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**INTRODUCTION**

The investigative interview conducted by police with suspects is crucial for obtaining accurate information while maintaining a non-accusatory approach (Bachari, 2022). The evolution of interrogation methods in cases such as the Cardiff 3 and Heron incidents has led to the formal adoption of investigative interviewing as a standard practice (Dixon, 2010). These interviews are designed to seek the truth rather than to coerce a confession, involving suspects, victims, witnesses, and other sources in the process (DeClue, 2010). Techniques like minimization play a role in engaging suspects during interrogation and can influence their confessions (Kelly et al., 2019). However, there is a risk of false confessions resulting from accusatory methods used by investigators to obtain admissions (Kassin, 2014). Frameworks such as 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 affect a suspect's decision to confess, cooperate, or disclose information (Bettens, 2024).

Research indicates that police interrogation methods often involve pressure and persuasion to elicit confessions from detained suspects (Leo & Liu, 2009). There is a prosecutorial bias in suspect interviews, with a focus on agendas driven by prosecution needs (Haworth, 2015). Interrogations of juvenile suspects mirror those of adult suspects, demonstrating a consistent approach by police (Cleary & Warner, 2016). Investigative interviewing encompasses a complex interaction between questioning techniques and strategies (Kelly & Valencia, 2020).

Certain interrogation techniques can significantly increase the risk of innocent suspects making false confessions, underscoring the critical importance of procedural justice during interrogations (Sivasubramaniam & Heuer, 2012). When interrogators operate under the presumption of guilt, it can lead to confirmation bias, highlighting the necessity for debiasing techniques in the interrogation process (Lidén et al., 2018). Suspects often prioritize short-term outcomes over long-term consequences when deciding whether to confess during an interrogation (Yang et al., 2019). The limited research on police interrogation tactics and outcomes reveals a gap in our understanding of this crucial aspect of law enforcement (Soukara et al., 2009).

The investigative interview process conducted by police officers while drafting examination reports frequently attracts criticism (Sinjaya et al., 2014). This criticism includes allegations of coercion and torture during investigations (Sugiharto, 2020), and instances where witnesses retract their statements in court, claiming that the information in the examination reports does not accurately reflect their testimony (Dirgantara, 2019; Sugiharto, 2020). Distortions in the preparation of examination reports can occur due to a lack of understanding of fundamental linguistic principles governing oral discourse production, the differences between spoken and written language, and the influence of context and audience on interactions.

Investigative interviewing practices in many countries often adopt a question-and-answer format. Activities such as questioning, listening to responses, and typing are typically carried out simultaneously (Komter, 2006; Van Charldorp, 2011, 2014). In Indonesia, during investigations to gather evidence, police officers ask questions, listen to suspects' or witnesses' answers, and then type the information into the examination report format. In this context, the emphasis is on collecting information essential for legal proceedings.

Language plays a crucial role in the actions, perceptions, and reporting of crime. Various studies have explored the intricate relationship between language and crime from multiple perspectives. For example, research has investigated linguistic deception among cybercriminals (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). Despite extensive research on police investigative interview processes in general, studies specifically examining approaches to suspects in defamation cases in Indonesia remain limited. Most research tends to focus on the technical or legal aspects of defamation, while the nuances and effective interview techniques within the cultural and legal context of Indonesia have not been extensively explored. Additionally, interview approaches that consider the psychological and social factors of suspects in defamation cases, as well as their impact on investigative outcomes, have yet to be fully elucidated. This study aims to analyze police investigative interviews with suspects of defamation in Indonesia. Defamation discourse is a form of linguistic crime (Shuy, 2010). This research contributes by developing more adaptive and contextual interview methods for the Indonesian police, which can enhance the effectiveness of obtaining more accurate information in defamation cases.

Linguistic crimes encompass both spoken and written utterances that violate legal norms and can harm others, such as character assassination, reputational damage or defamation, attacks on honor, public embarrassment, incitement of public disorder through false information or propaganda, and the creation of fear through threats, among others (Sholihatin, 2019). Defamation, as a legal issue, centers on the protection of individuals from false statements that damage their reputation (Cheng et al., 2016). Defamation law focuses on the reputation and the consequences of its damage (Post, 1986). The impact of defamation extends to both traditional media and the digital world, raising concerns about fake news and online publications (Pearson, 2017). Consequently, defamation inherently carries a negative connotation with the intent to harm another party.

**Forensic Linguistics in Police Investigative Interviews**

The application of forensic linguistic techniques in police investigative interviews is crucial, as it significantly impacts the collection and validity of evidence in cases such as defamation. By analyzing linguistic patterns and speech acts used during interviews, researchers can assess the reliability of the information provided (Amelia et al., 2018). This analysis involves evaluating the quality of questions posed by investigators, the strategies employed to elicit information, and the adherence to accurately reporting information (Amelia et al., 2018). Moreover, linguistic analysis proves valuable in cases where forensic evidence is scarce, such as missing person investigations, by offering insightful perspectives on the language used by individuals (Richards et al., 2023).

The implementation of forensic linguistic techniques in investigative interviews is essential to ensure the accuracy and validity of the evidence collected. Research has demonstrated that linguistic analysis can aid in detecting deception during interviews, where conflicting statements often constitute the primary evidence available to investigators (Porter & Yuille, 1996). Additionally, the use of criteria-based content analysis in forensic linguistics enables the verification of statements through independent evidence sources, such as DNA or medical records, thus enhancing the reliability of the gathered evidence (Vrij, 2005).

In the context of police interviews, the linguistic features utilized can significantly influence the quality and validity of the information obtained. Studies have highlighted the importance of understanding specific linguistic aspects of investigative interviews to effectively formulate appropriate questions (Heydon, 2012). Furthermore, the use of leading questions in forensic interviews with children has been shown to impact the quality of the information gathered, underscoring the need for open-ended questions to collect relevant forensic details (Sumampouw et al., 2019).

Overall, forensic linguistic techniques play a vital role in improving the validity and reliability of the evidence collected during police investigative interviews. By analyzing linguistic patterns, speech acts, and interview strategies, investigators can enhance the quality of the information obtained, detect deception, and ensure the accuracy of the evidence presented in defamation cases.

**Critical Discourse Understanding in the Context of Investigation**

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a linguistic methodology that examines discourse through its linguistic components and their relationship to context. Unlike conventional discourse analysis, CDA encompasses contextual elements that imbue discourse with color and meaning. This approach enables researchers to investigate and interpret both spoken and written discourse by considering its linguistic structure alongside the surrounding social, political, and cultural contexts. While both traditional and critical discourse analysis study language, CDA emphasizes that language is inseparable from its context. Discourse formation is inherently linked to social practices. In other words, discourse not only reflects social reality but also serves as an active tool in shaping and transforming social order. In CDA, discourse functions not merely as a communication tool but also as a representation of ideologies, power, and customs that guide behavior. This analysis provides a deeper understanding of how meaning is created and how power dynamics are embedded within language. CDA explores how discourse can actively shape worldviews and influence social structures by examining the intricate relationships between language and its context. It offers insights into the holistic dynamics of language in society.

In the context of interrogation interviews, discourse can be depicted as a verbal struggle between the suspect or witness and law enforcement officers, with each party striving to optimize their speech acts to gain an advantage. Interrogation transcends the mere revelation of facts; it becomes a battleground for power, where every utterance carries strategic significance. Law enforcement officers employ questioning techniques as linguistic tools to elicit confessions from suspects. In this scenario, power refers to the officers' ability to employ strategies that help achieve their goals, such as control and manipulation through various resources. Interrogation plays a crucial role in obtaining confessions and asserting authority by controlling the narrative that unfolds. During testimony, speakers can leverage various resources and actions; the effective use of these resources, aligned with one's identity and situational context, determines the success of the discourse. While linguistic resources are central to discourse, their roles and influences are dynamic. They are shaped by interactive discourse and evolving situations, as well as by existing institutional structures. The disparity in speech act resources is manifested in power asymmetries, leading to imbalances in discourse dynamics. The subsequent sections will explore different types of questions posed during interrogations and the power inherent in these questions, highlighting the complexity of linguistic strategies employed to support dominance throughout the investigative process.

**Classification of Questions in Investigative Interviews**

Linguistic studies in the legal field are particularly intriguing, especially within the context of investigative interviews conducted by police officers with suspects in defamation cases. The process of gathering legal evidence begins with investigative interviews, and the proceedings in court significantly depend on this initial stage. Obtaining accurate data is crucial, and the type of questions posed by investigators greatly influences the quality of the information obtained (Griffiths and Milne, 2006). Linguistic research on investigative interviews helps to unravel the complexities of the interaction between interviewers and respondents, whether they are witnesses or suspects, in the pursuit of valid and informative evidence. The questions posed by investigators can significantly impact the responses and statements provided by interviewees. Therefore, understanding the structure, purpose, and impact of these questions on the quality of information is vital in these situations. By examining the linguistic aspects of investigative interviews, researchers can reveal the dynamics of power, communication techniques, and other elements that affect the quality of the evidence produced. Consequently, this research not only enhances our understanding of the linguistic aspects of such communications but also deepens our insight into the overall legal investigation process.

Investigative interviews conducted by police officers with suspects and/or witnesses aim to search for and collect evidence that can clarify a criminal act. The results of the investigation are documented in the police investigation report. Once the investigators complete their work by gathering at least two valid pieces of evidence, as required by Article 183 of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code (Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana), the case file is then handed over to the public prosecutor (Article 110 of the same code). According to Article 184, Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, valid evidence in the Indonesian criminal justice system includes witness statements, expert testimonies, documents, indications, and the defendant's statements. After the public prosecutor receives and declares the case file complete (P21) as per the Decree of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia No. 518/A/JA/11/2001, the police investigation phase concludes. The case then proceeds further to court for trial.

In Indonesia, the laws governing investigative interviews are outlined in Chapter XIV of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code concerning investigations. Investigators who receive reports or complaints from the public about an event that is suspected to be a criminal act are required to carry out the necessary investigative actions. There is no differentiation in treatment between witnesses and suspects during investigative interviews. Furthermore, the implementation of human rights protections in carrying out police duties is regulated by the Chief of Police Regulation No. 8 of 2009 on the Application of Human Rights Principles and Standards in the Performance of Police Duties of the Republic of Indonesia. This regulation states that officers conducting investigations are prohibited from using intimidation, threats, or physical, psychological, or sexual abuse to obtain statements or confessions (Article 13a). Based on this explanation, it is clear that the police are fundamentally committed to respecting human rights in the process of investigative interviews with both witnesses and suspects, aiming for justice, freedom, security, and protection from violence.

Investigative interviews are a crucial component of the law enforcement process, significantly impacting the criminal justice system. It is essential that the information gathered during these interviews be both relevant and accurate (Walsh & Oxburgh, 2008). The investigative process aims to determine the specifics of what transpired, who was involved, where, and when the crime occurred (McGurk et al., 1993; Milne & Bull, 2006). Given that investigative interviews focus on information collection, the types of questions posed by the investigators (Bull, 2010; Newlin et al., 2015) and the manner in which these questions are delivered (Almerigogna et al., 2007; Teoh & Lamb, 2013) greatly influence the accuracy of the testimony. A substantial body of literature has explored best practices for conducting investigative interviews across various countries. Practical guidelines and policies, such as the 'PEACE' method—comprising Planning and Preparation; Engage and Explain; Account; Closure; and Evaluate (Milne & Bull, 1999)—and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) protocol (Lamb et al., 2007), are well-documented..

The types of questions asked during interviews are of profound importance. According to Halliday's systemic functional grammar theory (1995) and subsequent work by Matthiessen and Halliday (2009), different discourse types convey distinct meanings depending on the purpose of use and the strategies employed. In a linguistic context, questions exert varying levels of power and control, offering respondents different degrees of freedom. Broad questions such as "Tell me everything that happened" are challenging to answer succinctly. The broader the question, the greater the informant's freedom, thereby reducing the interviewer's influence. Psychological research indicates that various types of questions—open-ended, directive, optional, and leading—and the way they are posed, including the interviewer's demeanor and support, can affect the quantity and accuracy of information provided by the interviewee (Teoh & Lamb, 2013; Vrij & Granhag, 2014). According to Liao's research (2004), questions can be structured along a continuum based on the degree of dominant or controlling power they exert over the informant, ranging from minimal to maximal. This continuum suggests that questions play a pivotal role in establishing power dynamics and control within verbal interactions. Closed questions, such as "Do you agree or not?" restrict the informant's freedom. More specific questions exert greater control and influence 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 statement for the informant to answer. | For example, 'After hitting him, you're going home, okay? (agree) |
| 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 |

Sumber: Zeng dkk., 2021 dan Oxburgh dkk., 2010

**RESEARCH METHOD**

Qualitative research perspectives (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Maxwell, 2008; Neuman & Robson, 2014; Creswell & Poth, 2016) highlight the utility of such studies in examining "cases" where themes and relationships can be identified through various interpretative techniques (Oun & Bach, 2014). Case studies specifically focus on subjects to understand a particular instance thoroughly (Stake, 2005), and are most effective "when the research aims to develop a deep understanding of a specific case" (Yin, 2006). Theoretically, most case studies rest on the belief that social phenomena, human challenges, and event characteristics are context-dependent (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Stake, 2005).

Using an interview protocol consisting of eight open-ended questions (see Appendix 1), this study draws on interview data from five police investigators from the East Java Regional Police, Situbondo Resort Police, Mojokerto Resort Police, Tuban Resort Police, and Malang Resort Police. Informants were selected through 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 (or equivalent), willing to provide information. Interviews were conducted face-to-face and by telephone. Primary data was collected using semi-structured interview techniques guided by an interview framework. Secondary data comprised ten case examination documents related to defamation cases, collected from the East Java Regional Police, Situbondo Resort Police, Mojokerto Resort Police, Tuban Resort Police, and Malang Resort Police.

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 |

Data source: research team, 2023

To ensure confidentiality, interview informants were anonymized during the transcription process, and pseudonyms were used. This study employs the interactive data analysis model proposed by Miles and Huberman, which involves several key components: data reduction, data presentation, data condensation, and drawing conclusions/verification (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014). Following these processes, data presentation steps are undertaken, where collected data is condensed and refined to reach a conclusion. This phase includes evaluating data from the initial collection to presentation, identifying patterns, and providing explanations.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Analysis of Police Investigation Reports on Defamation Cases**

Based on investigative interviews conducted by the police with suspects in defamation cases across five police departments in East Java, Indonesia, the analysis is drawn from ten police investigation reports. It has been observed that the questions posed by the investigating officers to the suspects can be categorized into two types: a) narrowly focused open-ended questions and b) broadly scoped open-ended questions, as detailed in the following table.

Table 3

Types of Police Investigation Interview Questions for Suspects in Defamation Cases Across Five Police Agencies in East Java, Indonesia, as Documented in Ten Police Examination Reports

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | Inspection Report Document Related to Defamation | | | | | | | | | |
| Strength Level | Question Classification | Information | Example Questions | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | 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 | 23 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 17 | 19 | 6 | 14 | 22 |
| 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

Table 3 illustrates the distribution of narrow and broad open-ended questions across various documents in the context of police investigative interviews with suspects in defamation cases in East Java, Indonesia. In Document I, there are 27 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions; Document II contains 23 narrow open-ended questions and 4 broad open-ended questions; Document III includes 16 narrow open-ended questions and 1 broad open-ended question; Document IV presents 21 narrow open-ended questions and 1 broad open-ended question; Document V lists 26 narrow open-ended questions and 4 broad open-ended questions; Document VI has 17 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions; Document VII features 19 narrow open-ended questions and 9 broad open-ended questions; Document VIII records 6 narrow open-ended questions and 26 broad open-ended questions; Document IX indicates 14 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions; Document X comprises 22 narrow open-ended questions and 3 broad open-ended questions. In percentage terms, narrow open-ended questions account for 191 (76.4%) of the total questions documented in the police investigative interviews across ten police stations in East Java, Indonesia. Conversely, broad open-ended questions constitute 59 (23.6%) of the total. Thus, narrow open-ended questions are 52.8% more prevalent than broad open-ended questions in these investigative interviews..

**Structured Approach in Formulating Interrogation Interview Questions**

In the context of police investigative interviews with suspects in defamation cases, it is crucial to consider the various interrogation techniques and practices employed by law enforcement. When drafting questions for suspects in defamation cases, it is emphasized by informants that a structured and detailed approach is essential. Informant 1 stated that "when creating questions for the suspect to be asked during the examination report, 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 the specific actions taken by the suspect. This includes questions such as "is the individual aware of the case concerning them?" and "did the individual commit the alleged actions?" The questions should also cover temporal and locational details such as "when was it done?" and "where was it done?" This approach ensures that every part of the reported event is thoroughly examined, including the context and motivations behind the suspect's actions.

**The "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" Framework as an Effective Guide**

Informants 2 and 4 highlighted the use of the "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" framework (siapa, apa, di mana, dengan siapa atau dengan cara apa, bagaimana, dan bilamana) - who, what, where, with whom or in what way, how, and when in formulating questions. Informant 2 expressed that "using this reference, the investigator will not deviate," indicating that this framework helps investigators stay focused and ensures that all critical aspects are covered during the examination. Informant 4 added that the framework provides flexibility in the number of questions, emphasizing 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. Utilizing this framework not only serves as a guide in formulating questions but also facilitates a more profound and relevant exploration of the case details being investigated.

**Protection of Suspects' Rights and Compliance with Legal Procedures**

Beyond the structure of questions, the protection of suspects' rights is a significant theme raised by Informants 3 and 5. Informant 3 emphasized the importance of ensuring that the suspect is indeed the one who uploaded the reported content in the defamation case, particularly when it involves social media. They stated, "we pursue the truth continuously, especially if the suspect is evasive or uncooperative," underscoring the need for perseverance in obtaining the actual facts. Informant 5 highlighted the importance of suspects' rights, such as legal counsel representation and the opportunity to present exculpatory witnesses. They referred to Law No. 8 of 1981 on Criminal Procedure, which grants suspects the right to legal assistance and the ability to present witnesses or experts who can mitigate their case. This reflects a commitment to procedural justice and the importance of ensuring that suspects are treated fairly during the examination process. Moreover, protecting these rights also prevents procedural errors that could harm the suspect or compromise the integrity of the legal process.

**Discussion**

**Analysis of Questions in Police Examination Reports**

Police investigative interviews categorize questions into two types: narrow-open and broad-open. This analysis evaluates data from ten examination reports labeled I to X. Narrow-open questions, rated with a strength level of 2, are designed to elicit specific answers. They typically employ interrogatives such as "what," "when," "where," "who," and "how many." For example, the question "when did you upload?" demands a concise and direct response. The data indicates that narrow-open questions are frequently used across the documents, with occurrences ranging from 6 to 27 times. Document I exhibits the highest usage (27 instances), whereas Document VIII shows the lowest (6 instances).

Broad-open questions, rated with a strength level of 1, require the suspect to provide more detailed and complex explanations. Investigators use interrogatives like "why," "how," and "in what way." An example provided is "How did you do it?" which prompts a deeper explanation. Broad-open questions appear less frequently than their narrow counterparts, with occurrences ranging from 1 to 9 times. Document VIII has the highest frequency (9 instances), while several documents (III, IV, and X) show minimal usage (1 instance each).

The utilization of both narrow-open and broad-open questions aligns with the theories discussed by Buckley (2013) and Read & Powell (2011), which emphasize the importance of structured and systematic questioning in investigative interviews. Buckley (2013) highlights the effectiveness of combining information-gathering strategies with accusatory techniques, supporting the use of narrow questions to obtain precise and factual details. Read & Powell (2011) advocate for the clarity and depth provided by a structured questioning framework.

The data suggests that Indonesian police predominantly use narrow-open questions to ensure clarity and specificity in the suspect's responses. This structured approach is seen as a measure to maintain procedural integrity by avoiding ambiguous questions. However, the frequent use of narrow-open questions in police investigative interviews can limit the scope of the suspect's answers, potentially affecting the comprehensiveness and richness of the examination report. This observation contrasts with Kassin et al. (2010), who emphasize the importance of comprehensive open-ended questions in eliciting detailed confessions and understanding the suspect's perspective fully. Broad-open questions complement this approach by encouraging more detailed narratives from suspects, which can reveal hidden information.

**Investigative Police Interviews with Suspects**

The emphasis on structured and detailed approaches in framing interview questions, as highlighted by Informant 1, aligns with the recommendations from Read & Powell (2011). This study demonstrates that formulating clear and focused questions based on the context of the case aids in elaborating every relevant detail associated with the suspect's actions. The use of questions covering temporal and locational aspects (such as "when" and "where" events occurred) ensures a comprehensive examination of all dimensions of the reported incident. This is crucial for understanding the full context and motivation behind the suspect's actions, which can facilitate the fact-finding and evidence-gathering processes in defamation cases.

The "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" framework implemented by investigators, as described by Informant 2 and Informant 4, provides a comprehensive structure to ensure all critical aspects of the case are thoroughly discussed. This framework helps investigators stay focused on essential details without deviating from the main topic, as suggested by Informant 2. This approach is consistent with Buckley's (2013) findings on the importance of systematic strategies in investigative interviews, which enable investigators to gather information effectively while minimizing the potential for bias or omission of crucial information. The flexibility offered by this framework also allows investigators to adjust the number and depth of questions according to the specific needs of each case.

Findings from Informant 3 and Informant 5 regarding the protection of suspects' rights and adherence to legal procedures highlight the importance of procedural justice in investigative interviews, as underscored by Diepeveen et al. (2022). The diligent effort to ensure that suspects genuinely committed the reported actions and the emphasis on legal rights, such as the right to legal counsel, demonstrate a commitment to protecting suspects' rights and preventing errors in the examination process. Additionally, respecting the suspect's right to present exculpatory witnesses or experts reflects the essential procedural fairness in the law enforcement process. This is consistent with Kassin et al.'s (2010) findings on the importance of ensuring that police behavior during interviews does not influence confessions or compromise the fairness towards suspects.

Overall, these findings underscore the importance of a structured and detailed approach in framing interview questions, the use of effective frameworks like "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI," and the respect for suspects' rights during police investigations. Integrating these techniques with best practices recognized in the literature, such as those outlined by Buckley (2013), Read & Powell (2011), and Diepeveen et al. (2022), can enhance the accuracy and fairness of law enforcement processes, particularly in defamation cases in Indonesia.

**CONCLUSION**

The findings of this study underscore the critical role of forensic linguistic techniques in police investigative interviews for effectively and validly extracting information in defamation cases in Indonesia. In the investigation of defamation cases across ten police reports in East Java, Indonesia, it was observed that narrow open-ended questions were used 191 times (76.4%), whereas broad open-ended questions were used only 59 times (23.6%). This indicates that narrow open-ended questions were 52.8% more prevalent than broad open-ended ones. The reliance on narrow open-ended questions has the drawback of potentially steering the suspect’s responses, thereby limiting the scope of information obtained. Consequently, this can result in less comprehensive and less rich examination records.

A discourse analysis-based approach and the structured interview model of "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" help investigators remain focused and systematic when asking relevant questions. Additionally, adherence to legal protocols regarding suspects' rights enhances fairness in the investigative process. The study’s findings suggest that the appropriate application of forensic linguistic techniques in investigative interviews bolsters the effectiveness of evidence gathering. This aligns with the evolution towards more humane and truth-oriented interrogation methods discussed in the introduction. The use of the "SI-A-DI DE-MEN BA-BI" model helps maintain structure and focus during interviews, supporting approaches that avoid accusatory techniques and minimize the risk of false confessions. This highlights the importance of systematic approaches and adherence to suspects' rights to ensure justice and accuracy in legal processes.

Based on these conclusions, it is recommended for the Indonesian National Police to:

1. Increase the Use of Broad Open-Ended Questions: 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.
2. Conduct Additional Training and Education: Provide additional training to investigators on effective interview techniques, including how to formulate and ask questions that can uncover in-depth information.
3. Develop a Communication Skills-Based Approach: Enhance investigators' communication skills to build better rapport with suspects, ensuring they feel more comfortable and willing to provide complete information.

**Research Limitations and Future Research**

This study has several limitations. First, the findings are based on a relatively small number of interviews, which limits the generalizability of the results. Furthermore, strict data protection agreements between the authors and police institutions prevented an inter-rater reliability assessment of the coding of questions and suspects' responses. The inability to achieve inter-rater reliability in coding the types of questions poses a significant threat to the objectivity of the current findings. Therefore, the present results should be interpreted with caution. Additionally, the inability to examine the suspects' responses significantly limits the informativeness of our findings. Questions and responses are interrelated, and suspects' answers might influence the investigators' subsequent questioning strategies. Hence, analyzing questions and responses together could provide valuable insights and be particularly useful in research on police interviews. Future research is recommended to focus on examining suspects' responses in police investigative interviews from a forensic linguistic perspective. Such studies could reveal language manipulation techniques used by suspects and enhance the effectiveness of lie detection and behavioral analysis in investigative contexts.
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**Appendix 1: Interview Guide**

1. How do you identify an individual as a suspect in a defamation case?
2. What are the first steps you take to collect preliminary information about the suspect?
3. How do you plan and execute the interrogation of a suspect in a defamation case?
4. What methods do you use to verify the information provided by the suspect?
5. How do you address denials or alibis presented by the suspect?
6. How do you collaborate with IT specialists and other experts to gather and analyze evidence in this case?
7. How do the results of the investigation influence the continuation of legal proceedings in a defamation case?
8. What types of questions do you ask to uncover specific details about who was involved, what happened, where, and when the events occurred??