |
| 203/6 203/7 203/14 203/23 203/24 204/2 | 111/25 112/2 112/20 113/3 113/23 115/1 | 136/12 138/25 153/25 160/20 175/9 204/25 |
| 206/19 206/19 212/12 212/19 212/19 213/8 | 115/7 116/23 121/6 121/22 125/20 126/23 | 215/11 |
| 214/7 214/8 214/8 214/12 214/19 214/25 | 128/15 129/8 129/14 131/13 131/21 132/1 | thereafter [4] 197/13 227/21 227/23 229/11 |
| 215/6 215/14 216/10217/10217/11 217/16 | 132/8 132/16 132/21 133/11133/16 134/3 | therefore [2] 185/4 190/25 |
| 217/20 217/25 219/13 220/7 224/7 224/13 | 134/4 134/24 135/9 135/18 135/25 137/10 | therefrom [2] 169/20 183/11 |
| 224/14 224/15 224/17 224/18 224/24 224/25 | 139/10 140/3 140/7 140/9 140/15 140/17 | thereof [2] 74/6 122/2 |
| tested [2] 162/8 213/19 | 141/12 141/14 144/12 144/21 145/1 145/10 | these [47] 13/13 18/19 18/21 19/6 20/2 20/7 |
| testified [20] 4/17 10/7 14/14 14/15 14/19 | 145/18 146/6 148/14 149/7 149/7 150/7 | $33 / 5$ 33/7 34/8 36/19 36/19 36/19 36/20 38/8 |
| 14/21 20/13 21/7 21/9 21/13 21/22 22/21 | 151/6 153/13 154/9 155/19 158/20 158/21 | 49/9 55/13 55/22 56/25 70/7 73/20 74/10 |
| 58/21 116/13 151/4 155/13 157/4 159/5 | 159/3 162/6 163/16 163/21 166/18 169/1 | 92/4 92/5 92/6 92/23 93/13 102/9 111/2 |
| 170/7 177/20 | 171/9 171/23 172/14 175/11 175/19 177/5 | 129/4 139/3 148/8 153/23 157/19 158/7 |

these... [13] 158/24 165/22 172/20 183/9 188/23 189/6 191/17 191/18 192/4 194/14 214/15 214/16 219/16 they [149] 7/13 10/19 11/24 17/25 18/14 18/15 19/1 19/13 27/24 28/3 28/6 28/8 28/15 28/15 29/17 29/19 29/20 33/20 33/22 33/22 36/11 36/12 36/13 36/13 36/14 36/16 36/16 36/17 39/6 39/7 42/22 44/23 50/19 50/24 52/1 52/20 52/21 53/8 54/19 54/20 59/17 59/18 59/19 59/21 62/7 62/8 62/10 62/23 71/10 75/6 75/7 75/7 75/19 75/23 78/2 78/5 80/18 87/2 87/7 88/2 88/4 88/4 93/1 100/14 100/19 104/7 104/8 104/9 104/10 104/11 104/20 106/8 106/19 108/22 108/25 $109 / 5$ 110/17 113/20 115/24 116/23 117/8 121/1 126/24 127/1 127/1 127/2 $128 / 5129 / 6$ 129/15 129/18 129/20 129/21 129/25 $130 / 3$ 130/4 130/7 130/8 130/9 130/21 130/21 130/21 131/25 132/4 132/7 133/12 133/15 133/21 133/24 133/25 135/6 135/7 135/21 142/21 142/24 143/9 145/22 146/2 146/3 147/2 147/6 147/7 148/4 148/10 148/11 148/18 153/10 157/24 164/13 164/15 164/16 169/17 170/11 187/11 187/14 188/3 189/17 190/2 195/1 197/4 197/5 201/17 205/16 205/19 205/24 210/18 215/23 218/20 221/22 $228 / 2$
they're [42] $7 / 13$ 24/7 24/8 35/15 36/14 36/14 36/22 39/8 44/13 50/20 51/22 51/24 52/1 52/21 53/1 53/2 53/22 53/23 54/10 54/11 59/17 65/9 71/9 71/12 98/15 104/9 104/18 105/1 108/17 108/23 109/2 122/5 134/2 146/11 146/11 148/7 148/17 155/22 158/17 158/25 205/18 205/23 they've [8] 14/2 14/7 126/14 127/5 127/5 132/22 146/20 187/8
thick [1] 16/22
thing [9] 35/16 43/18 65/20 90/7 101/6 149/19 15015 150/8 202/24
things [29] 67/10 88/5 94/13 104/14 113/10 116/21 127/7 129/24 130/20 130/25 145/16 145/22 146/3 $146 / 3$ 146/7 146/9 146/20 $146 / 22$ 147/1 147/1 $147 / 4187 / 8187 / 17$
188/22 192/6 195/8 195/24 198/22 208/2 think [66] 8/17 8/19 18/1 37/3 37/3 42/9 43/2 44/1 48/12 51/6 52/8 53/17 57/22 60/2 61/3 64/5 79/5 79/19 81/16 82/21 83/7 84/15 91/3 91/7 91/16 97/8 113/5 119/4 119/15 121/7 128/25 130/10 131/14 135/23 138/1 142/18 143/15 144/17 144/21 144/21 151/20 153/8 161/10 167/7 168/9 172/6 172/12 173/23 174/3 182/20 184/17 185/13 198/5 199/20 200/4 202/3 203/1 206/3 214/2 215/2 215/8 216/18 216/20 219/23 223/24 225/16 thinking [1] 125/25
thinks [1] 12/22
third [4] 130/1 132/9 183/21 183/24
thirty [6] 151/25 152/1 207/15 207/19
207/20 226/3
thirty-one [2] 151/25 152/1
thirty-two [3] 207/19 207/20 226/3
this [283]
THOMAS [2] 1/15 203/11
Thompson [5] 136/3 137/22 139/6 140/13 204/6
thorough [2] 50/1 57/3
those [117] 7/11 10/15 10/19 12/5 12/6 12/8 13/25 14/3 17/21 18/2 18/10 18/18 19/14 21/5 24/3 24/6 24/16 25/24 28/18 30/10 30/12 30/14 32/12 32/20 33/1 33/1 33/25 35/15 36/12 36/13 37/13 40/9 41/6 42/2

75/18 75/21 77/15 81/5 87/793/794/1 95/7 95/24 98/18 99/6 101/4 101/15 106/1 106/2 109/15 109/21 109/25 113/11 113/19 113/24 114/12 116/12 116/17 116/20 117/5 120/6 122/1 122/4 123/8 123/22 124/19 124/25 125/1 128/25 131/13 132/14 139/25 146/9 147/15 153/9 156/11 157/23 158/17 158/20 159/9 162/4 169/16 170/1 174/16 $180 / 5$ 182/16 187/16 189/8 190/1 192/1 192/9 194/15 $195 / 4195 / 15196 / 5196 / 19197 / 1$ 200/4 203/5 206/4 212/23 215/9 215/19 215/22 217/23 218/11 218/14 219/14 219/24 $220 / 24$
though [7] 34/1 80/1 96/11 142/25 197/1 199/12 210/10
thought [5] 26/14 90/24 91/6 119/6 122/21
thousand [2] 23/8 118/3
thousands [3] 29/11 158/13 $159 / 6$ three [40] $7 / 24$ 8/22 20/17 20/17 21/8 21/8
22/25 23/8 34/7 34/9 38/8 40/3 54/6 54/25 64/4 64/4 86/7 87/1 110/18 $110 / 20120 / 15$ 120/18 127/21 128/4 128/20 128/25 130/13 145/13 157/14 157/19 173/6 176/1 188/5 189/9 190/10 198/23 205/15 205/16 213/20 213/20
three-hour [1] $128 / 4$
three-year [1] 213/20
through [20] 27/6 34/6 34/12 57/24 61/13
64/25 70/18 114/10 141/2 146/8 146/15
146/21 147/5 150/4 150/11 179/20 189/21
194/25 197/21 $219 / 6$
throughout [3] 23/3 50/10 73/13
Thursday [1] $10 / 18$
thus [1] $40 / 5$
tied [2] 121/10 124/22
time [57] 7/5 7/5 10/4 12/19 21/11 22/18
27/9 29/21 53/19 53/22 53/23 58/25 60/20 65/9 72/22 75/19 79/9 79/15 95/17 103/16 107/3 110/9 121/17 125/5 137/4 139/4 141/6 141/9 141/10 141/17 141/25 173/24 174/5 176/24 178/13 179/19 180/14 181/9 181/22 182/7 182/14 184/19 187/25 195/1 195/10 199/13 199/20 201/16 201/21 201/22 202/13 202/14 202/24 204/19 211/17 226/10 228/5 times [21] 10/9 14/20 20/7 20/17 21/6 21/8 53/21 54/14 54/16 54/19 54/19 54/21 159/17 161/5 161/11 161/14 165/13 168/24 181/1 189/22 213/20
title [2] 12/17 $16 / 25$
titles [1] 224/13
today [8] 76/1 107/15 180/21 182/21 $211 / 13$ 211/14 211/17 222/17
together [4] 40/9 167/19 195/13 206/21 told [24] 16/8 62/6 62/8 70/5 73/7 80/19 92/12 100/2 100/12 101/6 110/3 120/9 122/22 122/23 123/24 125/1 128/18 134/3 134/17 148/10 148/13 164/24 205/20 225/5 Tom [1] 4/7 tomorrow [2] 227/9 227/13 too [7] 77/16 104/14 136/13 147/16 147/19 195/24 $217 / 10$
took [5] 25/5 48/13 58/2 114/19 148/9 tool [1] $17 / 4$
tools [4] $17 / 1117 / 1418 / 919 / 8$
top [6] 29/6 34/3 34/13 34/14 41/12 124/6
topic [3] 11/10 21/4 219/21
topics [2] 14/2 32/25
torture [1] 127/3
total [5] 55/9 55/10 55/13 55/13 179/11 totality [2] 73/23 158/6
touched [4] 59/8 59/9 59/11 165/17
toward [1] 192/25

172/16 186/19
town [1] 204/13
trade [2] 12/3 12/7
traditional [1] 194/6
trained [5] 13/20 13/22 92/18 93/15 217/22
training [11] 5/16 13/21 38/5 153/24 155/3 187/7 194/1 194/4 196/23 200/15 218/2 trainings [1] 14/1
trait [18] 38/23 38/24 39/18 72/23 72/24
88/19 88/23 89/9 89/19 90/9 90/19 91/8 91/9 192/10 192/23 193/1 212/20 216/4 traits [7] 18/16 37/11 37/20 73/21 90/6 98/13 99/2
$\operatorname{tran}$ [1] 25/16
transcribed [1] 229/11
transcript [7] 2/2 24/4 63/24 64/17 110/5 229/8 229/12
transcription [1] 229/11
transcripts [1] 70/20
traumatic [1] 22/14
traveler's [2] 136/7 138/14
treatment [2] 7/25 11/18
tree [1] 86/22
trends [1] 13/8
trial [8] $1 / 420 / 2122 / 3109 / 21110 / 11$
170/25 174/7 180/23
trials [2] 10/23 10/25
tried [1] 216/11
trouble [4] 50/19 97/9 97/15 130/17
Trowbridge [8] 125/22 125/25 128/19 129/3 129/11 130/1 130/2 212/7
true [117] 19/5 21/15 21/18 23/4 28/21
31/10 32/2 49/11 50/6 59/20 63/11 67/17 72/6 77/20 78/13 79/4 79/11 79/12 79/13 81/1 81/20 82/1 83/6 83/23 83/24 88/8 88/25 89/2 90/2 92/8 92/9 92/22 93/24 94/17 96/9 97/13 97/14 98/1 98/6 98/16 104/23 105/8 105/19 106/7 106/9 106/14 107/6 107/18 107/22 108/3 108/4 108/12 108/16 109/8 109/12 109/19 109/20 110/8 110/15 112/19 112/20 114/4 114/7 114/8 115/7 124/1 125/14 127/22 129/15 131/22 132/2 132/3 132/9 132/15 133/14 134/4 134/24 140/3 140/7 140/9 140/17 140/18 140/18 140/25 142/5 142/12 144/1 144/15 144/23 147/8 147/9 148/6 148/19 149/6 149/8 155/20 157/3 159/8 160/13 161/13 161/17 163/14 163/19 164/3 164/9 165/7 165/12 165/24 $177 / 5186 / 5187 / 18195 / 11197 / 6214 / 18$ 223/24 225/12 229/12
true/false [2] 31/10 92/8
truly [1] 205/8
truth [2] 67/11 97/19 truthful [4] 69/18 92/24 106/24 106/25 truthfulness [3] 106/16 106/21 132/12 try [11] 22/15 60/19 77/21 110/24 130/24 137/2 168/12 196/19 198/6 205/10 205/17 trying [2] 104/14 205/23
Tuesday [2] 6/3 182/5
turn [5] 16/1 19/12 64/2 85/13 86/6
turning [1] 23/18
twelve [1] 128/15
twenty [2] 145/14 176/1
twenty-three [1] 176/1
twice [4] 21/6 116/22 187/25 205/23 two [73] 5/11 6/12 9/7 9/11 13/2 13/10 16/12 18/1 29/23 36/9 37/16 37/18 40/19 41/6 46/7 46/17 49/24 50/2 51/20 51/20 51/23 52/10 52/13 55/13 66/4 66/4 66/18 73/9 73/9 75/17 83/19 83/20 83/21 83/25 90/20 90/24 97/10 100/10 100/17 103/6 106/1 106/2 114/1 118/3 124/19 125/17 127/20 128/14 145/13
$1+$
two... [24] 147/24 151/25 152/1 181/21
182/6 184/3 184/3 184/17 185/11 188/5
188/6 201/3 201/3 203/8 207/15 207/19
207/19 207/20 207/20 209/8 211/7 220/24 226/3 226/3
two-and-a-half [1] 188/6
type [12] 10/10 21/4 21/20 23/5 28/19 74/8
74/21 101/13 141/14 160/25 173/15 215/14
types [8] 14/20 21/21 63/15 128/20 159/9
181/5 187/14 214/15
typical [2] 197/19 223/4
typically [4] $131 / 24197 / 4198 / 7$ 202/10

## $\mathbf{U}$

uh [608]
Uh-huh [1] 223/18
ultimate [5] 88/24 100/4 113/11 120/22
169/23
ultimately [1] $\mathbf{1 3 2 / 1 1}$
um [284]
Um-hmm [4] 207/17 209/9 213/10 219/22
un [2] 34/5 102/4
unable [1] $190 / 17$
unchallenged [1] 171/25
unclaiming [1] 171/13
uncomfortable [2] 27/4 190/8
under [19] 44/21 45/4 45/12 52/23 60/21
66/13 81/14 81/14 84/18 84/25 98/22 99/1
109/25 110/18 175/24 175/25 184/25 185/2
214/10
underestimate [1] 93/12
Undergraduate [1] 178/7
underlines [1] 189/15
undermine [1] 88/6
understand [27] 44/16 46/2 46/10 60/9
81/25 98/2 105/21 110/22 122/7 126/8
130/22 133/6 134/12 134/16 136/1 138/6
138/10 146/8 146/11 147/1 171/22 172/14
193/20 204/11 213/11 221/18 224/20
understanding [10] 15/17 85/1 130/13
154/13 167/12 171/11 173/1 190/3 213/1 225/4
understands [4] 85/24 94/12 106/15 135/3
understood [5] 77/12 136/17 137/21 154/10 185/16
unethical [1] 222/2
unfinished [1] 175/21
unfortunately [1] 38/12
unhappy [1] 102/4
uninvolved [1] 50/16
unique [1] 107/25
United [2] 29/19 200/19
universally [1] 131/25
universities [1] 180/20
university [18] 5/5 5/7 5/9 5/12 6/7 8/25
29/15 37/6 94/20 96/12 178/9 178/10 178/19
178/23 180/10 192/17 194/18 196/25
unjustified [1] 206/6
unless [2] $46 / 4$ 130/19
unmarked [1] 198/24
unprofessionally [1] 26/19
unquote [2] 15/12 84/17
until [17] 5/19 5/23 6/18 8/19 8/21 10/18
67/24 76/7 113/18 149/14 158/22 178/17
179/10 188/7 209/3 209/21 226/13
unusual [6] 76/23 77/2 160/3 162/17 202/15
218/14
unwielding [1] $58 / 1$
unwieldy [2] $152 / 18$ 152/21
up [48] 8/19 8/21 10/18 14/4 16/11 22/15
26/10 27/3 29/24 30/18 53/5 55/10 65/9 80/7

114/10 114/16 120/10 121/10 121/10 124/22 124/22 126/2 126/23 136/4 150/25 154/16 156/19 156/22 158/22 161/2 163/17 167/8 186/25 188/7 198/20 204/9 204/13 206/15 209/21 212/18 $217 / 19$ upon [21] 17/2 55/22 59/8 59/9 59/11 75/12 77/23 78/2 82/8 120/17 147/11 154/16 155/2 161/16 194/15 200/24 207/3 216/9 218/1 218/19 228/2
upper [2] 138/5 138/10
us [16] 20/6 24/18 68/10 68/10 68/15 68/17
97/21 104/2 124/5 135/12 135/24 139/18 178/2 190/23 201/11 207/7
use [26] 27/14 27/17 28/1 38/7 44/19 44/20
57/18 57/21 147/7 159/9 159/11 159/14 160/17 164/7 167/2 $177 / 5190 / 19197 / 16$ 198/18 215/13 215/16 215/19 216/6 216/9 217/3 218/14
used [40] 15/23 19/2 29/25 31/10 31/15 42/10 42/15 44/6 44/17 44/17 44/18 56/18 56/18 57/14 89/10 90/15 91/23 94/19 118/7 144/1 144/2 146/1 158/7 183/18 183/23 184/5 186/9 188/15 188/23 189/19 192/14 195/17 196/22 198/4 198/9 203/22 203/22 204/3 214/22 225/3
useful [1] $159 / 13$
user [1] 215/7
uses [2] 198/7 203/25
using [7] 43/18 46/20 62/4 70/11 159/18 215/22 215/23
usually [6] 51/1 103/8 103/9 104/7 197/22 220/14
utility [1] $217 / 5$

## V

vague [2] 20/19 191/22
valid [5] 26/10 31/16 32/18 74/4 158/17 validate [1] 39/22
validation [2] 202/6 202/16
validity [9] 31/15 32/17 93/2 93/7 103/9
197/18 199/15 202/22 202/25
value [3] 83/11 104/15 $119 / 19$
variables [1] 158/18
variety [11] 5/14 13/4 14/2 14/10 26/6 74/6
91/12 158/12 179/4 181/4 195/7
various [6] 14/20 92/13 93/15 160/24 194/8 217/19
vary [2] 184/23 186/9
vegetative [1] 102/1
ventured [1] 174/1
verbal [9] 86/14 86/17 87/11 87/17 88/11
184/3 184/9 184/18 189/12
version [10] 29/9 83/16 91/14 91/16 132/4
136/13 168/11 184/13 193/22 197/17
versus [6] 21/21 37/17 46/17 113/10 126/19 163/10
very [39] 13/19 21/16 $26 / 25$ 27/4 38/7 39/9
50/25 53/24 56/25 62/25 67/6 80/8 86/7
91/25 113/9 116/25 117/4 127/18 135/13
135/13 149/10 152/18 166/19 170/6 170/19
180/16 181/1 181/21 182/24 191/3 192/1
196/14 202/15 205/10 205/17 207/2 207/8
207/10 218/8
via [1] 57/25
victim [1] 104/9
victim's [1] 123/16
victims [1] 24/8
video [7] 24/6 63/24 112/21 160/8 160/21 161/18 165/11
videotape [2] 120/1 127/24
videotaped [2] 25/11 110/4
videotapes [2] 24/16 24/17
viewed [2] 24/6 24/9
vigilant [1] 77/14
violation [2] 96/12 152/20
violence [2] 126/22 127/15
violent [2] 11/16 126/2
virtually [3] 189/15 196/13 198/4
Vitae [8] 8/8 8/14 173/3 187/2 187/4 207/16 209/5 $210 / 9$
vocational [1] 173/10
voluntary [2] 129/4 130/19
vulgar [1] 104/12
vulnerability [7] 58/8 58/19 59/6 82/7 82/13
100/5 113/15
vuinerable [13] 17/8 18/12 20/4 20/9 37/23
51/5 55/19 56/1 106/6 106/20 111/4 123/25 206/25
W
walked [1] 65/19
walking [1] 142/20
Walstad [1] 174/8
want [28] 8/4 25/1 27/13 28/1 28/25 29/3
32/23 33/15 34/7 40/13 43/3 50/17 53/19
70/23 76/21 92/1 98/23 101/19 101/20
105/21 109/13 125/10 135/20 148/13 150/25
158/10 168/10 218/20
wanted [11] 33/13 39/5 42/25 49/25 50/1
58/3 83/10 84/2 149/19 164/24 194/20
wanting [1] $19 / 18$
wants [2] 77/18 112/2
warmth [1] 190/10
was [335]
Washington [2] 5/7 210/7
wasn't [20] 30/18 38/12 99/16 102/14 111/7
111/8 111/13 111/22 112/9 136/20 137/7
140/13 141/20 144/9 150/5 162/17 171/10
199/24 221/17 223/12
watch [4] $111 / 5$ 111/9 111/22 $112 / 10$
watched [1] 111/1
watching [3] 110/16 110/20 112/21
Wausau [1] $80 / 7$
way [36] 22/9 22/13 32/5 38/20 39/22 43/15
55/9 58/22 60/3 61/17 88/9 90/13 91/3 93/25
96/5 109/2 109/16 110/12 110/16 112/3
113/1 113/13 115/8 123/8 127/3 128/17
134/1 137/23 139/4 142/4 179/20 186/24
196/10 201/13 218/21 220/19
ways [3] 39/1 160/25 190/1
we [79] 20/20 20/21 24/17 36/5 44/25 62/11
62/12 62/13 62/14 64/11 64/13 65/10 65/10
67/7 67/9 68/14 68/14 68/17 68/17 69/14
69/16 69/16 69/19 85/3 89/22 94/2 96/3
107/3 108/1 125/8 125/8 125/8 126/23 127/8
$137 / 9$ 149/21 167/7 167/17 168/11 168/14
170/7 172/24 176/1 $177 / 4177 / 5$ 177/8
181/12 182/11 182/18 184/8 185/8 185/10
185/10 186/5 186/24 186/24 188/20 189/20
189/21 190/8 193/17 195/12 197/1 197/6
199/4 199/6 199/8 204/23 205/12 205/21
206/7 206/10 206/10 209/11 212/9 226/18
227/7 227/7 227/22
we'd [2] 172/22 226/8
we'll [18] 40/15 47/19 47/19 52/2 76/7
168/14 185/9 192/8 203/4 209/4 226/12
226/13 227/19 227/24 227/24 228/2 228/2 $228 / 5$
we're[13] 17/19 32/5 44/1 78/11 126/18
132/12 132/13 141/1 149/13 191/19 225/1 227/6 228/8
we've [4] 56/16 166/23 172/17 173/25
weakens [1] 62/21
wearing [7] 140/13 140/14 140/19 140/20
"
wearing... [3] 141/8 141/10 141/20 web [2] 22/24 23/4
Wechsler [40] 40/20 40/21 40/23 41/1 41/24 42/6 42/12 42/18 43/1 43/11 43/15 44/9 44/17 45/3 45/7 45/14 45/17 45/18 45/23 $46 / 8$ 46/17 46/23 47/16 47/20 47/22 48/11 49/2 81/4 81/9 81/14 81/15 82/19 82/24 83/15 183/13 183/20 185/25 186/2 203/23 213/6
Wechsler's [1] 81/20
Wechsler-Bellevue [1] $40 / 23$
week [7] 7/5 13/2 51/25 52/1 182/6 182/17 $188 / 6$
weekly [1] 22/25
weeks [5] 181/10 181/21 182/6 201/3 203/8 welcome [2] 149/12 150/21
well [127] 6/11 7/13 12/12 12/22 13/10 14/2 15/16 15/24 19/10 20/17 21/23 24/9 24/19 25/7 25/14 25/20 26/5 26/7 26/8 27/21 28/3 28/15 29/23 30/6 30/6 31/10 31/25 32/13 33/9 35/11 37/3 38/12 39/5 40/5 40/19 41/1 43/23 44/25 46/12 48/1 48/18 52/25 55/23 57/18 59/14 60/5 61/13 61/21 62/5 66/20
70/20 71/19 72/23 73/1 80/19 80/20 80/20 85/3 86/18 87/13 87/13 93/23 97/12 97/23 98/4 98/4 98/11 98/21 103/8 104/3 104/7 105/4 113/7 115/19 117/13 117/22 121/4 126/23 129/1 131/21 134/19 135/1 135/25 136/13 136/15 145/17 147/3 152/21 153/22 155/3 158/21 158/22 158/25 159/7 159/10 161/2 164/10 168/23 172/6 178/7 179/25 180/9 183/18 185/14 186/20 187/2 187/22 190/22 191/25 194/17 196/7 196/16 197/18 199/18 203/12 205/23 208/10 211/25 213/7 213/14 215/19 218/15 219/20 220/1 220/16 224/6 224/17
well-accepted [1] 158/21
well-being [1] 196/16
well-known [1] 203/12
well-respected [2] 30/6 218/15
went [7] 16/16 102/14 121/22 147/16 147/19 147/19 200/15
were [114] 8/17 $16 / 4$ 18/25 22/19 23/7 24/3
25/16 31/11 32/9 32/12 32/1632/19 32/20
32/24 33/3 33/7 33/14 34/8 34/9 39/20 42/22
50/2 50/7 50/10 54/20 55/7 55/24 58/5 62/5
62/8 62/8 63/7 67/12 67/15 69/4 70/9 71/19
74/23 74/24 75/7 75/7 75/7 75/18 75/23 93/1 94/13 95/1 96/1 96/5 99/6 102/7 102/10
102/15 102/17 102/17 103/21 110/10 111/10 116/13 119/21 120/2 120/8 120/12 121/2 122/14 122/21 124/20 128/18 131/15 139/21 147/6 150/2 152/4 153/9 156/13 157/23 159/21 159/22 159/22 159/23 161/1 161/1 161/21 163/10 165/8 165/22 169/17 175/23 175/24 182/15 182/22 184/15 184/18 185/16 188/3 189/4 189/4 190/2 192/4 195/1 195/19 195/25 196/3 197/2 198/1 198/2 198/23 203/15 208/19 210/21 212/24 213/5 216/17 222/1
weren't [8] 62/14 95/3 113/17 153/10 155/14 157/24 176/1 221/18
what [235]
what's [18] 8/13 11/22 16/8 35/9 37/8 44/18 $46 / 4$ 46/6 82/23 92/7 93/25 108/20 140/10 140/15 $156 / 8157 / 12186 / 3191 / 4$ whatever [10] 33/21 86/22 99/3 158/19 173/18 183/10 208/10 212/13 218/2 228/3 when [106] 9/16 9/19 13/15 14/13 14/21 15/21 16/4 21/24 22/17 24/7 24/8 24/15 27/2 30/25 49/13 52/11 52/17 54/1 54/20 55/7

65/10 65/14 65/19 66/12 71/9 71/11 71/12 72/7 72/8 72/17 72/20 73/23 74/9 75/6 75/7 80/1 80/10 92/5 92/6 92/23 94/1 96/18 96/22 97/18 98/4 98/8 100/21 103/3 103/3 103/11 104/2 104/2 104/4 104/14 113/12 125/1 128/19 129/18 131/22 133/12 133/22 136/4 136/12 137/22 138/13 141/18 141/23 141/24 144/23 147/5 148/10 153/22 155/4 155/24 156/6 159/17 160/20 162/3 164/21 164/23 165/8 165/14 172/22 182/15 186/9 190/20 191/24 196/5 197/4 199/10 201/19 201/20 202/1 203/15 203/21 205/22 214/14 214/19 where [37] 5/18 5/18 6/1 6/1 10/17 11/22 45/22 51/23 53/15 64/21 65/1 65/4 65/16 67/4 86/19 102/8 102/15 103/21 112/18 112/23 120/16 124/11 130/15 137/23 138/1 138/5 139/15 151/7 155/25 156/15 157/19 166/13 185/24 187/13 195/17 208/5 209/10 wherein [1] 121/11
whether [95] 9/13 11/24 15/19 17/6 18/10 18/22 19/16 20/3 20/9 23/14 31/16 31/17 37/22 50/9 51/4 53/7 55/19 55/25 59/20 62/5 62/5 62/7 63/3 65/8 65/10 72/24 73/23 75/13 76/24 77/7 78/5 93/4 96/24 96/25 98/14 102/7 107/1 108/11 108/23 109/18 110/13 111/1 115/2 117/25 118/21 119/17 123/13 124/11 129/14 133/3 136/16 137/21 138/9 139/20 143/6 143/9 144/3 147/6 148/8 151/1 152/8 153/11 154/19 155/8 155/16 157/25 160/17 162/9 163/14 164/6 165/3 169/4 169/4 169/7 170/16 170/17 171/7 171/17 171/19 171/24 173/16 174/24 175/23 182/11 187/15 195/22 195/23 202/12 203/2 203/6 204/21 204/23 213/24 220/12 222/23 which [74] 7/14 7/22 15/20 16/22 29/12 29/24 30/11 31/10 31/12 38/19 38/25 42/2 42/5 43/7 43/19 47/4 49/16 52/8 52/19 54/8 58/22 61/17 78/12 81/25 84/15 87/19 90/13 91/7 94/2 97/19 99/9 100/12 103/5 125/4 126/11 126/14 126/20 126/21 134/8 136/6 144/2 147/13 159/23 161/24 161/25 169/14 180/4 180/9 183/21 185/2 185/17 186/9 188/20 189/18 192/6 192/23 193/18 194/21 195/2 195/10 195/13 195/20 196/21 197/25 204/1 204/5 207/18 211/3 213/19 214/8 214/11 217/12 220/20 224/8 while [2] 118/8 188/2
Whitewater [1] $8 / 25$
who [60] 15/9 15/24 28/5 29/18 29/22 33/18 34/19 35/6 35/6 35/7 36/9 36/15 37/24 41/16 43/7 51/8 56/1 68/20 71/7 72/12 74/7 80/13 80/16 86/4 88/2 96/20 106/5 106/6 106/11 116/10 119/20 129/7 134/9 148/1 148/5 148/9 151/3 156/19 156/19 165/22 167/22 171/20 188/24 189/25 190/7 192/16 194/20 195/3 195/4 195/5 196/7 204/13 205/7 210/21 211/4 211/8 213/15 215/12 218/8 $218 / 16$
who's [1] 28/11
whole [4] 64/24 135/20 139/2 184/7
whom [2] 36/12 36/13
whose [2] $148 / 12148 / 12$
why [44] 13/7 19/6 21/1 21/19 24/22 26/3
30/4 31/24 33/7 33/12 39/3 41/15 44/13 44/13 44/20 49/24 59/14 63/2 69/7 74/1 83/25 91/5 91/8 91/20 92/4 111/19 117/24 118/13 122/16 129/14 152/16 153/10 153/21 157/19 158/10 160/14 176/4 176/14 178/16 201/25 205/10 205/21 225/4 225/5 wide [1] 144/20 widely [5] 29/25 183/23 193/18 203/22 218/8

69/14 69/1669/19 70/3
wife [2] 12/22 109/12
will [35] 6/1 6/3 7/4 23/14 62/16 62/23 78/18 85/22 85/25 103/6 117/12 117/25 127/24
168/21 169/22 170/5 170/22 171/3 171/20
177/16 178/4 185/24 187/10 202/3 202/4
202/13 210/18 220/21 224/21 225/1 227/8
227/9 227/10 227/22 228/3
Williams [1] 218/6
willing [1] 181/19
Winnebago [9] 179/6 179/10 180/18 $210 / 13$ 210/15 210/20 210/25 211/6 211/11
WISCONSIN [23] $1 / 11 / 31 / 141 / 161 / 18$ 4/3 5/12 7/16 7/19 8/25 79/16 80/13 80/24 151/3 $179 / 5179 / 15180 / 15180 / 24183 / 16$ 204/14 209/12 229/1 229/6
Wisconsin-Whitewater [1] 8/25
wish [2] 29/2 175/12
wished [1] 168/19
withdraw [1] 216/2
withdrawal [2] 35/17 71/23
withdrawn [4] 19/17 35/7 190/7 190/22
withheld [1] 133/17
withhold [1] 44/3
within [30] 32/1633/3 50/24 57/20 71/24 71/24 71/24 76/2 78/16 81/11 82/12 86/11 99/24 128/5 128/14 140/7 144/22 171/18 181/10 186/2 186/5 187/24 188/4 188/16 191/14 191/16 $193 / 5196 / 15$ 196/17 210/19 without [6] 41/9 46/20 55/8 119/13 119/14 222/3
witness [20] 3/9 4/16 25/1 25/4 31/5 42/4 43/5 46/4 47/21 79/24 95/18 112/6 149/12 174/15 177/19 180/25 186/25 215/25 221/13 223/15
witnesses [4] 3/2 167/5 226/17 226/20 woman [6] $137 / 22139 / 7140 / 13142 / 14$ 204/7 205/5
won't [9] 28/15 28/15 70/18 78/10 78/10 154/1 194/25 217/11 217/11
wondering [1] 102/22
word [11] 8/10 116/3 116/5 132/20 138/17
138/19 138/22 162/24 163/9 164/8 197/16 words [25] 34/8 35/19 52/8 75/6 77/15 83/3 85/17 92/14 98/13 101/12 108/15 112/25 113/12 115/24 123/16 131/24 133/22 139/12 141/4 142/6 148/4 178/13 189/12 198/3 218/4
work [19] $6 / 8 \quad 7 / 2$ 23/15 74/8 80/2 80/11 114/2 125/12 125/22 134/12 179/9 180/11 180/16 187/14 200/19 208/4 210/3 216/7 220/21
workbook [1] 11/18
worked [1] $6 / 12$
worker [1] 194/22
workers [1] 14/9
working [2] 6/1 187/14
works [4] 126/12 128/19 194/12 209/24
workshops [3] 5/15 5/17 12/24
world [2] 36/17 114/24
worry [1] 195/7
worth [3] 73/9 136/7 138/14
worthy [2] 11/25 78/6
would [188] $10 / 1412 / 5 \quad 16 / 2318 / 919 / 12$
19/13 23/9 27/16 27/19 27/22 28/3 28/8
30/11 30/12 30/14 31/12 31/19 33/24 34/19 34/20 34/23 35/20 36/6 36/10 36/11 37/10 37/10 39/10 40/5 40/8 40/8 40/12 41/8 41/16 41/17 43/17 43/17 43/18 43/21 44/19 44/19 47/16 47/17 49/4 49/22 51/1 51/7 51/10 52/9 52/9 54/18 54/18 54/20 55/1 55/2 55/11 55/13 55/14 55/16 56/20 56/20 56/23 58/12

|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| would... [125] 60/9 62/7 64/4 70/19 73/3 | yield [29] 52/13 52/15 52/17 54/5 54/8 54/11 |
| 73/20 79/18 82/3 84/5 84/24 86/25 91/11 | 54/12 54/18 55/2 55/10 61/24 63/10 |
| 91/12 91/20 95/20 97/9 97/14 105/8 106/8 | 67/1 67/13 69/3 70/15 87/6 140/22 142/17 |
| 107/23 110/22 111/1 113/7 115/8 115/20 | 147/13 160/24 161/2 161/20 161/24 163/8 |
| 116/14 118/7 118/19 119/19 122/22 122/23 | 163/13 166/5 166/9 |
| 123/15 123/17 123/19 126/5 130/19 132/25 | yielding [3] 54/13 55/15 140/23 |
| 133/4 137/16 140/23 141/21 143/21 144/14 | yields [2] 70/10 87/6 |
| 147/20 147/22 147/25 150/2 151/10 152/17 | York [1] 57/24 |
| 152/18 152/20 152/22 152/24 153/2 153/2 | you [930] |
| 153/5 154/4 154/4 154/5 156/10 158/25 | you'd [13] 25/13 41/12 80/24 85/13 86/6 |
| 159/25 164/9 164/10 164/11 164/13 164/15 | 112/8 114/22 126/12 129/22 135/18 135/23 |
| 166/22 167/20 167/21 168/9 168/10 176/1 | 147/14 208/15 |
| 178/15 180/4 180/11 181/18 181/20 182/1 | you'll [2] 89/7 114/17 |
| 182/2 182/4 182/11 185/21 186/3 193/19 | you're [59] 8/14 11/2 15/1 15/3 15/4 17/23 |
| 195/20 197/4 197/10 201/3 204/12 205/10 | 23/18 24/20 28/11 28/20 50/22 51/1 62/13 |
| 205/19 205/22 207/4 207/5 $207 / 6$ 208/10 | 62/14 64/19 66/12 70/15 79/14 82/21 85/14 |
| 208/12 210/3 212/10 215/3 215/6 215/9 | 85/15 85/24 87/3 88/20 89/6 91/3 98/24 |
| 215/10 215/10 215/18 216/15 220/7 220/9 | 105/9 106/16 109/10 111/8 111/21 125/12 |
| 220/12 220/22 221/4 221/4 221/13 221/23 | 125/22 126/15 127/21 129/8 131/14 132/17 |
| 221/25 222/2 222/5 222/24 223/5 223/15 | $137 / 9$ 138/20 141/23 144/5 145/20 145/25 |
| 224/2 224/10 224/18 225/7 | 146/17 146/23 149/12 150/21 151/2 178/2 |
| wouldn't [24] 11/3 28/6 28/18 51/3 51/6 | 179/17 202/25 203/1 207/20 208/23 215/16 |
| 57/4 57/4 58/15 62/15 80/25 92/1 92/3 105/4 | 216/3 219/16 |
| 105/6 105/14 115/20 116/14 126/13 129/23 | you've [33] 9/9 10/9 13/21 14/19 14/21 17/4 |
| 142/22 143/1 143/13 147/15 174/1 | 21/13 40/5 42/14 54/4 57/6 74/9 79/9 80/19 |
| wrap [1] 206/15 | 85/9 96/15 110/19 112/15 122/2 134/25 |
| write [2] 137/3 137/3 | $157 / 8158 / 7159 / 5159 / 5159 / 17177 / 9$ |
| writing [4] 78/7 89/12 198/22 199/1 | 181/16 193/14 200/7 216/8 220/6 222/13 |
| written [15] 12/2 16/21 25/4 48/12 48/15 | 223/20 |
| 61/21 63/3 89/3 99/7 110/5 115/17 174/19 | young [5] 91/6 105/12 190/6 193/12 194/2 |
| 183/1 206/18 $217 / 8$ | your [175] 4/19 4/19 5/2 7/12 8/6 13/22 |
| wrong [8] 67/10 89/25 113/20 141/19 205/20 | 17/14 21/1 22/17 22/22 23/3 23/6 23/9 23/9 |
| 215/23 223/2 225/5 | 24/22 26/13 28/17 28/23 30/5 31/20 33/8 |
| wrongdoing [1] 15/21 | 34/8 34/12 35/4 36/19 38/24 39/19 40/11 |
| wrote[4] 15/25 75/19 80/3 137/2 | 43/4 49/19 50/9 51/16 53/14 55/18 56/11 |
| $\mathbf{Y}$ | 57/20 57/24 58/5 58/5 58/12 58/18 61/20 |
| ya [1] 65/13 | 74/9 75/15 75/22 75/25 76/1 76/21 77/22 |
| yeah [7] 122/19 122/24 134/4 144/11 175/6 | 78/10 78/11 78/16 78/18 79/7 79/13 81/10 |
| 175/8 175/10 | 81/22 82/19 83/1 84/14 85/1 85/2 85/5 85/9 |
| year [G] 5/8 58/2 197/4 210/20 211/2 213/20 | 85/13 88/9 88/9 88/13 88/21 88/24 89/3 |
| years [18] 6/12 7/1 7/15 23/16 37/5 103/19 | 89/16 90/14 91/7 95/16 97/4 99/7 99/20 |
| 115/13 179/8 179/11 180/9 187/24 188/7 | 99/24 100/16 101/2 101/12 102/7 103/4 |
| 188/16 194/1 209/3 210/12 211/7 217/2 | 103/13 103/19 103/23 104/5 105/22 107/11 |
| Yep [1] 129/24 | 107/15 108/20 110/13 110/21 112/15 113/3 |
| yes [166] $4 / 12$ 8/11 8/16 8/22 10/8 11/6 11/9 | 113/6 113/10 113/14 119/5 120/19 120/22 |
| 15/13 18/13 20/5 20/15 23/1 24/24 25/12 | 121/17 121/23 123/10 125/12 128/9 128/24 |
| 25/23 28/25 32/11 33/6 34/11 35/25 36/3 | 128/24 128/24 131/10 137/9 138/14 138/15 |
| 40/1 40/17 42/19 44/8 45/11 45/15 46/19 | 141/4 141/5 142/1 143/4 143/13 145/10 |
| 49/8 50/3 51/13 51/17 52/5 53/8 54/3 55/21 | 148/13 149/4 149/5 151/10 151/11 154/13 |
| 56/2 56/5 57/9 58/15 59/7 60/11 60/17 60/24 | 155/1 155/2 $157 / 5157 / 9157 / 10157 / 20$ |
| 61/21 62/1 63/17 64/1 65/12 66/6 67/2 67/5 | 158/3 158/11 159/14 159/21 160/1 160/11 |
| 67/23 68/7 69/12 70/17 71/3 71/18 72/5 | 160/22 161/5 162/4 162/12 162/12 163/23 |
| 72/10 72/19 72/22 73/5 74/22 76/4 78/1 | 164/11 177/17 177/22 177/22 181/24 183/15 |
| 78/20 82/10 85/12 86/10 89/13 90/12 96/17 | $186 / 25187 / 19$ 198/20 207/3 207/16 208/7 |
| 98/19 99/16 99/19 99/23 100/6 103/16 | 209/4 210/9 210/9 211/13 213/11 215/5 |
| 103/24 106/4 107/8 113/2 120/11 120/13 | 221/5 221/9 221/20 222/19 223/22 |
| 121/13 121/14 121/19 122/13 122/21 123/21 | yourself [4] 12/20 77/1781/16 159/1 |
| 125/15 125/23 126/9 $127 / 8127 / 16128 / 8$ | yourselves [1] $227 / 14$ |
| 128/10 129/10 131/13 133/1 133/19 135/2 | Z |
| 135/15 136/10 136/25 137/8 139/5 142/3 |  |
| 142/21 147/23 148/7 148/20 151/9 151/13 | zero [1] 94/5 |
| 152/7 154/15 155/6 159/16 161/19 164/18 |  |
| 165/16 165/18 167/16 177/11 177/13 179/19 |  |
| 181/1 181/14 183/4 184/17 $189 / 8189 / 14$ |  |
| 191/7 191/15 193/25 197/15 201/10 202/7 |  |
| 207/1 207/17 208/18 208/22 209/13 209/20 |  |
| 209/23 210/1 210/11 210/14 210/18 211/20 |  |
| 212/12 213/1 213/8 213/24 214/4 214/18 |  |
| 215/21 219/19 219/22 220/1 220/9 222/18 |  |
| 223/24 225/12 226/25 |  |

