

Research paper

## Discoursal Features of Court Speech in Trial Sessions from a Forensic Linguistic Perspective

Shima Sayahi

Department of English, Arvand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran

### Citation

Sayahi, S. (2023). Discoursal features of court Speech in trial sessions from forensic linguistic perspective. *Journal of new advances in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 1425-1437.



10.22034/Jeltal.2023.5.2.10

### Received

2022-12-09

### Revised

2023-05-10

### Accepted

2023-07-14

### Keywords:

*forensic linguistics,  
verbal style,  
social interaction,  
discoursal features*

### Abstract

This research investigated verbal specialties in the text interpretation of the forensic discourses of the judges and defendants for verification or disapproval of allegations against suspects. The methodology of the current research is qualitative since the frequency of weak and strong styles of speech was counted in the five court sessions. McMenamin's (2002) Verbal Style Model was followed to investigate weak and strong verbal styles of judges and defendants in the court's trial sessions. Five visual files of several trial sessions in the Judicial Courts of the Islamic Republic of Iran were analyzed. Descriptive statistics revealed that strong and weak verbal styles were used differently. The total frequency of strong style markers was 247, while the frequency of weak style markers was 224. The most frequent discoursal weak style elements are anaphoric expressions, repetition, intensifiers, and ungrammatical sentences. In contrast, judges used more linguistic intensity and lexical variety of standard language, which were not observed in the defendants' speech. Implications suggest employing linguistic elements like situational context, including genres, style, verbal act, nonverbal communicative competence, and topic, can affect trial processes. Thus, the weak and strong styles of speech should be used with care by both judges and defendants.

\*Corresponding Author: Shima Sayahi

Address: No.24, Faculty of ELT, Arvand International University, Abadan, Iran

Tel: (+98) 9166094155

E-mail: *shima@gmail.com*

### Introduction

Discourse is a set of sentences expressed in a special interactive and communicative social context. Discourses have verbal and nonverbal representations, including performative acts, beliefs, ideas, values, and symbols, and follow specific verbal styles for achieving certain goals

(Coulthard et al, 2017). In trial sessions, the analysis of discourse surrounding a suspect's statements can serve as an essential instrument for evaluating accusations. Forensic linguistics, which investigates language within legal frameworks, can pinpoint linguistic indicators that may imply deceit, uncover inconsistencies, or reflect the suspect's psychological condition. Various methods such as authorship attribution, speech act analysis, and the examination of conversational dynamics assist in evaluating the trustworthiness and significance of the suspect's words (van Straalen et al, 2023). In instances where a suspect asserts that they were pressured into providing a confession, forensic linguistic examination may concentrate on the suspect's language usage, searching for signs of stress, confusion, or manipulation. Should the suspect's statement exhibit repetitive expressions, ambiguous language, and a deficiency of detail, it could prompt concerns regarding its credibility and imply possible coercion. By integrating forensic linguistics with additional investigative strategies, law enforcement and legal experts can achieve a more profound comprehension of the evidence and make better-informed choices regarding the prosecution and defense of suspects (Abbaszadeh et al, 2021).

In Sojoudi's (2009) view, 'sign' belongs to the semiotic para-linguistics. We always face the text in the authentic communicative act." Text" is a product of different codes, which are represented in the shape of various levels. Texts in the real world are more or less built with the combination of diverse discourse types and their description. Therefore, an intertextual analysis is the bridge between language and social context, which fills the gap between texts and contexts in the best way. Texts are constructed through a combination of various discourse types and their descriptions. Consequently, intertextual analysis serves as a bridge between language and social context, effectively bridging the gap between texts and contexts.

The process of understanding meaning is dependent on the speech used for communicating information about the daily speech events of the speakers (Abbaszadeh & Gorjian, 2023). Verbal communication is a highly structured form of interaction with set rules of grammar. These guidelines assist in comprehending and interpreting the messages and intentions of others. What distinguishes speaking from other abilities is the necessity for speakers to swiftly access all pertinent knowledge needed to articulate the suitable language based on their existing understanding within a limited timeframe (Wright, 2020). "In the context of meaning comprehension, social standing and status are crucial in conveying the intended meaning as expressed by the speaker. The meanings of words, interpretations, assumptions, and the fourth are influenced by the beliefs and attitudes of the interlocutors." (MacDanell, 1998:41).

Richards and Schmidt (2002: 160) noted that "discourse typically pertains to larger language units such as paragraphs, conversations, and interviews". In today's society, all activities and speech acts associated with identity formation occur within the social sphere. Discourse markers offer a valuable opportunity and furnish insights into the dynamics between speakers and listeners, facilitating the integration of forms, functions, and meanings to achieve a comprehensive understanding of what is articulated during interactions. Schiffrin (1987) characterizes them as "sequentially dependent elements that enclose a unit of talk" (p.31).

Individuals often communicate rapidly, lacking unity and continuity in their discussions, which leads to ineffective and misunderstood exchanges, frequently omitting crucial details or relying on assumptions. The interpretation of text fosters a reciprocal relationship between linguistic and social contexts (Kunkuri & Kingsley, 2025). Taking into account the time and place can serve as an effective strategy for addressing linguistic challenges in legal and forensic matters. To foster improved social interactions, it is essential to enhance skill performance in everyday and natural conversations. Analyzing semantic and discoursal characteristics for improved interpretation, crime detection, or criminal authorship significantly contributes to this endeavor (Nkane Ekpang & Ogolekwu, 2024).

Groot (2003) define ‘‘forensic linguistics’’ as a science that supervises other linguistic fields' performance, including phonetics in identification, writing skills of the forensic texts, semantics, and discourse analysis for achieving the goals concerning legal issues. The application area of such a science is related to linguistic science and the needs of forensic and judicial settings, especially the courts (Wright, 2020). The number of units at various levels of the language is different. Phrases, clauses, and sentences are considered the highest level of language. Whereas, speech sounds are in the lowest layer (van Charldorp, 2014). Through specific determined rules, unlimited units are created. Grammar is extended with features describing the information structure. Language function and meaning can enhance our understanding of people’s cultures, social values, social organization, and language use within a community. Through cultural knowledge, we interpret the behavior of others (Mehrabani et al, 2022).

The present study focused on the gap that has been observed in recent studies which has not compared strong and weak styles of speech in the courts, especially in the conversations of judges and defendants. Although forensic linguistics has gained recognition as a vital interdisciplinary field bridging language and law, significant research gaps remain that hinder its full integration into judicial practice. One major gap lies in the limited synthesis of linguistic subfields—such as phonetics, semantics, and discourse analysis—despite Groot’s (2003) definition of forensic linguistics as a supervisory science. Current studies often treat these areas in isolation, lacking a unified framework that could enhance analytical precision. Furthermore, while Wright (2020) underscores the relevance of linguistic expertise in courtroom settings, there is a shortage of empirical research demonstrating its direct impact on legal outcomes. Another overlooked dimension is the role of sociocultural context in language interpretation; as Mehrabani et al. (2022) suggest, cultural knowledge is essential for understanding behavior, yet forensic linguistics rarely incorporates sociolinguistic variation into its analyses. Additionally, van Charldorp’s (2014) discussion of language units highlights the absence of standardized models for systematically analyzing linguistic structures in forensic contexts. Addressing these gaps would not only strengthen the reliability of forensic linguistic evidence but also promote more equitable legal processes by accounting for linguistic and cultural diversity. Regarding the research gap of the study, the following research question is formulated:

RQ. What are discoursal characteristics in the interpretation for determining defendants in trial sessions?

The above research question is to determine the extent to which type of discourse verbal styles in judges and defendants (i.e., the couples who were transferred to civil courts, appealing divorce) is variable in transferring communicative signs and intentions. It also aims to explore strong and weak discoursal characteristics in text interpretation for determining suspects' accusations in trial sessions of the judicial courts through McMenamin' (2002) verbal style model.

### Literature Review

The linguistic crime's illocutionary force accompanies the specific formal characteristics. He classifies the structure of bribery into four categories, which start and end with specific sentences (van Straalen et al (2023)). For the approval of linguistic crimes, we should separate them from other sentence types; for example, in the case of bribery, the stages are arranged in the order: problem, suggestion, finishing, and continuation. In his view, crime exploration in various layers, such as phonological, morphological, grammatical, discoursal, stylistic, and sociological, is possible through employing the linguistic devices: tone, intonation, syllable, stress, pitch range, and pause (Gorjian & Abbaszadeh, 2023).

In instances where a speaker faces allegations of a language crime, it is often beneficial to conduct a topic analysis of the entire conversation or series of conversations (Coulthard et al, 2017). Topic introductions are characterized by clear semantic transitions from the preceding topic, by structural indicators such as pauses and changes in intonation, by discourse markers like 'well', and by performative phrases that signal a change in topic, such as 'not to change the subject but . . .', 'let's move on to something else', or 'let me tell you something here' (Coterrill, 2002: 9).

Momeni (2010) conducted an analysis regarding the role of witnesses in court, focusing on their linguistic traits. She categorized verbal styles into strong and weak types. Ultimately, it was determined that each of these styles possesses distinct characteristics. Through the use of linguistic tools, one can investigate lies, witnesses, and various criminal activities. Johnson (2001) explored the claim made by Drew and Heritage (1992) that this type of interaction effectively enables professionals to 'gain a measure of control over the introduction of topics and hence of the "agenda" for the occasion' (p. 49). His focus was on the unique application of so-prefaced questions during police interviews with child witnesses and adult defendants, as well as the significance of these questions in marking topics and navigating within a narrative framework. Interviews were conducted across various regions of England by different police personnel. The children served as witnesses in abuse cases, while the adults were defendants facing a variety of serious criminal charges. The analysis aimed to highlight the differences in the distribution and function of so-prefaced questions between adults and children during the interviews. The data indicated that police interviews exhibited a specialized and frequent employment of so-prefacing (Sobhani et al, 2023). He concluded that the institutional context

exerts a greater influence on the formal and pragmatic aspects of conversation than the style of the interviewer. Although there were similarities in the function and application of these questions in both conversational and institutional contexts, in both environments, so-prefaced questions were utilized to mark, sequence, and even challenge the pragmatic effects and implications that arise from the asymmetrical institutional setting, which were more summative. Additionally, a comparison between the interviews of child witnesses and adult defendants revealed that fluctuating asymmetries were present. In interviews with very young child witnesses, the asymmetrical dynamic between the interviewer and interviewee should not be interpreted as a power imbalance between the powerful and the powerless.

Coultard (2010) suggested that context is a dynamic category produced by discourse through linguistic and nonlinguistic devices. Forensic text has various semantic layers with different applications. Such a discourse includes specific verbal characteristics that have priority in the communicative system. There is a hierarchical relationship between the judge, lawyer, police, and judiciary in the system. Chaski's (2005) findings indicated that the quantitative method is concerned with linguistic features counted numerically, including the length of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, and also word frequency of occurrence. Halliday and Hassan (1985) emphasized the three effective factors in communication: verbal and nonverbal communicative systems, knowledge of the material and sociocultural world, and the amount of connection of people with such a piece of knowledge. There are three kinds of meaning: conceptual (dealing with thoughts and ideas), interpersonal (concerning social interactions), and situational.

Coulthard and Johnson (2007) discussed the problems encountered and the techniques applied in the analysis of linguistic evidence of very different natures: phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, discursal, textual, and pragmatic. They also consider the recording of interaction in written form, the narrative analysis of disputed statements, and courtroom contexts in which either the defendant is a non-native speaker, with subsequent problems in language comprehension and production, or the question is that of determining the nationality of people claiming refugee status.

The research aimed to find out the effective discursal elements in the strong and weak styles of judges and couples as defendants in the civil courts' different sessions to determine the extent of linguistic elements effect on couples' faults and accusation in their marital relations and to decide whether their request for divorce is correct and efficient. The subsequent parts will present theoretical background on the previous studies accomplished, data collection, and analytical instrumentation and procedures, regarding some of the most influential studies that examine this linguistic phenomenon, and methodology, and then conclude with results, discussion, and conclusion.

## Methodology

The methodology of the current research is qualitative since the frequency of weak and strong styles of speech were counted in the five court sessions and then the data were compared

to examine the judges and couples who referred to the courts for appealing divorce. As the model of the study, McMenamin' (2002) Verbal Style Model was followed to investigate effective verbal and discoursal characteristics and specialties in text interpretation of the judges and defendants in the court's trial sessions for approval or disapproval of suspects' accusations.

### ***Corpus***

Among the pool of data, five visual file sessions in five divorce cases in the civil courts were analyzed after being transcribed to clarify their rights and decide on the final verdict after holding various sessions for their compromise and agreement in their life or the court's acceptance of the couple's request for divorce. Since the visual files were broadcasted on the TV Channel of the Documentary Series, the use of civil court cases of several trial sessions with different topics and contents were allowed to be used in public by Judicial Courts of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Each session took 30 minutes and the speech of judges and defendants (i.e., couples appealing divorce) were transcribed by the researcher. Totally, 150 minutes of the court conversations were recorded and transcribed to gather the data for analysis.

### ***Data Analysis***

McMenamin' (2002) verbal style divided speech style into two main categories, for which there are some linguistic signs: strong and weak. Strong style is effective through observing some rules of conversation, including using standard language, linguistic intensity, diversity in lexical selection, and speed of speech. In the weak speech style, there are some specific characteristics such as incomplete, ungrammatical sentences, pauses, and hedges. In this study, we allocate the strong verbal style to the judges and the weak style to the couples since the strong style includes criteria that judges in judicial courts rather than common people observe and obey most of the time.

### ***Theoretical Framework***

The theoretical framework of McMenamin' (2002) Verbal Strong and Weak Styles was used in the analysis. Accordingly, McMenamin' (2002) focused on the process of building meaning is dependent on discourse. He used on the strong and effective and weak verbal styles with specific linguistic signs. The strong style includes four categories of style. (1) Standard or nonstandard (vernacular) language- dialect, accent, and pronunciation can be linguistic varieties that result in satisfaction; that is, the speaker with the standard and nonnative language, increases the effectiveness of his message to a large extent. (2) Lexical Variety-The message with high lexical selection creates a more positive attitude than the lower ones. (3) Speech speed-enhancing the speed of speech helps in efficient communication. And (4) Linguistic Intensity (Quality)- It is the degree of the interlocutor's attitude toward an issue from the most positive or neutral attitude to the weakest or most negative one. They also refer to the sex criterion as a high and powerful device for speech.

In this case, men have more chances (as cited in Momeni,2010:70). They showed that those with low power used the weak discoursal style including:

- A. Intensifiers-("I really love my aunt.")
- B. Tag question or statement as interrogative- ("I love her? ")
- C. Hedges- ("I think I love her.")
- D. Anaphoric expression- ("That woman there loves her.")
- E. Polite expression-("Yes Sir, I love her.")

## Results and Discussion

In this section, the results of descriptive statistics of divorce to the couple's satisfaction are presented in 5 cases in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

*Descriptive Statistics of the Judges' Strong Verbal Style in the Civil Court Sessions*

Court Cases	Standard Language	Lexical Variety	Linguistic Intensity	Total/%
1	9	24	8	41/16.5
2	10	13	5	28/11.5
3	25	16	17	58/23.4
4	6	40	9	55/22.2
5	16	35	14	65/26.3
Total frequency	66	128	53	247
Total percentage	26.7	51.8	21.4	100

In the speeches of Judges in the five divorce sessions, having lexical variety, using standard language, and linguistic intensity had the frequency of 128(51.8%), 66 (26.7%), and 53(21.4%). Employing sentences with standard language has the highest frequency in session three (25). Concerning lexical variety and linguistic intensity, the judges used these elements mostly in sessions four (40) and three (17). In sessions five, three, and four, employing these three linguistic components was found nearly high (session five; 66 (26.3%); session three;58(23.4), session four; 55(22.2%)) in contrast to other sessions. Discourse as exchanges between speakers in courtrooms are controlled along the power hierarchy through turn-taking. The judge occupies the dominant position in the physical layout of the courtroom. The court situation determines the standard language that judges use. To have significant and effective speech, they have the linguistic intensity to prevent the couple's discursal ambiguity. Judges did not have speed in their speeches to clarify their clients much better and to have efficient communications in the civil courts.

**Table2.**  
*Descriptive Statistics of the Couples' Weak Verbal Style in the Civil Court Sessions*

Court Cases	Styles										Total/%
	Grammatical Sentences	Incomplete Sentences	Hedges	Polite Requests	Tag Questions	Anaphoric Expressions	Intensifiers	Repetitions	Duration	Self-repair	
1	10	5	1	4	3	7	4	6	2	1	49/19.1
2	8	4	4	3	1	9	7	7	1	1	44/19.6
3	2	9	2	2	3	15	3	5	2	1	34/15.1
4	4	6	3	9	2	20	5	3	1	1	54/24.1
5	2	5	2	6	2	14	8	7	2	1	49/21.8
The total frequency	26	29	12	24	13	65	27	28	8	5	237
Total percentage	11.6	12.9	5.3	10.7	5.8	29	12	12.5	3.5	2.2	100

The couples used different grammatical elements in their speeches, a weak discursal style. This result is in line with Sobhani et al (2023) who indicated the wrong use of discourse regarding the context and situation. For example, "I take into account his requests. Maybe he understands that I intend to live with him", "So the disagreements were probably for this, right?". The grammatical sentences which they produced were "I'm too busy to come to wither all the time", "She demands a divorce", "The court should resolve your problem", "I shouldn't say this before you", "He can come to the court and complain about this". They had the intensifiers: "He's so doubtful", "He annoyed me in all stages of our life: and "My wife had an effort for this" in their talks. In divorce case one, the grammatical sentences with a frequency of 10 are the highest element of the weak verbal style. Whereas, in cases three and five, it has the lowest frequency (2). In case two, using anaphoric expressions with the occurrence of 9 and grammatical sentences with the frequency of 8 are the most frequent weak style components. In that session, the frequency of occurrence for anaphoric expressions in cases three, four, and five is almost high (15, 20, 14).

In session four, it is the most frequent of all. The frequency of incomplete sentences is 9 for case three. Whereas, in other cases, it is low. In case four, polite requests have a frequency of 9. The couples use intensifiers in cases two and five with the occurrence of 7 and 8. The spouses employed repetition with a frequency of 7. The spouses of all cases used tag questions with a few numbers (3,2,1). Using words with duration and length with a frequency of 8 as a whole and self-repair with the occurrence of 5 were not high in all of the cases, while polite requests have a frequency of 9. The couples use intensifiers in cases two and five with the occurrence of 7 and 8. The spouses employed repetition with a frequency of 7. The spouses of

all cases used tag questions with a few numbers (3,2,1). Using words with duration and length with a frequency of 8 and self-repair with the occurrence of 5 were not high in all of the cases. The most frequent discorsal weak style element is the anaphoric expression, which is 65.

Incomplete sentences, repetition, intensifiers, and grammatical sentences are nearly equal in their frequency (29, 28, 27, 26). The frequency of occurrence for the usage of polite requests and hedges is 29 and 12. As a result, the statistics indicate that these elements affect the way couples transfer their intentions to achieve their rights. Anaphoric expression, as the most frequent weak verbal style, reflects the way they described their lives and the events that happened to them to clarify the judges. The most frequent discorsal weak style element is anaphoric expression, which is 65. Repetition, intensifiers, and grammatical sentences are nearly equal in their frequency (28, 27, 26). As a result, the statistics indicate that these elements affect the way couples transfer their intentions to achieve their rights. There are various speech problems and obstacles: ambiguity of the message, lack no affection in language production, inappropriate intonation, not observing the politeness rules in a specific situation, and decreasing the effect of transferring the message through a high tone. Findings are in ne with Abbaszadeh et al (2021) who revealed that judges and defendants use different discorsal styles and foregrounding. People use particular communicative styles.

Sentence connectors that the participants used relate text and context to each other, like complete or incomplete repetition, and lexical substitution. Language not only reflects and records events, but also shapes customs and traditions and creates cultural facts. This agrees with Gorjian and Abbaszadeh (2023) who reveal that fundamental factors determine transferring religious and social values, and also expressive and affective norms of behavior of judges and defendants' speech styles. All these linguistic and meta linguistic elements should be taken into account. Since observing values leads to fewer ideological heterogeneity and belief differences within a community. Speech repair is considered a key element in social interactions through the strategies of addition, deletion, repetition, and substitution.

Regarding strong and weak verbal styles, the total frequency of all linguistic elements is 247 and 224. The couples used different grammatical elements in their speeches, a weak discorsal style; for example, "I take into account his requests. Maybe he understands that I intend to live with him", "So the disagreements were probably for this, right?". The grammatical sentences that they produced were "I'm too busy to come with her all the time", "She demands a divorce", "The court should resolve your problem", "I shouldn't say this before you", "He can come to the court and complain about this". They had the intensifiers: "He's so doubtful", "He annoyed me in all stages of our life: and "My wife made an effort for this" in their talks. In divorce case one, the grammatical sentences with a frequency of 10 are the highest element of the weak verbal style. Whereas, in cases three and five, it has the lowest frequency (2). In case two, using anaphoric expressions with the occurrence of 9 and grammatical sentences with the frequency of 8 are the most frequent weak style components. In that session, the frequency of occurrence for anaphoric expressions in cases three, four, and

five is almost high (15, 20, 14). In session four, it is the most frequent of all. The frequency of incomplete sentences is 9 for case three. Whereas, in other cases, it is low.

The results of the study, regarding the research question, showed consistency to Yu and Monas (2020) aligned with the use of verbal strong and weak style elements that affect communicative intentions and goals of defendants' speech in the courts. The usage of various forensic terms in judges' discourses indicates that their background knowledge is effective. They try to highlight their discourses by employing culture-oriented religious instructions in their speech. In the divorce cases, it was concluded that each one of the couples behaved based on their personal needs, not their shared interests in life, which led to negative individuation in the family caused by social conditions. They talked about their feelings and emotions. In both participants' utterances, the linguistic components were variable. Speaker acquires linguistic competence/form and displays linguistic performance/function to improve skill performance. A successful social interaction is the ability to communicate an intended message to produce coherent utterances, to adjust the message according to the response of the listener, and to use communicative strategies. Thus, every utterance forms the immediate context for some next action, and the participants draw their knowledge from the cooperative principle. Thus, they can draw a major distinction between what is said and what is implicated.

Speech repair is regarded as a fundamental component of social interactions, employing strategies such as addition, deletion, repetition, and substitution. Factors such as age, sex, race, ethnicity, values, and social distance contribute to the dimensions of identity. The formation of identity and the attainment of higher status are influenced by social value and prestige, which serve as sources of social and political power. Analyzing semantic and discursal characteristics enhances the interpretation of speech and facilitates the investigation of crimes. The role of an expert witness, with their professional expertise and experience in court, is crucial for both spoken and written texts.

Speech repair serves as an essential mechanism in daily communication, allowing speakers to uphold coherence, rectify mistakes, and negotiate meaning in real-time. This agrees with Yu and Monas (2020) who focus on techniques such as addition, deletion, repetition, and substitution are not simply linguistic instruments—they embody cognitive flexibility and social consciousness. These repairs frequently indicate a speaker's intentions, uncertainties, or emotional conditions, and can expose underlying power structures or cultural conventions within an interaction.

At the same time, identity construction is intricately woven into discourse. Elements such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, personal beliefs, and social distance influence how individuals portray themselves and how they are perceived by others. These aspects are dynamic; they are enacted and negotiated through language. For example:

- A speaker might modify their register or choice of words to conform to perceived social hierarchies.

- Code-switching or variations in dialect may indicate group membership or a deliberate distancing strategy.

Social value and prestige are crucial in this context. Individuals frequently adopt linguistic styles or discursive practices associated with higher-status groups, thus utilizing language as a means for social advancement or political leverage. Language choices linked to prestige—such as formal syntax, legal terminology, or an authoritative tone—can enhance a speaker’s credibility and perceived authority. This is consistent to Sobhani et al’s (2023) findings that judges’ style may vary based on several circumstances since judges and attorneys frequently modify their linguistic register to correspond with the seriousness of legal proceedings. While formality is essential in courtroom dialogue, a more informal tone may be utilized during mediation or negotiation. Code-switching can be examined within the realm of forensic linguistics to determine group affiliation or intent in criminal communications, and uncover deception or authorship in anonymous writings by analyzing switching patterns. For example, a threatening letter that alternates between dialects or registers may provide insights into the writer's identity or emotional condition.

A speaker may employ a regional dialect in a private setting but transition to standard language in public to mitigate stigma or demonstrate professionalism. Within youth culture, the ability to switch between slang and formal language can signify evolving identities ranging from peer connection to adult negotiation. This is noted by Coulthard (2010) who addressed the speakers who use a regional dialect in private settings—such as at home or among close friends—they are often expressing cultural identity. Dialects reflect local heritage, community ties, and familial bonds. The comfort and authenticity can be seen in informal environments allowing speakers to be linguistically themselves without fear of judgment. However, in public or professional settings, the same speaker may shift to standard language to avoid stigma that is a non-standard dialect are often unfairly perceived as less educated or less competent. The speakers in the courts demonstrate professionalism to show standard language which is associated with authority, clarity, and social prestige. Moreover, they navigate power structures to achieve reward linguistic conformity, making standard speech a strategic choice. This shift is a form of code-switching, a conscious or subconscious adaptation to social expectations.

## Conclusion

Findings revealed that a context needs to be structured, and background knowledge can be acquired by the language system through the categorization of the inferred type information, and more attention should be paid to the semantic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic areas of communication. By changing language, cultural values, and social behavior, individual and social identities are modified. Positive beliefs and attitudes include joy and satisfaction, but negative attitudes involve hopelessness and anger. Speech repair is considered a key element in social interactions through the strategies of addition, deletion, repetition, and substitution. Age, sex, race, ethnicity, values, and social distance are dimensions of identity. Shaping identity and higher status are affected by social value and prestige as a source of social and

political power. Investigating semantic and discursal features leads to the speech's better interpretation and the exploration of crimes. An expert witness with his professional performance and experience in the court is so significant for the spoken and written texts.

The application of diverse forensic terminology in the discourses of judges suggests that their foundational knowledge is impactful. They endeavor to enhance their discourses by incorporating culturally relevant religious directives into their speech. The combination of forensic accuracy and religious significance implies that judges function not only as interpreters of the law but also as cultural communicators. Their discourse demonstrates an understanding of the moral framework of the society they serve, and their capacity to weave in religious language can improve the perceived equity and moral transparency of their rulings.

However, this approach also raises concerns. In pluralistic or secular legal frameworks, the integration of religious guidelines must be meticulously managed to prevent compromising judicial neutrality or constitutional impartiality. Academics propose a model of judicial self-awareness, wherein judges recognize their cultural influences while basing their decisions on universally applicable legal standards.

## References

- Abbaszadeh, F., & Gorjian, B. (2023). Examining discursal patterns among judges and defendants in criminal courts. *Zabanpazhuhi (Journal of Language Research)*, 14(45), 33-61. <http://doi.org/10.22051/jlr.2021.34893.1987>
- Abbaszadeh, F., Gorjian, B. & Veysi, E. (2021). Analyzing linguistic and stylistic patterns of forensic discourse in revolution courts. *Persian Language and Iranian Dialects*, 2(10), 231-244.
- Chaski, C. E. (2005). Who's at the keyboard? Authorship attribution in digital evidence investigation. *International Journal of Digital Evidence*, 4(1), 1-15.
- Cotterill, J. (2002). *Language in the legal process*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coulthard, M. (2010). *Handbook of forensic linguistics*. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence*. Routledge.
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2017). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: language in evidence (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. Routledge.
- Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (eds) (1992), *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gorjian, B., & Abbaszadeh, F. (2023). *Stylistic variations in divorce cases of Iranian courts*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4618399> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4618399>
- Groot, G. R. (2003). *Language and law*. Maastricht University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hassan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press.
- Johnson, A. J. (2001). 'Ask me a story – the narrative effect of *And*-prefaced questions in formal interviews', unpublished manuscript. International Pragmatics Association.
- Kunkuri, D., & Kingsley, K. C. (2025). Move-structure analysis of police written witness statements in Ghana: An account of a context-defining police discourse. *Eric*, 42(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883251328319>
- MacDanell, D. (2001). *An introduction to discourse theory*. Translated by Nozari. Farhange Gofman Publication.

- McMenamin, G. R. (2002). *Forensic linguistics: Advances in forensic stylistics*. CRC Press.
- Mehrabani, J, Dehghan, M, Sabri, K, & Badakhshan, E. (2022). Representation of discourse features of lawyers on judge persuasion from forensic linguistics perspective: A case study of the discourse of criminal cases. *LRR* 2022, 13 (2), 529-562. <https://doi.org/10.52547/LRR.13.2.17>
- Nkane Ekpong, J. & Ogolekwu, O. (2024). Socio-legal discourse analysis of a selected court proceeding. *Ahyu, A Journal of Language and Literature* 7, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.56666/ahyu.v7i.192>
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.
- Schiffirin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sobhani S, Gorjian B, & Veysi, E. (2023). Analyzing discursal style of judges and defendants in courtroom based on forensic linguistics. *Journal of Linguistic Studies: Theory and Practice*, 2(1), 41-63. [In Persian] <https://doi.org/10.22034/jls.2023.139833.1045>
- Sobhani, S, Gorjian, B, Mahmoudi, K, & Veysi, E. (2023). Classification of interrogating defendants' spoken and written discourse markers in courts based on McMenamin's forensic linguistics framework. *LRR* 2023, 14 (4), 63-93. <https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.14.4.3>
- Sojoudi, F. (2009). *Semiotics: Theory and practice*. Elm Publication.
- Van Charldorp, T. C. (2014). "What happened?" From talk to text in police interrogations. *Language & Communication*, 36, 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2014.01.002>
- van Straalen, E. K., de Poot, C., Malsch, M., & Elffers, H. (2023). The interpretation of forensic conclusions by professionals and students: Does experience matter? *Forensic Science International Synergy*, 29(7), 1-12. Doi: 10.1016/j.fsisyn.2023.100437. PMID: 38046474; PMCID: PMC10690568.
- Wright, D. (2020). Forensic linguistics. In S. Adolphs and D. Knight(eds), *Routledge handbook of English language and digital humanities* (pp. 360-377). Routledge.
- Wright, D. (2020). Forensic linguistics. In Svenja Adolphs and Dawn Knight(eds), *Routledge handbook of English language and digital humanities* (pp. 360-377). Routledge.
- Yu, H., & Monas, N. (2020). Recreating the scene: An investigation of police report writing. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 50(1), 35–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281618812441>