



COURSE UNIT (MODULE) DESCRIPTION

Course unit (module) title	Code
Forensic Linguistics / Teismo lingvistika	

Lecturer(s)	Department(s) where the course unit (module) is delivered
Coordinator: assoc. prof. dr. Justina Urbonaitė	Department of English Philology Faculty of Philology

Study cycle	Type of the course unit (module)
2 nd (MA)	Optional

Mode of delivery	The period when the course unit (module) is delivered	Language(s) of instruction
Face-to-face	Autumn semester	English

Requirements for students	
Prerequisites: Prior knowledge of linguistics (e.g. a BA level course in introductory linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, etc.)	Additional requirements (if any): Proficient English (C1)

Course (module) volume in credits	Total student workload	Contact hours	Self-study hours
5	150	32	118

Purpose of the course unit (module): programme competences to be developed
<p>Purposes of the course unit</p> <p>The course provides an overview of forensic linguistics, focusing on the relationship between language and the law and on the application of linguistic theory and methods to the analysis of language as evidence in criminal and civil proceedings. It addresses central areas of practice, including authorship analysis, speaker comparison, the examination of disputed confessions and police interviews, and the analysis of language-based offences. Drawing on case materials, academic research, and published expert reports, the course examines how linguistic tools are applied to written and spoken evidence and how such analyses are interpreted in legal contexts. The aim is to provide students with a systematic understanding of the field and to develop their ability to critically evaluate the use of linguistic analysis as evidence.</p> <p>Generic competences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • find, analyse, synthesise and evaluate data needed for studies and for professional, cultural, and creative activities; integrate knowledge, apply the acquired knowledge in practice, recognise problems, and propose possible solutions; • generate ideas and knowledge, independently find appropriate forms of expressing them, seek new knowledge and skills, and apply them in solving tasks in a new environment and in the implementation of innovations. • identify differences between one's own and others' cultural identities and attitudes, explore others' ideas despite cultural differences, and express one's ideas in ways that are understandable and acceptable to different people; • understand and value the common public interest, work in a team to achieve a common goal, cooperate with people of various cultures, take responsibility for the quality of one's own and the team's activities and their improvement; • set realistic goals, identify all the steps and effective strategies needed to fulfil such goals within the time available; meet deadlines, make necessary decisions, and flexibly adapt to the circumstances;

- take initiative and carry out one's activities, rationally assess the strengths and weaknesses of one's work, reflect and be responsible for one's decisions and actions, be aware of the impact of one's activities and their outcomes on society and the environment.

Subject-specific competences:

- Competence of an expert in linguistics: knowledge of contemporary linguistic theories and methods and their application to the study of the English language.
- Knowledge about the major branches of linguistics and contemporary linguistic theories and research methods; will be able to see links between various linguistic schools of thought; will appropriately use general and specific terms in linguistics and be able to explain various linguistic phenomena in a wider linguistic and cross-cultural context; will be able to define linguistics as a discipline in the context of other disciplines.
- Ability to analyse and interpret various aspects of the English language on different levels (phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic) on the basis of certain linguistic theories; will be able to provide valid argumentation in discussions on contemporary linguistic processes and issues.
- Ability to effectively communicate in English in writing and orally; analyse and produce scholarly, critical or other kinds of texts in English, fitting the specificity of the communicative situation and conventions.
- Ability to make effective use of modern and English-related information technologies, databases and resources (different corpora, dictionaries, term banks, etc.) and properly present the results of the linguistic analysis to the public.
- Ability to independently formulate a relevant research question in linguistics, literature, culture or interdisciplinary studies and design a research study; will be able to critically evaluate the application of research methods and approaches and selection of the theoretical framework(s), methodology and empirical material.
- Ability to conduct a research study by adopting innovative methods of data collection and processing, interpret findings of the study, draw conclusions and evaluate the results of the research within the context of other studies.
- Ability to present the results of research in writing and orally to a variety of audiences and demonstrate the ability to provide logical arguments in discussions.

Learning outcomes of the course unit (module)	Teaching and learning methods	Assessment methods
<p>Upon successful completion of the course, students will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate integrated disciplinary knowledge. Show a coherent and critically informed understanding of forensic linguistics as an applied linguistics discipline, situating specific analytical practices in broader linguistic theory and legal procedure. • Engage critically with forensic linguistic analyses. Read and evaluate expert reports, case studies, and scholarly debates, identifying underlying assumptions, methodological choices, and potential sources of bias or overstatement. • Understand the application of linguistic tools in forensic contexts. Explain how different levels of linguistic analysis are used in criminal and civil cases and assess the appropriateness of approaches for specific evidentiary questions. • Synthesise and present forensic linguistic research. Conduct a rigorous non-empirical research-based analysis of a specific forensic linguistic theoretical debate or case study. Students will be able to synthesise academic literature, apply appropriate disciplinary terminology, and present their findings clearly and coherently to their peers in a formal 	<p>The course combines structured input with research-driven and discussion-based learning. Teaching and learning methods include interactive lectures, flipped learning, seminar-style discussions and workshops based on assigned readings, and guided analysis of case studies and authentic forensic data. Emphasis is placed on critical engagement with scholarly literature, methodological reflection and active learning.</p> <p>To achieve the intended learning outcomes, students will undertake the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent preparation through close reading of academic publications, expert reports, and case materials; • Participation in seminar discussions focused on theoretical, 	<p>Cumulative assessment: Assessment in this course is cumulative and consists of three components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-term examination – 30% • Research-based presentation – 30% • Final examination – 40% <p>Each component is assessed on a 10-point scale. The assessment criteria reflect the MA-level expectations of conceptual understanding, methodological awareness, analytical precision, and the ability to engage critically with forensic linguistic research covered during the course.</p>

<p>academic setting, adhering to the principles of academic integrity.</p>	<p>methodological, and evidential issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical exercises involving the examination of written and spoken forensic data; Written assignments that require critical evaluation of methods, case studies, or theoretical debates; Oral presentations based on research into a specific topic or case in forensic linguistics; Individual or small-group research-based tasks; Written mid-term and/or final assessments. <p>Teaching and assessment activities may be conducted in person or online and may combine synchronous and asynchronous formats, as appropriate.</p>	
--	--	--

Content: breakdown of the topics	Contact hours							Self-study work: time and assignments	
	Lectures	Tutorials	Seminars	Exercises	Laboratory work	Internship/work	Contact hours	Self-study hours	Assignments
<p>1. Introduction to the course content, assessment scheme and policies. Introduction to the scope of the course, expectations, and the practical applications of the skills acquired in the course.</p>	2						2	2	<p>Study reading: close reading of the course description, getting familiar with the course content, assessment scheme, and course policies.</p>
<p>2. Introduction to the application of linguistics to legal questions and issues. Critical, theoretical and methodological approaches to language in legal settings. Overview of the history of the discipline, distinguishing between theoretical legal linguistics and applied forensic linguistics.</p>	2						2	10	<p>Study reading: Coulthard et al. (2017: 9–30); Olsson (2004: 1–16); [optional] Guillén-Nieto & Stein (2022: 1–33).</p> <p>Tasks prepared by the lecturer.</p>
<p>3. The language of the legal process, police interviews and lie detection. Analysis of spoken legal discourse, particularly of court proceedings and police questioning. Exploring power asymmetry, the administration of Miranda warnings, and the discursive construction of confessions. Critical evaluation of lie detection methods used by law enforcement, such as the</p>			2				2	8	<p>Study reading: Niclaus & Stein (2022: 131–186); Heydon (2019: 60–77); [optional] Coulthard et al. (2017: 51–77); [optional] selected case studies from Shuy (1998).</p> <p>Tasks prepared by the lecturer.</p>

problematic Scientific Content Analysis (SCAN) technique.									
4. Emergency calls and public appeals in missing persons cases. Analysis of the linguistic structure and five-phase sequence of emergency (911/999) calls. Focus on evaluating caller attitude, phonetic output (such as overlap and rising pitch), and whether callers use explicit or implicit requests for assistance based on their perceived entitlement. Developing methodological tools to differentiate genuine emergencies from malicious hoax calls. Analysis of deceptive versus truthful spoken language in televised public appeals for help in missing persons cases.			2				2	12	Study reading: Drew & Walker (2010: 95–110); Heydon (2019: 60–77); Coulthard et al. (2017: 51–56); Whelan et al. (2014); [optional] Allard-Gaudreau et al. (2025). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
5. Authorship attribution and sociolinguistic profiling. The scientific study of patterns of variation in written language to determine authorship. Examining demographic profiling, idiolect, and both qualitative (stylistic) and quantitative (computational) approaches. Case studies: The Unabomber manifesto, the JonBenét Ramsey ransom note, the Lindbergh kidnapping ransom notes, and the "devil strip" dialect marker case. Text messaging forensics and digital evidence.	1		1				2	10	Study reading: Coulthard, et al. (2017: 151–172); Grant (2010: 508–522); Grant & McLeod (2020: 154–159); [optional] Selznick (2024: 325–335); [optional] Shuy (2014: 72–89). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
6. The linguistic analysis of suicide notes. Methodological approaches to differentiating genuine suicide notes from forged or simulated texts. Examining the communicative situation, rhetorical moves, and thematic fields. The application of corpus linguistics to text authenticity, drawing on data such as the Polish Corpus of Suicide Notes (PCSN).	1		1				2	8	Study reading: Zaśko-Zielińska (2022: 373–418); Olsson (2009: 51–56). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
7. Mid-term test.			2				2	6	Revision, preparation.
8. Forensic phonetics and speaker identification. The use of phonetic techniques in criminal investigations, including auditory and acoustic voice comparisons, voice line-ups, and transcript authentication. Real-life applications: analysis of selected case studies.			2				2	12	Study reading: Coulthard, et al. (2017: 129–145); de Jong-Lendle (2022: 261–264, 278–292; 295–301); Beckman (2011: 11–12); [optional] Leeman et al. (2022: 8 – 32; 93–115). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
9. Language crimes, semantics, pragmatics and hate speech. Analysis of crimes committed through language alone, such as solicitation, bribery, threats, perjury, and hate speech.			2				2	10	Study reading: Shuy (2023: 625–627); Longhi (2022: 439–460); Anesa (2022: 419–438). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.

Application of speech act theory to distinguish between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts in legal evidence. Linguistic analysis of cybercrime, extremist propaganda, terrorist threats, and online hate speech.									
10. Civil cases: Trademark disputes and product warnings. The role of the forensic linguist in civil litigation. Applying linguistic tools to assess the “likelihood of confusion” and the “strength of a mark” in trademark disputes. Evaluating the readability, syntactic complexity, and semantic adequacy of consumer product warnings and contract disputes.	2						2	8	Study reading: Butters (2008: 233–243); Shuy (2002: 28–45); Dumas (2010: 365–377). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
11. Plagiarism, copyright infringement, and online identities. Methodological approaches to identifying intellectual property theft. Qualitative and computational methods for evaluating text similarity, textual borrowing, and translanguing plagiarism. Investigating the creation and performance of online personas, particularly regarding the undercover policing of Internet sexual crime and Dark Web chat rooms.	1		1				2	8	Study reading: Guillén-Nieto (2022: 321–372); Coulthard, et al. (2017: 174–192); Grant & MacLeod (2020: 1–25). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
12. The linguist as an expert witness. The role of the forensic linguist in the courtroom and navigating adversarial versus civil law systems. Understanding courtroom epistemics, interacting with counsel, and preparing for cross-examination. Navigating legal requirements for scientific evidence, including the Daubert and Frye standards for admissibility.	1		1				2	4	Study reading: Coulthard, et al. (2017: 203–208); Shuy (2006: 96–101); Solan (2010: 395–401). Tasks prepared by the lecturer.
13. Students’ in-class presentations of their research-based presentations.			6				6	20	Research on a chosen topic. Preparation for the presentation.
14. Final test.			2						
Total	10		22				32	118	
Assessment strategy	Weight, %	Timing		Assessment criteria					
Mid-term examination	30	Mid-semester		The exam consists of questions based on the materials covered in the first part of the course (e.g. scope and development of forensic linguistics, institutional discourse, authorship analysis, sociolinguistic profiling, disputed confessions, foundational methodological principles, etc.). A response to each question is evaluated considering: 1. Relevant and accurate content (clear understanding of key concepts and terminology); 2. Explicit and appropriate reference to course readings and theoretical frameworks where relevant;					

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Consistent and justified application of linguistic theory in the analysis of examples or short data extracts; 4. Clarity of structure and coherence of written argumentation; 5. Language accuracy. <p>The distribution of points is indicated in the test.</p>
Research-based presentation	30	Final seminar block	<p>Students prepare and deliver an individual presentation on a selected topic, case study, or theoretical issue in forensic linguistics.</p> <p>Assessment criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevant content and clear formulation of the research focus; 2. Demonstration of understanding of relevant theoretical and methodological frameworks; 3. Engagement with scholarly literature (explicit reference to readings and additional sources); 4. Coherent structure and consistency of argumentation; 5. Design and use of visual aids and consistent adherence to the principles of academic integrity. 6. Ability to respond to questions and discuss methodological or evidential issues. <p>The distribution of points is indicated in the task description.</p>
Final examination	40	End-of-semester	<p>The exam consists of questions based on the materials covered in the second part of the course (e.g. forensic phonetics and speaker identification, language crimes, civil cases such as trademark disputes and product warnings, plagiarism and digital authorship, the linguist as expert witness, admissibility standards).</p> <p>A response to each question is evaluated considering:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevant and accurate content; 2. Explicit reference to theoretical frameworks and course readings where appropriate; 3. Consistent application of linguistic theory in the analysis of examples; 4. Ability to relate linguistic analysis to evidential reasoning and methodological considerations; 5. Clarity, coherence, and language accuracy. <p>The distribution of points is indicated in the test.</p>

General criteria (applied to mid-term and final tests)

10 (excellent).

Excellent knowledge and abilities. 95–100% of questions answered correctly. Demonstrates comprehensive and precise understanding of the topics covered. Responses show accurate and consistent use of relevant forensic linguistic terminology and theoretical frameworks. Analytical tasks are completed with methodological awareness and clear justification of claims. Arguments are logically structured, critically informed, and well substantiated. Written expression is fluent, coherent, and adheres to academic conventions.

9 (very good).

Very good knowledge and abilities. 85–94% of questions answered correctly. Demonstrates very strong understanding of central concepts and approaches. Terminology is used accurately with only minor imprecision. Analytical responses show consistent application of relevant frameworks and generally clear reasoning. Some aspects may lack the depth or nuance of an excellent answer, but overall performance is methodologically sound and clearly structured.

8 (good).

Knowledge and abilities are above average. 75–84% of questions answered correctly. Demonstrates solid understanding of the main topics and theoretical issues. Terminology is generally appropriate, though occasionally imprecise. Analytical responses are coherent and relevant, though critical engagement or methodological reflection may not be fully developed. Minor conceptual or structural weaknesses may be present.

7 (average).

Average knowledge and abilities; there are a few non-essential mistakes. 65–74% of questions answered correctly. Demonstrates adequate understanding of key concepts, though responses may be partly descriptive or uneven in depth. Application of theoretical frameworks is basic and sometimes insufficiently justified. Terminology may be used inconsistently. Argumentation is generally understandable but may lack clarity or coherence in places.

6 (satisfactory).

Knowledge and abilities are below average; there are noticeable mistakes. 55–64% of questions answered correctly. Demonstrates partial or fragmented understanding of the material. Analytical tasks are handled superficially or with methodological imprecision. Limited ability to relate linguistic analysis to evidential or theoretical considerations. Responses may lack structure, clarity, or adequate substantiation.

5 (weak).

Knowledge and abilities meet the minimum requirements. 51–54% of questions answered correctly. Demonstrates minimal understanding of central concepts. Responses are largely descriptive, incomplete, or insufficiently focused on the question. Terminology is often inaccurate or used without clear understanding. Argumentation is underdeveloped and lacks coherence.

4, 3, 2, 1 (fail).

Minimum requirements are not met. Demonstrates inadequate or incorrect understanding of core concepts and methodological principles. Inability to apply relevant theoretical frameworks to the analysis of examples. Responses are largely inaccurate, incoherent, or incomplete. Academic standards of structure and language are not met.

Attendance requirements

Attendance of regular lectures and seminars throughout the semester is not mandatory but expected and highly recommended. **Attendance is mandatory** for all assessed in-class activities (**mid-term examination, research presentation, and final examination**). Absence from an assessed activity without documented justification results in a grade of 0 for that component.

Procedure for missing mandatory assessment components

All assessed components of the module (mid-term examination, research-based presentation, and final examination) are mandatory. A student who is unable to attend a scheduled assessed activity must inform the course instructor without delay and provide documented justification (e.g. medical certificate or other officially recognised evidence to the Department of Studies of the Dean's Office). Where the absence is formally justified and properly documented, the student will be granted an opportunity to complete the missed component at a time determined by the lecturer, either during the same semester or in accordance with the official assessment schedule. Failure to attend a mandatory assessment without timely notification and documented justification results in a grade of 0 for that component. In such cases, no make-up opportunity is provided.

Use of Vilnius University electronic learning system

All of the texts, compulsory and optional study materials, handouts and other relevant course materials will be made available on the webpage of Vilnius University Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) at <https://emokymai.vu.lt>. It is students' responsibility to refer to the course website on a regular basis to be able to access course materials and submit assignments as requested. Unless indicated otherwise by the course instructor, all home assignments must be uploaded in due time on the course website.

Academic integrity

All assignments must be completed independently by the students complying with the requirements of academic conventions of fair citing, paraphrasing and referencing. In accordance with the university regulations (see articles 49 and 77.2 of the Study Regulations of Vilnius University (https://www.vu.lt/site_files/Vertimai/EN_Translation_Vilniaus_universiteto_studij%C5%B3_nuostatai_30_April_2025.pdf) and articles 21–22 of the Code of Academic Ethics of Vilnius University (https://www.old.vu.lt/site_files/Studies/Study_regulations/Code_of_academic_ethics_VU.pdf), a student who commits an act of academic dishonesty (such as plagiarism or any other form of cheating) shall receive a failing grade on the work in which the dishonesty occurred. In addition, any act of academic dishonesty shall result in the failure of the module and the student who has committed the act may be subject to the dismissal from the University. In their applications of AI tools in academic settings, students must comply with the Guidelines on Artificial Intelligence Usage at Vilnius University (https://www.vu.lt/site_files/Vertimai/EN_Translation_Dirbtinio_intelektu_naudojimo_Vilniaus_universitete_gair%C4%97s.pdf).

Conditions for admission to the final examination

Students may sit the final examination irrespective of performance in earlier assessment components. Failure to participate in a mandatory component without justified absence results in a grade of 0 for that component.

Components of the retake of the examination

In accordance with the cumulative assessment structure of the module, **only written examination components may be retaken**. In the official retake session, students may retake the mid-term examination and/or the final examination, as applicable. The research-based presentation, which constitutes an assessed in-class academic performance conducted during the final seminar block, is not subject to retake in the official retake session. If the presentation was missed due to a documented and justified absence, a make-up may be arranged within the same semester at a time determined by the lecturer. Absent documented justification, a missed presentation is graded 0 and is not repeatable. In the retake examination, the scope of assessment corresponds to the originally defined content and learning outcomes of the respective examination component.

Use of technology and classroom conduct

The use of digital devices (laptops, tablets) during class is permitted solely for academic purposes directly related to the module (e.g. note-taking, accessing assigned readings, consulting authorised databases or linguistic resources). The use of smartphones during class is limited to strictly study-related purposes and must not disrupt teaching or discussion. Audio recording, video recording, photographing, screen capturing, live streaming, or otherwise reproducing classroom interactions, lecture content, seminar discussions, or peer presentations is strictly prohibited without the explicit prior written permission of the lecturer and all participants concerned. This prohibition applies to both in-person and online sessions. Unauthorised recording or dissemination of course materials or classroom interaction constitutes a violation of academic conduct and may result in disciplinary action in accordance with university regulations. Students are expected to use technology responsibly and in a manner that respects academic integrity, intellectual property, data protection principles, and the privacy of all participants.

Author	Year of publication	Title	Issue of a periodical or vol. of a publication	Publishing place and house or web link
Compulsory reading				
Anesa, P.	2022	Fighting Cybercrime through Linguistic Analysis (Chapter 12). In V. Guillén-Nieto & D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 419–438).		Cham, Switzerland: Springer
Beckman, K.	2007	<i>An Immigrant's Run-In with the Law: A Forensic Linguistic Analysis</i> .		New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC
Butters, R. R.	2008	Trademarks and other proprietary terms. In J. Gibbons & M. T. Turell (eds.), <i>Dimensions of</i>		Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

		<i>Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 231–247).		
Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D.	2017	<i>An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence</i> (2nd ed.).		Abingdon, Oxon / New York, NY: Routledge.
de Jong-Lendle, G.	2022	Speaker Identification (Chapter 9). In V. Guillén-Nieto & D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 257–319).		Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
Drew, P., & Walker, T.	2010	Citizens' emergency calls: Requesting assistance in calls to the police. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds.), <i>The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 95–110).		Abingdon / New York, NY: Routledge
Dumas, B. K.	2010	Consumer product warnings: Composition, identification, and assessment of adequacy. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds.), <i>The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 365–377).		Abingdon / New York, NY: Routledge.
Grant, T.	2010	Txt 4n6: Idiolect free authorship analysis? In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds.), <i>The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 508–522).		Abingdon / New York, NY: Routledge
Grant, T., & MacLeod, N.	2020	<i>Language and Online Identities: The Undercover Policing of Internet Sexual Crime</i> .		Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Guillén-Nieto, V.	2020	Plagiarism Detection: Methodological Approaches (Chapter 10). In V. Guillén-Nieto & D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 321–372).		Cham, Switzerland: Springer
Heydon, G.	2019	<i>Researching Forensic Linguistics: Approaches and Applications</i> .		Abingdon, Oxon / New York, NY: Routledge.
Longhi, J.	2022	Linguistic Approaches to the Analysis of Online Terrorist Threats (Chapter 13). In V. Guillén-Nieto &		Cham, Switzerland: Springer

		D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 439–460).		
Nicklaus, M., & Stein, D.	2022	A Lie or Not a Lie, That Is the Question: Methodological and Theoretical Issues in Linguistic Approaches to Lie Detection (Chapter 6). In V. Guillén-Nieto & D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 131–186).		Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
Olsson, J.	2004	<i>Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language, Crime, and the Law</i> .		London: Continuum
Olsson, J.	2009	<i>Wordcrime: Solving Crime Through Forensic Linguistics</i> .		London / New York, NY: Continuum
Shuy, R. W.	2002	<i>Linguistic Battles in Trademark Disputes</i> .		Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire / New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan
Shuy, R. W.	2006	<i>Linguistics in the Courtroom: A Practical Guide</i> .		New York, NY: Oxford University Press
Solan, L. M.	2010	The expert linguist meets the adversarial system. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (eds.), <i>The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 395–407).		Abingdon / New York, NY: Routledge
Wright Whelan, C., Wagstaff, G. F., & Wheatcroft, J. M.	2014	High-stakes lies: Verbal and nonverbal cues to deception in public appeals for help with missing or murdered relatives. <i>Psychiatry, Psychology and Law</i> .	21(4), 523–537	
Zaśko-Zielińska, M.	2022	The Linguistic Analysis of Suicide Notes (Chapter 11). In V. Guillén-Nieto & D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 373–418).		Cham, Switzerland: Springer
Optional reading				
Guillén-Nieto, V., & Stein, D.	2022	Introduction: Theory and Practice in Forensic Linguistics (Chapter 1). In V. Guillén-Nieto & D. Stein (eds.), <i>Language as Evidence: Doing Forensic Linguistics</i> (pp. 1–33).		Cham, Switzerland: Springer

Leemann, A., Perkins, R., Sullivan Buker, G., & Foulkes, P.	2022	<i>Introduction to Forensic Phonetics and Forensic Linguistics</i> . Routledge.		Abingdon / New York, NY: Routledge.
Selznick, J.	2024	Forensic Linguistics: Art or Science? <i>Rutgers University Law Review</i> ,	76, 319–354	
Shuy, R. W.	1998	<i>The Language of Confession, Interrogation, and Deception</i> .		Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
Shuy, R. W.	2014	<i>The Language of Murder Cases: Intentionality, Predisposition, and Voluntariness</i> .		New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Updated: March 1st, 2026