

Forensic Linguistics: A Means of Solving Crime

Kaukab Saba

Lecturer, Department of English, International Islamic University, Islamabad

Abstract

Forensic linguistics has become an important part of solving crime with the passage of time and the purpose of this research paper was to identify the role that it plays and to analyze verbal and non-verbal signs in American crime fiction. For the analysis the researchers have used the Information Manipulation Theory for analyzing verbal text and Kinesics Theory for studying non-verbal clues. The researchers wanted to see how when the verbal and non-verbal analysis is taken side by side, it increases the authenticity of the results. For this we took two cases from the American TV series *How to Get Away with Murder* and *American Crime Story*. After the analysis the researchers found out that the forensic linguistics is very helpful in detecting the authenticity of statement and non-verbal and verbal signs taken together generate more accurate results.

Keywords: forensic linguistics, verbal and non verbal signs, crime, legal text

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

In criminology we examine the crimes through law and other sciences and “is affected by sociology, psychology, biology, and statistics” (Nurbaha, 2000, p.1377). A crime is anything that is illegal due to which hiding a piece of information or lying also comes under the tempering of evidence. Hence it can be said that there are different ways one may carry out a criminal act. Therefore, in criminology, the crimes can be committed in various ways and, here, the sciences integrate with each other. A new form of linguistics, which has been called Forensic linguistics since 1980, was formed after the usage of linguistic analysis in law. (Shuy, 1998)

Forensic linguistics is the branch of applied linguistic that is applied in criminal investigations and the process with the help of the linguistic knowledge. This field is helpful in detecting language crimes like bribery, perjury, plagiarism but most importantly it can be used in crimes like kidnapping or murder to detect any kind of deception by the speaker whether he is guilty or not. (Momeni, 2011, p.734) cites Shuy(1998) that “Forensic linguistics now deals with sound identification, identification of writer of a written text, asymmetry of power in courts, miscommunication between lawyer and client, perjury, problems related to legal text, libel, problems about brands, interpretation and translation of communication in courts, recorded interviews as evidence”. Forensic linguistics, in this way, has been able to help in identifying whether a piece of language, written or spoken, is true or not and by doing that it can be further used to prove innocence or guilt of the accused.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

1.2.1 Hypothesis

- Forensic linguistics is a means of solving crime

1.2.2 Research Objectives

- To identify the role of forensic linguistics in detecting deception.
- To identify the frequency of verbal and non-verbal tells
- To analyze verbal and non-verbal evidence for deception and prove that deception detection can be more accurate if both cues are taken into account together.

1.2.3 Research Questions

- How forensic linguistics has become essential in criminal cases, to detect deception?
- What is the frequency of verbal and non-verbal tells?
- How verbal and non-verbal evidence can be analyzed to detect deception and truth?

1.2.4 Significance

The potential of forensic linguistic has been established through a number of research study. The researches in this regard tend to deal with the outcome in only real life situations, which are the cause of this specific field to be restricted to the people of a specific profession.

This study will highlight the significance of forensic linguistic by applying the respective theoretical framework on fictional situations presented by American crime fiction television series, by doing so the study tends to make the technique more relatable to the masses. The study will be significant in suggesting that the gap between what is studied and what is applicable can be minimized and that forensic linguistic can be applied in everyday life and does not have to be restricted to specific professions.

Framework

The sample crime fiction has been analyzed by one of the linguistic statement analysis techniques, information manipulation theory proposed by Steven McCornack and the kinesics model proposed by Ray Birdwhistell.

The information manipulation theory suggests that all human beings are wired to say the truth and if they lie they have subconscious indicators in their language that show that they are lying, or deceiving the other. The information manipulation theory suggest that when manipulate information in order to deceive they do not satisfy the Grice Maxims presented by Paul Grice .

While IMT analyses the language, Kinesis theory focuses on the non-verbal code system of bodily activity. Birdwhistell was of the view that all body function, such as emotions, posture, hand gestures and eye contact have meaning. By using this theory, the hidden meaning behind what people are saying and feeling can be examined and thus it will help in finding out the deceptive elements, if any. The theory of kinesics helps in giving a clear a list of characteristics that can be monitored if one wants to analyze the authenticity of the statement. These non-verbal cues can give away the liar's position due to the stress he or she is under because, no matter how much they try, the body language can be a reflection of one's inner thoughts. For instance, lack of body movement or too much projection of it can be an indicator of a person's psyche, and then it is up to us, the analysts, to examine it according to the available research and theories.

Literature review

Crime can be defined as "illegal activities in general" (Longman, 2006) and Criminology is the study of crime in which we deal with its development, creation, and prevention (Nurbaha, 2000, p.1377). While the detection of crime and the implementation of justice are done through the field of law, its linguistic analysis is done with the help of Forensic linguistics which helps in analyzing the language involved in criminal cases. Applied linguistics has many branches and forensic linguistics is one of them. The first time forensic linguistics was used was in an analysis of a suspect statement in 1968 by a Swedish linguist by the name of Jan Svartvik but it was not properly named until the 1980's (John Olsson, 2009). In 1994, the news was flooded with a women named Susan Smith who claimed that her children had been kidnapped at gunpoint.it was later discovered that she had made up a false story to deceive the police so that no one would pay attention on what she had done .by making up a story she tried to hide her own actions as she had drowned both her children. Before Smith was a suspect in the children's deaths, she told reporters, "My children wanted me. They needed me. And now I can't help them" (Newman, Pennebaker, berry and Richard, 2003, p.666) cited (Kastor, 1994).The use of past tense indicated that she already thought of her children as dead while normally in kidnaping scenarios the parents never lose hope till their child is found . (Newman, Pennebaker, berry and Richard, 2003, p. 666) cited (Adams, 1996).

A crime is not only the result of illegal actions but it can also can be committed through illocutionary acts like lying, threatening, or the use of any foul language(Gibbons, 2003,p.261). Forensic linguistics, thus, has been helping in detecting the language crimes and in solving the cases. In our paper we will discuss only a specific dimension of crime that is deception regardless of who is guilty or innocent in the respective case. "Deception includes practical jokes, forgery, imposture, conjuring, confidence games, consumer and health fraud, military and strategic deception, white lies, feints and ploys in games and sport, gambling scams, psychic hoaxes, and much more" (Hyman, 1989, p.133) In criminal investigation and everyday life it is seen that all those who socially connect with people may deceive the other due to various reasons, criminal or not.

Linguistic evidence is as important as any forensic evidence and behind every case there is a thorough research done on the basis of "linguistic principles, evidence from language databases, and on previous experience and findings" (John Olsson). While this field has proved to be a helpful source of study, it is also important for the analysis to be done carefully and not to overemphasize the facts. The process of evaluating the evidence can last for months if the texts are too many.

However, in our research paper, we have taken some cases from a TV series, which are fiction and based on reality, as our focus is going to be on how certain text or piece of language can be analyzed and used in solving the case. Telling a lie or fabricating a false incident is a very complex action. Not only does the deceiver have to state a story he has to create an alternate reality and create a proper timeline of events and describe all of it in a believable manner. (Friedman & Tucker, 1990). As a result, according to the literature on "reality monitoring," the quality of fabricated incidents is different from reality. (Johnson & Raye, 1981; Vrij, Edward, Roberts, & Bull, 2000; cf. Undeutsch , 1967). Language can be used as a tool to indicate fabrication or reality of a given situation of events. We will not be including any lie detection or polygraph test on the evidence as our focus will be on the linguistic aspects and non-verbal cues and the focus will be on detecting deception remotely, without the help of mechanical means. For this we will be analyzing the given text and discern whether the characters are telling the truth or trying to deceive the respective authority.

Not much work has been done in the analysis of TV based cases; however some real life-based criminal texts have been analyzed. Research suggests that by focusing on the word count and categorization of the words that are used by people we can know about their hidden intentions and learn a great deal of information about what in unsaid. (Pennebaker & King, 1999).

As the paper focuses on forensic linguistic, verbal cues that can be detected remotely will be under scrutiny .while researching linguistic features that may detect deception one comes across the way deception is carried out and what 'tells' does a person who is deceiving the other have .As discussed beforehand when

someone tries to deceive the other the cognitive work rate increase, so we also searched for linguistic features that have been associated with it and will be analyzing to what extent are they found in criminal cases. Several features of linguistic style, such as pronoun use, emotionally toned words, (a) fewer self-reference, (b) more negative emotion words, and (c) fewer markers of cognitive complexity are three features that have been associated with increased cognitive work. (Newman, Pennebaker, Berry and Richard, 2003, p.666)

First, when a person uses the first-person singular he/she indicates that the statement is theirs. Knapp, Hart, and Dennis (1974) hypothesized that those who deceive other try to avoid using first-person singular to “dissociate” themselves from the respective statement. (Newman, Pennebaker, Berry and Richard, 2003, p.666) cited (Buller, Burgoon, Buslig, & Roiger, 1996; Dulaney, 1982; Knapp & Comadena, 1979; Mehrabian, 1971). Guilt may burden the deceiver either about the false statement or the topic they are discussing (Newman, Pennebaker, Berry & Richard, 2003, p.666) cited (Ekman, 1985/ 1992; Knapp & Comadena, 1979; Knapp et al., 1974; Vrij, 2000). If this state of mind is reflected in patterns of language use, then deceptive communications should be characterized by more words reflecting negative emotion (e.g., hate, worthless, sad). (Newman, Pennebaker, Berry & Richard, 2003, 666)

Throughout the years, many detectives and linguists have given theories about the many cues and signs that indicate if the person is lying or not. In 1991 the Police Review Oxford published an article in which a Cambridgeshire detective offered his advice about both non-verbal and verbal cues to deception, which included “delayed responses and the use of phrases such as ‘If I remember correctly’ and ‘Now let me see’” (Kapardis, 2003, p.231). Vrij gives seven objective verbal characteristics that can give away the liar’s position, these are “negative statements, plausible answers, [unsolicited] irrelevant information, overgeneralised statements (for example, ‘never’, ‘everybody’, etc.), self-references, direct answers and response length” (Kapardis, 2003, p.234). Although these characteristics are said to have been affected by the emotions and the attempts to curb them, there are no specific traits or signs that are archetypal. Because of this hurdle, the art of finding out if the person is deceiving or not is to analyze the way they give information and also what they are not saying. As maintained by Vrij, the liars may suffer from guilt and irritability which may result in them giving indirect answers, making overgeneralizations, not referring directly to themselves while talking, or making negative statement while denying the questions. “The cognitive perspective on deception cues posits that producing a deceptive statement requires more cognitive effort than producing a truthful one (Cody et al., 1984), and results in a number of verbal cues such as number of specific references, and vocal cues to deception like how long one waits before answering a question and the number and duration of pauses” (Kapardis, 2003, p.235). A liar may also try to deflect the actual question by giving irrelevant information in stead of the one needed (Kapardis, 2003).

In avoiding the specifications of the question asked while answering, deflecting or providing irrelevant information one violates the maxims of Conversation Implicature presented by Paul Grice. Jacobs, Dawson and Brashers (1996) recount Grice stating “communication is made possible by communicators’ mutually orienting toward general principles of cooperation and rationality.” The Information manipulation theory is built upon this structure and states that deception occurs when one or more of the four maxims of conversation are violated. The four maxims are of Quantity, Quality Relation and Manner which are violated by the amount, truthfulness, relation and level of clarity of the provided information. (McCornack, 1992, p.1-16). If either of the four maxims are violated deception can be detected within a conversation but as liars can have different tells, so in order to reinforce the gathered verbal cues of deception one must take side by side the non verbal cues to enhance the authenticity of the respective data.

Along with verbal cues nonverbal cue will also be analyzed so that both verbal and non-verbal cue can facilitate each other and enhance the accuracy of the passed judgment. In the process of lying, some people may not be able to hide it because of the stress induced by guilt and may produce non-verbal leakage (Ekman & Friesen, 1972).

According to Vrij (2000, p.24–28), liars may experience the following three different processes during deception, but this does not mean that the presence of any of these indicators necessarily indicates deception: 1. the emotional approach: Deceit is associated with excitement, fear, guilt. 2. The content complexity approach maintains that lying can be a cognitive complex task because liars find it difficult to lie. This, in turn, will manifest itself in a number of cues to deception. Of course, liars may well be aware of their emotions and difficulty in lying and try to conceal both. Thus, the third approach is known as the attempted behavioral control approach: liars try to behave ‘normally’, to make an honest impression. (Kapardis, 2003, p.233)

Since late twentieth century, many linguists have been studying the field of applied linguistics factually.

Non-verbal behaviours comprise three categories: 1 Vocal characteristics: speech hesitations, speech errors, pitch of voice, speech rate, latency period, frequency of pauses and pause duration. 2 Facial characteristics: gaze, smile and blinking. 3 Movements: self-manipulations, illustrators, hand and finger movements, leg and foot movements, head movements, trunk movements and shifting position. (Vrij, 2000, p.233)

Behavior Analysis Interview predicts that liars’ differ from honest people in term of their verbal and

nonverbal behavior. Putting forward the ideas given by Aldert Vrij, Samantha Mann, and Ronald Fisher, Cutler(2008), in his book, writes that because liars feel more uncomfortable while lying, they show hints of nervousness like crossing their legs, changing their body postures and may look away from the investigator when asked about their involvement in the crime in terms of verbal signs, Cutler further says that innocent people try to be more helpful because they expect themselves to be eliminated from the suspects' list. As a result, innocent people will communicate in a more open and relaxed way while actively participating in the question answers session. Many scientists don't hold the same way and think that liar or not, the severe consequences will make him nervous while answering. The results from a mock theft laboratory test, using the BIA protocol, suggested that the movements of the liars will be less than truth tellers because their cognitive and mental load will be much more than the latter and for that their focus will be more on what they say. Also the results were contrary to the previous assumption that liars are not helpful, but suggested that, in fact, they will try to be more cooperative (Cutler,2008).

The theory that the researchers are going to use in this research paper, in order to analyze the nonverbal linguistic evidence, is going to be the theory of kinesics. Kinesics theory of communication was given by Ray Birdwhistell, an anthropologist, and was first used in 1952 by him. Kinesics, as the word implies, is the study or interpretation of body language, movements, and gestures. According to Birdwhistell, kinesics is the "study of body-motion as related to the non-verbal aspects of interpersonal communication" (2017) and he believed that every person had a different socially developed behavior which has its own meaning and can then be further interpreted in similar terms as verbal communication. In modern studies, kinesics is used to analyze different behaviors in order to check out the authenticity of the statement or claim. Kinesics can be classified into five categories namely emblems, regulators, illustrators, affective display and adaptors (5 types of kinesics, 2017). Emblems are a type of nonverbal signs that have a verbal equivalent for example the sign of victory, symbolizing the letter V, may be seen as a number in some countries while it may be considered as insulting in some regions. Regulators regulate the speech process and maintain its flow during the conversation, though every culture may have different regulators. In some cultures silence may be used for this purpose or in some nodding is interpreted as such. Illustrators are used to illustrate or reinforce what the speaker is saying by pointing towards something for clarity. The number of illustrators used, again, varies from culture to culture. Affective display is the way we display our feelings through the facial movements or emotions and every person has a different way of displaying his or her inner feelings. Adaptors are changes that are low-level or undetectable to feel more at ease or for some other purpose such as. For instance, a slumped posture may give the impression of inferiority while an upright posture will be taken as a sign of confidence. All of these characteristic are taken into account and then used in the analysis of the speaker's inner intentions and the authenticity of his words.

We will be using specific features of linguistic analysis techniques and kinesic theory to prove that detecting deception can be carried out by the help of linguistic means in an authentic manner and detect non verbal deception cue to further facilitate the authenticity of our acquired data.

Research Methodology

3.1.1 Methods and Procedure

This chapter will explain the methods of research used in this study. Furthermore, the subject of study, sampling technique, research instruments, and procedure of data gathering, statistical treatment and scheme of analysis will also be dealt with.

This study will determine the verbal cues i.e. Violation of maxims and non-verbal cues i.e. Regulators, effective display etc. which are considered the signifiers of deception in American television series.

3.1.2 Method of Research Used

The descriptive method of research is used in this study. The respective method of research is used to detect and collect all the verbal and non-verbal cues of deception in American television series.

3.1.3 Subject study

The subjects of study are American crime fiction TV series named American Crime Story and How to Get Away with Murder.

3.1.4 Research Instruments

The research instrument used to find out verbal and non-verbal cues in American crime fiction television shows is observation, as researcher have to observe the characters of the respective to case to detect any cues of verbal or non-verbal deception.

3.1.5 Validation of Research Instruments

The researchers have gained validation for television series as instruments in this respective research.

3.1.5. Procedure of Data Gathering

Various different methods are used for the collection of data in qualitative analysis such as interviews, focus groups, observation, collection of documented material (letters, diaries, photographs) collection of narrative,

open ended questions in questionnaires etc. the method of data collection used in this paper is the observation and collection of relevant material

As mentioned in 3.1.4 the research instrument used in this study is observation researchers will watch respective television series and select any one case from these three shows and further analysis will be carried on those three specific cases.

3.1.7 Sampling technique used

The technique used to select these respective seasons and specific episodes is purposive because of their highlighted themes and their relevance to the respective field of study that is forensic linguistics which deals with crime and how people may deceive the authorities or any superior power structure.

3.1.8 Scheme of analysis

As explain in the theoretical framework the analysis will be as following:

Researcher will analyze how forensic linguistics has become essential in criminal cases.

Researcher will analyze how verbal and non-verbal evidence can be analyzed to detect deception and truth.

Research Analysis

As first part of analysis, the data will be collected from two American television series; one will be based on reality while the other will be crime fiction. The second step involves the identification on the linguistic cues which answers our first question as to what role forensic linguistic plays in the identification of deception. The subsequent step of analysis is assembling the data in bar graphs so that the frequency of verbal and non-verbal cues could be determined.it will respond to the second research question. The final step of our analysis will answer the third and last research question as to how both the cue in accordance with each other enhance the process of detecting deception.

4.1 Verbal cues

4.1.1 The maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity refers to how one expects the other to be as informative as one possibly can, and gives as much information as is needed, and no more and so if one tries to leave out certain information s/he will be violating the maxim and hence be deceiving the other. For example in American crime story, when the investigator asks O.J “what time did you get back home?”, O.J answers “Oh 7 something, (SHAKES HIS HEAD) I’m tyin a think, did I leave? (Moving his hands against the table)You know (pointing towards the investigator with his thumb) I had to run and get my daughter recital flowers (moving both hands, smiles), then I call my girlfriend Paula as I headed to her house and Paula wasn’t home”. In doing so he violates the maxim of quantity as he leaves out the answer to question that has been asked.in the second case under consideration from How to Get Away with Murder when the lawyer asks “Are you speaking of the hard times you experienced due to working with your mother?” Karen fails to provide enough information that answers the question with clarity and says “Anyone who works with family knows it's not easy”. The maxim of quantity is violated 16 times in American crime story; People vs. O.J Simpson and 3 times in the respective case of How to get away with Murder. The rest of the instances are mentioned below:

American Crime Story

1) Investigator: O.J when was the last time you saw Nicole?

OJ: YESTERDAY, when we were leaving our daughters recital, it ended at about aaa 6:30 6:45 something like that

2) Investigator: and what time did you get back home?

OJ: (Frowns) Oh 7 something, (SHAKES HIS HEAD) I’m tyin a think, did I leave? (Moving his hands against the table)You know(pointing towards the investigator with his thumb) I had to run and get my daughter recital flowers(moving both hands ,smiles), then I call my girlfriend Paula as I headed to her house and Paula wasn’t home.

3) Investigator: When did you park your bronco in Rockingham?

OJ:8 something 7, 8 (hand movement) 9 I don’t know (shakes his head)around that area and then I was sitting with Kato hadn’t done a Jacuzzi so we went and got a burger.

4) Investigator: And what about your left hand, how did you get that injury?

OJ: Aaa(stutter) I don’t know (looking at his hand)first time I was in Chicago yeah and I got back to the house and I was running around and I broke a glass.

Investigator: Oh

OJ: Yeah, and then one of your guys had just called ,actually (stutter) ,I cut it before maybe I opened it ,yeah ,but it’s no big deal I bleed all the time ,I golf (forced laughter) you know it’s always something (laughs a deliberate laugh)nicks and stuff

5) Tom: Bob you are in your car?

Bobby Shapiro: Well almost, we’re about to leave

6) Tom: What! No, no bob don’t jerk me around

Bobby Shapiro: He's, (stutters) He's washing up, (pause) he's getting dressed, (pause) he's moving a bit slow

7) Gill: How did a murder suspect disappear from a house full of people?

Bobby Shapiro: I didn't know he was going to run I you've gotta believe me gill(put his hand on the table and takes support) I mean this means I'm the good guy here look who brought Menendez back from Israel huh?(stutters)who, who ,who backed your campaign ? You even came to my 50th birthday you loved it was a great party

8) The New Yorker reporter: Wait! What?

Bobby Shapiro: The LAPD has a shameful history, and everybody knows it, it's no secret, and this cop Mark Farman, who discovered evidence is an admitted racist, any evidence that he touches is questionable

9) The New Yorker reporter: So, I want to be clear your saying this policeman set up OJ Simpson?

Bobby Shapiro: Maybe, maybe Mark Farman maybe other and it can be a conspiracy

10) The New Yorker reporter: Wait okay wait all the blood evidence, somehow these cops all these racist police officers planted it from the murder scene to the bronco to rocking ham?

Bobby Shapiro: Who else could have ,take a step back I mean doesn't it seem odd that this glove happened to be at rocking ham the same time that detective Farman just happened to

11) The New Yorker reporter: So you're going to say that the whole case is based on race?

Bobby Shapiro: Yes, because it is.

12) Chris (co-prosecutor): How do you feel about inter racial conflicts detective?

Furman: Don't care. (Looks down)

13) Chris (co-prosecutor): I'm not sure what you mean by that what's there to care about?

Furman: I don't have an opinion they're the same as anybody else.

14) Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever been accused of unfairly targeting African Americans?

Furman: Probably, at some point suspects will just about say anything to get of

15) Chris (co-prosecutor): Detective have you used the word?

Furman: Has anyone told you that I used the word?

16) OJ's daughter: Are you helping daddy find the man who hurt my mommy?

DA's representatives: (ammm uses conversation fillers) Yeah, (stutter) yes ammm that's right, you daddy's busy working on other things today.

How to get away with murder

1) Laywer: "Let's make a skin suit out of her and wear it to the funeral" Duvall, you wrote that text to your brother and sister just two weeks before your mother took ill, - is that correct? -

Duvall: I was just venting. (Hands clenched together resting on the desk-affective display:shows the anxious or nervous attitude, erect position-adaptors: defensive, shakes head- regulator)

[Edith coughs]

Duvall: A dark sense of humor can get anyone through hard times.

2) Lauren-Here! Would you say you're involved in your children's love lives?

Edith-There isn't much to be involved in (Chuckling-affective display: smugness) sadly.

3) Lauren-Or did you find out by snooping into her secret e-mail?

Edith: excuse me (frowns-regulator: shows confusion)

4.1.2. The maxim of Quality

The maxim refers to the conversation implication that the information provided in response to a question must be truthful, and the maxim will be violated if the information provided is false .Hence in doing so one would deceive the other for example in American crime story when the Investigator asked "what about your left hand, how did you get that injury?". OJ replied "I don't know" therefore deceiving the investigator by providing false information and violating the maxim of quality In How to get away with murder when the Lawyer asks Karen "how would you describe your relationship with your mother outside of work?" she violates the maxim of quality by lying and saying "I'd say just like any other mother/daughter relationship".in such a way she violates not only the maxim of quality but also the maxim of manner as the statement she gives is also ambiguous and open to interpretation ,the maxim of manner is further explained in the chapter in detail .she further lies about the relationship with her mother by saying "Even when we disagreed, there was always love between us." It is clear that she's lying as she is on trial for the attempted murder of her mother. The maxim of quality is violated 23 times in American crime story, People vs. OJ Simpson and 9 times in the respective case of How to get away with Murder.

American Crime Story

1) Investigator: O.J when was the last time you saw Nicole?

OJ: YESTERDAY, when we were leaving our daughters recital, it ended at about aaa 6:30 6:45 something like that

2) Investigator: and what time did you get back home?

OJ: (Frowns)Oh 7 something, I'm tyin a think, did I leave? (Moving his hands against the table)You

know(pointing towards the investigator with his thumb) I had to run and get my daughter recital flowers(moving both hands ,smiles), then I call my girlfriend Paula as I headed to her house and Paula wasn't home.

3) Investigator: When did you park your bronco in Rockingham?

OJ:8 something 7, 8 (hand movement) 9 I don't know (shakes his head)around that area and then I was sitting with Kato hadn't done a Jacuzzi so we went and got a burger.

4) Investigator: And what about your left hand, how did you get that injury?

OJ: Aaa(stutter) I don't know (looking at his hand)first time I was in Chicago yeah and I got back to the house and I was running around and I broke a glass.Yeah, and then one of your guys had just called ,actually (stutter) ,I cut it before maybe I opened it ,yeah ,but it's no big deal I bleed all the time ,I golf (forced laughter) you know it's always something (laughs a deliberate laugh)nicks and stuff

5) Attorney (Bobby Shapiro): any time that I take on a new criminal case I always the client a question, now I won't be judgmental but I think it is crucial that the attorney and the client are truthful to each other, so anything you tell me is completely confidential and won't ever leave the room .so OJ did you do it?

Client (O.J): no, (shakes his head, and swallows hardly) I loved her blinks.

6) Bobby Shapiro: tom I have to apologize we're a few minutes behind

Tom: Bob you are in your car?

Bobby Shapiro: Well almost, we're about to leave

7) Tom: What! No, no bob don't jerk me around

Bobby Shapiro: He's, (stutters) He's washing up, (pause) he's getting dressed, (pause) he's moving a bit slow

8) Gill: How did a murder suspect disappear from a house full of people?

Bobby Shapiro: I didn't know he was going to run I you've gotta believe me gill(put his hand on the table and takes support) I mean this means I'm the good guy here look who brought Menendez back from Israel huh ?(stutters)who, who ,who backed your campaign ? You even came to my 50th birthday you loved it was a great party

9) The New Yorker reporter: Let what happen actually?

Bobby Shapiro: The systematic railroading of OJ Simpson by a racist LAPD, because he is a black man

10) The New Yorker reporter: Wait! What?

Bobby Shapiro: The LAPD has a shameful history, and everybody knows it, it's no secret, and this cop Mark Farman, who discovered evidence is an admitted racist, any evidence that he touches is questionable

11) The New Yorker reporter: So, I wana be clear your saying this policeman set up OJ Simpson?

Bobby Shapiro: Maybe, maybe Mark Farman maybe other and it can be a conspiracy

12) The New Yorker reporter: It isn't odd if Simpson dropped it if Simpson dropped it while climbing the wall in order to avoid being seen by the limo driver. So you're going to say that the whole case is based on race?

Bobby Shapiro: Yes, because it is.

13) Detective Lance: here's the usual spousal conflict form.

(Looking down the list of names she pauses at the last one and frowns)

Peggy: (sharp intake of air) nope, nothing rings a bell

14) Chris (co-prosecutor): How do you feel about inter racial conflicts detective?

Furman: Don't care. (Looks down)

15) Chris (co-prosecutor): I'm not sure what you mean by that what's there to care about?

Furman: I don't have an opinion they're the same as anybody else.

16) Chris (co-prosecutor): I'm surprised to hear that, in the past haven't you expressed dislike for African Americans?

Furman: (Pauses, with mouth open) No sir, I have not.(blinks two time and nods his head)

17) Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever unfairly targeted Africans Americans while on the job? (Squints eyes, and deepens frown)

Furman: No.

18) Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever been accused of unfairly targeting African Americans?

Furman: Probably, at some point suspects will just about say anything to get of

19) Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever used a racial slur in describing an African American?

Furman: No

20) Chris (co-prosecutor): So you're saying you've never used the n word?

Furman: (Cuts the lawyer while his talking) what's this got to do with the case? (Raises voice, and hand movement)

21) Chris (co-prosecutor): So if the defence calls a witness to testify that you used it how will you respond to that?

Furman: I haven't (pauses) ever. (Makes eye contact and stops normal blinking)

22) OJ's daughter: Are you helping daddy find the man who hurt my mommy?
DA's representatives: (ammm uses conversation fillers) Yeah, (stutter) yes ammm that's right, you daddy's busy working on other things today.

23) Judge lance: have you ever been arrested for kidnaping 620?

Jury 602: (scoffs) (stutters) what? (Laughs in a confused manner) I think id remember something like that.

Judge lance: (shows him the police report)

Jury 602: (nervous movement of lips) (stutters) aa aa ohhhkayyy(leans backwards, arm movement) now I know what you're talking about (sound form mouth)see that was my ex but she's cool with it now(shakes head in denial), we cool (everyone continues to stare at him) ahh aa (scared)I just locked the car and, and I drove around the neighborhood a few times that's all eh you know how ladies can get ,you know (nervous movement of arms)

23) Judge lance: 462 the reason why I asked you here today is that the sheriff's department reviewed some court records and you once accused your husband of abusing you physically?

Jury 462: (silence and shakes her head in denial) no, no it was never domestic violence typa thing I was never physically abused and (sighs) that's why I never said anything (sad expression) I mean anybody in a relationship with anybody know that there are times when things are difficult

How to get away with murder

1) Lawyer: Because it was so contentious?

[Edith Clears throat]

Karen: No. Even when we disagreed, there was always love between us. (Moves hands-adaptors)

2) Lawyer: Jared, a co-worker of yours stated that your mother humiliated you in front of a woman you were dating. Do you recall this event?

Jared: I do not.

3) Lawyer - You must have been angry with your mother for emasculating you like that, especially in front of a woman who you'd hoped to be intimate with. (Jared looks away-affective display: self-conscious, shaking head:-disagreeing)

Edith - She was never gonna screw him. (Jared looks down-affective display: submission).He's a virgin, probably will be till he dies.

4) Lauren: OH, sorry. Um, your Nelson testified that, uh, you depended on him for everything.

Edith-Is that what he said?

Lauren-Uh I believe so. Is that not true?

Edith-I relied on my son for things any mother would. I just never thought he'd try to murder me for that.(maintaining eye contact-regulator: dominance)

5) Lauren: Here! Would you say you're involved in your children's love lives?

Edith-There isn't much to be involved in (Chuckling-affective display: smugness) sadly.

6) Lauren: Really?

Edith-They're all single, unhappily so.

Lauren-Oh, because I believe Karen mentioned she was involved with a man who delivered your produce.

Edith- Oh, Roger Colby used her. That's not a real relationship. (Nodding head-emblem: encouraging/agreeing)

7) Lauren-Um Mrs. Duvall, Karen kept her relationship with Roger a secret. So how'd you find out about it?

Edith-Call it mother's intuition. (Shrugs, looks away -adaptors: hiding something)

8) Lauren-Or did you find out by snooping into her secret e-mail?

Edith: excuse me (frowns-regulator: shows confusion)

Lauren-You require your employees to lock their cellphones in your desk while they're working, correct?

Edith: Its company policy.

9) Analise- Then admit what you did. - Is this what you wanted to tell everyone how you feel? You gave your children your life, and they paid you back by fantasizing about your death. It devastated you to the point where that you risked your life to teach them a lesson. (prolonged staring-lying)

Lawyer-Mrs. Duvall, you have the right to seek advice of counsel.

Edith-Children always take their mothers for granted. Maybe now mine won't.

Lauren: Nothing further.

4.1.3. The maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is where the information provided in response to a question is relevant. In case of violating the maxim of relation the information given is usually not relevant to inquired statement and has nothing to do with it. For example in the television series the American crime story when the Investigator asks "When did you park your bronco in Rockingham?" OJ replied "8 something 7, 8 9 I don't know (shakes his head) around that area and then I was sitting with Kato hadn't done a Jacuzzi so we went and got a burger." and therefore violates the maxim of relation by taking about "burger" and a "Jacuzzi" which had nothing to do with

the question being asked .in how to get away with murder the Lawyer asks Jared how his mother emasculated him in front of the woman he liked Edith said “She was never gonna screw him. He's a virgin, probably will be till he dies”.Hence violating the maxim of relation. The maxim of relation is violated 6 times in American crime story, People vs. OJ Simpson and 6 times in the respective case of How to get away with Murder.

American Crime Story

1) Investigator: and what time did you get back home?

OJ: (Frowns) Oh 7 something, (SHAKES HIS HEAD) I'm tyin a think, did I leave? (Moving his hands against the table)You know(pointing towards the investigator with his thumb) I had to run and get my daughter recital flowers(moving both hands ,smiles), then I call my girlfriend Paula as I headed to her house and Paula wasn't home.

2) Investigator: When did you park your bronco in Rockingham?

OJ:8 something 7, 8 (hand movement) 9 I don't know (shakes his head)around that area and then I was sitting with Kato hadn't done a Jacuzzi so we went and got a burger.

3) Investigator: And what about your left hand, how did you get that injury?

OJ: Aaa(stutter) I don't know (looking at his hand)first time I was in Chicago yeah and I got back to the house and I was running around and I broke a glass.

Investigator: Oh

OJ: Yeah, and then one of your guys had just called ,actually (stutter) ,I cut it before maybe I opened it ,yeah ,but it's no big deal I bleed all the time ,I golf (forced laughter) you know it's always something (laughs a deliberate laugh)nicks and stuff

4) Tom: What! No, no bob don't jerk me around

Bobby Shapiro: He's, (stutters) He's washing up, (pause) he's getting dressed, (pause) he's moving a bit slow

5) Gill: How did a murder suspect disappear from a house full of people?

Bobby Shapiro: I didn't know he was going to run I you've gotta believe me gill(put his hand on the table and takes support) I mean this means I'm the good guy here look who brought Menendez back from Israel huh ?(stutters)who, who ,who backed your campaign ? You even came to my 50th birthday you loved it was a great party

6) Judge lance: have you ever been arrested for kidnaping 620?

Jury 602: (scoffs) (stutters) what? (Laughs in a confused manner) I think id remember something like that.

Judge lance: (shows him the police report)

Jury 602: (nervous movement of lips) (stutters) aa aa ohhhkayyy(leans backwards, arm movement) now I know what you're talking about (sound form mouth)see that was my ex but she's cool with it now(shakes head in denial), we cool (everyone continues to stare at him) ahh aa (scared)I just locked the car and, and I drove around the neighborhood a few times that's all eh you know how ladies can get ,you know (nervous movement of arms)

How to get away with Murder

1) Lawyer - You must have been angry with your mother for emasculating you like that, especially in front of a woman who you'd hoped to be intimate with. (Jarred looks away-affective display: self-conscious, shaking head-: disagreeing)

Edith - She was never gonna screw him. (Jared looks down-affective display: submission).He's a virgin, probably will be till he dies.

2) Lawyer: “Let's make a skin suit out of her and wear it to the funeral” Duvall, you wrote that text to your brother and sister just two weeks before your mother took ill, - is that correct? –

Duvall: I was just venting. (Hands clenched together resting on the desk-affective display: shows the anxious or nervous attitude, erect position-adaptors: defensive, shakes head- regulator)

[Edith coughs]

Duvall: A dark sense of humor can get anyone through hard times.

3) Lawyer: Let me remind you. "Edith then proceeded to tell a story" about how Jared once reached under his mother's dress "at his birthday party when he was 13."

Edith: He was 14 and old enough to know better.

4) Lauren: oh, because I believe Karen mentioned she was involved with a man who delivered your produce.

Edith- Oh, Roger Colby used her. That's not a real relationship. (Nodding head-emblem: encouraging/ agreeing)

5) Lauren: A policy that allowed you to read Karen's e-mail about poisoning you, which is why you decided to poison yourself. That's how angry you were at them.

Edith-I will not be accused of lies in this room.

6) Analise: Then admit what you did. - Is this what you wanted To tell everyone how you feel? You gave your children your life, and they paid you back by fantasizing about your death. It devastated you to the

point where that you risked your life to teach them a lesson. (Prolonged staring-lying)
Lawyer-Mrs. Duvall, you have the right to seek advice of counsel.

Edith-Children always take their mothers for granted. Maybe now mine won't.

4.1.4. The maxim of Manner

The maxim of manner refers to when one keeps clarity and brevity in their answer. When there is obscurity and ambiguity within a statement it implies that the maxim of manner has been violated and hence one is attempting to deceive the other. In both the examples mentioned in maxim of quality and relation the maxim of manner has also been violated as in both the answers given by OJ there is no clarity with regard to question that has been asked. The maxim of manner is seen to be violated the most 17 times in American crime stories and 10 times in *How to get away with murder*. For example in the second case in response to the lawyer's inquisition about her and her mother's relationship Karen replies "I'd say just like any other mother/daughter relationship". Hence violating the maxim of manner by making an ambiguous statement in which the meaning is open to interpretation

American Crime Story

1) Investigator: O.J when was the last time you saw Nicole?

OJ: YESTERDAY, when we were leaving our daughters recital, it ended at about 6:30 6:45 something like that

Investigator: and what time did you get back home?

2) OJ: (Frowns) Oh something, (SHAKES HIS HEAD) I'm trying to think, did I leave? (Moving his hands against the table) You know (pointing towards the investigator with his thumb) I had to run and get my daughter recital flowers (moving both hands, smiles), then I call my girlfriend Paula as I headed to her house and Paula wasn't home.

3) Investigator: When did you park your bronco in Rockingham?

OJ: 8 something 7, 8 (hand movement) 9 I don't know (shakes his head) around that area and then I was sitting with Kato hadn't done a Jacuzzi so we went and got a burger.

4) Investigator: And what about your left hand, how did you get that injury?

OJ: Aaa (stutter) I don't know (looking at his hand) first time I was in Chicago yeah and I got back to the house and I was running around and I broke a glass.

Investigator: Oh

OJ: Yeah, and then one of your guys had just called, actually (stutter) I cut it before maybe I opened it, yeah, but it's no big deal I bleed all the time, I golf (forced laughter) you know it's

5) Gill: How did a murder suspect disappear from a house full of people?

Bobby Shapiro: I didn't know he was going to run I you've gotta believe me Gill (put his hand on the table and takes support) I mean this means I'm the good guy here look who brought Menendez back from Israel huh? (stutters) who, who, who backed your campaign? You even came to my 50th birthday you loved it was a great party

6) The New Yorker reporter: So, I want to be clear your saying this policeman set up OJ Simpson?

Bobby Shapiro: Maybe, maybe Mark Farman maybe other and it can be a conspiracy

7) The New Yorker reporter: Wait okay wait all the blood evidence, somehow these cops all these racist police officers planted it from the murder scene to the bronco to rocking ham?

Bobby Shapiro: Who else could have, take a step back I mean doesn't it seem odd that this glove happened to be at rocking ham the same time that detective Farman just happened to find it?

8) Chris (co-prosecutor): How do you feel about inter racial conflicts detective?

Furman: Don't care. (Looks down)

9) Chris (co-prosecutor): I'm not sure what you mean by that what's there to care about?

Furman: I don't have an opinion they're the same as anybody else.

10) Chris (co-prosecutor): So you're saying you've never used the n word?

Furman: (Cuts the lawyer while he's talking) what's this got to do with the case? (Raises voice, and hand movement)

11) Chris (co-prosecutor): Detective have you used the word?

Furman: Has anyone told you that I used the word?

12) OJ's daughter: Are you helping daddy find the man who hurt my mommy?

DA's representatives: (ammm uses conversation fillers) Yeah, (stutter) yes ammm that's right, you daddy's busy working on other things today.

13) Judge Lance: have you ever been arrested for kidnaping 620?

Jury 602: (scoffs) (stutters) what? (Laughs in a confused manner) I think I remember something like that. (Judge Lance shows him the police report, nervous movement of lips) (stutters) aa aa ohhhkayyy (leans backwards, arm movement) now I know what you're talking about (sound from mouth) see that was my ex but she's cool with it now (shakes head in denial), we cool (everyone continues to stare at him)

ahh aa (scared)I just locked the car and, and I drove around the neighborhood a few times that's all eh you know how ladies can get ,you know (nervous movement of arms)

14) Judge lance: 462 the reason why I asked you here today is that the sheriff's department reviewed some court records and you once accused your husband of abusing you physically?

Jury 462: (silence and shakes her head in denial) no, no it was never domestic violence typa thing I was never physically abused and (sighs) that's why I never said anything (sad expression) I mean anybody in a relationship with anybody know that there are times when things are difficult

How to get away with murder

1) Lawyer: Are you speaking of the hard times you experienced due to working with your mother?

Karen: Anyone who works with family knows it's not easy.

2) Lawyer: And how would you describe your relationship with your mother outside of work?

Karen: I'd say just like any other mother/daughter relationship. (Clenched hands and moving them, looking at hands while talking-adaptors: nervousness)

3) Lauren-Oh, sorry. Um, your Nelson testified that, uh, you depended on him for everything.

Edith-Is that what he said?

4) Lauren-Uh I believe so. Is that not true?

Edith-I relied on my son for things any mother would. I just never thought he'd try to murder me for that. (Maintaining eye contact-regulator: dominance)

5) Lawyer: "Let's make a skin suit out of her and wear it to the funeral" Duvall, you wrote that text to your brother and sister just two weeks before your mother took ill, - is that correct? –

Duvall: I was just venting. (Hands clenched together resting on the desk-affective display:shows the anxious or nervous attitude, erect position-adaptors: defensive, shakes head- regulator)

[Edith coughs]

Duvall: A dark sense of humor can get anyone through hard times.

6) Lawyer: Because it was so contentious?

[Edith Clears throat]

Karen: No. Even when we disagreed, there was always love between us. (Moves hands-adaptors)

7) Jared- What kind of monster gets off on mocking her own son? (yells-affective display: defensive, leans forward-adaptor)

Edith-One of us needs to get off.

8) Lauren-Uh I believe so. Is that not true?

Edith-I relied on my son for things any mother would. I just never thought he'd try to murder me for that.(maintaining eye contact-regulator: dominance)

9) Lauren-Here! Would you say you're involved in your children's love lives?

Edith-There isn't much to be involved in (Chuckling-affective display: smugness) sadly.

10) Lauren: Um Mrs. Duvall, Karen kept her relationship with Roger a secret. So how'd you find out about it?

Edith: Call it mother's intuition. (Shrugs, looks away –adaptors: hiding something)

Maxim	Quality	Quantity	Relativity	Manner	Total no .of times maxims have been violated
No. of times used in How to get away with murder	9	3	6	10	18

Maxim	Quality	Quantity	Relativity	Manner	Total no .of times maxims have been violated
No. of times used in American crime stories	23	16	6	14	59

4.2Non-verbal cues

4.2.1 Regulators:

Regulators are non-verbal sign that are used to maintain the flow of speech or in order to show confusion if any. They can be eye movements as well as nodding or shaking of head. Every culture has different regulators for different purposes. 3 regulators were found in How to Get Away with Murder and 14 in American Crime Story.

For example, in American crime story, OJ frowns while answering a question which shows his confusion and similarly when Edith was asked a question by the lawyer during 16:47-18:25, she frowns as well. Similarly there are other types of regulators as well like shaking head which was noted in American crime story when OJ shakes

his head as a means of negating the lawyer's statement and in how to get away with murder Duvall shook his head to show that he disagreed.

How to Get Away With Murder

1. Duvall: shakes head
2. Edith- maintaining eye contact
3. Edith: frowns

American Crime Story

1. OJ: frowns
2. Oj: shakes his head
3. Oj: shakes his head
4. Client (O.J): shakes his head
5. Detective Lance: Looking down the list of names she pauses at the last one and frowns
6. Peggy: sharp intake of air
7. OJ: Shakes his head
8. Furman: Looks down
9. Furman: nods his head
10. Chris (co-prosecutor): deepens frown
11. Furman: Makes eye contact and stops normal blinking
12. DA's representatives: uses conversation fillers
13. Jury 602: shakes head in denial
14. Jury 462: silence and shakes her head in denial

4.2.2 Affective display:

Affective display is the facial expressions or body movements to show one's state of emotions. Two people can show their anger and happiness in completely different way. Also lack of affective display is not considered very positive. Examples of Affective display found in How to Get Away with Murder and in American Crime Story were 6 and 7 respectively. For example in American Crime Story, OJ smile while answering that shows his state or emotions that is, him feeling happy at the thought of some memory. In how to get away with murder Edith is constantly smirking/ smiling during her deposition that shows her smugness. Jury 462, in American Crime Story, has some sad expressions that show her sadness and Jared in How to Get Away with Murder, raises his voice while talking to show his anger and him being defensive.

American Crime Story

1. Jury 602: scoffs
2. Jury 602: Laughs in a confused manner
3. Jury 602: leans backwards, scared
4. Jury 462: sad expression
5. OJ: forced laughter
6. OJ: laughs a deliberate laugh
7. OJ: smiles

How to Get Away With Murder

1. Duvall: hands clenched together resting on the desk
2. Jared: looks away
3. Jared: looks down
4. Jared: yells
5. Edith: smirking
6. Edith: Chuckling

4.2.3 Adaptors:

Adaptors are body movements that are carried out at low level of awareness or they may be to perform some physical function for instance a person's body posture may help in understanding what is going through his or her mind. There are 3 adaptors found in How to Get Away with Murder and 11 in American Crime Story. In American Crime Story, there were many instances when OJ moved his hands against the table during the conversation which showed that he was trying to eliminate any nervous energy and the same kind of hand movement was shown by Karren in How to Get Away with Murder in the time duration of 16:47-18:25. Another example is of Duvall who is sitting erect while he is being question and his body posture shows that he is being defensive.

How to Get Away with Murder

1. Edith- shrugs, looks away
2. Duvall: erect position
3. Karren: Clenched hands and moving them, looking at hands while talking

American Crime Story

1. OJ: hand movement
2. OJ: looking at his hand
3. Attorney (Bobby Shapiro): Blinks three times before answering
4. OJ: swallows hardly
5. Bobby Shapiro: Walking back on forth and talking on the phone
6. Bobby Shapiro: stutters
7. Bobby Shapiro: put his hand on the table and takes support
8. Furman: Pauses, with mouth open
9. Jury 602: nervous movement of lips
10. Jury 602: arm movement
11. Jury 462: sighs

4.2.4. Illustrators:

Illustrators are non-verbal signals that are used to reinforce what you are saying to put stress on your point by pointing towards something or gesturing. We can see 1 example of this type of kinesics when OJ points towards the investigator with his thumb to emphasize whatever he was trying to say.

American Crime Story

1. OJ: pointing towards the investigator with his thumb

4.2.5 Emblems:

Emblems are the signs that have a verbal counterpart and have different meanings in different cultures but in our analysis we were unable to identify any in the taken cases.

Kinesics	Regulator	Emblems	Affective display	Adaptors	Illustrators
Number of non-verbal signs identified in American Crime Story	14	0	7	11	1

Kinesics	Regulator	Emblems	Affective display	Adaptors	Illustrators
Number of non-verbal signs identified in How to Get Away With Murder	3	0	6	3	0

Some of the non-verbal signs like emblems were not found in any of the TV show while no illustrator could be identified in How to Get Away With Murder. The non-verbal signs found in American Crime Story can be identified as distinctive cues of lying but the same cannot be said about How to Get Away With Murder. In the latter, the liar, sometimes, showed lack of any kind of affective display or other sign which shows that not every liar has some set signals which can give him/her away. Here the guilty person is seen to be more confident and at some points her overconfidence can also be taken as a cue to suspicion while the suspects, how nervous they seemed, were innocent. With time, in the light of different experiments done, psychologists have differed in their deductions about whether a liar shows visible signs of lying or not. In our analysis we came across both types of cases. In American Crime Story the signs, that can give away a liar's position, were visible which can be seen with the help of different types of kinesics analyzed. On the other hand in How to Get Away With Murder, the case is a little different. The suspects that were being questioned had many non-verbal signs that could give away their position but it was not because they were guilty but it was because they were lying and, at some points, nervous. On the other hand the accuser or the old lady, who was later revealed to be lying, had very few non-verbal signals and at some points her glances were far too long or she lacked any affective display. The reason it was so was that whatever she was saying was partially true but at some instances even the analyst can detect some signs which gave away her position for example when near the end she was about to be caught, she either stared to hard or looked away to avoid the conversation which are signs of lying or hiding something.

While analyzing the respective data the researchers came to know that in certain instances deception could not be detected if only one of the two ,verbal or non-verbal , cues where being analyzed.in some cases the liar is aware of the techniques used to assess the statement or the tells that they could give hence they controlled it for example in American Crime Story when Shapiro asks OJ if he murdered his wife he says NO in that way he is not violating any maxim as there is no proof of the crime yet and if we only analyzed it linguistically we would not have understood his attempt to deceive the lawyer .in how to get away with murder if we only looked at the non-verbal cues ,the case would have been ended differently as the children would have been convicted of the attempted murder and it was because of the linguistic analysis that the culprit was apprehended .hence proving the fact that accuracy of forensic data can only be attained if non-verbal cues are taken under consideration alongside with it as different people tend to have command over different aspect while attempting to deceive the other and have different tells .

Findings

1. How forensic linguistics has become essential in criminal cases?

Apart from the investigation and usual investigation that was done in the shows taken, the analysis of verbal and non-verbal cues was helpful in decoding the hidden messages of the behaviors of suspects and to get a grasp of their mental state. In the analysis done, the verbal and non-verbal cues provided a lot of help in finding out the hidden meanings because sometimes the physical forensic evidence can be misleading.

2. How verbal and non-verbal evidence can be analyzed to detect deception and truth?

Verbal and non-verbal cues have been examined by using Information Manipulation Theory and Kinesics Theory. With the help of Kinesics theory the non-verbal cues like Regulator, Emblems, Affective display, Adaptors and Illustrators and verbal cues like the maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relativity and Manner have been identified and then further studied in the analysis.

The cues have been identified with the help of these theories and are further analyzed.

3. Can deception detection be more accurate if non-verbal cues are taken into account along with verbal characteristics?

By looking at the analysis that was done, it is clear that only taking the non-verbal signs and ignoring the verbal, ones or vice versa, would be misleading. Both the verbal and non-verbal aspects have to be taken into account to correctly analyze a situation because at few points in the analysis, considering the non-verbal cues only was giving the wrong results.

The findings that were acquired through the analysis, support the literature review that linguistic evidence is as important as any forensic evidence and behind every case there is a thorough research done with the help of Forensic linguistics.

5.2 Recommendations

The researchers recommend readers who want to further take up the respective topic to keep in mind the following things

- 1) To use software's to prove their hypothesis to further facilitate the respective study.
- 2) To analyze crime fiction of various countries rather than just American.
- 3) The researchers are recommended to also include forensic phonetics as that can also provide a viable insight in the respective research.

5.3 conclusion

The study of this research paper showed how forensic linguistics has become an important part in the means of solving crimes and how verbal and non-verbal cues can be analyzed. This paper also highlighted that how the analysis of both verbal and non-verbal signals, if taken together, increases the chances of detection of deception to be more accurate. The research paper aimed at showing the importance of forensic linguistics by conducting an analysis on the criminal cases taken from American Crime Story and How to Get Away with Murder.

Thus the study was successful in proving the important role played by forensic linguistic by showcasing how the analysis can be done and how by taking the verbal and non-verbal signs side by side together the chances of valid results are increased.

Appendix

American Crime Story

Episode 1

23:37 – 25:12

Investigator: O.J when was the last time you saw Nicole?

OJ: YESTERDAY, when we were leaving our daughters recital, it ended at about 6:30 6:45 something like that

Investigator: and what time did you get back home?

OJ: (Frowns) Oh 7 something, (SHAKES HIS HEAD) I'm trying to think, did I leave? (Moving his hands against the table) You know (pointing towards the investigator with his thumb) I had to run and get my daughter recital flowers (moving both hands, smiles), then I call my girlfriend Paula as I headed to her house and Paula wasn't home.

Investigator: When did you park your bronco in Rockingham?

OJ: 8 something 7, 8 (hand movement) 9 I don't know (shakes his head) around that area and then I was sitting with Kato hadn't done a Jacuzzi so we went and got a burger.

Investigator: And what about your left hand, how did you get that injury?

OJ: Aaa (stutter) I don't know (looking at his hand) first time I was in Chicago yeah and I got back to the house and I was running around and I broke a glass.

Investigator: Oh

OJ: Yeah, and then one of your guys had just called, actually (stutter) I cut it before maybe I opened it, yeah, but it's no big deal I bleed all the time, I golf (forced laughter) you know it's always something (laughs a deliberate laugh) nicks and stuff

32:23 -32:59

Attorney (Bobby Shapiro): any time that I take on a new criminal case I always the client a question, now I won't be judgmental but I think it is crucial that the attorney and the client are truthful to each other, so anything you tell me is completely confidential and won't ever leave the room .so OJ did you do it?

Completely still and staring at the attorney)

Blinks three times before answering)

Client (O.J): no, (shakes his head, and swallows hardly) I loved her blinks.

49:10-49:30

Receives call

Bobby Shapiro: tom I have to apologize we're a few minutes behind

Tom: Bob you are in your car?

Bobby Shapiro: Well almost, we're about to leave

Tom: What! No, no bob don't jerk me around

Bobby Shapiro: He's, (stutters) He's washing up, (pause) he's getting dressed, (pause) he's moving a bit slow

Episode 2

0:28 – 1:00

(Walking back on forth and talking on the phone)

Bobby Shapiro calls Gill

Gill: What do you want?

Bobby Shapiro: Gill

Gill: I wish I could reach through this god dam phone and strangle you

Bobby Shapiro: I am so sorry he did this to us I mean you know that I am a fixer of things, (stutters) I, I, I don't tolerate this kind of stuff

Gill: How did a murder suspect disappear from a house full of people?

Bobby Shapiro: I didn't know he was going to run I you've gotta believe me gill(put his hand on the table and takes support) I mean this means I'm the good guy here look who brought Menendez back from Israel huh ?(stutters)who, who ,who backed your campaign ? You even came to my 50th birthday you loved it was a great party

Gill: Bob find your client and deliver him.

Episode 3:

19:50-21:23

The New Yorker reporter: thank you for taking out the time to see me.

Bobby Shapiro: you from the New york magazine or new Yorker ?

The New Yorker reporter: Newyorker, Adam told me to look you up

Bobby Shapiro: Ahh

The New Yorker reporter: I'm doing a piece on cash for trash stories witnesses selling their testimonies and the OJ Simpson trial seemed like

Bobby Shapiro: No, no, no it's inconsequential, its window dressing; it's not the best use of your time

The New Yorker reporter: Well that's the story I'm out here to cover

Bobby Shapiro: Well I know it is but wouldn't you rather ask me why a man like me would take a case like this you would be surprised

The New Yorker reporter: I might be surprised okay I'm surprised okay tell me

Bobby Shapiro: Because it has far reaching implications I've never seen anything like it and I couldn't stand by and let it happen

The New Yorker reporter: Let what happen actually?

Bobby Shapiro: The systematic railroading of OJ Simpson by a racist LAPD, because he is a black man

The New Yorker reporter: Wait! What?

Bobby Shapiro: The LAPD has a shameful history, and everybody knows it, it's no secret, and this cop Mark Farman, who discovered evidence is an admitted racist, any evidence that he touches is questionable

The New Yorker reporter: So, I wana be clear your saying this policeman set up OJ Simpson ?

Bobby Shapiro: Maybe, maybe Mark Farman maybe other and it can be a conspiracy

The New Yorker reporter: Wait okay wait all the blood evidence, somehow these cops all these racist police officers planted it from the murder scene to the bronco to rocking ham?

Bobby Shapiro: Who else could have ,take a step back I mean doesn't it seem odd that this glove happened to be at rocking ham the same time that detective Farman just happened to find it ?

The New Yorker reporter: It isn't odd if Simpson dropped it if Simpson dropped it while climbing the wall in order to avoid being seen by the limo driver. So you're going to say that the whole case is based on race?

Bobby Shapiro: Yes, because it is.

Episode 4 :

9:46-10:7

Detective Lance: here's the usual spousal conflict form.

(Looking down the list of names she pauses at the last one and frowns)

Peggy: (sharp intake of air) nope, nothing rings a bell

11:29-11:37

Judge Lance: Mr. Simpson (Simpson stands up) are you ready to enter a plea at this time?

OJ: Yes your hour

Judge Lance: And how do you choose to plead

OJ: Absolutely 100% not guilty (Shakes his head)

Episode 5:

48:2-49:09

Chris (co-prosecutor): How do you feel about inter racial conflicts detective?

Furman: Don't care. (Looks down)

Chris (co-prosecutor): I'm not sure what you mean by that what's there to care about?

Furman: I don't have an opinion they're the same as anybody else.

Chris (co-prosecutor): Got any hobbies detective?

Furman: I collect world war two memorabilia, medals mostly (blinks three times and does not look at the lawyer directly)

Chris (co-prosecutor): What about any sports heroes?

Furman: Aa George Foreman and Magic Johnson.

Chris (co-prosecutor): I'm surprised to hear that, in the past haven't you expressed dislike for African Americans?

Furman: (Pauses, with mouth open) No sir, I have not.(blinks two time and nods his head)

Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever unfairly targeted Africans Americans while on the job? (Squints eyes, and deepens frown)

Furman: No.

Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever been accused of unfairly targeting African Americans?

Furman: Probably, at some point suspects will just about say anything to get of

Chris (co-prosecutor): Have you ever used a racial slur in describing an African American?

Furman: No

Chris (co-prosecutor): So you're saying you've never used the n word?

Furman: (Cuts the lawyer while his talking) what's this got to do with the case? (Raises voice, and hand movement)

Chris (co-prosecutor): Detective have you used the word?

Furman: Has anyone told you that I used the word?

Chris (co-prosecutor): So if the defence calls a witness to testify that you used it how will you respond to that?

Furman: I haven't (pauses) ever. (Makes eye contact and stops normal blinking)

Episode 7

7:40 -8:05

Denies (Nicole's friend): There that's what's left of Nicole .

DA's representatives: thank you Denies.

OJ's daughter: Are you helping daddy find the man who hurt my mommy?

DA's representatives: (ammm uses conversation fillers) Yeah, (stutter) yes ammm that's right, you daddy's busy working on other things today.

Episode 8

11:53-12:48

Judge lance: have you ever been arrested for kidnaping 620?

Jury 602: (scoffs) (stutters) what? (Laughs in a confused manner) I think id remember something like that.

Judge lance: (shows him the police report)

Jury 602: (nervous movement of lips) (stutters) aa aa ohhhkayyy(leans backwards, arm movement) now I know what you're talking about (sound form mouth)see that was my ex but she's cool with it now(shakes head in denial), we cool (everyone continues to stare at him) ahh aa (scared)I just locked the car and, and I drove around the neighborhood a few times that's all eh you know how ladies can get ,you know (nervous movement of arms)

19:48--20:10

Jury number 462 walks inside

Judge lance: 462 the reason why I asked you here today is that the sheriff's department reviewed some court records and you once accused your husband of abusing you physically?

Jury 462: (silence and shakes her head in denial) no, no it was never domestic violence typa thing I was never physically abused and (sighs) that's why I never said anything (sad expression) I mean anybody in a relationship with anybody know that there are times when things are difficult

How to get away with murder

16:47-18:25

Lawyer: "Let's make a skin suit out of her and wear it to the funeral" Duvall, you wrote that text to your brother and sister just two weeks before your mother took ill, - is that correct? –

Duvall: I was just venting. (Hands clenched together resting on the desk-affective display: shows the anxious or nervous attitude, erect position-adaptors: defensive, shakes head- regulator)

[Edith coughs]

Duvall: A dark sense of humor can get anyone through hard times.

Lawyer: Are you speaking of the hard times you experienced due to working with your mother?

Karen: Anyone who works with family knows it's not easy.

Lawyer: And how would you describe your relationship with your mother outside of work?

Karen: I'd say just like any other mother/daughter relationship. (Clenched hands and moving them, looking at hands while talking-adaptors: nervousness)

Lawyer: Because it was so contentious?

[Edith Clears throat]

Karen: No. Even when we disagreed, there was always love between us. (Moves hands-adaptors)

Lawyer: Jared, a co-worker of yours stated that your mother humiliated you in front of a woman you were dating. Do you recall this event?

Jared: I do not.

Lawyer: Let me remind you. "Edith then proceeded to tell a story" about how Jared once reached under his mother's dress "at his birthday party when he was 13."

Edith: He was 14 and old enough to know better.

Analise: Strike Mrs. Duvall's last statement from the record and remind her she's not allowed to speak.

Edith: I apologize.

Lawyer: You must have been angry with your mother for emasculating you like that, especially in front of a woman who you'd hoped to be intimate with. (Jared looks away-affective display: self-conscious, shaking head:- disagreeing)

Edith: She was never gonna screw him. (Jared looks down-affective display: submission)

Analise: My client needs a break.

Edith: He's a virgin, probably will be till he dies.

Jared: And you wonder why people want you dead?!

Analise: Jared.

Jared: What kind of monster gets off on mocking her own son? (Yells-affective display: defensive, leans forward-adaptor)

Edith: One of us needs to get off.

Jared: I look forward to the day you die.

(Edith smirking-affective display: smugness)

28:49-31:05

Lauren: Mrs. Duvall, during his deposition yesterday, your oldest son, Jared, testified that..

Edith: My oldest is Nelson.

Lauren: Oh, sorry. Um, your Nelson testified that, uh, you depended on him for everything.

Edith: Is that what he said?

Lauren: Uh I believe so. Is that not true?

Edith: I relied on my son for things any mother would. I just never thought he'd try to murder me for that. (Maintaining eye contact-regulator: dominance)

Lauren: All right. Hang on. My, uh, cards got mixed up.

Analise: Just let us know if you need a break.

Edith: Oh, no. I've been waiting for this for a long time.

Lauren: Here! Would you say you're involved in your children's love lives?

Edith: There isn't much to be involved in (Chuckling-affective display: smugness) sadly.

Lauren: Really?

Edith: They're all single, unhappily so.

Lauren: Oh, because I believe Karen mentioned she was involved with a man who delivered your produce.

Edith: Oh, Roger Colby used her. That's not a real relationship. (Nodding head-emblem: encouraging /agreeing)

Lauren: Um Mrs. Duvall, Karen kept her relationship with Roger a secret. So how'd you find out about it?

Edith: Call it mother's intuition. (Shrugs, looks away –adaptors: hiding something)

Lauren: Or did you find out by snooping into her secret e-mail?

Edith: excuse me (frowns-regulator: shows confusion)

Lauren: You require your employees to lock their cellphones in your desk while they're working, correct?

Lawyer: You don't have to answer that. –
Edith: It's company policy.
Lauren: A policy that allowed you to read Karen's e-mail about poisoning you, which is why you decided to poison yourself. That's how angry you were at them.
Lawyer: I call for a break.
Edith: I will not be accused of lies in this room.
Analise: Then admit what you did. - Is this what you wanted to tell everyone how you feel? You gave your children your life, and they paid you back by fantasizing about your death. It devastated you to the point where that you risked your life to teach them a lesson. (Prolonged staring-lying)
Lawyer: Mrs. Duvall, you have the right to seek advice of counsel.
Edith: Children always take their mothers for granted. Maybe now mine won't.
Lauren: Nothing further.

Bibliography

- Adams, S. H. (1996, October). Statement analysis: What do suspects' words really reveal? *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, pp. 12-20.
- Buller, D. B., Burgoon, J. K., Buslig, A., & Roiger, J. (1996). Testing Interpersonal Deception Theory: The language of interpersonal deception. *Communication Theory*, 6, 268-289
- Chichester, UK: Wiley. Vrij, A., Edward, K., Roberts, K. P., & Bull, R. (2000). Detecting deceit via analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 24, 239-264.
- Cutler, B. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Psychology and Law*. doi:10.4135/9781412959537
- Ekman, P. (1985/1992). *Telling lies: Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics, and marriage* (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.
- Friedman, H. S., & Tucker, J. S. (1990). Language and deception. In H. Giles & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social psychology*. New York: John Wiley
- Johnson, M. K., & Raye, C. L. (1981). Reality monitoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88, 67-85.
- Kapardis, A. (2003). *psychology and Law*. New York: CUP.
- Knapp, M. L., & Comadena, M. A. (1979). Telling it like it isn't: A review of theory and research on deceptive communications. *Human Communication Research*, 5, 270-285.
- Knapp, M. L., Hart, R. P., & Dennis, H. S. (1974). An exploration of deception as a communication construct. *Human Communication Research*, 1, 15-29
- Mathews, B. (2003). A Kapardis, *Psychology and Law: A Critical Introduction* (2nd ed). *QUT Law Review*, Newman, M. L., Pennebaker, J. W., Berry, D. S., & Richards, J. M. (2003). Lying Words: Predicting Deception from Linguistic Styles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(5), 665-675.
- Pennebaker, J. W., & King, L. A. (1999). Linguistic styles: Language use as an individual difference. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 1296-1312.
- Pennebaker, J. W., Mehl, M. R., & Niederhoffer, K. G. (in press). Psychological aspects of natural language use: Our words, our selves. *Annual Review of Psychology*.
- Vrij, A. (2000). Detecting lies and deceit: The psychology of lying and the implications for professional practice.
- Vrij, A. (2004). Detecting Deceit Via Analyses of Verbal and Nonverbal Behavior in Children and Adults. *Human Communication Research*, 30
- Psychology and Crime News. (2009, February 28). Retrieved March 23, 2017, from Using forensic linguistics in the criminal justice system: <http://crimepsychblog.com/?p=1953>
- 5 types of kinesics. (2017). com101. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <https://amarit04.wordpress.com/2008/02/17/5-types-of-kinesics/>
- (2017). Retrieved March 29, 2017, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243459429_Understanding_body_language_Birdwhistell%27s_theory_of_kinesics
- Psychology and Crime News. (2009, February 28). Retrieved March 23, 2017, from Using forensic linguistics in the criminal justice system: <http://crimepsychblog.com/?p=1953>
- 5 types of kinesics. (2017). com101. Retrieved March 29, 2017, from <https://amarit04.wordpress.com/2008/02/17/5-types-of-kinesics/>
- Retrieved March 29, 2017, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/243459429_Understanding_body_language_Birdwhistell%27s_theory_of_kinesics