

How forensic linguistics can help fight international crime ⁽¹⁹⁾



Luna Filipović

<https://doi.org/10.3013/zqwnw42>

Abstract

This research-based contribution has two goals: to illustrate some of the areas in which forensic linguistic expertise can help fight international crime and to shed light on the importance of applying knowledge from linguistic research on multilingual communication in forensic investigations. The overall focus is on the evidentiary contribution of forensic linguistic insights obtained through the analysis of communication between law enforcement and suspects or reluctant witnesses and of communication among suspects interacting on the Dark Web. We will provide an overview and examples from the author's peer-reviewed research on police questioning in both the United States and the United Kingdom that highlight multiple aspects relevant to the quantity and the quality of elicited evidence, including the questioning method, awareness about linguistic and cultural differences and quality of language service provisions. We will also take a closer look at some features of non-native English – the language of international crime – and illustrate how this knowledge can be applied in the analysis of communicative exchanges on the Dark Web, resulting in investigative benefits and empirically enriched training courses for police forces globally.

Keywords: forensic linguistics, policing, miscommunication, non-native English, Dark Web.

Introduction

Studying language and communication in the context of organised crime has to be one of the priorities in tackling criminal networks because organised crime starts with communication. Similarly, when perpetrators are apprehended

⁽¹⁹⁾ This paper is dedicated to the memory of Professor Ross Anderson (Computer Laboratory, University of Cambridge), with whom I was hoping to collaborate for the Dark Web study mentioned here and whose life ended suddenly and unexpectedly over a year ago. Professor Anderson was a pioneer, an innovator and a true giant in the field of cybersecurity, remarkable in every way, as a scholar, friend and fighter for what he believed was right for society. It is my hope that the pilot idea introduced here – of recruiting multilingual forensic linguistic analysis for the purpose of helping the fight against international organised criminal networks on the Dark Web – will inspire (much-needed) further research and practical applications of forensic linguistic analysis in this and related areas. The author would also like to thank to two anonymous reviewers whose comments and suggestions inspired significant improvements in this paper. Any remaining errors remain exclusively with the author.

it is through communication with them that we stand the best chance of obtaining valuable information that can help prevent future crimes. Forensic linguistics is an empirical discipline that studies language use in the context of criminal law. It is known to have helped solve crime via authorship identification that led to the capture of many serious criminals, with one of the most well-known being the Unabomber in the United States in the 1990s, which is the case that marked the first instance of forensic linguistic evidence being deemed enough to issue a search warrant in the US justice system. Since then, forensic linguists have been used as expert witnesses or consultants more readily in criminal investigations and trials. However, forensic linguistics is still an underutilised tool, since its applications are much broader and wider with a potential to cover many more cases than those in which it is currently used (see Leonard et al., 2017 for further details and examples).

In this paper the focus is on something even more underutilised: a forensic linguistic analysis informed by knowledge about language differences and multilingualism that can, in turn, inform the elicitation of best evidence in the context of international criminal investigations. As a backdrop, this paper briefly describes two main suspect questioning methods (the United States versus the United Kingdom), which are most widely adopted worldwide (and sometimes combined) and which exemplify instances of both good and bad practices from both locales. In particular, the focus is on the cross-linguistic and cross-cultural conflicts arising in suspect questioning that may lead to elicitation of inadequate or misleading evidence. This paper argues that police training highlighting these conflicts with authentic examples from real-life datasets and including forensic linguistic analyses can improve the efficiency and quality of evidence-gathering in international policing. We will then discuss another investigative domain within which multilingual forensic linguistic expertise is very much underutilised, and that is the determination of the language of origin of perpetrators through analyses of chats on the Dark Web with non-native English as a lingua franca. Forensic linguists who are multilingual and understand how English (or any other language) is spoken non-natively by individuals with different first languages can point to features in non-native use that reveal the first languages of the speaker, which can assist in specialist training for discovering which groups are involved in collaborative criminal activities.

Eliciting better evidence through forensic linguistic insights

For the purpose of the discussion and argumentation in this paper, we will rely on a unique database of authentic, real-life exchanges between US and UK law enforcement and suspects in criminal investigation (a total of over 200 cases). So far, approximately half of the database (just over 100 cases) has been processed and studied by the TACIT lab (e.g. Filipović, 2021, 2022a, 2022b; Filipović et al., 2018; Hijazo-Gascón, 2019; Musolff, 2019; Pounds, 2019), and this is where the examples and findings reported in this paper come from. All the data were obtained through research collaborations with various police jurisdictions in California and England that our lab ⁽²⁰⁾ engaged in during the last two decades (2006–2026). All the data and publications received ethical permissions from the universities where the author and her academic colleagues were employed. The publication of data excerpts was agreed upon with data providers and all non-anonymous data sections were anonymised prior to publication and used solely for that purpose. The offences included serious crime (armed robbery, homicide, sexual assault). The languages spoken by the victims, witnesses and suspects (other than English) include Spanish, Lithuanian, Polish, Portuguese and Russian. The methodology in the studies presented here included both qualitative and quantitative approaches to data analysis. The conversations in these files were coded by the present author using NVivo12 software (with 30 %

⁽²⁰⁾ www.tacit.org.uk.

of the processed data also coded by another coder and tested for interrater reliability, which was 0.98, thus confirming the objectivity of the coding). The coding captures instances of miscommunication that were identified via either (a) clear communication breakdowns (e.g. one of the interlocutors says ‘Pardon?’, ‘Excuse me?’, ‘What do you mean?’) or (b) the clear indication that the response was ambiguous and potentially leading to the interlocutors drawing very different or even opposite conclusions from the same interaction (e.g. ‘He dropped the bags by the bushes’ – was this on purpose or accidental?). The reasons behind the miscommunications were divided into (a) those related to linguistic meaning and form (e.g. complex words or structures or culturally specific content) and (b) those pertaining to general language usage (e.g. relying on inferences rather than obtaining explicit confirmation). The comparative analyses reveal a statistically higher occurrence of miscommunication in bilingual police interviews and interrogations than in monolingual ones (see Filipović, 2021, 2022a, for further details, multiple examples and precise statistical information for the relevant comparisons), which signals the clear importance of these interactions for research and also for practice, as our societies and the criminal elements therein are increasingly multilingual. It is also relevant to highlight that the number of instances of miscommunication was higher in the United States policing context than the United Kingdom one. Another important point to make here is that cross-linguistic and cross-cultural contrasts require closer attention also because they can inform other spheres of interaction and criminal activity where this knowledge can come in handy (e.g. in the analysis of Dark Web communications, addressed further below). We now turn to the insights that multilingual forensic linguistic analyses have given us that can explain these findings.

Sources of miscommunication part 1: the questioning method and inferences

The United Kingdom and the United States differ considerably in their interviewing techniques and approaches to suspect interviews. The UK police employ non-adversarial interviewing strategies aimed at eliciting the best evidence possible (based on the PEACE approach, i.e. planning and preparation, engage and explain, account, closure, evaluation) and the United States applies the adversarial approach (based on the Reid technique) aimed at eliciting confession (although certain US states are slowly phasing out the Reid technique, e.g. California; see Filipović, forthcoming, for details). Miscommunication was found to be more frequent in the United States than the United Kingdom data overall, in part because of this striking difference in the questioning method. Similar findings were reported in the context of false confessions (i.e. when innocent people admit guilt due to personal reasons or mental health issues; Meissner et al., 2014) and inadvertent confessions (i.e. when people are not aware that miscommunication has occurred and that their answers were taken to be a confession or admission of guilt; Filipović, 2021; see also the next section for an example). Below we can see an example of the high-pressure, insistent questioning in the United States that leads to miscommunication and elicitation of compromised data that can easily be thrown out of court based on multilingual forensic linguistic analysis. In example (1) below, police officer 1 is the main investigator while police officer 2 acts as an interpreter (see Filipović, 2022a and forthcoming, for more examples and discussion).

(1)

Police officer 1: Did he push her? Did he push her onto the bed?

Police officer 2: ¿La empujaste?

[Did you push her?]

Suspect: *Solo sus manos.*

[Only her hands]

Police officer 2: *¿La empujaste sobre la cama, si o no?*

[Did you push her on the bed, yes or no?]

Suspect: No, sobre la cama no la toqué.

[No, on the bed I did not touch her]

Police officer 2: No, he did not push her.

We can notice that the suspect was saying that he pushed the victim's hands, so he did not fully deny pushing but he specified the kind of pushing that occurred (i.e. the pushing of hands). The coercive insisting on a yes-or-no answer and the pressure put on the suspect here means that information is lost. Furthermore, the translation equivalent that police officer 2 is using is inadequate – '*sobre*' does not mean 'onto' it means 'on'. Spanish does not have a category of dynamic prepositions (i.e. those that indicate a change of location, such as into, onto, or out of) like English does. As result, we have the misinformation that the suspect did not push the victim at all, and while he may not have touched her when she was on the bed that still does not mean that he did not push her onto the bed (by pushing her hands). Precision in expression and translation is relevant for understanding the victim's injuries and the extent of suspect's admission, which saves time and resources, while at the same time achieving equality in access to justice and avoiding miscarriages of justice (see also the section 'Sources of miscommunication, part 2: language and culture contrasts').

Many instances of miscommunication in both the United Kingdom and the United States stem from the general reliance on inferences (which is common to any type of interaction in any language). Additionally, interlocutors can be uncooperative and exploit the possibility that a miscommunication was left unresolved, as was the case in the following:

(2)

Police officer: Did you threaten to kill her?

Suspect: Her brother threatened to kill me.

Police: When did he threaten you?

In this example we see that the police officer did not elicit an admission but rather inferred it (i.e. the suspect threatened because he had been threatened himself earlier) and moved on to the next line of questioning, but there was no valid admission given that would legally stand and an opportunity to secure it was lost. This happens quite often because police communication, like other types of communication, can be reliant on inferencing rather than explicitness – this is how humans interact, and too much insistence on explicitness can lead to communication breakdown. The devil lies in the detail or, rather, in finding the right balance between maintaining rapport and not allowing manipulation by the suspect (see Filipović, 2019, and Musolf, 2019, for some examples of success versus failure in this regard).

Another issue arising in the UK data is the observation that lengthy non-confrontational questioning can sometimes lead to extended police time, which could be avoided through some specific adjustment in phrasing questions to ensure that the suspect is not able to avoid answering them while avoiding coercion at the same time (see Filipović, 2019; Pounds, 2019; Musolf, 2019). In other words, a balance may need to be struck in terms of when to insist on clarification and when to let the suspect elaborate, because it is through the suspect's elaboration that we find out

the crucial details that implicate involvement in crime (see Musolf, 2019, for detailed analyses and examples). One thing that we certainly do not want to do is lose our interlocutor, which happens when, for instance, a suspect starts responding but then decides to shut down and evoke their right to silence due to coercion. This occurs in the US data but not in the UK data, so we can conclude that US questioning methods hinder evidence elicitation or lead to miscommunication more often than UK questioning methods, and reflected in the Méndez principles for non-coercive investigative interviewing developed and adopted by the United Nations ⁽²¹⁾.

Sources of miscommunication, part 2: language and culture contrasts

Forensic linguistic analyses performed on police transcript data reveals that, in addition to miscommunications due to the way humans rely on inference, as discussed in the previous section (and also in Filipović, 2019, in more detail), there are other types of miscommunication that stem from language-specific and culture-specific features that differentiate one language from another, as illustrated in examples (3) and (4).

(3)

Police: Did she fall, or did he drop her?

Interpreter: *¿Ella se cayó o la botaste?*

[She fell or you threw her?]

Suspect: *Si, se me cayó.*

[Yes, to me it happened that she fell]

Interpreter: He dropped her.

The key notion to focus on here is that of intentionality, namely the information about whether something was done on purpose or not, which can be crucial for certain legal outcomes, thus making this information detail very important in police questioning. Intentionality is a concept that is expressed differently in different languages (Filipović, 2007, 2019). For instance, while speakers of Spanish consistently use different words or constructions to specify whether causation was intentional or not, English leaves this important information ambiguous. In the example above, 'He dropped her' could refer to either intentional or accidental act of dropping but it seems to have been interpreted as referring to an intentional act, because on this occasion it connects back to the police officer's distinction between falling (accident) and dropping (strongly indicating intention, reinforced by the Spanish translation equivalent offered ('botar' = 'throw'), which is clearly intentional). English verbs and constructions do not specify intentionality, and consequently this ambiguity, which is resolved negatively for the suspect, impacts the overall negative judgement – the police officers think they got a confession for an intentional act of dropping, which indicates murder rather than manslaughter. You can see how this line of miscommunication can lead to potentially catastrophic outcomes, especially in the countries like the United States that still exercises the death penalty. Crucially, this distinction for intentionality exists in many other languages, such as Italian, Greek and Serbian, and findings like this have very wide applicability. Here we have only demonstrated one of the many important insights into language contrasts that forensic linguistic analysis gives us. It is important to raise awareness about this and similar cross-linguistic contrasts in the context of eliciting evidence.

⁽²¹⁾ interviewingprinciples.com.

The example below shows how cultural differences create miscommunication with potentially serious consequences:

(4)

Police: *¿Con quién, uh, usas el locker?*

Translation: With whom, uh, do you use the locker?

Suspect: *Con otro amigo pero no, su nombre sí no sé.*

Translation: With another friend but I don't, I don't know his name.

Police: *¿No sabes el nombre de él?*

Translation: You don't know his name?

We can observe in the excerpt (4) above that the suspect's reference 'amigo' ('friend') to a person whose name he did not know was suspicious to the police officer and this reflected negatively on the suspect in this case. However, this is indeed a very common and appropriate usage of the word 'friend' in Latin American cultures, while it sounds awkward in the context of the American English-speaking culture: why would you call anyone your friend if you do not even know their name? In this case the police officer was noticeably annoyed and started viewing the suspect as uncooperative and treating him with suspicion, which ultimately led to a complete breakdown of rapport and refusal to be questioned further on the part of the suspect. Heightened sensitivity with regard to linguistic and cultural contrasts and also close collaborative work between law enforcement and language professionals can raise awareness about how to detect and resolve such conflicts in multilingual exchanges.

Language service provision

One of the most striking findings that the comparative forensic linguistic analysis of the police transcripts presented here is that transcripts of US police interviews are bilingual: they include exchanges both in the original language and in a translation that is the product of the interpreting during the interview, and a subsequent control translation by another translator that is different from the one present in the interview. All US interrogations are transcribed verbatim; that is, everything that the speakers said, including speech features such as hesitations and concurrence by uttering 'um', is provided. By contrast, UK transcripts are non-verbatim, which means that substantial portions of the dialogue can be missing, and they also do not include any lines in the original language of the interviewee – they are typically produced in English only, though in some very rare cases bilingual transcripts may be produced but only if requested by the police. In the United States, bilingual police transcripts are the norm in the state of California where our US data come from. In addition to the advantage of bilingual transcript production, US police interview data have a further beneficial feature – that of a control interpreter/translator presence. US police interview recordings are given to another language specialist post-interrogation, who (independently) provides a full translation of everything that was said during the interrogation in a column parallel to the transcript of the record of the original exchange (see Filipović, 2022b). Not only does this make it easier to study the evidence collected and verify what has been said without having to replay the tapes, which is time-consuming and expensive, it also makes it much faster to detect any translation and communication issues in the interview that may be of timely importance for the investigation, in addition to ensuring quality control in the judiciary process and full legal rights. This is particularly relevant in the United States and in jurisdictions that have similar practices (i.e. where bilingual police officers still act as interpreters) (see Filipović et al., 2018). We can see the importance of using a qualified interpreting service in the previously cited examples (1, 3 and 4) from our US portion of the dataset. Multilingual police officers acting as interpreters is highly problematic, as interpreting is a skill that needs to be taught explicitly through

professional training. However, multilingual police officers may be able to help with their knowledge about the languages they speak, such as what the linguistic and cultural stumbling blocks may be between two or more languages they speak and working together with the interpreter to prepare for the interview and avoid those stumbling blocks in the best possible way (Mayfield, 2017). Such relevant language and communication skills can be honed through forensic linguistic training ⁽²²⁾.

Forensic linguistics on the Dark Web

Multilingual forensic linguistic analysis can be helpful in another domain, currently not widely utilised, namely detecting the language of origin in criminals by recognising L1 (first-language) patterns in L2 (second-language) English used on the Dark Web. English is the global international language nowadays for science, education, global entertainment and crime. It is the most frequent language used on the Dark Web ⁽²³⁾, but not all the English there is used by natives. Many English users have another language as their L1 and, as is well known in psycholinguistic literature, the L1 influence is very strong and persists even at the highest levels of proficiency (see Hawkins et al., 2012, for exemplification and discussion). Crucially, bilinguals cannot ‘switch off’ their other language, as it were; it is something that is impossible to control perfectly and consistently.

We have ample evidence that this is the case. We have studied large electronic corpora (over 140 million words) containing data from speakers of 40 different L1s for an educational project (the ‘English Profile’ project; see Hawkins et al., 2012). It is there that we noticed that certain errors by learners of L2 English are systematically revealing of their L1. The key idea here is that error profiles can be created for languages or language groups so that we can identify, for example, Chinese L2 English as opposed to Russian L2 English. Most often the predictions can be made about a language family rather than specific languages, such as Romance (Spanish, Italian, Romanian, etc.) L2 English as opposed to Slavic (Polish, Russian, Ukrainian, etc.) L2 English. Below are some examples extracted from L2 learner data with different L1s:

(5)

- a) I by bus go to train station (L1 Chinese) (*).
- b) Yesterday came my friend (L1 Spanish) (*).
- c) I like very much that car (L1 Italian) (*).

All of these sentences are marked with an asterisk because they are grammatically incorrect in English, but they reflect what would be the correct grammar in Chinese, Spanish and Italian, respectively. Word order is just one of the relevant features that can help us reveal non-native English. Others include gender marking (for example, speakers of Slavic languages use ‘he’ or ‘she’ in many cases where English speakers use ‘it’) and definite and indefinite articles (such as ‘the’ or ‘a’) – languages that do not have articles, such as Russian, Turkish and Korean, make it difficult for speakers to acquire and use articles in L2 English properly even at the highest levels of L2 English proficiency (see Filipović et al., 2013).

⁽²²⁾ See www.tacit.org.uk for further information.

⁽²³⁾ See <https://slcyber.io>.

We used this knowledge about typological language contrasts that cause difficulty in the acquisition of non-native English and checked for similar occurrences in exchanges among different cybercriminals on the Dark Web. For example, one very telling feature that we immediately noticed is the consistent lack of articles in the L2 English used in chats known to be involving Russian users (e.g. we find outputs like 'piece of cake' instead of 'a piece of cake'). English native speakers do not omit articles in this fashion even when using an efficient medium such as texting. Staying on the same theme of articles, if somebody wants to get help by using AI to translate, in this case, from a language without articles (such as Russian and most other Slavic languages) to languages with articles (such as English, German or Italian), translation choices will be made by AI that are based on statistics rather than the specifics of the current case or a particular context. A human analyst who knows both languages is necessary to establish whether a reference to 'gun' in Russian would be better rendered as 'a gun' or 'the gun': the former indicating a lack of prior awareness of there being a gun and the latter implying the speaker knew about the prior existence and presence of the gun, which can result in a different interpretation of the whole event (e.g. the suspect being part of a premeditated armed robbery versus being blindsided about the weapons involved) (see Coulthard, 2007, for details of a real case where such use of articles in English was crucial; see also Filipović, forthcoming, for other contrastive features in translation that AI cannot capture yet).

The central claim here is that a forensic linguistic analysis will benefit from being informed by applied language typology – that is, the field that studies multiple language contrasts at different levels of meaning and grammar that cause cross-linguistic conflicts in second or additional language learning and multilingual communication across different spheres of life, such as legal or medical (Filipović, 2017a, 2017b). Knowledge about the key typological differences between any two languages would enable us to determine, or at least narrow down, the possible linguistic and cultural background of individuals that are involved in and collaborating with criminal networks on the Dark Web, and also more generally members of international criminal networks who communicate via any kind of electronic media platform.

Furthermore, it is important to reiterate here that forensic linguists and multilingual specialists will still be needed in spite of the technological progress made in the domain of AI-assisted translation and analysis. In the context of international organised crime, the perpetrators are often bilingual or multilingual, able to switch from one language to another frequently and able to create and use novel codes, abbreviations or inferable omissions, which are hard for AI to master. For instance, Capuset al. (2005) cites an example of innovative phonetic spelling in an SMS in French used in this context: '*Ti vawar si ti don pah mon larsan*', which in proper French would have been written as: '*Tu vas voir si tu donnes pas mon argent*' ('You'll see if you don't give me my money'). A human analyst immediately understands what is going on here and deciphers the message instantly, and this matters a lot when time is of the essence.

The examples given here should be understood as a proof-of-concept proposal at present, which should build on findings within applied language typology and second-language-acquisition research, and include a systematic incorporation of multilingual forensic linguistic analysis in the crime investigations that take place on the Dark Web. Some automated models that can help us in this regard have already been developed and trialled on L2 learner data – the proposal here is to use the Dark Web as a corpus large enough to test and improve the current technology.

There are numerous AI tools that perform language detection in speech and text, but the field is still very underdeveloped for various reasons. For example, the various translation engines are primarily oriented towards

the target language (i.e. the language into which translation happens) rather than the source language. Furthermore, AI tools can mistakenly identify some outputs as coming from different speakers of English just because the AI model was trained on thematic information (e.g. references to Italian places such as Rome or Italian specialities such as *spaghetti al ragù*) (see Brooke et al., 2012, for a critical overview and discussion). AI tools would certainly be helpful in speeding up identification processes in the future and helping narrow down the potential pool of L1s detectable in the use of L2 English for criminality purposes. At the moment, training these tools require large datasets, which are not available, as indicated in previous research (Tetreault et al., 2012). AI is also unreliable when it comes to identifying outputs with high proficiency in the L2, and erroneously identifies texts produced by L2 English-speaking humans as fully AI-generated (see Liang et al., 2023). Thus, at present, multilingual AI cannot do the invaluable work of human multilingual forensic linguistic analysis, especially as criminals are constantly trying to be more creative in their use of language (as we saw earlier in the example of phonetic texting in French). Forensic linguists, with a typological, multilingual and multicultural knowledge base, may stand a better chance of figuring out the crucial, investigation-relevant information in this context.

Conclusions

In this paper we offered an original overview of the connections between findings from different studies, different types of data and different locales, which all point to the relevance of forensic linguistic analyses in multilingual and multicultural police investigations. We brought to light the neglected importance of applying insights from decades' worth of academic work on multilingualism and language typology to the contexts of forensic data analysis, evidence elicitation and evidence evaluation.

Forensic linguistic analysis and professional training based thereon helps to elicit better evidence. It provides empirical insight into what works and what does not with regard to many aspects of the investigative process, including different questioning methods, linguistic and cultural contrasts and language service provision, which are all relevant – if not crucial – in police communication across borders. We also exemplified the value of integrating multilingualism and a language typology knowledge base into the forensic analysis of any type of communication relevant to law enforcement.

The main practical conclusion to draw is that we need to integrate the findings and authentic, real-life examples like the ones presented in this paper into regular training provision for law enforcement and other crime investigators, such as the financial police. This can be done through the development of hands-on, situation-based training courses that teach police officers through first-hand exposure how to detect, prevent and resolve miscommunications and investigate their source in a way that maintains rapport and does not compromise the investigation and the quantity and quality of evidence, and all based on the latest scientific and empirical confirmations from both real-world fieldwork and lab work as done by our group. Visit our website for the latest research, professional training and a free sample toolkit ⁽²⁴⁾, along with the policy-informing documents we contributed to (Korkman et al., 202; Mayfield, 2017).

⁽²⁴⁾ See <https://www.tacit.org.uk/toolkit/>.

References

- Brooke, J. and Hirst, G. (2012), 'Robust, lexicalized native language identification', in: Kay, M. and Boitet, C. (eds), *Proceedings of COLING 2012: Technical papers, COLING 2012 Organizing Committee, Mumbai*, pp. 391–408, <https://aclanthology.org/C12-1025/>.
- Capus, N., Griebel, C. and Havelka, I. (2024), *Multilingual Communications Surveillance in Criminal Law: The role of intercept interpreters-translators*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035331475>.
- Coulthard, M. (2007), *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in evidence*, Routledge, London, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203969717>.
- Filipović, L. (2019), 'Evidence-gathering in police interviews: Communication problems and possible solutions', *Pragmatics and Society*, Vol. 10, Issue 1, pp. 9–31, <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.00013.fl>.
- Filipović, L. (2021), 'Confession to make: Inadvertent confessions and admissions in United Kingdom and United States police contexts', *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 12, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.769659>.
- Filipović, L. (2022a), 'Language and culture as sources of inequality in US police interrogations', *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 43, Issue 6, pp. 1073–1093, <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac022>.
- Filipović, L. (2022b), 'The tale of two countries: Police interpreting in the UK vs. in the US', *Interpreting*, Vol. 24, Issue 2, pp. 254–278, <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.00080.fl>.
- Filipović, L. and Hawkins, J. A. (2013), 'Multiple factors in second language acquisition: The CASP model', *Linguistics*, Vol. 51, Issue 1, pp. 145–176, <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2013-0005>.
- Filipović, L. and Vergara, S. A. (2018), 'Juggling investigation and interpretation: The problematic dual role of police officer-interpreter', *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 62–79, <https://ojs.lettras.up.pt/index.php/LLLD/article/download/4547/4262>.
- Hawkins, J. A. and Filipović, L. (2012), *Criterial Features in L2 English: Specifying the reference levels of the Common European Framework*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Korkman, J., Otgaar, H., Geven, L. M., Bull, R., Cyr, M. et al. (2025), 'White paper on forensic child interviewing: Research-based recommendations by the European Association of Psychology and Law', *Psychology, Crime & Law*, Vol. 31, Issue 8, pp. 987–1030, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2024.2324098>.
- Leonard, R., Ford, J. E. R. and Christensen, T. K. (2017), 'Forensic linguistics: Applying the science of linguistics to issues of the law', *Hofstra Law Review*, Vol. 45, Issue 3, pp. 881–897, <https://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/hlr/vol45/iss3/11/>.

Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E. and Zou, J. (2023), 'GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers', *Patterns*, Vol. 4, Issue 7, 100779, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100779>.

Mayfield, K. (2017), 'Language services protocol for law enforcement bodies', https://www.hf.uio.no/multiling/english/projects/flagship-projects/forensic/open-access-repository/guidelines-and-protocols/language-services-protocol_katrina-mayfield-2017-vf.pdf.

Meissner, C. A., Redlich, A. D., Michael, S. W., Evans, J. R., Bhatt, S. et al. (2014), 'Accusatorial and information-gathering interrogation methods and their effects on true and false confessions: A meta-analytic review', *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, Vol. 10, pp. 459–486, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9207-6>.

Musolff, A. (2019), 'You keep telling us different things, what do we believe?' Meta-communication and meta-representation in police interviews', *Pragmatics and Society*, Vol. 10, Issue 1, pp. 32–48, <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.00014.mus>.

Pounds, G. (2019), 'Rapport-building in suspects' police interviews: The role of empathy and face', *Pragmatics and Society*, Vol. 10, Issue 1, pp. 97–124, <https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.00017.pou>.

Tetreault, J., Blanchard, D., Chalill, A. and Chodorow, M. (2012), 'Native tongues, lost and found: Resources and empirical evaluations in native language identification', in: Kay, M. and Boitet, C. (eds), *Proceedings of COLING 2012: Technical papers*, COLING 2012 Organizing Committee, Mumbai, pp. 2585–2602, <https://aclanthology.org/C12-1158.pdf>.