The Importance Of Proper Question Formulation In Criminal Investigations Using Layered Voice Analysis (LVA)

Kurbanov Elbek Elmuradovich

Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Professor of the Department of English Language and Literature, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines the role of linguistically and pragmatically sound question formulation in criminal investigations employing Layered Voice Analysis (LVA). The study aims to theoretically substantiate that carefully constructed interrogative sentences significantly influence the quality of voice data obtained and, consequently, the reliability of interpreting the emotional and psychological state of the interviewee. The paper analyzes the theoretical foundations of LVA, linguistic and psycholinguistic aspects of interrogative constructions, and their impact on investigative procedures. The study concludes that an interdisciplinary approach integrating criminology, linguistics, and digital technologies is essential for the effective application of voice analysis tools.

Introduction: Modern criminal investigation systems increasingly rely on digital and analytical technologies designed to enhance objectivity and reproducibility of evidentiary data. Against the backdrop of rapid development in artificial intelligence, automated analytical systems, and digital forensics, Layered Voice Analysis (LVA) has emerged as a technology aimed at identifying the emotional and psychological states of speakers through the analysis of vocal parameters.

Despite its technological sophistication and potential, scholarly and practical literature increasingly emphasizes that the effectiveness of such systems is not autonomous and depends heavily on the conditions under which they are applied. One of the key yet often underestimated factors is the linguistic form of the speech stimulus—specifically, the structure and pragmatic orientation of interrogative sentences used during interrogations and interviews.

In investigative practice, questions are traditionally viewed as tools for information extraction. However, within the context of LVA application, a question performs a more complex function: it acts as a trigger for cognitive, emotional, and psychophysiological processes reflected in the speaker's voice. Poorly formulated questions may distort vocal responses, increase stress levels, and thereby reduce the reliability of voice analysis interpretations.

The relevance of this study lies in the need for a theoretical understanding of the relationship between the linguistic organization of interrogative constructions and the effectiveness of LVA in criminal investigations. The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that linguistically and pragmatically appropriate question formulation has a substantial impact on the course and outcomes of investigations utilizing voice analysis technologies.

1. Theoretical Foundations of Layered Voice Analysis

1.1. Concept and Principles of LVA

Layered Voice Analysis (LVA) is a technology for multi-level analysis of voice signals based on the registration and interpretation of micro-dynamic changes in acoustic speech parameters. Unlike traditional credibility assessment methods that focus primarily on the semantic content of statements, LVA concentrates on paralinguistic characteristics that are less susceptible to conscious control by the speaker.

LVA is grounded in the assumption that emotional and cognitive states are reflected in micro-variations of the voice, including changes in frequency, amplitude,

timbre, and vocal instability. These parameters are recorded and processed using digital signal processing algorithms, enabling the detection of emotional reactions associated with tension, anxiety, or internal conflict.

1.2. LVA as an Auxiliary Investigative Tool

In forensic contexts, LVA is applied not as an independent evidentiary instrument but as an auxiliary analytical tool complementing traditional interrogation and interviewing methods. This distinction is crucial, as the effectiveness of LVA depends not only on algorithmic accuracy but also on the quality of the initial speech material.

A subject's vocal response is formed in reaction to a specific linguistic stimulus. Consequently, the structure, semantics, and pragmatic orientation of a question directly influence the vocal parameters analyzed by LVA systems. Ignoring this factor may lead to erroneous interpretations and diminish the practical value of the technology.

2. Linguistic Nature of Interrogative Sentences

2.1. Typology of Interrogative Constructions

In linguistics, interrogative sentences are regarded as a distinct syntactic category aimed at eliciting information and activating cognitive processes in the addressee. Depending on communicative intent and structure, questions are commonly classified as general (yes/no), special, alternative, clarifying, or rhetorical.

Each type of question activates different cognitive mechanisms. General questions typically elicit minimal verbal responses, whereas special questions require detailed answers and memory retrieval. Alternative and clarifying questions may impose additional cognitive load, which is particularly significant in investigative contexts.

2.2. Pragmatic Aspects of Questions in Investigative Discourse

The pragmatic interpretation of a question extends beyond its formal structure and encompasses the speaker's communicative intent, situational context, and expected effect on the addressee. In investigative communication, questions often perform not only an informative but also a regulatory function, influencing the behavior of the interviewee.

From the perspective of LVA application, the pragmatic component of questions is of particular importance. Leading, evaluative, or accusatory formulations may provoke defensive reactions and elevated stress levels, which are reflected in vocal parameters but do not necessarily correlate with the veracity of statements. Consequently, linguistically inappropriate questions pose a risk of distorting voice analysis results.

3. Impact of Question Formulation on LVA Outcomes

3.1. Questions as Cognitive-Emotional Stimuli

Within the framework of LVA application, interrogative sentences should be viewed not merely as tools for information acquisition but as complex cognitive-emotional stimuli. Any question initiates processes of interpretation, situational assessment, and response strategy selection, all of which are accompanied by psychophysiological changes manifested in vocal characteristics.

From a psycholinguistic standpoint, the degree of cognitive load induced by a question depends on its syntactic complexity, semantic ambiguity, and pragmatic pressure. The higher the load, the more pronounced the micro-variations in voice registered by LVA systems. Importantly, such variations are not always indicative of deception but may result from inappropriate linguistic formulation.

3.2. Correlation Between Question Types and Vocal Parameters

Different types of interrogative constructions exert varying effects on acoustic speech features. General questions tend to produce minimal vocal fluctuations, whereas special and clarifying questions require memory activation and event reconstruction, leading to increased variability in pitch and timbre.

Leading and evaluative questions present particular challenges for LVA analysis. Their pragmatic orientation may evoke feelings of threat or accusation, intensifying stress responses. As a result, voice changes may be recorded as emotionally significant, although their methodological interpretation becomes questionable.

3.3. Linguistic Errors and Reliability of Voice Analysis

Common linguistic errors in investigative questioning include complex syntactic constructions, double questions, and the use of evaluative or accusatory vocabulary. Such formulations violate the principle of neutrality and impose excessive pragmatic pressure on the interviewee.

For LVA technology, this results in increased background distortions of vocal signals unrelated to the content of responses but rather to reactions to question form. Without accounting for linguistic factors, interpretation of LVA results may lead to false conclusions, posing serious risks to the investigative process.

4. A Linguopragmatic Model for Question Construction in LVA Interviews

4.1. Principles of Neutrality and Clarity

One of the fundamental principles of question construction for LVA application is linguistic neutrality.

Questions should be formulated to exclude evaluative language, implicit accusations, or presuppositions that may trigger defensive reactions.

Clarity and unambiguity are equally essential. Complex or ambiguous formulations increase cognitive load and may distort vocal responses, reducing the interpretability of analytical results.

4.2. Pragmatic Balance and Cognitive Load Control

Effective LVA-based interviews require maintaining a pragmatic balance between information gathering and minimizing undue pressure on the interviewee. Questions should be logically sequenced and aligned with the subject's level of awareness.

Controlling cognitive load contributes to more stable vocal parameters, enhancing the reproducibility and reliability of voice analysis outcomes. In this context, linguistic training of investigators becomes as important as technical proficiency with LVA systems.

4.3. Interdisciplinary Nature of the Model

The proposed linguopragmatic model integrates principles from linguistics, psychology, and criminology. It does not replace technical aspects of LVA but complements them by ensuring appropriate interaction between technology and linguistic material.

Implementing this model in investigative practice necessitates reconsidering traditional interrogation approaches and developing specialized guidelines focused on the linguistic formulation of questions.

CONCLUSION

This theoretical study substantiates the critical role of linguistically and pragmatically appropriate question formulation in criminal investigations utilizing Layered Voice Analysis. The analysis demonstrates that the effectiveness of voice analysis depends not only on technological capabilities but also on the quality of the linguistic stimulus that triggers cognitive and emotional responses in interviewees.

The study establishes that questions in investigative discourse function as complex cognitive-emotional triggers directly reflected in acoustic speech parameters. Improperly formulated, leading, or evaluative questions may distort voice data and result in methodological misinterpretations. Accordingly, LVA cannot be regarded as an autonomous tool and requires systematic linguistic support.

The linguopragmatic model proposed in this article, based on principles of neutrality, clarity, and cognitive load control, constitutes a theoretical contribution to interdisciplinary research at the intersection of criminology, linguistics, and digital technologies. Future research directions include developing question typologies tailored to different investigative stages and empirically validating the proposed model in real-world interview settings.

REFERENCES

1. Arguedas, M., & Pallotti, G. (2020). Question design and interactional control in institutional interviews. Journal of Pragmatics, 168, 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.004

2. Bull, R., & Milne, R. (2004). Investigative interviewing: Psychology and practice. John Wiley & Sons.

3. Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2016). An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence (2nd ed.). Routledge.

4. Fraser, H. (2018). The role of forensic linguistics in the criminal justice system. Language and Law / Linguagem e Direito, 5(2), 7–29.

5. Granhag, P. A., & Hartwig, M. (2008). A new theoretical perspective on deception detection: On the psychology of instrumental mind-reading. Psychology, Crime & Law, 14(3), 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160701645181

6. Gudjonsson, G. H. (2003). The psychology of interrogations and confessions: A handbook. Wiley.

7. Heydon, G. (2015). The language of police interviewing. Palgrave Macmillan.

8. Hirschberg, J., & Shriberg, E. (2012). Detecting deception in speech. In Proceedings of Interspeech 2012 (pp. 1–4).

9. Köhnken, G. (1995). Interviewing suspects: Principles and practices. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 9(3), 215–228. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.2350090303

10. Lacerda, F., & Eriksson, A. (2019). The forensic phonetic practitioner's role in voice analysis. Journal of Phonetics, 73, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2018.12.002

11. Rock, F. (2011). Interpreting interrogatives in institutional discourse. Discourse Studies, 13(4), 465–489. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445611405909

12. Vrij, A. (2008). Detecting lies and deceit: Pitfalls and opportunities (2nd ed.). Wiley.

13. Vrij, A., Fisher, R. P., & Blank, H. (2017). A cognitive approach to lie detection: A meta-analysis. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 31(4), 421–431. https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3330

14. Vrij, A., Granhag, P. A., & Mann, S. (2010). Good liars. Journal of Psychiatry & Law, 38(1–2), 77–98.