

Person reference in police interviews: A case study of domestic violence in Indonesia

Dhion Meitreya Vidhiasi¹, R. Dian Dia-an Muniroh^{2*}, Wawan Gunawan³, Eri Kurniawan⁴, Budi Hermawan⁵, Yanty Wirza⁶, and Teni Hadiyani⁷

^{1,2,3,7}Linguistics Study Program, School of Postgraduate Studies, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudi No.229, Isola, Sukasari, Bandung, West Java, 40154, Indonesia

^{4,5}English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudi No.229, Isola, Sukasari, Bandung, West Java, 40154, Indonesia

⁶English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jl. Dr. Setiabudi No.229, Isola, Sukasari, Bandung, West Java, 40154, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Person reference holds significant sway in judicial discourse, shaping perceptions of impartiality and esteem. It can convey partiality or reverence, whether through alignment with, or the humanization of, witnesses, victims, suspects, or defendants within legal contexts. Moreover, it is crucial to recognize that verbal aggression or dehumanization may at times be construed as an expression of impartiality, as individuals employ language that inflicts harm upon others. This qualitative study delves into the utilization of person reference by two police investigators during their interrogation of a suspect implicated in a domestic violence incident. The dataset comprises transcripts from two experimental interview scenarios conducted by the investigators with one adult individual assuming the role of the suspect. The findings unveil that law enforcement personnel deployed formal nomination categories during interviews to establish a notable level of detachment between themselves and the subject of inquiry. The study highlights that despite efforts by the investigators to humanize the suspect, the shift from using honorifics such as "Bapak/Pak (Mr/Sir)" as a mark of deference for older males to the term "Saudara (metaphorical brother/sister)" within a legal framework, indicative of a lack of familiarity in the relationship, leads to an increase in social distance. This insight enhances our understanding of the nuanced impact of linguistic choices on law enforcement interactions, presenting valuable implications for enhancing the equity and efficacy of judicial discourse.

Keywords: Domestic violence; Indonesian police; investigative interview; person reference; suspect

First Received:

20 December 2022

Revised:

27 September 2023

Accepted:

January 2024

Final Proof Received:

23 January 2024

Published:

31 January 2024

How to cite (in APA style):

Vidhiasi, D. M., Muniroh, R. D. D., Gunawan, W., Kurniawan, E., Hermawan, B., Wirza, Y., & Hadiyani, T. (2024). Person reference in police interviews: A case study of domestic violence in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(3), 490-499. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i3.66954>

INTRODUCTION

Communication dynamics significantly pivot on the deployment of individual references, serving to delineate one's or another's position within discourse and furnish contextual cues regarding their social status (Ewing, 2015; Ewing & Djenar, 2019). The exhibition of bias or deference by law enforcement toward specific individuals, such as witnesses,

victims, or suspects/defendants, often manifests through processes of humanization (Chaemsaitong, 2019). Previous studies have underscored the significance of scrutinizing personal pronoun usage within Indonesian legal discourse, notably within police settings, to elucidate law enforcement's grasp of social and interpersonal dynamics vis-à-vis institutional objectives (Mavunga et al., 2017;

* Corresponding Author

Email: ddmuniroh@upi.edu

Ostermann, 2003). Despite the voluminous literature on person reference, scant attention has been directed towards its implications in Indonesian police interviews, particularly concerning recent reforms.

The Indonesian National Police's primary mandate encompasses conducting investigations. However, this issue has garnered international scrutiny due to persistent allegations of human rights violations and instances of false confessions leading to wrongful convictions, especially in cases involving suspected individuals (Muniroh, 2019). Numerous accounts have surfaced regarding law enforcement's adoption of aggressive tactics during interrogations, targeting not only suspects but also victims and witnesses. The absence of scientific methodologies informing Indonesian police interrogation practices has exacerbated this issue (Muniroh, 2019; Muniroh & Heydon, 2022). Unlike police institutions in countries such as the United Kingdom, Norway, Australia, and New Zealand, which have embraced evidence-based investigative interviewing techniques (Clarke & Milne, 2001; Griffiths & Rachlew, 2018; Meissner et al., 2017; Muniroh & Aziz, 2016; Schollum, 2005), the Indonesian police traditionally relied on experiential knowledge transfer from senior to junior officers, resulting in a dearth of systematic approaches.

Since the inception of police reforms and the initiation of investigative interviewing training for Indonesian police officers by the Norwegian Centre for Human Rights in 2014 (Muniroh, 2019), a gradual shift from coercive practices to a more empathetic approach has transpired. This evolution is discernible in the modification of discursive strategies employed during police interviews, transitioning from predominantly asymmetrical interactions to more participatory and empathetic exchanges. As posited by Muniroh (2019), person reference serves as a linguistic instrument enabling police investigators to position suspects while demonstrating empathy and adherence to ethical standards. Employing appropriate person reference conveys respect and decency toward suspects, potentially facilitating access to reliable information (Shepherd & Griffiths, 2013) and thereby enhancing investigative outcomes.

Indonesian linguistic conventions encompass a diverse array of resources for person reference, including non-pronominal forms such as self-names and kinship terms (Enfield, 2007; Sneddon et al., 2012). This means that non-pronominal forms such as self-names and kinship words are widely employed in Indonesian for both self- and other-reference and that the language has freely taken sources of designation from other languages (Ewing, 2015). Notably, police investigators frequently employ terms such as "Saudara (metaphorical brother/sister)" or "Anda (distant you)" rather than kinship labels when referring to individuals,

underscoring the question of whether such usage promotes humanization. "Saudara," translating to "metaphorical brother/sister," denotes a distant connection between interlocutors, while "Anda" predominantly signifies social distance, commonly employed in formal and impersonal contexts (Djenar et al., 2018).

Existing scholarship has extensively examined person reference in informal communication across various global contexts, including the Netherlands (de Hoop & Tarenskeen, 2015), Australia (Rendle-Short, 2007, 2010), Chile (Helincks, 2015), and Belgium (Coesemans & De Cock, 2017), as well as in Indonesia (Ewing, 2014, 2015; Ewing & Djenar, 2019; Manns, 2017; Utsumi, 2020). However, apart from Muniroh (2019), scant research delves into person reference within Indonesian judicial discourse, particularly in police interviews.

Person reference assumes paramount importance in police interviews for three reasons. Firstly, it delineates the positions of interlocutors within the dialogue, affirming or asserting their roles within the investigative process. Secondly, it furnishes contextual cues regarding social hierarchies, a crucial consideration within Indonesian societal norms (Ewing, 2015; Ewing & Djenar, 2019). Thirdly, person reference can humanize or implicate individuals, profoundly impacting their treatment and outcomes within legal contexts.

Notably, Muniroh (2019) identified three discernible dimensions of formality in Indonesian police interviews: person reference, lexical choice, and discourse markers. Formality emerges as a multifaceted construct (Trudgill, 2000), encompassing respectfulness, professionalism, and affability within the Indonesian context (Muniroh, 2019). Respect is conveyed through honorifics such as "Bapak (Mr)" and "Ibu (Mrs)," professionalism through elevated vocabulary, and affability through discourse markers. These dimensions collectively shape the transactional, relational, and institutional facets of police interviews, striking a delicate balance of formality conducive to effective communication.

The honorifics "Bapak" and "Ibu" extend beyond literal parental designations to encompass individuals deemed older, socially superior, or of equivalent status within Indonesian societal norms (Muniroh, 2019). According to Aziz (2000; 2003a), such social variables such as age holds a prominent role in the appropriate choice of language varieties. Rather than creating distance, employing "Bapak/Ibu" or its equivalents signifies respect and courtesy, reflecting sensitivity to age and social status. Additionally, addressing adult witnesses with "Bapak" or "Ibu" implies gender and relative age awareness, exemplifying appropriateness in communication (Taguchi, 2013).

Van Leeuwen (2008) provides a theoretical framework elucidating the power dynamics inherent in naming practices and the ideologies they encode. Proper names accentuate individuals' identities and humanity, with varying levels of formality denoted by their usage. Conversely, unofficial designations devoid of honorifics may serve to discredit or delegitimize referents (Hart, 2011). Muniroh (2019) identified four person reference variants in Indonesia ranging from the very informal to the very formal: *kamu* 'you', *Bapak/Ibu* 'Mr/Mrs', *Saudara* 'metaphorical brother/sister', and *Anda* 'distant you'.

Categorization, a facet of person reference, encompasses functionalization and identification processes that ascribe roles or essential characteristics to individuals within discourse (Van Leeuwen, 2008). Whereas functionalization denotes individuals' roles within a setting (e.g., worker, victim), identification highlights intrinsic attributes such as age, ethnicity, or gender. These labels may carry connotations and value judgments, shaping perceptions and interactions within legal contexts.

Impersonalization tactics, such as metonymic or symbolic references, serve to de-emphasize individuals' humanity and individuality, often focusing on actions or attributes rather than the persons themselves (Van Leeuwen, 2008). This depersonalization strategy, such as in the act of rape "she felt his finger penetrate her vagina" (Rosulek, 2015), underscores the nuances of language in shaping perceptions and power dynamics within legal discourse.

This study scrutinizes how Indonesian police investigators employ person reference when interrogating suspects in domestic violence cases, aiming to ascertain whether suspects are humanized or stigmatized. Employing a qualitative design and a mock-crime paradigm, the research seeks to shed light on the intricacies of ethical interviewing practices within Indonesian police investigations, offering insights applicable to other jurisdictions undergoing similar reform efforts.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative approach, analyzing data derived from a larger investigation into the use of person reference in police interviews. Specifically, transcripts of oral interactions from two recorded simulations of police interviews involving two investigators (A, an adult male, and B, an adult female) from the Directorate of General Criminal Investigation of the West Java Regional Police, along with one participant portraying an adult suspect, were scrutinized. These simulations were conducted within the framework of the mock-crime paradigm, as advocated by Heydon (2007), to generate a corpus of police interviews. The aim was to elucidate the types of person reference utilized. Recruitment of police investigators was based on criteria stipulating a minimum of ten years'

experience as domestic violence case investigators and voluntary participation in the research. The acting suspect was an adult participant willingly assuming the role.

Prior to the interview simulations, communication with the Directorate of General Criminal Investigation of the West Java Regional Police was initiated to comprehend investigative interview parameters, secure necessary permits, and address ethical considerations. An interview scenario was then devised by the researchers, followed by a meeting at the Directorate to organize scenarios, select investigators, and determine interview timing and location. The scenarios outlined disclosure of personal data and narrative accounts of events, approved by the Directorate.

Investigative questions were solely derived from individual investigators, mirroring customary investigative procedures. The interview duration within the simulation was at the discretion of each investigator, ensuring simulated data validity under conditions akin to real interviews. Feedback solicitation from investigators post-simulation was conducted collaboratively.

Simulation participants were provided with a case vignette portraying a 30-year-old woman disclosing domestic abuse by her spouse. Preparation included consultation with senior police investigators to ensure vignette fidelity to authentic interview contexts. Audio recording and visual documentation via a handycam were employed, with subsequent transcription following Jefferson's model. Emphasis was placed on oral communication in qualitative analysis.

Person reference analysis employed Van Leeuwen's (2008) categories of nomination, categorization, and identification, focusing primarily on the nomination category. Person references by Investigators A and B were categorized into four distinct levels—very formal, formal, semi-formal, and informal—based on Van Leeuwen's framework. Frequency and percentage calculations for each investigator's person reference employment were conducted, aiming to discern demeanor nuances and potential impacts on suspect perception.

FINDINGS

In this section, the frequency of person references utilized by the two investigators throughout their interactions, including instances of addressing, reprimanding, or referring to the acting suspect during investigative interviews, will be elucidated (Sari & Zamzani, 2020). According to Masduki (2017), the analysis of person reference can be approached from a sociolinguistic perspective, as these references encapsulate characteristics of social culture commonly observed or performed within specific groups or communities, particularly in Indonesia. Tables 1 and 2 present the utilization of person references in the two police investigations.

Table 1
Person Reference used by Investigator A (male)

| No. | Person Reference | Σ | % | Category |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1. | Asep Supriyatna | 1 | 0.6% | Informal |
| 2. | Pak Asep (Mr. Asep) | 10 | 6% | Least Formal |
| 3. | Bapak (Mr.) | 99 | 59.2% | Semi Formal |
| 4. | Pak (Sir) | 31 | 18.6% | Semi Formal |
| 5. | Saudara (metaphorical brother/sister) | 26 | 15.6% | Formal |
| TOTAL | | 167 | 100% | |

Table 2
Person Reference used by Investigator B (female)

| No. | Person Reference | Σ | % | Category |
|--------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1. | Asep Supriyatna | 1 | 0.6% | Informal |
| 2. | Pak Asep (Mr. Asep) | 7 | 4.4% | Least Formal |
| 3. | Bapak (Mr.) | 91 | 57.3% | Semi Formal |
| 4. | Pak (Sir) | 60 | 37.7% | Semi Formal |
| TOTAL | | 159 | 100% | |

When considering the appropriateness of person references within Indonesian culture, it is imperative to acknowledge their significant divergence from those in Western cultures, as classified by Leeuwen (2008) and Chaemsaitong (2019). Muniroh (2019) delineates five distinct categories for person references found in research data: informal, least formal, semi-formal, formal, and highly formal.

The informal category involves referring to an individual by their name, whether a full name or a nickname, without a formal salutation like Bapak/Ibu (Mr/Mrs) or an equivalent term. The least formal category includes salutations such as Pak/Bu/Mas/Mbak (Sir/Mam/Ms) or similar forms, followed by a truncated name. The semi-formal category employs salutations like Bapak/Ibu/Mas/Mbak (Mr/Mrs/Ms) or equivalent terms without a specific name. The formal category includes the salutation "Saudara" (which metaphorically translates to "brother/sister"), with or without a specific name. The very formal category uses salutations like Bapak/Ibu/Saudara (Mr/Mrs/Saudara) or titles preceding the full name.

Analysis of Tables 1 and 2 reveals that both investigators A and B predominantly employed person references in a semi-formal manner. However, Table 1 indicates that investigator A frequently utilized person references, specifically the salutation "Saudara" (metaphorical brother/sister), without subsequently mentioning the name of the individual under investigation. These findings suggest that investigator A may be actively seeking to widen the social distance between themselves and the individual under investigation (Chaemsaitong, 2019; Muniroh, 2019).

What follows will provide a more detailed analysis of the person references employed by Investigator A and Investigator B, as delineated in Table 1 and Table 2.

Investigator A

In Table 1, Investigator A utilized five distinct person references. Notably, the term "Bapak (Mr.*)" was the most frequently employed among these references. Conversely, the utilization of least formal references, exemplified by "Pak Asep," was relatively infrequent, occurring only ten times out of a total of 167 person references. Nonetheless, Investigator A managed to establish a congenial atmosphere at the onset of the interaction with the suspect, as evidenced by the utilization of a least formal person reference, as depicted in Excerpt #1.

Excerpt #1

Penyidik A : Selamat sore **pak Asep**, kumaha damang?

Investigator A : Good afternoon, **Pak Asep**, how are you?

Pak Asep : Alhamdulillah pak sehat.

Pak Asep : Alhamdulillah I am fine.

Penyidik A : Terima kasih **pak Asep** nyak sudah datang sudah memenuhi surat panggilan ya.

Investigator A : Thank you, **Pak Asep**, for coming and already fulfilling the summons.

In the initiation of investigative procedures, individuals implicated in a criminal matter are initially designated either as witnesses or suspected perpetrators. The transition of an individual's status from a witness or suspected perpetrator to that of a suspect hinges upon the investigator acquiring a minimum of two pieces of sufficiently persuasive evidence. Throughout investigative interviews, it is crucial for investigators to categorize individuals as either witnesses or suspects, adhering to the principle of presumption of innocence. Within this context, maintaining politeness is paramount.

Excerpt #1 exemplifies the utilization of the least formal salutation "Pak Asep" as an expression of courtesy. According to the Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI), salutations like Bapak or Pak (Mr.) denote an individual perceived as an elderly gentleman or one held in high regard.

Chaemsaitong (2018) suggests that in a legal setting, using the greeting "Bapak" or "Pak" (Mr.) without following it with the individual's name may create a perception of increased social distance between Investigator A and the suspect. However, employing the salutation "Pak Asep (Mr. Asep)" serves to mitigate this perceived social distance, aligning with the implicated individual's name, as previously indicated by Investigator A. Additionally, Rosulek's (2008) study implies that the individual involved in the incident is perceived as someone known rather than unfamiliar.

Upon scrutinizing the transcript of the simulated interview between Investigator A (male) and a suspect, a shift was observed in person reference usage. A closer examination of the interview data reveals frequent changes in person reference, with the most common alteration being the transition from the least formal category to the semi-formal category, as illustrated in Excerpt #2.

Excerpt #2

Penyidik A : Terima kasih **pak asep** nyak sudah datang sudah memenuhi surat panggilan ya. .hhh Eeh **pak asep** saat ini mau dimintai keterangan ya keterangan, setelah kita melakukan rangkain penyidikan ehh saat ini **pak asep** dimintai keterangan sebagai tersangka, Dugaan tindak pidana kekerasan fisik dan psikis yang dilaporkan sama Bu N ya, Nanti **pak asep** eh dalam pemeriksaan akan dilakukan pemeriksaan dalam bentuk berita acara **pak asep** ya, huuh, Terus nanti mohon kerjasamanya ya **pak asep** ya, **Pak asep** dinaikan statusnya menjadi tersangka karena memang ini sudah::sudah kita pelajari semua keterangan saksi dan barang bukti ya? Nanti ada tahapan-tahapan yang memang hak dari **pak asep** saya pertanyakan dalam berita acara ini ya? .hhh Tidak usah **pak asep** nutup nutupi atau berbelit-belit itulah salah satunya bentuk kerjasama yang saya inginkan dari **bapak** .hhh toh ini juga nanti untuk memperlancar proses dari **bapak** sendiri ya pak ya, oke. **bapak** diminta keterangan pada hari ini, rabu ya **pak** ya tanggal 20 juli jam 11 ya **pak** ya. **Bapak** diperiksa oleh saya nama saya iptu S pak. Saya penyidik dari ditreskim umum polda jabar ya pak ya. Tempat **bapak** datang kesini ya? Boleh saya mintakan identitas **bapak**, nanti **bapak** sampaikan secara jelas, ehh **bapak**==nama asep siapa **pak**?

Investigator A : Thank you, **Pak Asep**, for coming and already fulfilling the summons. .hhh, **Pak Asep** is currently asking for information, yes, after we carry out a series of investigations, now **Pak Asep** is being asked for information as a suspect, Allegations of criminal acts of physical and psychological violence that were reported by Bu N. The examination is in the form of an official report, **Pak Asep**, huh, huuh. Then ask for your cooperation, **Pak Asep**, **Pak Asep**, the status is raised to a suspect because this is indeed:: have we studied all the statements of witnesses and evidence, right? Later, there will be stages that are the right of **Pak Asep**, I ask in this report, right? .hhh, **bapak**, you don't have to cover it up or make it complicated, that is one of the forms of cooperation

that I want from **bapak**. I was asked for information today, Wednesday, yes, sir, on July 20 at 11 am, yes, sir. Sir, my name is Iptu S, **pak**. I am an investigator from the General Ditreskim of the West Java Regional Police, yes, sir. Where did **bapak** come here? May I ask for your (**bapak**) identity, later **bapak** will explain clearly, **bapak** == what is Asep's name, **pak**?

In the second excerpt, it is evident that the investigator modified the least formal salutation "Pak Asep," replacing it with the semi-formal salutations "Bapak" and "Pak." This alteration suggests that the investigator encountered difficulties in accurately determining the appropriate address for the acting suspect. While the utilization of least formal greetings initially establishes a comfortable and non-stressful interview atmosphere, the suspect's status prompts the investigator to adopt a more formal approach during the questioning process. By employing honorific terms such as "Bapak" or "Pak" without explicitly referencing the individual's name, the investigators employed a strategy to maintain a perceived emotional distance from the suspect.

Excerpt #3

Penyidik A : ya, (.) maaf **bapak** muslim?
Investigator A : Yes, (.) Sorry, are you (**bapak**) Muslim?
Penyidik A : pekerjaan **pak** saat ini **pak**?
Investigator A : **pak**, what is your current job, **pak**?
Penyidik A : Mungkin alamat yang saat ini **bapak** tempati, dimana alamatnya **pak**?
Investigator A : Maybe the address that you (**bapak**) currently occupy, where is the address, **pak**?

The appropriateness of establishing a distant social relationship between the investigator and the suspect is further supported by examining the ensuing dialogue. Additionally, the absence of any reference to "Pak Asep" throughout the entirety of the interview procedure, as indicated in Excerpt #3, bolsters this assertion. Despite the earlier observation in Excerpt #2 regarding Investigator A's use of variable person references, suggesting some confusion in determining the appropriate address, Investigator A consistently employs semi-formal person references in the form of "Bapak/Pak (Mr./Sir)" without appending the name of the suspected individual until the conclusion of the interview. This consistent usage provides additional evidence that Investigator A deliberately maintains a social distance from the suspect to uphold a detached stance throughout the interaction.

Excerpt #4

Pak Asep : Asep Supriyatna
Pak Asep : Asep Supriyatna
Penyidik A : Asep Supriyatna, bapak usia berapa sekarang pak?
Investigator A : Asep Supriyatna, how old are you now, sir?

During the interview, the investigator also utilized a casual salutation, as evidenced in Excerpt #4. The indication of the suspect's full name is apparent through the mention of "Asep Supriyatna." While initially, this salutation may seem like a mere repetition of the suspect's statement, investigators have the option to incorporate the terms "Bapak" or "Pak" before introducing their own complete name. The inclusion of these honorific terms could be seen as a demonstration of the aspiration for legal equality and an effort to uphold the principle of politeness.

Excerpt #5

Penyidik A : Oh gitu, selama berumah tangga, (.) dimanakah saudara bertempat tinggal? Di komplek eta nyak?

Investigator A : Oh I see, while you were married, where did you (saudara) live? In the that housing area?

Pak Asep : NYA.

Mr. Asep : Yes.

Penyidik A : Bersama siapa saja saudara bertempat tinggal di komplek Margahayu Raya?

Investigator A : With whom do you (saudara) live in the Margahayu Raya housing area?

Pak Asep : di, anak, istri, (.) mertua pak.

Mr. Asep : son, wife, (.) mother-in-laws, sir.

Penyidik A : (0.8).hhh hhh. (0.9) Pak ini sebelum di lanjutkan saya tawarkan kepada bapak ini ya. Saat ini sudah masuk jadwalnya untuk sholat, apakah bapak mau break atau lanjut?

Investigator A : (0.8).hhh hhh. (0.9) Sir (Pak), before continuing, I offer this to you (bapak). Now it's time for prayer, do you (bapak) want to take a break or continue?

Penyidik A : Ok jadi atas kesepakatan bapak kita lanjutkan pemeriksaan bapak sebagai tersangka saat ini ya? Ya? Jangan nanti sampai nanti ada komplain pak.

Investigator A : Ok, so with your (bapak) agreement, we will continue your (bapak) investigation as a suspect, right? Yes? Do not complain, sir (pak).

Pak Asep : [Aman.]

Mr. Asep : [Done.]

Penyidik A : Huh. (.) Apakah selama: saudara berumah tangga dengan Novi, Ibu Novi (.) saudara memperlakukan Ibu Novi sebagaimana mestinya sebagai seorang istri? Jelaskan

Investigator A : Huh. (.) Is it that as long as: you (saudara) are married to Novi, Ibu Novi (.) do you (saudara) treat Ms. Novi properly as a wife? Explain.

Another type of nomination observed in Excerpt #5 is the utilization of the person reference "saudara," which metaphorically translates to "brother/sister." Based on the information obtained from interviews, it has been determined that the individual in question was born in the year 1988. Consequently, it may be inferred that the individual would be 34 years of age in the year 2022. The age

of the investigator remains undisclosed. Nevertheless, the investigators once again exhibit a lack of clarity in selecting the appropriate word designation. The term "saudara" is commonly employed by individuals of similar age or by elders when addressing someone younger. According to Muniroh (2019), "saudara" is used to refer to individuals perceived to have minimal or nonexistent social connections, including foreigners or those with whom one has only distant social ties.

Excerpt #6

Penyidik A : Gitu ya? Tadi bapak sampaikan yang menjadi korban dalam kekerasan rumah tangga adalah ibu novi, (.) kapan dimana peristiwa tersebut saudara lakukan? Dimana tuh pak?

Investigator A : Is that so? Earlier, you (bapak) said that the victim of domestic violence was Ibu Novi, (.) When did you (saudara) do this incident? Where are you sir?

Excerpt #6 illustrates a growing confusion and inconsistency in the use of person reference by investigators. In a single extended speech, the investigator transitions from "Bapak" to "saudara" and then to "Pak." The recurring use of "saudara" throughout the interview suggests a possible assumption by the investigators regarding the suspect's age, perceiving them as younger.

As van Leeuwen (2008) noted, mentioning a person's name can convey consideration and humanization. Referring to the suspect as "Pak Asep" not only adheres to norms of politeness but also humanizes the individual. However, Investigator A consistently maintains a distance from the suspect throughout the conversation.

While terms like "Bapak" or "Pak" carry formal nuance and fulfill norms of politeness, the absence of the suspect's name suggests a distant social relationship between Investigator A and the suspect. Furthermore, mentioning the suspect's full name without preceding it with "Bapak" or "Pak" is considered impolite in Indonesian culture, typically reserved for older individuals addressing younger ones.

The use of "saudara" to refer to the suspect carries nuanced connotations. Muniroh (2019) suggests that using "saudara" is inappropriate and impolite, creating emotional and physical distance. Addressing a witness as "saudara" may indicate the investigator perceives them as unfamiliar (Flannery, 2013). Despite its classification as impolite, using "saudara" may imply a bias towards labeling the suspect as guilty rather than engaging in a respectful interview process. Such bias may hinder the acquisition of comprehensive information.

Investigator B

The analysis of the simulated interviews between Investigator B and the suspect reveals a distinct approach introduced by Investigator B,

characterized by the incorporation of direct citations from individuals falling into the formal category. Investigator B begins the interview process by utilizing a formal salutation, specifically addressing the subject as "bapak" (Mr./Sir), as evidenced in Excerpt #7.

Excerpt #7

Penyidik B : ok Baik bapak assalamualaikum warohmatullohi wabarokatuh, terimakasih bapak sudah memenuhi panggilan bapak ya pak asep bapak, bapak uhhh saya boleh pinjem ktp nya sebentar ya mau ambil identitasnya bapak ya (0.16) Pak asep, pak asep siapa nama lengkapnya bapak?

Investigator B : ok, sir, assalamualaikum warohmatullohi wabarokatuh, thank you, sir, for answering your call, sir, asep, sir, sir, uhhh, can I borrow your ID card for a moment, will you take your identity, sir? (0.16) Pak asep, sir, what is your full name, sir?

Police Investigator B demonstrated a similar pattern to Police Investigator A, as evidenced in Excerpt #7. Investigator B transitioned the person reference used to address the suspect from a semi-formal greeting, "Bapak (Mr)," to a less formal one, "Pak Asep." This indicates a possible confusion on Investigator B's part regarding the appropriate person reference to use for the suspect. The confusion is highlighted in the statement "... terima kasih bapak sudah memenuhi panggilan bapak ya pak asep bapak ..." (Thank you, sir, for answering the call, Mr. Asep sir...). Although incorporating greeting words accompanied by names such as "Pak Asep" can enhance the politeness and humaneness of the interview process, the police investigator inadvertently created a sense of distance between themselves and the suspect.

Excerpt #8

Pak Asep : Asep Supriatna.

Pak Asep : Asep Supriatna.

Penyidik B : Asep Supriatna, (0.8) usia berapa tahun pak? Investigator B : Asep Supriatna, (0.8) how old are you sir?

Excerpt #8 reveals that Investigator B also employs a person reference strategy by mentioning the full name of the suspect. Similar to the approach taken by Investigators A and B, the repetition of the suspect's name has become a common practice in investigative interviews conducted by police investigators. However, from the perspective of politeness norms, mentioning a person's full name without accompanying it with a greeting word can be deemed disrespectful. Such actions may contribute to discomfort experienced by the suspect during the investigative interview process.

Excerpt #9

Penyidik B : Sudah baca, saya kira sudah paham apa maksud dimintai keterangan saat ini, bapak ya?

.hhh Saya cuman meminta bapak memberikan keterangan yang benar, pak ya sebenar-benarnya yang terjadi yang bapak alami yang bapa rasakan yang bapa lakukan terhadap uh pelapor ibu novi, bener pak ya? Uhhh Sebelumnya bapak disini dimintai keterangan::sehat jasmani rohani?

Investigator B : Have been read, I think you understand what it means to be questioned at this time, sir? .hhh I just ask you to give the correct information, sir, really what happened to you, what you feel is what you did to the reporter, Mrs. Novi, is that right, sir? Uhhh Previously, you were asked for information here:: physically and mentally healthy?

In Excerpt #9, the presence of consistent person references is more apparent in the investigative interviews conducted by Investigator B. Unlike Investigator A, who utilized five distinct categories of person references, Investigator B consistently employed the honorifics "Bapak (Mr)" or "Pak (Sir)" when referring to the suspect throughout the entirety of the interview procedure.

According to Aziz (2000), kinship phrases in the Indonesian language, such as "Bapak/Ibu" which translate to 'Sir/Madam', are commonly associated with expressions of reverence or politeness. This option may be considered appropriate in cases where the investigator lacks knowledge of the interviewee's identity. However, it is important to note that the use of kinship phrases like "Bapak/Ibu" to address individuals might enhance the amicability of the interaction when accompanied by the individual's name being referenced.

Given that the identities of the suspect are already known to the two investigators, the utilization of the personal reference "Pak Asep" during the initial encounter between the investigators and the suspect serves as supporting evidence. There exists a disparity in the manner in which Investigator A and Investigator B express distance. While Investigator A opts to employ the term "Saudara" as a metaphorical reference to a sibling in order to establish social distance, Investigator B selects the terms "Bapak" or "Pak" as a means of address, which translate to "Mr." or "Sir" respectively.

Excerpt #10

Penyidik B : Hmm berapa kali di pukul?

Investigator B : Hmm, how many times have you hit?

Pak Asep : satu kali bu.

Pak Asep : one time ma'am.

Penyidik B : Dimana?

Investigator B : Where?

Pak Asep : di pipi kiri.

Pak Asep : on the left cheek.

Penyidik B : Di pipi kiri? Itu pake ..?

Investigator B : On the left cheek? By..?

Pak Asep : tangan.

Pak Asep : hand.

Penyidik B : Tangan kosong atau alat?

Investigator B : Empty hands or using tools?
Pak Asep : Tangan kosong bu.
Pak Asep : Empty hands ma'am.
Penyidik B : Tangan kanan tangan kiri?
Investigator B : Right hand left hand?
Pak Asep : Kanan bu.
Pak Asep : Right ma'am.
Penyidik B : Dikepal dibuka?
Investigator B : closed opened?
Pak Asep : Dibuka.
Pak Asep : Opened.

In a particular instance, Investigator B posed numerous inquiries to the suspect without making any explicit allusions to individuals. Although this instance is not directly related to the use of person references, as shown in Excerpt #10, it demonstrates Investigator B's role as an interrogator positioning the suspect as the perpetrator of the crime. Despite continuing to use the person reference "Bapak (Mr.)" in this data, the absence of a friendly demeanor in Investigator B's brief questioning suggests a tendency to label the suspect as guilty in this case.

This observation aligns with evidence presented by Muniroh (2019) indicating that Indonesian police institutions often err in the provision of justice due to poor interview processes. If such an interview process occurred outside of a role-play scenario, there is a possibility that the findings from Amnesty International (2009) may have manifested. Amnesty International (2009) reports that criminal suspects can be subjected to excessive use of power, torture, and other forms of ill-treatment, while victims or witnesses may face intimidation and harassment during arrest or interrogation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study aimed to analyze the utilization of person references and their impact on the dynamics of interviews between investigators and suspects. Investigator A employed five distinct person references, ranging from informal to formal, while Investigator B used four distinct person references, primarily focusing on formal and least formal tones. Despite variations, both investigators maintained social distance from the suspect, with Investigator A creating a more hostile environment.

The findings suggest that the status of the suspect as a "suspect" played a role in maintaining social distance. Kinship terms like "Bapak/Ibu" were used by the investigators to establish respect and empathy, although Investigator A's shift to "saudara" increased social distance.

Kinship terms, such as "Bapak/Ibu" in the Indonesian language, are commonly associated with notions of deference, politeness, and various aspects of authority and solidarity (Aziz, 2000; Budiñana, 2003; Djenar et al., 2018; Muniroh, 2019). From

this explanation, it can be inferred that the use of honorifics like "bapak" (Mr.) and "pak" (sir) by the investigators aimed to foster a sense of respect and empathy during the interviews. However, the level of social distance increased when Investigator A shifted from using "Bapak (Mr)" to "saudara (metaphorical brother/sister)". These findings suggest the potential development of a reference selection strategy emphasizing respect in investigative interviews. Implementation of such an approach could enhance the interview experience, not only in Indonesia but also globally. Creating a comfortable and respectful atmosphere is expected to facilitate the acquisition of comprehensive information in legal contexts. Future research could involve a comparative analysis of simulated and authentic interview procedures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers extend their gratitude to Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia and the West Java Regional Police for their collaboration and support in facilitating this research. Financial assistance for this study was provided by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia (KemdikbudristekRI), Balai Pembiayaan Pendidikan Tinggi (BPPT), Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP), Pusat Layanan Pembiayaan Pendidikan (Puslapdik), and Beasiswa Pendidikan Indonesia (BPI). Their contributions were invaluable to the successful completion of this project.

REFERENCES

- Amnesty International. (2009). *Indonesia: Unfinished business: Police accountability in Indonesia*. Amnesty.
<http://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/ASA21/013/2009/en/>
- Aziz, E. A. (2000). *Refusing in Indonesian: Strategies and politeness implications*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Monash University, Melbourne.
- Aziz, E. A. (2003a). Indonesian English: What's det tuh? *TEFLIN Journal*, 16(1), 140–148.
<http://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v14i1/140-148>
- Budiñana, Y. E. (2003). Klasifikasi dan deskripsi 'you' dalam bahasa Indonesia kaitannya dengan dimensi 'Tu-Vous' [Classification and description of 'you' in the Indonesian language in relation to the 'Tu-Vous' dimension]. *Paper presented at the KIPBIPA IV Jakarta*.
- Chaemsaitong, K. (2019). Person reference, identity, and linguistic violence in capital trials. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 142, 90–104.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.01.010>

- Clarke, C., & Milne, R. (2001). *A national evaluation of the PEACE investigative interviewing course*. Home Office.
- Coesemans, R., & De Cock, B. (2017). Self-reference by politicians on Twitter: Strategies to adapt to 140 characters. *Journal of Pragmatics, 116*, 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.12.005>
- de Hoop, H., & Tarenskeen, S. (2015). It's all about you in Dutch. *Journal of Pragmatics, 88*, 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.07.001>
- Djenar, D., Howard, M., & Ewing, M. (2018). *Style and intersubjectivity in youth interaction*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Enfield, N. J. (2007). Meanings of the unmarked: How “default” person reference does more than just refer. In N. J. Enfield & T. Stivers (Eds.), *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives* (pp. 97–120). Cambridge University Press.
- Ewing, M. C. (2014). Motivations for first- and second-person subject expression and ellipsis in Javanese conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 63*, 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.09.023>
- Ewing, M. C. (2015). Localizing person reference among Indonesian youth. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*. https://www.tilburguniversity.edu/sites/default/files/download/TPCS_143-Ewing_2.pdf
- Ewing, M., & Djenar, D. N. (2019). Address, reference and sequentiality in Indonesian conversation. In P. Bouissac (Ed.), *The social dynamics of pronominal systems: A comparative approach* (pp. 253–288). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Flannery, G. (2013). *The new ‘you’: A diachronic survey of self-reference and addressee reference terms in the mainstream print media of New Order Indonesia* [Doctoral dissertation]. Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Griffiths, A., & Rachlew, A. (2018). From interrogation to investigative interviewing: The application of psychology. In A. Griffiths & R. Milne (Eds.), *The psychology of criminal investigation: From theory to practice* (pp. 154–178). Routledge.
- Hart, C. (2011). Legitimizing assertions and the logico-rhetorical module: Evidence and epistemic vigilance in media discourse on immigration. *Discourse Studies, 13*(6), 751–769.
- Helincks, K. (2015). Negotiation of terms of address in a Chilean television talk show. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, 92*(7), 731–752. <https://doi.org/10.3828/bhs.2015.44>
- Heydon, G. (2007a). ‘Do you agree that she would have been frightened?’ An investigation of discursive practices in police-suspect interviews. *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law, 10*(1), 160–163.
- Heydon, G. (2007b). The importance of being (in)formal: Discourse strategies in police interviews with children. In K. Kredens, S. Goz´dz´-Roszkowski & B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (Eds.), *Language and the law: International outlooks* (pp. 279–303). Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Manns, H. J. (2017). *Stance, style and identity in Java*. [Doctoral dissertation]. Monash University, Melbourne.
- Masduki, M. (2017). The translation of Madurese cultural expressions into English. *Bahasa dan Seni: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Pengajarannya, 44*(2), 162-174. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um015v44i22016p162>
- Mavunga, G., Mutambwa, J., & Kutsaru, N. (2014). ‘Iwe’ or ‘imi’? An analysis of terms of address used by police officers at Mbare Police Station. *Language Matters, 45*(1), 148-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2013.872694>
- Meissner, C., Oleszkiewicz, S., Surmon-Böhr, F., & Alison, L. (2017). Developing an evidence-based perspective on interrogation: A review of the U.S. government’s high-value detainee interrogation group research program. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 23*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000136>
- Muniroh, R. D. D. (2019). *“It’s better to see a tiger than a police officer” : Adapting the cognitive interviewing technique to the Indonesian policing context* [Doctoral dissertation]. RMIT University. <https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/view/rmit:162708>
- Muniroh, R. D. D., & Aziz, E. A. (2016). The contemporary practices of Indonesian police interviewing of witnesses. In D. Walsh, G. E. Oxburgh, A. D. Redlich, & T. Myklebust (Eds.), *International developments and practices in investigative interviewing and interrogation volume 1: Victims and witnesses* (pp. 7–18). Routledge.
- 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*(2), 312-324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-021-09474-7>
- Ostermann, A. C. (2003). Localizing power and solidarity: Pronoun alternation at an all-female police station and a feminist crisis intervention center in Brazil. *Language in Society, 32*(3), 351–381. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404503323036>
- Rendle-Short, J. (2010). ‘Mate’ as a term of address in ordinary interaction. *42*, 1201–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.013>

- Rendle-Short, J. (2007). "Catherine, you're wasting your time": Address terms within the Australian political interview. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(9), 1503–1525.
- Rosulek, L. F. (2008). Manipulative silence and social representation in the closing arguments of a child sexual abuse case. *Text & Talk*, 28(4), 529-550.
- Rosulek, L. F. (2015). *Dueling discourses: The construction of reality in closing arguments*. Oxford University Press.
- Sari, A. N., & Zamzani, Z. (2020). An analysis of translation strategies of honorific term in the film "The Boss Baby." *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 5(2), 355.
- Schollum, M. (2005). *Investigative interviewing: The literature*. Office of the Commissioner of Police.
<http://www.police.govt.nz/resources/2005/investigative-interviewing/>
- Shepherd, E., & Griffiths, A. (2013). *Investigative interviewing: The conversation management approach* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Sneddon, J. N., Adelaar, K. A., Djenar, D. N., & Ewing, M. C. (2012). *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge.
- Taguchi, N. (2013). Refusals in L2 English: Proficiency effects on appropriateness and fluency. In O. Marti-Arnandiz & P. Salazar-Campillo (Eds.), *Refusals in instructional contexts and beyond* (pp. 101–120). Rodopi.
- Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An introduction to language and society*. Penguin.
- Utsumi, A. (2020). Address terms in the Malay World. *NUSA*, 68, 23–50.
<https://doi.org/10.15026/94899>
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice: New tools for critical discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.