

ANALYSIS OF POLICE INVESTIGATION INTERVIEWS IN DEFAMATION CASES: A FORENSIC LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

¹Endang Sholihatin, ²Sukirmiyadi, ³Nanang Haryono

¹Indonesian Linguistics Study Program, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Indonesia

²Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Indonesia

³Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Airlangga University, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author Email: endang.sholihatin.ak@upnjatim.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: May 2024 Revised: June 2024 Published: July 2024	<i>Police interviews with suspects often face criticism due to distortions in the preparation of examination reports. These distortions arise from a lack of understanding of the basic linguistic principles governing oral discourse production and the differences between spoken and written language. This study addresses the following research questions: (a) What is the structure of interrogative sentences?; (b) What strategies are employed in the formulation of interrogative sentences?; (c) How are investigative interview questions classified? The objectives of this study are to elucidate: (a) the structure of interrogative sentences; (b) strategies for formulating interrogative sentences; (c) the classification of investigative interview questions. This qualitative study utilizes a case study approach. Primary data sources include interviews with five police investigators from the East Java Regional Police and secondary data from ten examination reports in defamation cases from local police departments in East Java, Indonesia. Primary data were collected using semi-structured interview techniques. The study employs an interactive model of qualitative data analysis. This research reveals: (a) clear, precise, logical, and unambiguous sentence structures that enable suspects to provide complete and structured information; (b) current strategies used by investigators in information elicitation, utilizing the SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI model; (c) the classification of police investigative interview questions into broad open-ended questions and narrow open-ended questions. The application of forensic linguistics techniques in police investigative interviews contributes new insights by developing adaptive and contextual interview methods. These methods effectively and accurately elicit information related to defamation cases, promoting justice in legal processes.</i>
Keywords Police interview; Forensic interview; Forensic linguistics; Defamation;	
How to cite: Sholihatin, E., Sukirmiyadi, Haryono, N., (2024). Analysis of Police Investigation Interviews in Defamation Cases: A Forensic Linguistics Perspective. <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 12(3), 1137-1154. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i3.12064	

INTRODUCTION

Police investigative interviews with suspects are crucial for obtaining accurate information while maintaining a non-accusatory approach (Bachari, 2022). The evolution of interrogation methods, exemplified by cases such as the Cardiff 3 and Heron incidents, has led to the formal adoption of investigative interviewing practices (Dixon, 2010). These interviews should prioritize uncovering the truth rather than coercing confessions, involving suspects, victims, witnesses, and other sources in the process (DeClue, 2010). Techniques such as minimization play a role in engaging suspects during interrogation and influencing their confessions (Kelly et al., 2019). However, there is a risk of false confessions resulting from accusatory methods used by investigators (Kassin, 2014). Frameworks like the Police

Interviewing Analysis Framework (PIAF) aim to systematically analyze and measure the dynamics of suspect interviews (Pearse & Gudjónsson, 1999). The interrogation techniques employed by police significantly impact a suspect's decision to confess, cooperate, or disclose information (Bettens, 2024).

Research indicates that police interrogation methods often involve pressure and persuasion to obtain confessions from detained suspects (Leo & Liu, 2009). There is prosecutorial bias in suspect interviews, focusing on a prosecution-driven agenda (Haworth, 2015). Interrogations of juvenile suspects are conducted similarly to those of adult suspects, demonstrating a consistent approach by police (Cleary & Warner, 2016). Investigative interviews involve a complex interaction of questioning techniques and strategies (Kelly & Valencia, 2020). Certain interrogation methods can increase the risk of innocent suspects making false confessions, highlighting the importance of procedural justice in interrogations (Sivasubramaniam & Heuer, 2012). Presumptions of guilt in suspect interrogations can trigger confirmation bias, underscoring the need for debiasing techniques (Lidén et al., 2018). Suspects are more likely to consider short-term outcomes over long-term consequences when deciding to confess during interrogation (Yang et al., 2019). Limited research on police interview tactics and outcomes with suspects reveals a gap in understanding this critical aspect of law enforcement (Soukara et al., 2009).

Interview processes in police investigations often face criticism (Sinjaya et al., 2014), particularly concerning the use of coercion and torture during investigations (Sugiharto, 2020). Witnesses frequently retract their statements during trials, asserting that the information recorded in the police investigation reports does not accurately reflect their true accounts (Dirgantara, 2019; Sugiharto, 2020). These distortions in the preparation of investigation reports can be attributed to a lack of understanding of the fundamental linguistic principles governing the production of spoken discourse, the differences between spoken and written language, and the influence of context and audience on interaction. Investigative interview practices in many countries tend to follow a question-and-answer structure. Asking questions, listening to responses, and typing are often done simultaneously (Komter, 2006; Van Charldorp, 2011, 2014). In the context of evidence collection for legal proceedings in Indonesia, police investigators ask questions, listen to the answers from suspects or witnesses, and then type this information into the investigation report format. Here, the emphasis is on information gathering for legal purposes.

Language plays a crucial role in actions, perceptions, and the reporting of crimes. Various studies have explored the complex relationship between language and crime from different perspectives. For instance, research has investigated linguistic deception among online fraudsters (Tan et al., 2017), the impact of language use on violence at a macro level (Feldmeyer et al., 2016), and the construction of race and crime in media discourse (Collins, 2013). While much research has addressed police investigative interview processes in general, studies specifically examining approaches to suspects in defamation cases in Indonesia are still very limited. Most research tends to focus on the technical or legal aspects of defamation, whereas the analysis of police investigative interviews with suspects or witnesses in defamation cases in Indonesia remains underexplored.

The research questions of this study are: (a) What is the structure of interrogative sentences in police investigation interviews of defamation suspects as documented in official examination reports?; (b) What strategies are currently employed by investigators in formulating questions to extract information in police investigation interviews of defamation suspects as documented in official examination reports?; and (c) How are the questions in police investigation interviews of defamation suspects classified as documented in official examination reports? The objectives of this study are: (a) To explain the structure of interrogative sentences in police investigation interviews of defamation suspects as documented

in official examination reports; (b) To explain the strategies currently used by investigators in formulating questions to extract information in police investigation interviews of defamation suspects as documented in official examination reports; and (c) To explain the classification of questions in police investigation interviews of defamation suspects as documented in official examination reports.

This study offers a new contribution by developing a more adaptive and contextual interview method for the Indonesian police, which can enhance the effectiveness of obtaining more accurate information in defamation cases. Linguistic crimes involve spoken or written statements that violate legal norms and can harm others, such as character assassination, damaging reputation or defamation, attacking honor, causing public embarrassment, spreading false information or propaganda, creating public disorder, inducing fear through threats, and more (Sholihatin, 2019). Defamation, as a legal issue, revolves around protecting individuals from false statements that damage their reputation (Cheng et al., 2016). Defamatory speech is a subset of linguistic crimes (Shuy, 2010). Defamation law focuses on reputation and the consequences of damaging it (Post, 1986). The impact of defamation extends to traditional media and the digital world, with concerns about fake news and online publications (Pearson, 2017). Thus, defamation involves negative elements intended to harm others.

Literature Review

Forensic Linguistics in Police Investigative Interviews

Forensic linguistic techniques are crucial in police investigative interviews as they significantly impact evidence collection and validity in defamation cases. By analyzing linguistic patterns and speech acts used in interviews, researchers can assess the reliability of the information provided (Amelia et al., 2018). This analysis includes evaluating the quality of questions posed by investigators, strategies used to elicit information, and the accuracy in reporting information (Amelia et al., 2018). Additionally, linguistic analysis aids in cases where forensic evidence is lacking, such as missing person investigations, by offering valuable insights into the language used by individuals (Richards et al., 2023).

The application of forensic linguistic techniques in investigative interviews is vital for ensuring the accuracy and validity of the collected evidence. Research has shown that linguistic analysis can help detect deception in interviews, where conflicting statements often serve as the primary evidence available to investigators (Porter & Yuille, 1996). Moreover, the use of criteria-based content analysis in forensic linguistics allows for the verification of statements through independent evidence sources such as DNA or medical records, thereby enhancing the reliability of the collected evidence (Vrij, 2005). In the context of police interviews, the linguistic features used can significantly impact the quality and validity of the obtained information. Research has highlighted the importance of understanding specific linguistic aspects of investigative interviews to effectively frame appropriate questions (Heydon, 2012). Additionally, the use of leading questions in forensic child interviews is known to affect the quality of the obtained information, underscoring the need for open-ended questions to gather relevant forensic details (Sumampouw et al., 2019).

Sentence Structure in Investigative Interviews

The structure of interrogative sentences in investigative interviews is crucial for uncovering the truth and ensuring the accuracy of information obtained from witnesses or suspects. Manser (1995) states that syntax comprises the rules for forming sentences from words and phrases. Gleeson (2001) similarly indicates that syntax is defined as the principles for organizing words into larger constructions of various kinds. Syntax is a system of rules and categories that underlie sentence formation in human language. Bergmann, Hall, and Ross (2009) describe syntactic analysis as the analysis of the syntactic structure of sentences heard

or read: reconstructing the hierarchical structure of a flat sequence of words. Through syntactic analysis, readers can understand how words transform into phrases, clauses, and sentences.

Strategies for Formulating Questions in Investigative Interviews

The 5W1H approach serves as a foundational framework in communication, guiding the structured presentation of information. Originating from journalism, the 5W+1H model has been widely adopted across various fields for formulating investigative questions. Investigating officers use investigative questions to gather evidence (Jia & Yu, 2013). The 5W+1H investigative questions, which stand for Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How, represent a structured approach used across different domains to collect comprehensive and thorough information (Jia et al., 2016). The 5W+1H framework functions as a systematic method to guide investigations, ensuring that critical information such as motivation, time, actors, location, content, and causality are considered (Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021). In communication, the 5W1H approach plays a crucial role in ensuring the effective sharing and understanding of information. By using the 5W1H approach, communicators (investigating officers) and communicatees (suspects or witnesses) can provide comprehensive and structured information that aids in clarity and understanding (Benziane & Zemouri, 2014).

Classification of Questions in Investigations

Linguistic studies in the legal field are particularly intriguing, especially in the context of investigative interviews conducted by the police with suspects in defamation cases. The process of collecting legal evidence begins with investigative interviews, significantly impacting the judicial process. Obtaining accurate data is crucial, and the type of questions asked by the investigator greatly influences the information obtained (Griffiths & Milne, 2006). Linguistic research on investigative interviews helps to understand the complexity of interactions between the interviewer and the respondent, whether as a witness or a suspect, in an effort to obtain valid and informative evidence. The questions posed by investigators significantly affect the answers and statements provided by the interviewees. Therefore, understanding the structure of questions, their purpose, and their impact on the quality of information is essential in these situations. By examining the linguistic aspects of investigative interviews, researchers can reveal the dynamics of power, communication techniques, and other elements that influence the quality of the evidence produced. Consequently, this research not only enhances our understanding of the linguistic aspects of such communication but also contributes to our overall understanding of the legal investigative process.

Interrogative interviews conducted by police investigators with suspects or witnesses aim to search for and collect evidence that can clarify a criminal act. The results of the investigation are documented in a police examination report. Once the investigator completes the investigation by collecting at least two pieces of valid evidence in accordance with Article 183 of the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP), the case file is then submitted to the public prosecutor (Article 110 of the Indonesian Criminal Code). According to Article 184 Paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Code, valid evidence in the Indonesian criminal justice system includes witness statements, expert statements, documents, instructions, and statements from the defendant. Once the case file is received and declared complete (P21) by the public prosecutor (Attorney General's Decree of the Republic of Indonesia Number 518/A/JA/11/2001), the police investigation phase is concluded. The next phase involves further processing of the case file until it reaches court proceedings.

In Indonesia, the law governing investigative interviews is the Criminal Procedure Code Chapter XIV on investigation. Investigators receiving reports or complaints from the public about incidents suspected to be criminal offenses must conduct necessary investigative actions. There is no difference in the treatment of witnesses and suspects during investigative interviews. Likewise, the implementation of human rights protection in the execution of police

duties is regulated in the Indonesian National Police Regulation Number 8 of 2009 concerning the Application of Human Rights Principles and Standards in Police Duties. According to this policy, investigators are prohibited from using intimidation, threats, physical, psychological, or sexual abuse to obtain information or confessions (Article 13a). From this description, it is evident that the police fundamentally respect human rights in the process of investigative interviews with witnesses and suspects to ensure justice, freedom, security, and freedom from violence.

Investigative interviews are a crucial part of law enforcement activities. This stage is important because it has significant implications for the criminal justice process. The information collected must be relevant and accurate (Walsh & Oxburgh, 2008). The investigation process must also determine what happened, who did what, where, and when the crime occurred (McGurk et al., 1993; Milne & Bull, 2006). Since investigative interviews are an information-gathering process, the types of questions asked by investigators (Bull, 2010; Newlin et al., 2015) and the manner in which these questions are posed (Almerigogna et al., 2007; Teoh & Lamb, 2013) significantly affect the accuracy of testimony. A substantial body of literature has been compiled on best practices for investigative interviews in various countries, practical guidelines, and policies, such as the PEACE method (P-plan and preparation; E-engage and explain; A-account; C-closure; E-evaluate) (Milne & Bull, 1999) and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) protocol (Lamb et al., 2007).

The types of questions asked during conversations are highly significant. According to the "systemic functional grammar theory" by Halliday (1995) and Matthiessen & Halliday (2009), different types of discourse have different meanings depending on the reasons for their use and the strategies chosen. In a linguistic context, questions have varying levels of power and control, and respondents have varying degrees of freedom. It is difficult to answer broad questions like "Tell me everything that happened" with simple words or phrases. The broader the question, the greater the informant's freedom, and the less influence the interviewer has. Psychological research has found that various types of questions, such as open, directive, optional, and leading questions, and the manner in which they are asked, such as the interviewer's attitude and support, can affect the amount and accuracy of information provided by the interviewee (Teoh & Lamb, 2013; Vrij & Granhag, 2014). According to the principles put forward by Liao (2004), different types of questions can be arranged on a continuum based on the dominant or controlling power they exert over the informant, ranging from lowest to highest. This indicates that questions play a crucial role in creating power and control dynamics in verbal interactions. Closed questions, like "Agree or disagree?", restrict the informant's freedom. More specific questions exert greater control and power over the conversation (Liao, 2004).

Table 1

Types of Police Interrogation Interview Questions (ranked from highest (8) to lowest (1))			
Strength Level	Question Classification	Information	Example Questions
	Closed	Does not require new information from respondent	
8	Tag Questions	A type of yes-no question that consists of two parts. The first part is a statement of affirmation or negation of something, and the second part raises questions regarding the authenticity of the	For example, 'After hitting him, you're going home, okay? (agree)

Strength Level	Question Classification	Information	Example Questions
		statement for the informant to answer.	
7	Yes/No Questions in the form of Statement	Yes/no questions only require the informant to give a positive or negative answer, they do not require new information.	The difference between this type of question and other questions is that it can be answered with body language such as nodding or shaking your head
6	Yes/No Questions in Negative Form	Yes/no questions only require a negative form	Aren't you going to be here tomorrow?
5	Yes/No Questions in Affirmative Form	Yes/no questions are affirmative or validating	"Will you be here tomorrow?"
4	A-Not-A Questions	A-Not-A questions put two items in a positive or negative form, and let the informant choose one of them. This is similar to forced choice questions in the literature (Griffith & Milne, 2006)	For example: did you give the man money or not?', or 'Did you hit him or not?'
3	Alternative Questions	This does not require the informant to provide new information. Some alternative questions use explicit choice words such as 'either/or'	For example, 'Did A ask you to upload it or was it your own wish?'
	Open	Requires new information from respondent	
2	Narrow Open Questions	Narrow open questions are questions that involve 'what', 'when', 'who', 'where', 'how much', and require short answers.	Questions with "when", "who", "which", "where", "how many/ how much" etc. For example, when do you upload
1	Broad Open Questions	Wide-open questions require informants to provide more complex answers, not just one word or phrase, and respondents have greater freedom of expression.	Questions with "why", "how", "what", "in what way", "tell me more", "go on" etc

Source: Zeng et al., 2021 and Oxburgh et al., 2010

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research method with a case study design. Qualitative research is used to understand the meanings, interpretations, and perspectives of individuals or groups within a specific social context (Maxwell, 2008; Creswell & Poth, 2016). A case study design allows researchers to comprehend the specific context and complex dynamics of particular cases (Yin, 2018). The qualitative research perspective (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Neuman & Robson, 2014) is advantageous in cases where themes and relationships can be identified through interpretative techniques (Oun & Bach, 2014). Case studies focus on what can be precisely learned about a case (Stake, 2005) and are most effective "when the research aims to generate an in-depth understanding of a case" (Yin, 2006). Theoretically, most case

studies rest on the belief that social phenomena, human challenges, and the characteristics of an event depend on the context (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Stake, 2005).

Data and Data Sources

Using an interview protocol consisting of nine open-ended questions (see Appendix 1), this study draws on interview data from five police investigators from the East Java Regional Police, Situbondo Police, Mojokerto Police, Tuban Police, and Malang Police. Primary data collection employed semi-structured interviews with an interview guide. Informants were selected using purposive sampling (non-probabilistic participant identification) and convenience or snowball sampling techniques (Parker, Scott, & Geddes, 2019). The informants are police investigators with at least five years of experience who were willing to provide information. Interviews were conducted both face-to-face and via telephone. Interview informants were anonymized during transcription, and pseudonyms were used to ensure confidentiality. Secondary data consists of ten investigation reports on defamation cases, analyzed from documents collected from the East Java Regional Police, Situbondo Police, Mojokerto Police, Tuban Police, and Malang Police, as detailed in the following table.

Table 2
Sources of Secondary Data for the Research

No	Data source	Number of Documents
1	East Java Regional Police	3
2	Situbondo Resort Police	1
3	Mojokerto Resort Police	2
4	Tuban Resort Police	2
5	Malang Resort Police	2
Total		10

Source: Research Team, 2023

Data Analysis

This study employed interactive data analysis as proposed by Miles and Huberman, encompassing several key components: data reduction, data presentation, data condensation, and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). Following these processes, steps for data presentation were conducted, involving the condensation and refinement of the collected data to reach a conclusion. This phase included the evaluation of data from the initial collection to its presentation, as well as the identification of patterns and explanations.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Structure of Questions in Investigator Interviews

The following outlines the structure of questions used in police investigation interviews with suspects accused of defamation, as documented in examination reports.

Table 3
Structure of Questions in Police Investigation Interviews

No	Sentence Structure	Example Question
1	Predicate – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial	"Apakah Anda mengetahui siapa yang pertama kali menyebarkan informasi tersebut di media sosial facebook?"
2	Predicate – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial	"Kapan Anda pertama kali mengetahui tentang tuduhan ini?"

3	Object – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial	"Tuduhan ini, apakah Anda mengetahui asal-usulnya?"
4	Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object	"Kapan Anda pertama kali mendengar informasi ini?"
5	Predicate – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial and Predicate	"Dapatkah Anda bisa menjelaskan tuduhan ini secara rinci? Jelaskan!"
6	Object – Predicate – Subject – Object	"Apa yang membuat Anda mengungkapkan kalimat tersebut?"
7	Object – Subject – Predicate – Adverbial	"Apa yang Anda lakukan setelah menerima informasi tersebut?"
8	Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object	"Bagaimana Anda bisa melihat melihat kejadian tersebut?"
9	Object – Subject – Predicate – Adverbial	"Apa bukti yang Anda miliki terkait dengan tuduhan ini?"
10	Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object	"Bagaimana Anda membuktikan bahwa tuduhan tersebut tidak benar?"

Source: Research Team, 2023

Referring to the example questions in the table, the explanation of sentence structures 1-10 can be observed in the detailed description below.

1. Predicate – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial
 - The sentence structure in example question 1 emphasizes the use of an interrogative word at the beginning of the sentence, followed by the subject, predicate, object, and ending with the adverbial of place.
2. Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object
 - The sentence structure in example question 2 emphasizes the adverbial of time at the beginning of the sentence to highlight when the event occurred.
3. Object – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial
 - The sentence structure in example question 3 is used to emphasize the object at the beginning of the question, followed by the subject and additional information, to highlight the importance of the information within the context of the question asked.
4. Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object
 - The sentence structure in example question 4 emphasizes the adverbial of time at the beginning of the sentence to highlight when the event occurred.
5. Predicate – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial and Predicate
 - The sentence structure in example question 5 consists of two parts: the first part is an interrogative sentence with the pattern Predicate – Subject – Predicate – Object – Adverbial, and the second part is an imperative sentence with the pattern Predicate. The first part asks the subject's ability to explain something in detail, while the second part is a direct command to perform the action.
6. Object – Predicate – Subject – Object
 - The sentence structure in example question 6 indicates that "What" functions as the first object asking for a reason or cause, followed by the predicates "makes" and "reveals," with the subject "you" performing the action, and the second object "this sentence" as something disclosed by the subject.
7. Object – Subject – Predicate – Adverbial
 - The sentence structure in example question 7 indicates that "What" functions as the object asking about the action, followed by the subject "you," the predicate

"do," and ending with the adverbial "after receiving that information," which provides additional context about the condition or timing of the action.

8. Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object
 - The sentence structure in example question 8 shows that "How" functions as an adverbial manner asking about the method or way, followed by the subject "you," the predicate "can see," and the object "that event" as something observed by the subject.
9. Object – Subject – Predicate – Adverbial
 - The sentence structure in example question 9 shows that "What evidence" functions as the object asking about something possessed by the subject, followed by the subject "you," the predicate "have," and ending with the adverbial "related to this accusation," which provides additional context about the object.
10. Adverbial – Subject – Predicate – Object
 - The sentence structure in example question 10 shows that "How" functions as an adverbial manner asking about the method or way, followed by the subject "you," the predicate "prove," and the object "that the accusation is false" as something the subject wants to prove.

The sentence structures in the police interrogation interview questions with suspects of defamation, as documented in the examination report, demonstrate clear, precise, logical, and unambiguous sentence structures, enabling the suspect to provide the required information completely and systematically.

Strategies for Formulating Investigative Question Sentences

The strategies for formulating investigative interview questions currently used by police investigators to gather information from suspects in defamation cases, as documented in examination reports, can be observed as follows.

Structured Approach to Formulating Interrogation Interview Questions

In the context of police investigative interviews with suspects in defamation cases, it is crucial to consider various interrogation techniques and practices employed by law enforcement. When formulating questions for suspects in defamation cases, informants emphasize the importance of a structured and detailed approach. Informant 1 stated, "when creating questions for suspects to be asked in examination reports, the object of the case must be considered." The questions should be designed to explore every aspect of the case, from the suspect's knowledge of the case to specific actions taken by the suspect. This includes questions such as "is the suspect aware of the case involving them?" and "did the suspect take those actions?" Questions should also cover temporal and locational details like "when was it done?" and "where was it done?" This approach ensures that every part of the reported event is thoroughly investigated, including the context and motivation behind the suspect's actions.

The "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" Framework as a Guide

Informants 2 and 4 highlighted the use of the "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" framework (who, what, where, with whom or how, how, and when) in question formulation. Informant 2 noted that "this framework ensures that the investigator does not deviate from the essential aspects," indicating that it helps investigators stay focused and ensure that all critical elements are covered during the examination. Informant 4 added that the framework provides flexibility in the number of questions, asserting that "there are no specific rules regarding the number of questions," but the "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" framework helps maintain the relevance and depth of the questions. This framework not only serves as a guide in formulating questions but

also facilitates a more in-depth and relevant exploration of the details of the case under investigation.

Classification of Police Investigative Interview Questions

The classification of police investigative interview questions for suspects of defamation, as documented in official examination reports, is described as follows. Based on data from police investigative interviews with suspects in defamation cases at five police stations in East Java, Indonesia, as recorded in ten police examination reports, it is found that the questions posed by the investigating officers to the suspects include: a) narrow open-ended questions and b) broad open-ended questions, as illustrated in the following table.

Table 3
Types of Police Investigative Interview Questions for Suspects in Defamation Cases

Strength Level	Question Classification	Information	Example Questions	Inspection Report Document Related to Defamation									
				I	II	II I	IV	V	VI	VII	VII I	IX	X
Open													
2	Narrow Open Questions	Narrow open questions are questions that involve 'what', 'when', 'who', 'where', 'how much', and require short answers..	Questions with "when", "who", "which", "where", "how many/ how much" etc. For example, when do you upload	27	2	1	2	2	1	19	6	1	22
					3	6	1	6	7			4	
1	Broad Open Questions	Wide-open questions require informants to provide more complex answers, not just one word or phrase, and respondents have greater freedom of expression.	Questions with "why", "how", "what", "in what way", "tell me more", "go on" etc	3	4	1	1	4	3	9	28	3	3

Source: Research Team, 2023

Explanation: I—X represent the ten Police Examination Reports related to defamation cases involving various police agencies in East Java, Indonesia

Based on Table 3, it is evident that in Document I, there are 27 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions. In Document II, there are 23 narrow open-ended

questions and 4 broad open-ended questions. Document III contains 16 narrow open-ended questions and 1 broad open-ended question. Document IV has 21 narrow open-ended questions and 1 broad open-ended question. Document V includes 26 narrow open-ended questions and 4 broad open-ended questions. Document VI features 17 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions. Document VII comprises 19 narrow open-ended questions and 9 broad open-ended questions. Document VIII presents 6 narrow open-ended questions and 26 broad open-ended questions. Document IX includes 14 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions. Document X contains 22 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions. In percentage terms, the narrow open-ended questions in police investigative interviews with suspects in defamation cases across five police stations in East Java, Indonesia, documented in ten police examination reports, total 191 (76.4%). Meanwhile, the broad open-ended questions in these interviews amount to 59 (23.6%). Thus, narrow open-ended questions are 52.8% more frequent than broad open-ended questions.

Discussion

Sentence Structure in Investigator Interview Questions

This section outlines the structure of interview questions used by police investigators in defamation cases. The structure incorporates variations in subject, predicate, object, and additional information (adverbs) to frame specific questions aimed at eliciting detailed responses from the suspect. Each question structure is designed to focus on different aspects of the incident, such as the timing of awareness, the source of information, the suspect's actions, and the evidence they possess. For example, the first question structure emphasizes the use of an interrogative word at the beginning, followed by the subject, predicate, object, and location details. This structure ensures that the suspect addresses the person who first disseminated the information on Facebook, targeting specific details in the investigation. The second structure prioritizes time, placing temporal details at the beginning to establish when the suspect first became aware of the allegations. Similarly, other structures focus on the origin of the allegations, the suspect's reactions, and methods of validating their statements, thus ensuring a comprehensive examination from various angles.

The design of these questions reflects a strategic approach to gathering comprehensive and accurate information. By varying the structures, investigators can reduce the risk of ambiguity and encourage suspects to provide thorough and clear answers. This approach aligns with the principles of effective investigative interviewing, which emphasize the importance of clarity, relevance, and completeness of questions (Milne & Bull, 2006). Effective questioning techniques are crucial in legal investigations to avoid misunderstandings and collect reliable information. According to Fisher and Geiselman (1992), the use of structured and varied questions can significantly enhance the recall and accuracy of witness and suspect reports. These methods help build a clear narrative and uncover important details that might otherwise be overlooked. By using diverse question structures, investigators ensure a holistic exploration of the incident, aiding in the pursuit of justice and uncovering the truth.

Strategies for Formulating Questions Currently Used by Investigators

Emphasizing a structured and detailed approach in formulating interview questions, as described by Informant 1, aligns with the recommendations of Read and Powell (2011). This study demonstrates that constructing clear and focused questions based on the case context aids in elaborating every relevant detail related to the suspect's actions. The use of questions encompassing temporal and locational aspects (e.g., "when" and "where" the event occurred) ensures that the interview examines every dimension of the reported incident. This is crucial for understanding the overall context and motivations behind the suspect's actions, which can assist in the fact-finding and proof process in defamation cases.

The "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" framework applied by investigators, as explained by Informants 2 and 4, provides a comprehensive structure to ensure that every critical aspect of the case is thoroughly discussed. This framework helps investigators stay focused on essential details without deviating from the main topic, as suggested by Informant 2. This is consistent with Buckley's (2013) findings on the importance of systematic strategies in investigative interviews, which allow investigators to gather information effectively and minimize the potential for bias or omission of critical information. The flexibility provided by this framework also enables investigators to adjust the number and depth of questions according to the specific needs of each case.

Findings from Informants 3 and 5 regarding the protection of suspects' rights and adherence to legal procedures reflect the importance of procedural fairness in investigative interviews, as highlighted by Diepeveen et al. (2022). The diligence in ensuring that the suspect indeed committed the reported actions, along with the emphasis on legal rights such as the presence of legal counsel, demonstrates a commitment to protecting suspects' rights and preventing errors in the examination process. Additionally, respecting the suspect's right to present mitigating witnesses or experts underscores the essential procedural fairness in law enforcement processes. This aligns with Kassin et al.'s (2010) findings on the importance of ensuring that police behavior during interviews does not influence confessions or undermine fairness toward suspects. Overall, these findings underscore the importance of a structured and detailed approach in formulating interview questions, the effective use of frameworks like "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI," and the respect for suspects' rights in police investigative processes. Integrating these techniques with best practices recognized in the literature, as outlined by Buckley (2013), Read and Powell (2011), and Diepeveen et al. (2022), can enhance the accuracy and fairness of law enforcement processes, particularly in defamation cases in Indonesia.

Classification of Police Investigation Interview Questions

Police investigation interviews are categorized into two types of open-ended questions: narrow open-ended and broad open-ended. This data is evaluated based on several examination report documents labeled I to X. Narrow Open-ended Questions are assigned a strength level of 2 and are designed to elicit specific answers. They generally use interrogatives such as "what," "when," "where," "who," and "how many." An example given is "when did you upload?" which indicates the need for a brief and direct response. Data shows that narrow open-ended questions are frequently used across the documents, with occurrences ranging from 6 to 27 times. Document I shows the highest usage (27 times), while Document VIII has the lowest (6 times). Broad Open-ended Questions are assigned a strength level of 1 and require the suspect to provide more detailed and complex explanations. Investigators use interrogatives such as "why," "how," and "in what way." An example provided is "how did it happen?" which encourages a more thorough explanation. Broad open-ended questions appear less frequently than narrow ones, with occurrences ranging from 1 to 9 times. Document VIII has the highest frequency (9 times), while several documents (III, IV, and X) show minimal usage (1 time each).

The use of narrow and broad open-ended questions aligns with the theories discussed by Buckley (2013) and Read & Powell (2011), which emphasize the importance of structured and systematic question formulation in investigative interviews. Buckley (2013) highlights the effectiveness of combining information-gathering strategies with accusatory techniques, supporting the use of narrow questions to obtain accurate and factual details. Read & Powell (2011) advocate for the clarity and depth provided by a structured question framework. The data indicates that Indonesian police more frequently use narrow open-ended questions to ensure clarity and specificity in the suspects' answers. This structured approach is considered a procedural step to avoid ambiguous questions. However, narrow open-ended questions in police

investigative interviews can lead suspects' answers to be confined to a limited scope, potentially affecting the quality of examination reports by making them less comprehensive and rich in detail. This finding contrasts with Kassin et al. (2010), who emphasize the importance of comprehensive open-ended questions in obtaining more detailed confessions and fully understanding the suspect's perspective. The use of broad questions complements this approach by encouraging more detailed narratives from suspects, potentially revealing hidden information.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions of this study indicate that: (1) The structure of interrogative sentences in police investigation interviews with suspects of defamation, as documented in the official examination reports, demonstrates clear, precise, logical, and unambiguous sentence structures, enabling suspects to provide necessary information comprehensively and systematically; (2) Furthermore, the question structuring strategies currently employed by investigators in eliciting information during police investigation interviews with defamation suspects, as documented in the reports, utilize the SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI model, which aids investigators in remaining focused and systematic in asking relevant questions. Adherence to legal protocols concerning the rights of suspects reinforces fairness in the investigation process. The study findings show that the appropriate application of forensic linguistic techniques in investigative interviews enhances the effectiveness of evidence collection, aligning with the evolution of more humane and truth-oriented interrogation methods discussed in the introduction. The SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI model helps maintain structure and focus during interviews, supporting an approach that avoids accusatory techniques and minimizes the risk of false confessions. This underscores the importance of systematic approaches and adherence to suspects' rights to ensure justice and accuracy in legal processes; (3) Next, the classification of questions in police investigation interviews with defamation suspects, as documented in the official examination reports, shows that 191 (76.4%) are narrow open-ended questions, while 59 (23.6%) are broad open-ended questions. Thus, narrow open-ended questions are 52.8% more prevalent than broad open-ended questions. The use of narrow open-ended questions has the drawback of directing the suspect's answers, potentially limiting the information obtained to a narrow scope, which ultimately affects the comprehensiveness and richness of the examination reports.

Based on these conclusions, it is recommended to the Indonesian National Police to: (1) Consistently use appropriate and unambiguous sentence structures when questioning defamation suspects to prevent misunderstandings in the suspects' statements documented in the examination reports; (2) Increase the proportion of broad open-ended questions in the examination reports of defamation suspects. This aims to encourage suspects to provide more detailed and comprehensive answers. Questions like "Can you describe in detail what happened that day?" can yield more valuable information; (3) Conduct training and education for investigators on the selection of language for formulating questions in defamation suspects' examination reports, thereby enhancing their ability to extract more in-depth and effective information; (4) Develop persuasive language skills for interviews with defamation suspects to build better communication relationships, making suspects feel more comfortable providing complete information. Therefore, the use of forensic linguistic techniques in police investigative interviews is crucial for effectively and validly eliciting information in defamation cases in Indonesia. Consequently, the quality of questions in examination reports must be given due attention.

Research Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations of this study include, first, the findings are based on a small number of interviews, limiting the generalizability of the results. Furthermore, strict data protection

agreements between the authors and the police institution prevented the inter-rater reliability examination of the coding of questions and suspects' responses to these questions. The inability to achieve inter-rater reliability in coding question types significantly compromises the objectivity of the current findings. Therefore, the present findings should be interpreted with caution. Additionally, the inability to examine the suspects' responses also greatly limits the informativeness of our findings. Questions and responses go hand in hand, and suspects' responses may influence investigators' subsequent questioning strategies. Therefore, analyzing questions and responses simultaneously could be highly informative and beneficial in police interview research. Future research is recommended to investigate suspects' responses in police investigative interviews from a forensic linguistic perspective, as such research could reveal the linguistic manipulation techniques used by suspects and enhance the effectiveness of lie detection and behavior analysis in investigative contexts.

REFERENCES

- Almerigogna, J., Ost, J., Bull, R., & Akehurst, L. (2007). A state of high anxiety: How unsupportive interviewers can increase the suggestibility of child witnesses. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 963–974.
- Alsalamah, A. and Callinan, C. (2021). The kirkpatrick model for training evaluation: bibliometric analysis after 60 years (1959–2020). *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 54(1), 36-63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2020-0115>
- Amelia, F., Firdaus, A. Y., & Lailiyah, S. (2018). A study on the use of speech acts and the levels of trustworthiness in investigative interviews. *PIONEER: Journal of Language and Literature*, 10(2), 170. <https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v10i2.248>
- Bachari, A. D. (2022). The elicit function of speech acts in questioning on investigative interviews in criminal inspection of dump truck theft cases at Cirebon city police station. *Jomantara: Indonesian Journal of Art and Culture*, Vol. 2 No. 2 July 2022. <https://doi.org/10.23969/jijac.v2i2.5691>
- Bettens, T., Cleary, H. M. D., & Bull, R. (2024). Humane interrogation strategies are associated with confessions, cooperation, and disclosure: Evidence from a field study of incarcerated individuals in the United States. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 51(6), 949-969. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548241232068>
- Benziane, I. and Zemouri, M. (2014). Knowledge management and higher education = le management de la connaissance et l'enseignement supérieur. *Algerian Review of Economic Development*, (1), 47-54. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0020023>
- Bergmann, A., Hall, K.C. dan Ross, S.M. (2009). *Language Files: Materials for an Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Linguistic Society of America. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40492878>
- Bull, R. (2010). The investigative interviewing of children and other vulnerable witnesses: Psychological research and working/professional practice. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 15(1), 5–23.
- Cheng, L., Cheng, W., & Li, J. (2016). Defamation case law in Hong Kong: A corpus-based study. *Semiotica*, 2016(208), 203-222. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0114>
- Cleary, H. M. D., & Warner, T. C. (2016). Police training in interviewing and interrogation methods: A comparison of techniques used with adult and juvenile suspects. *Law and Human Behavior*, 40(3), 270-284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000175>
- Collins, R. E. (2013). The construction of race and crime in Canadian print media: A 30-year analysis. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 14(1), 77-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895813476874>
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage publications.
- DeClue, G. (2010). Three things that should be used to guide investigative interviews by military and intelligence agencies. *The Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 38(1-2), 251-262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009318531003800111>
- Denzin, K. N., & Lincoln, S. Y. (2005). *Qualitative research* (3rd ed., Vol. 3). California: Sage Publications. <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Dirgantara, G. (2019, Aug 7). Witness in drug case withdraws statement in BAP. Retrieved Aug 17, 2021, from <https://www.antaranews.com/berita/999050/saksi-kas-narkoba-cabut-kerahan-di-bap>
- Diepeveen, A., Svennevig, J., & Urbanik, P. (2022). Suspects' opportunities to claim their legal rights in police investigative interviews. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 28(2). <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijssl.20349>
- Dixon, D. (2010). Questioning suspects: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26(4), 426-440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986210377107>
- Feldmeyer, B., Harris, C. T., & Lai, D. W. L. (2016). Language use and violence: Assessing the relationship between linguistic context and macrolevel violence. *Sociological Forum*, 31(2), 267-290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12246>
- Gibbons, J. (2003). *Forensic linguistics: An introduction to language in the justice system*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Griffiths, A., & Milne, R. (2006). Will it all end in tiers? Police interviews with suspects in Britain. In: Williamson T (ed) *Investigative interviewing*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing, 167-189.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences*.
- Glesson, A. (2001). *Information-seeking behavior of Scientists and their adaptation to electronic journals*. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. North Carolina. <https://ils.unc.edu/MSpapers/2672.pdf>
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1995). Systemic theory. In: *Concise history of the language sciences*. Oxford: Pergamon, 272-276.
- Haworth, K. (2015). The discursive construction of evidence in police interviews: Case study of a rape suspect. *Applied Linguistics*, 38(2), 194-214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv009>
- Heydon, G. (2012). Helping the police with their enquiries: Enhancing the investigative interview with linguistic research. *The Police Journal*, 85(2), 101-122. <https://doi.org/10.1350/pojo.2012.85.2.581>
- Indonesia. *Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Acara Pidana (KUHAP)*, LN No. 76 Tahun 1981, TLN No. 3209.
- Jia, C. and Yu, Y. (2013). Using the 5w+1h model in reporting systematic literature review: a case study on software testing for cloud computing. <https://doi.org/10.1109/qsic.2013.13>
- Jia, C., Cai, Y., Yu, Y., & Tse, T. (2016). 5w+1h pattern: a perspective of systematic mapping studies and a case study on cloud software testing. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 116, 206-219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2015.01.058>
- Kassin, S. M. (2014). False confessions. *Policy Insights From the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1(1), 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732214548678>
- Keputusan Jaksa Agung RI Nomor: KEPJA-518/A/JA/11/2001 tanggal 1 November 2001 tentang Perubahan KEPJA Nomor: 132/A/JA/11/1994 tanggal 07 November 1994 tentang Administrasi Perkara Tindak Pidana.

- Kassin, S. M. (2014). False confessions. *Policy Insights From the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1(1), 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732214548678>
- Kelly, C. E., Russano, M. B., Miller, J. C., & Redlich, A. D. (2019). On the road (to admission): Engaging suspects with minimization. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 25(3), 166-180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000199>
- Kelly, C. E., & Valencia, E. (2020). You ask and do not receive, because you ask wrongly. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 23(1), 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461355720955077>
- Komter, M. L. (2006). From talk to text: The interactional construction of a police record. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 39(3), 201-228. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3903_2
- Liao, M. Z. (2004). *Linguistic techniques in court discourse*. Beijing: Legal Press.
- Lidén, M., Gräns, M., & Juslin, P. (2018). The presumption of guilt in suspect interrogations: Apprehension as a trigger of confirmation bias and debiasing techniques. *Law and Human Behavior*, 42(4), 336-354. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000287>
- Leo, J., & Liu, B. A. B. (2009). What do potential jurors know about police interrogation techniques and false confessions? *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 27(3), 381-399. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.872>
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., & Halliday, M. A. K. (1997). *Systemic functional grammar: A first step into the theory*. Macquarie University, Australia, Working Paper. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christian_Matthiessen/publication.pdf (accessed 29 July 2020).
- Manser, M. H. (1995). *Oxford Learners's Pocket Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2008). Designing a qualitative study (Vol. 2, pp. 214-253). *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods*.
- McGurk, B. J., Carr, M. J., & McGurk, D. (1993). *Investigative interviewing courses for police officers: An evaluation*. Home Office Police Research Group. Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.603.4361&rep1/4rep1&type1/4pdf>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis, a methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). USA: Sage Publications. Terjemahan Tjetjep Rohindi Rohidi, UI-Press.
- Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2006). Interviewing victims of crime, including children and people with intellectual disabilities. In: Kebell M. R. & Davies G. M. (Eds.), *Practical psychology for forensic investigations and prosecutions* (pp. 7-24). Chichester: Wiley.
- Neuman, W. L., & Robson, K. (2014). *Basics of social research*. Pearson Canada, Toronto.
- Newlin, C., Steele, L. C., Chamberlin, A., Anderson, J., Kenniston, J., Russell, A., Stewart, H., & Vaughan-Eden, V. (2015). Child forensic interviewing: Best practices. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 1-20. Available at: <https://www.nationalcac.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Child-Forensic-Interviewing-Best-Practices.pdf>
- Olsson, J. (2004). *Forensic linguistics: An introduction to language, crime and the law*. London: Continuum.
- Oxburgh, G. E., Myklebust, T., & Grant, T. (2010). The question of question types in police interviews: A review of the literature from a psychological and linguistic perspective. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 17(1), 46-66. <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijssl.v17i1.45>
- Parker, C., Scott, S., & Geddes, A. (2019). Snowball sampling. *SAGE Research Methods Foundations*.

- Pearse, J., & Gudjónsson, G. H. (1999). Measuring influential police interviewing tactics: A factor analytic approach. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 4(2), 221-238. <https://doi.org/10.1348/135532599167860>
- Pearson, M. (2017). Teaching media law in a post-truth context: Strategies for enhancing learning about the legal risks of fake news and alternative facts. *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 27(1), 17-26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1326365x17704289>
- Peraturan Kapolri Nomor 8 Tahun 2009 tentang Penerapan Prinsip dan Standar Hak Asasi Manusia Dalam Melaksanakan Tugas Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia.
- Porter, S., & Yuille, J. C. (1996). The language of deceit: An investigation of the verbal clues to deception in the interrogation context. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20(4), 443-458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01498980>
- Post, R. C. (1986). The social foundations of defamation law: Reputation and the constitution. *California Law Review*, 74(3), 691. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3480391>
- Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2009 concerning the Implementation of Human Rights Principles and Standards in Carrying out the Duties of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Richards, Y., McClish, M., & Keatley, D. (2023). Finding the missing: Using statement analysis to assist in missing persons cases. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*, 13(4), 300-315. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jcp-02-2023-0008>
- Shuy, R. W. (2010). *The language of defamation cases*. Oxford University Press
- Sholihatin, E. (2019). *Linguistik forensik dan kejahatan berbahasa*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sinjaya, A., Sudarsono, S., Nurjaya, I. N., & Adi, K. (2014). The police investigator's authority to issue provision letter of investigation cancellation: Its urgency in the perspective of the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure. *US-China Law Review*, 11, 336-345.
- Sivasubramaniam, D., & Heuer, L. (2012). Procedural justice evaluations in interrogations. In *Conviction of the Innocent: Lessons From Psychological Research* (pp. 79-102). <https://doi.org/10.1037/13085-004>
- Soukara, S., Bull, R., Vrij, A., Turner, M., & Cherryman, J. (2009). What really happens in police interviews of suspects? Tactics and confessions. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(6), 493-506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802201827>
- Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*.
- Sugiharto, J. (2020, 5 Juni). Kasus bom ikan, 8 saksi mencabut berkas penyidikan di pengadilan. *Tempo*. <https://metro.tempo.co/read/1349869/kas-bom-ikan-8-saksi-cabut-bap-menyidikan-di-pengadilan>
- Sumampouw, N. E. J., Otgaar, H., Rooy, D. L. V., & Ruiter, C. d. (2019). The quality of forensic child interviewing in child sexual abuse cases in Indonesia. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 35(2), 170-181. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-019-09342-5>
- Sukumar, D., Hodgson, J., & Wade, K. A. (2016). How the timing of police evidence disclosure impacts custodial legal advice. *The International Journal of Evidence & Proof*, 20(3), 200-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365712716643548>
- Tan, K. H., Abdollahi-Guilani, M., & Chen, C. (2017). Linguistic deception of Chinese cyber fraudsters. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 23(3), 108-122. <https://doi.org/10.17576/31-2017-2303-08>
- Teoh, Y. S., & Lamb, M. E. (2013). Interviewer demeanor in forensic interviews of children. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 19(2), 145-159.
- Van Charldorp, T. C. (2011). The coordination of talk and typing in police interrogations. *CLIC*, 8(1), 61-92. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2h1110cs>

- 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>
- Vrij, A. (2005). Criteria-based content analysis: A qualitative review of the first 37 studies. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 11(1), 3-41. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.11.1.3>
- Vrij, A., & Granhag, P. A. (2014). Eliciting information and detecting lies in intelligence interviewing: An overview of recent research. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28(6), 936–944.
- Walsh, D., & Oxburgh, G. E. (2008). Investigative interviewing of suspects: Historical and contemporary developments in research. *Forensic Update*, 92, Winter 2007/8 (Feb 08), 41–45.
- Yang, Y., Moody, S. A., Cabell, J. J., & Madon, S. (2019). Why suspects confess: The power of outcome certainty. *Law and Human Behavior*, 43(5), 468-476. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000350>
- Yin, R. K. (2006). Mixed methods research: Are the methods genuinely integrated or merely parallel. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 41-47.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Zeng, F., Huang, C. Y., & Bull, R. (2021). Police interviews of suspects in China: Developments and analyses. *Sage - Crime and Justice*