

Subject Code	ENGL5034
Subject Title	Language and Crime
Credit Value	3
Level	5
Pre-requisite/ Co-requisite/ Exclusion	N/A
Objectives	<p>This course is designed to help students to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • understand crime-related discourses in the legal process; • examine the professional role of forensic linguists in the legal process; • develop critical thinking, analytical and problem-solving skills for use in their workplace and everyday life through the application of their linguistic knowledge to solving real-world crime-related problems, specifically by conducting linguistic analysis and presenting linguistic evidence in a legal context.
Intended Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <p>Category A: Professional/academic knowledge and skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) define and discuss some key areas of study related to language, crime and the law; b) identify the salient features of some common crime-related discourses in the legal context; c) analyse, evaluate and produce a range of crime-related discourses through the application of relevant linguistic knowledge; d) apply appropriate terminology in the discussion of crime-related discourses in the legal process; e) develop a critical understanding of the professional role of forensic linguists and their challenges in the legal process; <p>Category B: Attributes for all-roundedness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) discuss and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different methodological approaches in collecting, analysing and presenting linguistic data as evidence; g) reflect critically on the challenges involved in the processes of data collection, analysis and presentation in the legal process; h) improve analytical and problem-solving skills through hands-on crime-solving activities designed for problem-based learning.
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scope of forensic linguistics • Written language of the law • Discourses in the reporting of crime • Discourses in the investigation of crime • Discourses in the adjudication of crime • Forensic linguists as consultants • Forensic linguists as expert witnesses

Teaching/Learning Methodology	This subject follows a flipped classroom format. It is highly interactive in that the majority of the weekly sessions will be devoted to in-class activities while instructional content will mainly be delivered outside the classroom, mostly online. Students are therefore expected to prepare for the in-class activities by completing the assigned reading and relevant tasks beforehand in order to actively engage in the in-class activities concerned.																																																											
Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes	<table border="1" data-bbox="536 551 1390 1093"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="8">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th>d</th> <th>e</th> <th>f</th> <th>g</th> <th>h</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Paper</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. In-class and online assessment</td> <td>15</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Three in-class assignments</td> <td>45 (3 x 15)</td> <td></td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100 %</td> <td colspan="8"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="536 1149 1390 1496">Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes: Students will conduct an analysis of a crime-related discourse in approximately 2000 words (Assessment 1). Throughout the course of the subject, there will be a number of small in-class and online activities such as short questions and forum discussions (Assessment 2), which assess students' participation and knowledge. There will also be three in-class assignments (Assessment 3), which require students to produce, analyse and evaluate crime-related discourses in order to solve crime-related problems in the legal process in imagined and authentic settings.</p>		Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed								a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	1. Paper	40		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		2. In-class and online assessment	15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		3. Three in-class assignments	45 (3 x 15)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Total	100 %								
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed																																																										
		a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h																																																			
1. Paper	40		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓																																																				
2. In-class and online assessment	15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓																																																				
3. Three in-class assignments	45 (3 x 15)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓																																																			
Total	100 %																																																											
Student Study Effort Expected	<table border="1" data-bbox="536 1568 1390 1966"> <tr> <td colspan="2">Class contact:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ interactive face-to-face sessions</td> <td></td> <td>39 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Other student study effort:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ preparation for interactive sessions</td> <td></td> <td>65 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>▪ other private study</td> <td></td> <td>16 Hrs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Total student study effort</td> <td>120 Hrs.</td> </tr> </table>		Class contact:			▪ interactive face-to-face sessions		39 Hrs.	Other student study effort:			▪ preparation for interactive sessions		65 Hrs.	▪ other private study		16 Hrs.	Total student study effort		120 Hrs.																																								
Class contact:																																																												
▪ interactive face-to-face sessions		39 Hrs.																																																										
Other student study effort:																																																												
▪ preparation for interactive sessions		65 Hrs.																																																										
▪ other private study		16 Hrs.																																																										
Total student study effort		120 Hrs.																																																										
Reading List and References	Recommended reading																																																											

	<p>Coulthard, M. & Johnson, A. (2017). <i>An introduction to forensic linguistics. Language in evidence</i> (2nd edition). London; New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Guillén-Nieto, V. & Stein, D. (eds.) (2022). <i>Language as evidence: Doing forensic linguistics</i>. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Shuy, R. (2005). <i>Creating language crimes: How law enforcement uses (and misuses) language</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Further reading</p> <p>Cotterill, J. (ed.) (2002). <i>Language in the legal process</i>. Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Cotterill, J. (2003). <i>Language and power in court: A linguistic analysis of the O.J. Simpson trial</i>. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Coulthard, M. (2012). Analysing language in legal contexts. <i>Linguística Aplicada das Profissões</i> 16(1): 19-30.</p> <p>Coulthard, M., May, A. & Sousa-Silva, R. (eds.) (2021). <i>The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics</i> (2nd edition). London; New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Fraser, H. (2003). Issues in transcription: factors affecting the reliability of transcripts as evidence in legal cases. <i>The International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law</i> (formerly <i>Forensic Linguistics</i>) 10(2): 1350-1771.</p> <p>Gibbons, J. (2003). <i>Forensic linguistics. An introduction to language in the justice system</i>. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.</p> <p>Gibbons, J. & Turell, M. T. (eds.) (2008). <i>Dimensions of forensic linguistics</i>. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.</p> <p>Heydon, G. (2005). <i>The language of police interviewing: A critical analysis</i>. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.</p> <p>Imbens-Bailey, A. & McCabe, A. (2000). The discourse of distress: a narrative analysis of emergency calls to 911. <i>Language & Communication</i> 20: 275-296.</p> <p>McMenamin, G. R. (2002). <i>Forensic linguistics: Advances in forensic stylistics</i>. Florida: CRC Press.</p> <p>Svartvik, J. (1968). <i>The Evans statements: A case for forensic linguistics</i>. Göteborg: University of Gothenburg Press.</p> <p>Shuy, R. (2008). <i>Fighting over words. Language and civil law cases</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Shuy, R. (1993). <i>Language crimes. The use and abuse of language evidence in the courtroom</i>. Oxford; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.</p>
--	--

Prepared in January 2023 by Dr Phoenix Lam