

Аббасов Г.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти магістра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: Богущкий В.

THE STRUCTURAL AND LINGUISTIC ORGANISATION OF POLICE REPORTS: A FORENSIC ANALYSIS

Police reports are essential documents in the Philippine criminal justice system, so they must be written clearly, accurately, and factually. This study examines the linguistic features and organizational patterns of several types of police reports – blotter, incident, after-operation, and investigation reports – collected from selected police stations. A qualitative content analysis was conducted using Swales' (2004) [1] moves framework and Coulthard and Johnson's (2007) principles of forensic linguistics [2]. Findings show that legal texts follow their own conventions and display distinctive linguistic characteristics, including specialized vocabulary with unique meanings. The paper also highlights pedagogical implications and suggests directions for further research involving legal texts.

This study examines the rhetorical moves that make up the structure of police reports. This section analyzes the organization of the collected reports, focusing specifically on investigation reports, as they are used in prosecution and contain more detailed information than other types of police documents.

Move 1 – Identifying and establishing the jurisdiction of the Police Report.

This move aims to identify the police office responsible for filing the report and documenting the related events. It includes details such as the report's date, subject, author, and recipient. Its main purpose is to show where the police report, as a genre, is produced. The move can be recognized through the following steps:

Step 1: Identifying the institution's location.

Across all samples, this information is presented consistently, with the only differences being the specific police station. The name of

the institution, municipality, and province appears at the top of each report, as also noted by Sumaljag (2018) [3].

Step 2: Stating the report's recipient, source, subject, and date.

This step lists who sends the report, who receives it, what it is about, and when it was written. It clarifies the parties involved in the communication process and appears in all investigation reports.

Move 2 – Categorizing the facts and circumstances.

The officer preparing the report must collect details from the complainant, victim, or witness. After obtaining the information, the officer analyzes it and evaluates whether the described behavior corresponds to any offense defined in the criminal code. This move consists of two steps:

Step 1: Establishing the legal or technical classification. This step shows how the incident is legally categorized. After gathering all relevant information, the officer assesses whether the act constitutes a crime. It is assumed that the facts have already been verified.

Step 2: Presenting the circumstances.

Here, the officer outlines the time and location of the incident. While the structure of this step is generally consistent across reports, specific details vary depending on the nature of the investigation.

Move 3 – Narrating the facts.

This is the central part of the police report, presenting verified information about the incident. Using details provided by the complainant, victim, witness, or sometimes the suspect, the officer constructs a clear narrative that explains what happened, why it happened, and what its consequences were. Reports usually include both the victim's and, when available, the offender's accounts:

Step 1: Identifying the victim or complainant.

Including the name of the complainant or victim is the starting point for narrating the facts.

Step 2: Detailing the circumstances.

The officer recounts the sequence of events, providing enough detail for the reader to visualize what occurred.

Step 3: Describing the perpetrator's actions.

The narrative outlines previous events and classifies the incident as criminal or non-criminal, following the order in which the witness or victim presented the facts.

Move 3 – Typically includes orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution, and conclusion. Orientation introduces the people involved, the setting, and the background, though not all reports contain every element. The complication presents the main problem, followed by evaluation and resolution, which signal the closing of the incident. The conclusion marks the end of the narrative. Report narratives differ in detail and complexity, as shown in the data used in this study.

Move 4 – Identifying the participants.

This move clarifies the roles of all individuals involved in the incident described in Move 3. Participants are typically classified as complainants, victims, suspects, or witnesses. It consists of three steps:

Step 1: Identifying the victim or complainant.

Step 2: Identifying the suspect.

Step 3: Describing the actions connected to each participant.

Move 5 – Identifying the personnel responsible for the report.

This move specifies the officer who prepared the report and the head of the police station.

Using Swales' (2004) framework, the study analyzed the moves found in the police reports [1]. The results show that the presence and frequency of moves and steps differ across reports. Some moves appear consistently, while others are omitted or combined into a single paragraph. This supports Duenas' (2007) claim that moves vary depending on the case [4].

The findings also indicate that the rhetorical structure of police reports is shaped by the type of incident. Move 1 provides key identifying information, such as the report's date, subject, source, recipient, and station address. Move 2 categorizes the facts and circumstances. Move 3 narrates the events, presenting the complainant's account, situational details, and the perpetrator's actions. Move 4 identifies the report's intended recipient, which depends on the nature of the case. Move 5 names the personnel responsible for preparing the document, ensuring proper reference and accountability.

References:

1. Swales J. Research genres: Explorations and applications. Ernst Klett Sprachen. 2004.

2. Coulthard M., Johnson A. An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence. Routledge. 2007.

3. Sumaljag M. V. A Forensic Linguistic Analysis of Police Reports. *OSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 2018. 23(1), P. 80-103.

4. Duenas P. M. A cross-cultural analysis of the generic structure of Business Management Research Articles: The Method Section. 2007.

5. Leonard R. A., Ford J. E. R., Christensen T. K. Forensic Linguistics: Applying the Science of Linguistics to Issues of the Law. *Hofstra Law Review*, 2017. 45(3), Article 11.

6. Olsson J. Forensic Linguistics and the Law: Some Key Issues and Challenges. In *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*, 2004.

Аббасов Ф.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти магістра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Богуцький В.**

LANGUAGES AND MILITARY CO-ORDINATION

A further way in which information is a relevant area for language planning in the context of security is the language issues related to communication with others. Language issues arise in communication both within coalitions of allies and in communicating with local people in theatres of conflict. Language planning responses to these issues have traditionally focused on developing the language capacities of military personnel who have a need to communicate with others, or in the provision of interpreting and translation services, to facilitate the communication. Language learning may involve the teaching of languages of allies to members of the armed forces for use in a multilingual force in combat situations. During the Ottoman Empire, the janissaries were recruited and enslaved from among the Christian population and as part of the military preparation were taught Turkish, which became the normal language of the janissary corps. In this case, Turkish provided a common language between recruits from