



Forensic Linguistic Analysis of the Construction of Investigation Report of Suspect in Criminal Cases of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group in Southeast Sulawesi

Indah Permata Sari^{1*}, I Nyoman Kardana², I Nyoman Muliana³

^{1,2,3} Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Postgraduate, Universitas Warmadewa, Denpasar 80239, Indonesia

Email: ind.permata17juni@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: 29 Jul 2025	This study examines the construction of the investigation report (BAP) by using forensic linguistics study. This study employs a qualitative approach to analyze the BAP. The primary data used consist of two copies obtained from the Regional Police Department of Southeast Sulawesi. The results show that total of 26 productive questions and 4 non-productive questions were found. The most dominant type of question used in the interrogation of the criminal case of insulting the Tolaki ethnic group is the productive closed question type, with 15 occurrences, representing approximately 46.6 percent. In addition, there were six types of presuppositions were identified as correlating with all speech events. These include existential presupposition, factual presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, non-factual presupposition, and temporal clause presupposition. The most dominant type of presupposition found was structural presupposition, with a total of 13 occurrences. These research findings affirm that forensic linguistics plays a strategic role in evaluating the quality of investigative examinations and the evidentiary strength of the BAP. The analysis of question types and presuppositions demonstrates that language is not merely a means of communication, but a legal instrument that can influence the validity of a suspect's statements. Accordingly, the application of forensic linguistic principles enables an objective assessment of whether a BAP is produced through examination procedures that are fair, non-misleading, and consistent with legal standards of proof.
Accepted: 18 Oct 2025	
Published: 22 Dec 2025	
Keywords:	
Discourse construction, Investigation report (BAP), Forensic Linguistics, Language investigation, Language in legal context	
Doi: https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.4.3.2025.185-202	

*Corresponding Author
E-mail: ind.permata17juni@gmail.com
Copyright © 2025 The Author(s)
CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 License

1. Introduction

The application of linguistic principles and methods in law represents the use of linguistic science to analyze language samples in investigative processes (Yu & Monas, 2020; Sari et al., 2025). In any legal system, everything is related to language, whether explicitly or implicitly. For examples include summons, warrants, questions, testimonies, contracts, decisions, confessions, investigation report and others. All of these are expressed through language (Alduais et al., 2023). This illustrates that linguistics is essential in addressing legal issues for the purpose of law enforcement. The important role of forensic linguistics is to connect the fields of language, crime, and law, legal issues and law enforcement, and even disputes that involve potential legal violations or the need to find legal solutions (McMenamin, 2008).

Forensic linguistics is a branch of study closely related to law. In this case, law serves as a domain of linguistic inquiry. Olsson (2008) states that forensic linguistics is an interdisciplinary field that combines linguistics with law. Forensic linguistics is the study of language applied in forensic contexts for purposes related to forensic (legal) evidence (McMenamin, 2008). Essentially, research in forensic science is applied linguistic research that refers to the scientific study of language to solve forensic problems. In other words, forensic linguistics seeks to scientifically analyze linguistic evidence from an action that constitutes a legal offense for law enforcement purposes.

In this case, the investigation report (BAP) is a legal document produced through investigative processes and practices carried out by police officers or investigative expert teams (see also Adhikara, 2022; Kassin et al., 2007; Sumampouw et al., 2022). However, in obtaining the report, several studies have indicated that interrogation practices in Indonesia still lack a systematic, evidence-based approach to interviewing techniques, robust empirical field data, and strong integration between academic research, practical policing procedures, and legal frameworks (Adhikara, 2022; Muniroh & Heydon, 2022; Ramadani et al., 2023). Moreover, the BAP constitutes a document that contains complex and crucial information, as it involves interactions between investigators' questions and suspects' statements, which may significantly influence judicial decisions (Verhoeven, 2018). Therefore, the BAP is highly important to be analyzed using a forensic linguistics approach, as it fundamentally involves language within a legal context (Sumaljag, 2018).

Accordingly, the application of forensic linguistics often arises from requests made by law enforcement agencies to gain insights into interview or interrogation texts (Lee, 2020), thereby assisting in the development of effective strategies for interviewing or interrogating suspects in criminal cases (Mahsun, 2018). An interview or interrogation refers to the process of asking questions to obtain information from examinee, conducted by investigators and formally recognized as an examination. According to Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure, Article 1, Number 2, the main objective of examinations in criminal investigations is to gather statements or information from the examinee so that the criminal case becomes clear and the perpetrator of the crime can be identified with certainty. Within the investigative process, examinations play a crucial role in determining the effectiveness and success of criminal case handling (Harahap, 2007).

From a linguistic perspective, examinations are referred to as interrogations, which are question-and-answer activities conducted by investigators with the examinee to obtain evidence related to the criminal act that occurred. Interrogation is the only examination technique used to obtain statements from examinees who are considered to know or at least be related to the criminal case being investigated (Bachari et al., 2019). The uncovering of criminal cases in court proceedings is always determined by the completeness and accuracy of the statements collected by investigators during examinations (Milne & Bull, 2025). Conversely, the failure of criminal prosecutions in court often results from incomplete or inaccurate information collected by investigators during examinations. This reality shows that the examination process, manifested through question-and-answer interaction, is an important aspect that must be considered to support fair law enforcement. This condition aligns with the views of Griffiths and Milne (2005), who place examinations as an essential phase in the investigative process of criminal cases.

This research analyzes the list of questions posed by investigators to the examinee (suspect) about defamation against the Tolaki ethnic group in Southeast Sulawesi (see Mintowati, 2016). Through this analysis, it becomes possible to understand what is embedded in the investigator's thoughts and expressed through utterances that are understood by the examinee, ultimately leading to the examinee providing valid answers. As an illustration, consider one form of interrogation by an investigator in a theft case involving a suspect (Panggabean, 2019):

Investigator: *Ya... ya apa yang Abang ambil sama kwan Abang itu, Bang?*

[Yeah... yes, what did you take from that your friend, bro?]

Suspected: *Sawit, Bang* [Palm oil, bro]

The types of questions posed by the investigator in above have not been able to reveal clearer and more detailed information. There are still hidden facts that should have been brought to the surface by the investigator, such as whether only palm oil was stolen or whether other items were also taken. This information is crucial in relation to presenting evidence in court. In addition, the investigator's attitude in extracting information also plays a very important role. Therefore, it is essential for investigators to map out the types of questions to obtain answers to what, who, where, how, or why (see Griffiths & Milne, 2005; B. Milne & Powell, 2010). This aims to ensure that investigators can obtain the clearest possible information from the examinee.

Based on the above background, this research aims to identify the types of questions applied by investigators in the BAP of a suspect in a criminal case of insulting the Tolaki ethnic group in Southeast Sulawesi and to describe the presuppositions employed by investigators during the interrogation of the suspect.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Forensic linguistics

Forensic linguistics is a branch of linguistics that analyzes and examines language as an evidentiary tool in judicial proceedings and the legal domain (Gibbons, 2003; Olsson,

2012; Perkins & Grant, 2013; Varney, 1997). According to Coulthard (2016), there are three main areas that constitute the core focus of forensic linguistics: (1) language as a product of law. It involves investigating the language used within legal systems, including statutes, regulations, and legal documents; (2) language in the legal process. It refers to the analysis of spoken discourse that occurs during legal proceedings from various perspectives. This area includes the language used by courtroom participants such as judges, lawyers, and witnesses; and (3) language as evidence. It concerns issues of authorship and communication that require the application of linguistic theories for analysis, including phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax, pragmatics, and discourse analysis.

2.2 Investigation report (BAP)

The investigation report (Berita Acara Pemeriksaan / BAP) of a Suspect is an authentic written document prepared by investigators (Jannah, 2019; Sumaljag, 2018). It contains a description of the alleged criminal act, specifying the time, place, and circumstances of the offense (Violine, 2008). Fundamentally, BAP of suspects, witnesses, and experts provide a representation or construction of a criminal act. These records can be classified into three forms: (1) a narrative or chronological description, (2) a question-and-answer format, and (3) a combination of narrative and question-and-answer forms (Jannah et al., 2024). In other words, a BAP contains the substantive material of an ongoing criminal investigation (Malombeke et al., 2021).

Based on Article 184 paragraph (1) of the Indonesian Criminal Procedure Code, the legally recognized forms of evidence are explicitly limited to witness testimony, expert testimony, documents, indications, and the defendant's statement. The BAP forms part of the case file. Within the field of forensic linguistics, the BAP falls under language as evidence, as it relates to issues of authorship and communication that require the application of linguistic theories for analysis and interpretation.

2.3 Investigative interviewing theory

Investigative interviewing refers to a systematic, ethical, and evidence-driven communication approach employed in investigative contexts—such as law enforcement and corporate inquiries—to obtain accurate, comprehensive, and reliable information from victims, witnesses, and suspects (B. Milne & Powell, 2010). This method emphasizes rapport-building and the use of open-ended, non-coercive questioning techniques to enhance memory retrieval while reducing the risk of information contamination (see Heydon, 2012). Rather than prioritizing confessions, investigative interviewing focuses on establishing factual accounts and achieving justice. As such, it serves as a fundamental instrument for reconstructing events, identifying responsible parties, and safeguarding human rights in the pursuit of truth.

3. Method

This study is a forensic linguistics study (Gibbons, 2003). It employs a qualitative approach to analyze the BAP. The BAP constitutes a legal document produced through the stages of investigation. The primary data in this study consist of two copies of BAP involves insults against the Tolaki ethnic group in Southeast Sulawesi obtained from the Regional Police Department of Southeast Sulawesi. The Regional Police Department is the main territorial operational unit of the Indonesian National Police in Southeast Sulawesi that handles the case of insult against the Tolaki ethnic group and is legally authorized to process the case. These documents were officially obtained with research permit Number: B/32/I/2023/Ditreskimsus.

The BAP is examined using a forensic linguistics framework. Forensic linguistics is a branch of linguistics that examines language used as evidentiary material in judicial and legal contexts (Coulthard & Johnson, 2011). Forensic linguistics is a combination of two disciplines, namely linguistics and forensic science. In forensic linguistic studies: 1) Language is a legal product. This means investigating the language used in the legal system, particularly the styles and registers involve; 2) Language in court processes. This refers to examining spoken discourse occurring in legal proceedings from various perspectives. This includes the language used by courtroom participants, such as judges, lawyers, and witnesses; 3) Language as evidence. This relates to authorship and communication that require linguistic theories for their resolution (Coulthard & Johnson, 2010).

Additionally, this study employs Griffiths and Milne's (2005) theory to analyze questioning techniques in the BAP. Meanwhile, Levinson's (2001) theory is applied to analyze types of presupposition. Furthermore, the data were analyzed through several stages based on the qualitative data analysis (Mackey & Gass, 2016; Miles et al., 2014). First, the list of questions posed by the investigators in each BAP was identified and marked. Second, these questions were classified according to their types (See Table 2 and 3). Subsequently, the data were interpreted based on data categories (e.g., Data 1, Data 2), followed by the sequence of questions and responses between the investigator and the defendant. Finally, conclusions were drawn based on the research findings obtained.

4. Results and Discussion

The investigator's view of a case comprises elements that generally consist of facts and evidence described by the suspect, which require the investigator's reasoning and logical analysis (Panggabean, 2019). This requirement highlights the need for investigators to possess effective interrogation strategies when questioning a suspect. Referring to these elements, the interrogation strategies employed by investigators in the BAP of the Tolaki ethnic insult case can be examined through the types of interrogation questions proposed by Griffiths and Milne (2005).

4.1 Types of Questions in the Investigation Report of a Suspect in the Criminal Case of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group

A total of 30 questions derived from the BAP are categorized into productive question types and non-productive question types, as described in Table 1 below. This analysis was conducted to describe the patterns of the investigator's examination of the suspect in the case of insulting the Tolaki ethnic group, in accordance with the theory of Griffiths and Milne (2005).

Table 1. Results of Question Type Analysis in the Investigation Report of the Criminal Case of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group

Type of Question		Recapitulation	
		Number	Percentage
Productive questions	Open questions	1	3.3%
	Closed questions	15	50%
	Investigative questions	9	30%
Non-productive questions	Infective questions	1	3.3%
	Multiple questions	2	6.7%
	Leading questions	2	6.7%
Total		30	100%

Table 1 shows that in this case the investigator posed 20 questions in the first BAP and 10 questions in the second report. A total of 26 productive questions and 4 non-productive questions were found. The most dominant type of question used in the interrogation of the criminal case of insulting the Tolaki ethnic group is the productive closed question type, with 15 occurrences, representing approximately 46.6 percent.

1. Productive Questions

The productive question type refers to questions posed to the examinee in order to elicit detailed information. In this analysis, productive questions are divided into three types, namely open questions, investigative questions, and closed questions.

a. Open questions

In the process of asking open questions, the investigator can guide the examination to obtain more detailed information from the examinee regarding the occurrence of the criminal act involving the suspect. Open questions are described as questions that allow the examinee to provide a full response. This type of question expects longer and more accurate answers from the suspect. Open questions are typically marked by words such as *tell*, *explain*, or *describe*, which are also known as TED Questions (Griffiths and Milne, 2005).

Open questions are addressed to the suspect to obtain accurate and detailed information regarding the following matters:

- 1) Who committed the insult?
- 2) What issue triggered the act of insult?
- 3) Where did the incident occur?

- 4) Why did the perpetrator do it?
- 5) With what did the perpetrator carry out the act?
- 6) How was the condition of the victim?
- 7) How did the incident happen?

Data 1

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan apakah hingga saat ini saudara masih memiliki atau menguasai serta mengakses akun facebook atas nama DE tersebut, jika ia, perangkat apakah yang saudara gunakan?* [Would you please explain whether you currently still own or control and access the Facebook account of DE, if so, what device do you use?]

b. Closed questions

In the BAP, closed questions are those posed by the investigator to the suspect in order to confirm certain matters that are already known. Generally, closed questions are addressed to suspects to verify and confirm the truth or falsity of information regarding the following:

- 1) The identity of the suspects
- 2) The suspect's understanding
- 3) The admissions made by the suspect
- 4) Other statements provided by the suspect

Data 2

Investigator: *Apakah saudara dalam keadaan sehat jasmani dan rohani?* [Are you in good physical and mental health?]

Data 2 above is a question posed by the investigator to the suspect to confirm the suspect's condition during the examination process. This question must be asked by the investigator as a formal requirement regulated in Article 27 paragraph (1) of Perkap No. 8 of 2009 concerning the implementation of Human Rights Principles and Standards in the Performance of the Main Duties of the Indonesian National Police, which obligates investigators to ensure the readiness of the examinee during the examination process.

c. Investigative questions

Investigative questions are questions that require specific and accurate answers from the suspect. This type of question is usually marked by interrogative words such as who, what, why, where, when, and how, often referred to as wh-questions. These questions are asked after the investigator knows or possesses certain information related to the matter being asked of the examinee (Griffiths and Milne, 2005).

Similar to open questions, investigative questions are posed by investigators to the suspect to reveal information related to the essential elements contained in Article 45A paragraph (2), which is used to charge the suspect, namely:

- 1) Who committed the insult, in this case who posted it and who was involved in the act of insult?

- 2) What issue triggered the act of insult?
- 3) Where did the incident occur?
- 4) With what means did the perpetrator commit the insult?
- 5) Why did the perpetrator do it?
- 6) How did the incident happen?

Data 3

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan secara tegas dan terperinci apakah yang saudara maksud dengan Hubungan Khusus antara saudara dengan saudara RA?* [Could you explain clearly and in detail what do you mean by a special relationship between you and RA?]

Data 3 above is an investigative question posed by the investigator to uncover information about the motive behind the criminal act of insult. In this case, the suspect provided an answer that met the investigator's expectations, namely by explaining the special relationship between the suspect and RA, which triggered the criminal act. This information further reinforces that the examinee committed a violation of Article 45A paragraph (2).

2. Non-Productive Questions

Non-productive questions are associated with poor questions that are unable to elicit information of evidentiary value. According to Griffiths and Milne (2005), there are five types of questions that fall into the category of non-productive questions.

a. Infective questions

Infective questions are defined as questions that give the examinee the opportunity to evade or provide less detailed answers. This may occur because the question is not delivered appropriately, causing the suspect to withhold information they actually possess.

Data 4

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan mengapa sehingga saudara dapat mengetahui semua postingan yang ada pada ketiga akun media sosial tersebut diatas?* [Could you explain why you can find out all the posts on the three social media accounts above?]

In Data 4, the investigator expected a detailed explanation from the suspect regarding how the suspect knew about all the insulting posts. This is considered infective because the answer provided by the suspect did not meet the investigator's expectations, which led the investigator to follow up with questions directed toward RA's social media access.

b. Multiple questions

Multiple questions are questions that contain several inquiries at once directed to the examinee. This causes the examinee to experience difficulty in determining which

question should be answered first. The following is a multiple question found in the suspect's BAP.

Data 5

Investigator: *Dipertanyakan kepada tersangka kapan dan dimanakah akun facebook RA memposting konten tersebut diatas dan siapakah yang menshare atau mengirimnya ke group facebook SULTRA WATCH dan KENDARI JUAL BELI?* [The suspect was asked when and where did the RA Facebook account post the above content and who shared or sent it to the SULTRA WATCH and KENDARI JUAL BELI Facebook groups?]

Data 6

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan sejak kapankah sudara mengenal saudara RA dan apakah saudara memiliki hubungan keluarga atau hubungan pekerjaan atau hubungan lain yang sifatnya pribadi?* [Please explain how long you have known RA and do you have a family relationship, work relationship or other personal relationship?]

Data 5 and 6 are multiple questions that must be answered by the suspect. This type of question places the suspect in a difficult position, making the resulting statements unreliable as evidentiary information because they are produced through a procedure that disadvantages the suspect.

c. Leading questions

Leading questions are questions that provide answer options that corner the suspect. In other words, these questions only allow the suspect to choose or admit one of the answers provided by the investigator. Leading questions give the suspect only two possible responses, "yes" or "no." The following is an example of a leading question found in the suspect's BAP.

Data 7

Investigator: *Apakah benar perangkat ini (sambil pemeriksa memperlihatkan kepada tersangka sebuah handphone merek VIVO Y51L warna hitam dengan nomor Imei 1: 8690390xxxxxxx dan nomor Imei 2: 8690390xxxxxxx) adalah perangkat yang saudara gunakan untuk dapat mengakses masuk atau login dan menggunakan akun media sosial facebook atas nama RA dan akun Instagram atas nama FA serta akun WhatshApp dengan nomor 0822xxxxxxx?* [Is it true that this device (while the examiner showed the suspect a black VIVO Y51L brand cellphone with IMEI number 1: 8690390xxxxxxx and IMEI number 2: 8690390xxxxxxx) is the device that you used to access or log in and use the Facebook social media account in the name of RA and the Instagram account in the name of FA as well as the WhatsApp account with the number 0822xxxxxxx?]

Data 8

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan selama saudara kenal dan berhubungan dengan saudara RA, apakah telah terjadi transaksi keuangan antara saudara dengan saudara*

RA, jika ia dalam bentuk apa transaksi tersebut? [Would you please explain during the time you have known and been in contact with RA? Have there been any financial transactions between you and RA? If so, what form did those transactions take?]

To sum up, productive question types were found more frequently than non-productive questions in the BAP of the suspect in the Tolaki Ethnic Insult Case. This indicates that the investigator applied proper examination procedures, particularly in using effective questioning strategies toward the suspect.

Closed questions were identified as the most frequently used type of productive question, followed by open questions and investigative questions. This shows that the investigator required accurate, confirmed, detailed, and clear information from the suspect. Through closed questions, the investigator attempted to verify the accuracy and consistency of the evidence and witness statements with the suspect's confession in order to prove the actual criminal act that occurred.

Overall, the dominance of productive questioning in the suspect's examination record (BAP) has a positive impact on the high evidentiary value of the BAP as documentary evidence. The language patterns and questioning strategies employed by investigators contribute to the construction of a criminal narrative that is clear, coherent, and difficult to refute. This strengthens the position of the BAP within the judicial process and supports the judge's conviction in delivering a lawful and just verdict, as reflected in the decision of the Kendari District Court, which found the defendant guilty and imposed a sentence in accordance with the applicable legal provisions.

4.2 Investigator's Presuppositions in the Interrogation of the Suspect in the Criminal Case of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group

Presupposition is something assumed by the speaker in an utterance, and afterward there will be an entailment that carries meaning and is assumed within the utterance (Levinson, 2001). This is because presupposition can reduce the potential for misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. The following section presents the types of presupposition along with their specific features (characteristics) that distinguish each type of presupposition.

Table 2. Results of Presupposition Analysis in the Interrogation of the Criminal Case of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group

Type of Presupposition	Recapitulation	
	Number	Percentage
Existential Presupposition	3	10%
Factual Presupposition	8	26.66%
Lexical Presupposition	2	6.66%
Structural Presupposition	13	43.33%
Non-factual Presupposition	1	3.33%
Temporal Clause Presupposition	3	10%
Total	30	100%

Table 2 show that there are six types of presuppositions were identified as correlating with all speech events. These include existential presupposition, factual presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, non-factual presupposition, and temporal clause presupposition. All six types are described according to their respective categories by considering the specific features (characteristics) inherent in each type. Thus, the most dominant type of presupposition used in the interrogation of the Tolaki ethnic insult case is structural presupposition, with a total of 13 occurrences (43.33 percent).

1. Existential Presupposition

Existential presupposition indicates the existence of something that can be expressed through presupposition (Panggabean, 2019). The following is the existential presupposition data found in the BAP of the suspect in the Criminal Case of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group.

Data 9

Investigator: *Apakah saudara memiliki akun di media sosial? Jelaskan* [Do you have any social media accounts? Please explain]

Data 9 above was presented by the investigator to the examinee in order to obtain information related to the offense alleged against the suspect, namely the criminal act of defamation or insult on social media. The question met the investigator's expectations, allowing for further investigative questioning related to the examination of the case.

2. Factual presupposition (Factive presupposition / Factive predicates)

This type of presupposition arises from information intended to be conveyed or expressed through words that indicate a fact or a piece of news believed to be true. In this presupposition, there are several lexical items used to identify that an utterance contains factual presupposition, such as "realize, regret, be aware, glad, know, be sorry that, be proud that, be indifferent that, be glad that, be sad that" (Panggabean, 2019). The following is the factual presupposition data found in the BAP of the suspect in the Criminal Case of Insulting the Tolaki Ethnic Group.

Data 10

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan sejak saudara masuk atau login atau menggunakan dan mengakses akun media sosial facebook atas nama RA dan akun Instagram atas nama FA serta akun WhatshApp dengan nomor 0822 xxxx xxxx sedangkan ketiga akun media sosial tersebut adalah milik teman saudara bernama RA?* [Would you please explain how you entered or logged in or used and accessed the Facebook social media account in the name of RA and the Instagram account in the name of FA and the WhatsApp account with the number 0822 xxxx xxxx, while the three social media accounts belong to your friend named RA?]

Data 10 above shows that the investigator assumed that the suspect had a certain motive for accessing a social media account that did not belong to her. In this case, the investigator attempted to obtain detailed answers regarding the underlying reasons for the criminal act of insult. This is based on an important principle in the examination process, namely that the investigator must ensure that the examinee can recount everything they know freely and without feeling influenced, and may then be guided through further questions to clarify the relationship between their statements and the existing facts or to complete the information already provided (Pangestuti, 2020).

3. Lexical presupposition (Aspectual / Change-of-state predicates)

Lexical presupposition is a type of utterance that arises from information intended to be conveyed (Yule, 2020). In cases of lexical presupposition, the use of specific expressions by the speaker is taken to presuppose another concept that is not explicitly stated. The following is the lexical presupposition data found in the BAP of the Tolaki ethnic insult case.

Data 11

Investigator: *Mohon ceritakan riwayat hidup saudara secara singkat dan jelas?* [Please tell us your life history briefly and clearly?]

Data 11 represents a lexical presupposition because it contains an utterance that is interpreted through emphasis within the utterance. Utterances that constitute lexical presuppositions are expressed implicitly, yet they are already understood by the hearer. In this case, the investigator already possessed the identity of the perpetrator, so the question was intended to confirm the examinee's identity. It also refers to an additional concept, namely that the investigator attempted to obtain another implied meaning, one of which was identifying the examinee's character.

4. Structural presupposition

Structural presupposition is a type of presupposition expressed through utterances whose sentence structure is clear and can be directly understood without focusing on the specific words used. In English, the use of structural presupposition can be seen in interrogative forms such as *wh*-questions, alternative questions, and *yes/no* questions (Panggabean, 2019). The following is the structural presupposition data found in the BAP.

Data 12

Investigator: *Apakah saudara dalam keadaan sehat jasmani dan rohani?* [Are you in good physical and mental health?]

Data 12 shows a structural presupposition marked by the interrogative sentence "are you in a physically and mentally healthy condition?" This is conventionally interpreted as a statement already known as an issue, producing the structural presupposition that "the examinee is in a physically and mentally healthy condition."

5. Non-factual presupposition

Non-factual presupposition is a type of presupposition that is assumed to be untrue. This presupposition still allows the possibility of misunderstanding because it involves the use of uncertain or ambiguous expressions. It is used to assume something that is not true or not real (Panggabean, 2019). The following is the non-factual presupposition data found in the BAP.

Data 13

Investigator: *Apakah sebelumnya saudara pernah terlibat dalam suatu perkara tindak pidana kemudian diproses hukum dan mendapat putusan yang tetap dari pengadilan?* [Have you ever been involved in a criminal case before, which was then processed by law and received a final decision from the court?]

Data 13 is a non-factual presupposition because what is assumed is not true. This presupposition still allows the possibility of misunderstanding due to the use of uncertain or ambiguous expressions. The question is a sentence that is doubtful in relation to the facts presented, because the presupposition that emerges is non-factual. Referring to the suspect's answer, namely "has never been involved in any criminal case and subsequently processed by law and received a final decision from the court," the presupposition is structural in nature. This helps the investigator pose more investigative questions and form the final conclusion of the BAP, which may have evidentiary value.

6. Temporal clause presupposition

Temporal clause presupposition is marked by the presence of time indicators in an utterance or sentence. Several linguistic markers of this type of presupposition include when, after, before, as soon as, until/till, by the time, once, the moment (that), immediately, and while. The following is the temporal clause presupposition data found in the suspect's BAP.

Data 14

Investigator: *Saudara jelaskan sejak kapankah saudara mengenal saudara RA dan apakah saudara memiliki hubungan keluarga atau hubungan pekerjaan atau hubungan lain yang sifatnya pribadi?* [Would you please explain how long you have known RA and do you have any family or work relationships or other personal relationships?]

Data 15

Investigator: *Apakah saudara tetap pada keterangan saudara sebelumnya sebagaimana dalam Berita Acara Pemeriksaan (BAP) Tersangka pada hari Minggu tanggal 4 Oktober 2020, jelaskan?* [Do you stick to your previous statement as stated in the Suspect's Examination Report (BAP) on Sunday, October 4, 2020? Explain?]

As shown above in Data 14, there is a linguistic unit used, namely "when." Meanwhile, Data 15 contains a temporal marker, namely "on Sunday, 4 October 2022." All of these temporal details aim to indicate that the suspect is assumed to have carried out a specific activity at a particular time. Presupposition is an important component in

an interaction process or in communication between speakers. This is because presupposition can reduce the possibility of misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer (Panggabean, 2019). The analysis and classification of presuppositions across the six categories served to describe the acceptability patterns of assumptions or signals within presuppositions.

Based on the results of the analysis, the most dominant type of presupposition is structural presupposition. This dominance is identified through a forensic linguistic perspective, which shows the large number of markers of clarity and sentence structures that can be directly understood without considering other words in the utterance. This aligns with the characteristics of structural presupposition, which focuses on the form and arrangement of sentences. In the context of interrogation, investigators must possess the ability to analyze the suspect's utterances in order not to be misled by pretense or deception. As the front line of the legal process, investigators are required to be firm and to comply with the Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for examinations when interrogating suspects.

It must be understood that the SOP regulates several mandatory questions that investigators must ask in accordance with applicable provisions. For example, the question "Are you in a physically and mentally healthy condition?" is a required question that must be asked before entering more in-depth questions related to the case. This is important because the suspect's physical and mental condition may affect the course of the interrogation. These mandatory questions are generally structured in clear and easily understood sentence forms, thereby producing explicit structural presuppositions. Thus, the clarity of meaning in the investigator's utterances can be obtained directly through the sentence structure used.

From a forensic linguistics perspective, these findings underscore that presupposition functions not merely as a pragmatic phenomenon, but also as a linguistic mechanism that plays a crucial role in ensuring the validity, reliability, and evidentiary strength of a suspect's statements before the law.

5 Conclusion

To sum up, the investigative examination conducted by the investigators has generally applied linguistic strategies that are relatively effective and consistent with the principles of forensic linguistics. This is reflected in the dominance of productive questioning and the use of structured linguistic presuppositions in the interrogation of the suspect. Both aspects play a crucial role in constructing statements that are systematic, focused, and possess high evidentiary value. Overall, the combination of dominant productive questions and structural presuppositions results in an examination record with strong linguistic and juridical force. From a forensic linguistics perspective, the BAP functions not merely as an administrative document, but also as a legal discourse product capable of accurately representing the criminal event, minimizing the potential for retraction of statements, and supporting judicial conviction in the evidentiary process during trial.

These research findings affirm that forensic linguistics plays a strategic role in evaluating the quality of investigative examinations and the evidentiary strength of the BAP. The analysis of question types and presuppositions demonstrates that language is not merely a means of communication, but a legal instrument that can influence the validity of a suspect's statements. Accordingly, the application of forensic linguistic principles enables an objective assessment of whether a BAP is produced through examination procedures that are fair, non-misleading, and consistent with legal standards of proof.

Furthermore, this study reinforces the view that pragmatic analysis, particularly presupposition, can be employed to identify potential bias, pressure, or leading practices in interrogation. Therefore, Forensic Linguistics is not only relevant at the trial stage, but also serves as an important evaluative and preventive tool during the investigative phase.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in the writing of this scientific article.

Authors' contribution

The authors made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the study. The authors took responsibility for data analysis, interpretation and discussion of results. The authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to Mr. Bambang Wijanarko, S.I.K., Director of the Special Criminal Investigation Directorate, Regional Police of Southeast Sulawesi, for the support and research permission granted under Letter Number: B/32/I/2023/Ditreskimsus.

References

- Adhikara, R. (2022). Investigative Interview of Indonesian Police Investigator. *Legal Brief*, 11(3), 1754–1762. <https://doi.org/10.35335/legal>
- Alduais, A., Al-Khulaidi, M. A., Allegretta, S., & Abdulkhalek, M. M. (2023). Forensic linguistics: A scientometric review. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2214387>
- Bachari, A. D., Sudana, D., & Gunawan, W. (2019). Ragam dan Arah Pertanyaan Penyidik dalam Berita Acara Pemeriksaan Perkara Pidana Anak. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 36(1), 67–91. <https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v36i1.73>
- Coulthard, M. (2016). An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics. In *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315630311>
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics. In *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203855607>

- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2011). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b11275-2>
- Gibbons, J. (2003). *Forensic Linguistics: An Introduction to Language in the Justice System*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Griffiths, A., & Milne, R. (2005). Will it all end in tiers: police interviews with suspects in Britain. In T. Williamson (Ed.), *Investigative Interviewing: Rights, Research, Regulation*. Willan.
- Harahap, Y. (2007). *Pembahasan Permasalahan Dan Penerapan KUHP: Pemeriksaan Sidang Pengadilan, Banding, Kasasi, dan Peninjauan Kembali* (2nd ed.). Sinar Grafika.
- 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>
- Jannah, J. M., Munirah, & Munir, A. (2024). Tindak Tutur pada Berita Acara Pemeriksaan sebagai Penegakan Hukum yang Setara dan Berkeadilan (Kajian Linguistik Forensik). *Jurnal Riset Guru Indonesia (JGRI)*, 3(1), 32–38. <https://doi.org/10.62388/jrgi.v3i1.401>
- Jannah, R. (2019). *Analisis Linguistik Forensik pada Berita Acara Pemeriksaan sebagai Upaya Penegakan Hukum yang Adil dan Setara*. Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel.
- Kassin, S. M., Leo, R. A., Meissner, C. A., Richman, K. D., Colwell, L. H., Leach, A.-M., & Fon, D. La. (2007). Police Interviewing and Interrogation: A Self-Report Survey of Police Practices and Beliefs. *Law and Human Behavior*, 31(1), 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-006-9073-5>
- Lee, Y. H. (2020). How Police Policies and Practices Impact Successful Crime Investigation: Factors That Enable Police Departments to “Clear” Crimes. *Justice System Journal*, 41(1), 37–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0098261X.2020.1719246>
- Levinson, S. C. (2001). *Pragmatics: Linguistic* (N. J. Smelser & P. B. B. T.-I. E. of the S. & B. S. Baltes (eds.); pp. 11948–11954). Pergamon. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03008-4>
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design* (2nd ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Mahsun. (2018). *Linguistik Forensik: Memahami Forensik Berbasis Teks dengan Analogi DNA*. Rajawali Pers.
- Malombeke, E., Aling, D. F., & Lembong, R. R. (2021). Peranan Berita Acara Pemeriksaan Perkara (BAP) dalam Proses Peradilan Pidana. *Lex Administratum*, IX(4), 140–149.
- McMenamin, G. R. (2008). Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics. In *The Handbook of Linguistics*. CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756409.ch30>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Milne, B., & Powell, M. (2010). Investigative interviewing. In J. M. Brown & E. A.

- Campbell (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Forensic Psychology* (pp. 208–214). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511730290.026>
- Milne, R., & Bull, R. (2025). *Investigative Interviewing: Psychology and Practice* (2nd ed.). Wiley. <https://doi.org/978-1-119-80627-1>
- Mintowati. (2016). Pencemaran Nama Baik: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *Paramasastra*, 3(2), 197–208.
- Muniroh, R. D. D., & Heydon, G. (2022). Addressing the Gap Between Principles and Practices in Police Interviewing in Indonesia. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 37(1), 312–324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-021-09474-7>
- Olsson, J. (2008). Forensic linguistics: Second Edition. In *Handbook of Language and Communication: Diversity and Change*. Continuum International Publishing Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003082637-25>
- Olsson, J. (2012). *Wordcrime: Solving Crime through Forensic Linguistics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Pangestuti, E. (2020). Tugas Penyidik di dalam Melaksanakan Pemeriksaan Terhadap Tersangka Residivis. *Yustitiabelen*, 6(2), 76–97. <https://doi.org/10.36563/yustitiabelen.v6i2.246>
- Panggabean, S. (2019). *Konstruksi Wacana Pemeriksaan Tersangka: Kajian Linguistik Forensik*. Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Perkins, R., & Grant, T. (2013). Forensic Linguistics. In *Encyclopedia of Forensic Sciences: Second Edition* (2nd ed.). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-382165-2.00030-1>
- Ramadani, Syaifullah, A. R., Gunawan, W., Kusriani, D., Rahayu, S., & Putra, B. C. D. (2023). Implicature and Question Types of Police Interrogation: An Analysis of Communication in a Theft Case. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(7), 585–596. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n7p585>
- Sari, R. P., Anwar, M., & Kamal, M. (2025). Investigating Hate Speech Comments: A Forensic Linguistic Study. *Austronesian: Journal of Language Science & Literature*, 4(1), 47–64. <https://doi.org/10.59011/austronesian.4.1.2025.47-64>
- Sumaljag, M. V. O. (2018). A Forensic Linguistic Analysis of Police Reports. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(1), 80–102. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-23010480102>
- Sumampouw, N., Bjrndal, L. D., Magnussen, S., Otgaar, H., & Brennen, T. (2022). Knowledge about eyewitness testimony: a survey of Indonesian police officers and psychologists. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 28(8), 763–777. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2021.1962868>
- Varney, M. H. (1997). Forensic Linguistics: A New, Varied and very Practical Application of Linguistic Science. *English Today*, 13(4), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400010014>
- Verhoeven, W. (2018). The complex relationship between interrogation techniques, suspects changing their statement and legal assistance. Evidence from a Dutch

- sample of police interviews. *Policing and Society*, 28(3), 308–327.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2016.1157594>
- Violine, M. (2008). *Bahasa Hukum Indonesia dalam Berita Acara Pemeriksaan: Sebuah Tinjauan Mengenai Keefektifan Kalimat*. Universitas Indonesia.
- Yu, H., & Monas, N. (2020). Recreating the Scene: An Investigation of Police Report Writing. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 50(1), 35–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281618812441>
- Yule, G. (2020). *The Study of Language* (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.