**Verbal Deceptive Analysis of Amanda Knox During Her Interview With CNN’s Chris Cuomo, May 2, 2014**

Amanda Knox; accused, jailed, and acquitted for murdering Meredith Kercher on the evening of November 1, 2007, while both were studying abroad in Perugia, Italy. During this CNN interview between Chris Cuomo and Amanda Knox, published on May 2, 2014 on YouTube, Amanda Knox continues to defend herself against accusations that she murdered Meredith Kercher. Knox answered Chris Cuomo’s questions slowly and methodologically, even six years after Meredith’s murder. Although you can see her struggling to carefully choose her words to plea her innocence, the words she used actually tell a different story.

**TEST YOUR VERBAL DECEPTIVE ANALYSIS SKILLS**

This is a transcription of Amanda Knox’s answers: (‘CC’ is Chris Cuomo, ‘AK’ is Amanda Knox.)

**CC:** *“Why do you think that this judge goes further than any other, that not only does he say that this is the knife, not only does he say that you had it because of DNA around the bottom of the blade and the hilt, but that he believes you are the one who actually killed Meredith Kercher.”*

**AK**: *(Deep sigh and smile) I believe, I mean I can’t speculate what this judge’s motivations are personal motivations or otherwise, what I can say is that as this case has progressed…the evidence that the prosecution claims exists against me has been, has been proven less and less and less, and, all that has happened is that they filled these holes with speculation. My DNA, m…, any trace of me is not there. When you’re talking about traces of me that they attribute to be, to the crime scene, they’re talking about my DNA in my own bathroom, or my footstreps (word slip on her part) that tested negative for blood that had my DNA and Meredith’s DNA on the floor between our bedrooms and the bathroom, well of course our DNA was there, we lived there for a month it was there, it tested negative for blood, so it wasn’t blood, and so it’s irrelevant to the crime, but we are talking about the crime that happened in Meredith’s bedroom and there is no trace of us. If Rudy Guede committed this crime, which he did, we know that because his DNA is there, on the… on Meredith’s body around Meredith’s body, his hand prints and foot prints in her blood, none of that exists for me, and if I were there, I would have had traces of Meredith's broken body on me. And I would have left traces of myself around -- around Meredith's corpse. And I -- I am not there. And that proves my innocence. I--, I did not kill my friend, I did not wield a knife, I had no reason to, I—I was—in the month that we were living together we were becoming friends, a week before the murder occurred we went out to a classical music concert together, like-- we had never fought, and the idea, I mean, he’s brought up lots of things, crazy motives...”*

First, before any analysis can be done, I want you to know that it is crucial to understand three very important things when detecting deception; they are the *Baseline, Clusters and Context*. I call it the ‘rule of three’ when detecting deception. If you do not baseline a person’s normal verbal and non-verbal behavior, look for clusters of deceptive indicators (not just one) and consider the context in which these indicators are observed (is the person nervous, in shock, in pain, sick, etc…), you will fall victim to thinking you are a mind reader and inaccurately assess deception in truthful people.

That being said, seeing as though I cannot conduct my own interview on Amanda Knox to baseline her behavior, I watched numerous interviews with her to get a sense of how she speaks, her tone, pitch, words, and how she uses her body language and gestures. As I listened to this interview, in particularly, what immediately caught my attention were her long pauses in her speech pattern. These pauses happen for one reason and that is when person has to think about what and how to say something. Does it mean they are being deceptive? Not necessarily, but it *could* mean they are being deceptive, and usually is a good indicator of deception. Although this is a verbal “hot spot” we need to look for “clusters” of deceptive tells, not just long pauses. Two other things that caught my attention were her word slips as well as her broken speech.

Let’s get into analyzing her words in her response to Chris Cuomo’s question below.

**Here is my verbal analysis of Amanda Knox’s statements made during this interview.**

*\*Please note, I will write “could be” and “may indicate” because I cannot say with absolute certainty that she lied, although with all of the indicators I will reference, I do think she was lying. However, I don’t know if she killed Meredith, my professional opinion is that she knows more than she has admitted to.*

**AK**: *(Deep sigh and smile) [A deep sigh could indicate stress, the smile could be what is called “dupers delight,” a term coined by Dr. Paul Ekman, the smile people leak when they secretly feel pleasure in manipulating someone or when the feel they are getting away with a lie] I believe, (uncertainty) I mean I can’t speculate (she just negated her previous statement, “I believe”) what this judge’s motivations are personal motivations or otherwise, what I can say [people will say this when there is something the cannot say, keep in mind, if the information they cannot say is not known, they may be truth-telling] is that as this case has progressed…[pause, thinking of what to say next or how to say it] the evidence that the prosecution claims exists against me has been, has been [double talk] proven less and less and less, and, …[pause, thinking of what to say next or how to say it] all that has happened is that they [first, this is too wordy and confusing, liars will typically use more words than necessary, and second, who is they? sometimes liars use a lot of pronouns] filled these holes with speculation. My DNA, m— [word start/stop, when people go to say one thing then change it] any trace of me [too wordy and she softened “DNA” to “trace, however she uses ‘trace’ throughout, she should have said “My DNA wasn’t on Meredith’s body”] is [present tense, should be past tense] not there [“there” which is vague instead of the saying in the room, on her body, etc.]. When you’re [again, who is “you are,” vague pronoun usage] talking about traces of me [should be my DNA, however, the fact that she uses ‘me’ could indicate a thought process that as she is remembering that night she is worried about traces – or evidence – that would tie her there to the crime scene, not her DNA] that they attribute to be, [word start/stop] to the crime scene, they’re [vague pronoun usage] talking about my DNA in my own bathroom, or my footstreps (word slip on her part) [she meant to say footsteps but tripped over her word] that tested negative for blood [confusing, bloody footprints testing negative for blood doesn’t make sense] that had my DNA and Meredith’s DNA on the floor between our bedrooms and the [she distances herself from the bathroom, she refers to the bedrooms as “our” but the bathroom is “the”] bathroom, well of course our DNA was there, we lived there for a month it was there, it [vague] tested negative for blood, so it [vague, also the pitch of her voice is raised] wasn’t blood, and so it’s irrelevant to the crime, but [coordinating conjunction that negates everything that comes before it] we [vague pronoun usage] are talking about the crime that happened in Meredith’s bedroom and there is [present verb tense, should be ‘was’] no trace of us [who is ‘us?’ up until now she was only referring to herself, she could be referring to her and her boyfriend at the time, Raffelo]. If [conditional clause] Rudy Guede committed this crime [softening language, we would expect to hear ‘if Rudy Guede killed Meredith’], which he did [she just said “if” he did now she changes her story to say he did with conviction], we [vague pronoun usage] know that because his DNA is there, on the…[pause, thinking of what to say or how to say it] on Meredith’s body around Meredith’s body, his hand prints and foot prints in her blood, none of that exists for me [too wordy, should have said, “mine aren’t there’ or something to that affect], and if [conditional clause] I were there, I would have had traces of Meredith's broken [Meredith’s body was stabbed and her throat slit, there were no broken bones in her body, this is a prime example of softening language] body on me. And I would have left traces of myself around -- …[pause, thinking of what to say or how to say it] around Meredith's corpse [odd word choice, possibly formalizing language]. And I --[word start/stop] I am [present verb tense, should be ‘was’ and a non-contracted denial] not there. And that proves my innocence [what does, that fact that she says she is not there?]. I--, --[word start/stop] I did not [non-contracted denial] kill my friend [distancing language, she should have said “Meredith”], I did not [non-contracted denial] wield [odd word choice, perhaps formalizing language] a knife, I had no reason to [I call this ‘fluff,’ information that doesn’t need to be there but liars often times add information to try to convince others of their lie], I—I [word start/stop] was—in [word start/stop] the month that we were living together we were becoming friends [‘were becoming friends’ tells me they were not friends], a week before the murder occurred we went out to a classical music concert together [smokescreen], like-- [word start/stop] we had [extra word usage] never fought, and the idea, [break in thought process] I mean, [break in thought process] he’s brought up lots of things, crazy motives...”*

--------------------------------------------------------

How did you do? If you want to learn what all of this means, and want to be able to develop your verbal analysis deception skills, then take our courses! We will teach you dozens of verbal indicators of deception and most importantly, what to do next when you discover deception. How do you get the truth?