CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Background of the Study

If Indonesia meets its deadline, we should be living in an ‘Indonesia drug free’ by 2015. Within Indonesia there is a large bureaucracy that monitors trends in the production and consumption of drugs such as cocaine, cannabis and heroin. The reports produced by these bodies show the 2015 target to be hopelessly unrealistic. A cursory reading of the drug-related documentation produced by BNN leads to the conclusion that an ‘Indonesia drug-free’ is itself an unachievable and utopian objective.

In fact, Indonesia has faced the narcotic emergency condition. Even, it has been in emergency one. Many individuals operate such as producers, distributors, buyers, and consumers. There is considerable social interest in drugs activity, demonstrated by widespread media coverage of drugs abuse: productivity and health, addiction, family disintegration, loss of employment, failure in school, domestic violence, child abuse, and doing crimes.

To represent a public issue, a drug crime creates difficulties for the police investigation. Evidence in drug crime cases is limited. Once a suspect was caught, he would try to deny other’s involvement. He works through network. There are also difficulties involved in extracting comprehensive statements from the suspect. Therefore, drug crime investigations frequently rely on establishing the reliability of suspect testimony through the effective implementation of the police interrogation.
The aims of this research are to examine how police officers talk to suspected drug criminals. Talking is a central activity in social life. Much of our daily lives is spent talking to one another, in both ordinary conversation and more specialized settings such as meetings, interviews, classrooms, and courtrooms. It is largely through conversation that the major institutions of our society – economy, religion, politics, family, and law – are implemented. When we engage in various kinds of activities: we ask and answer questions, agree and disagree with each other, and tell stories and provide feedback when listening to stories, for example. Shortly, it can be said that we talk to one another to negotiate meaning in that way we are able to communicate our purpose in different settings.

Consider the following conversation. Norman Fairclough in Woods (2006) presents the following data taken from an interview between a police officer (P) and a witness (W).

(1)  P: Did you get a look at the one in the car?
(2)  W: I saw his face, yeah.
(3)  P: What sort of age was he?
(4)  W: About 45. He was wearing a…
(5)  P: And how tall?
(6)  W: Six foot one.
(7)  P: Six foot one. Hair?
(8)  W: Dark and curly, Is this going to take long? I’ve got to collect the kids from school.
(9)  P: Not much longer, no. What about his clothes?
(10) W: He was a bit scruffy-looking, blue trousers, black…
(11) P: Jeans?
(12) W: Yeah.

(Fairclough 2001: 15)

Much can be learned about the nature of spoken legal interrogations from this short extract. Examine, for example, how the police officer uses multiple questions to exert control over the interview. Question-answer structures are an example of adjacency pairs, a concept that has been particularly productive in the conversation analysis approach towards explaining the sequencing of discourse.
Adjacency pairs are probably best understood by an example. When someone gives a compliment, for instance, he typically expects a reply, and, if he does not receive one, he may feel that the compliment has been ‘wasted’. Similarly, when one greets a friend or acquaintance, he expects a greeting in return. He considers himself badly or rudely treated if his compliments or greetings (first pair parts of adjacency pairs) are not ‘balanced’ with appropriate expressions of thanks or returned greetings (second pair parts). Questions typically function as the first pair parts of adjacency pairs, and they demand responses (second pair parts) that are relevant to the questions asked.

Beyond the sequential pairing, questions may also secure the return of the third turn to the questioner. By presenting the witness with a checklist of questions, the police officer therefore exerts considerable control over what follows: control not only of the organization and the ordering of speaking turns in the interview, but also of the topic to be spoken about in each turn.

The power and authority of the police officer is also revealed in the use of interruptions: at lines 5 and 11 the officer interrupts the witness’s account of what the suspect was wearing. Furthermore, a little later in the interview, note how the police officer leads the witness into a certain response regarding the suspect’s clothes: at line 11, the officer prompts ‘jeans’ in response to the reference to ‘blue trousers’, and the witness agrees.

This research is going to study conversation in police institution. One aspect of language and social contexts is to do with how the rules of our society (some written, many not) and its rituals and customs affect the way we use language in both spoken and written (Coultas, 2003:4). One of the most obvious
rules is around what we should not say in certain situations; for example, it would not be considered legal to accuse a suspect of a crime without being proved and confessed guilty by law enforcement officials.

Crime is an enduring social problem. As a result, we rely on law enforcement officials to temper crime and to protect and serve the citizens of our communities. A major factor in the reduction of crime and determining guilt is suspect interrogation. Police talk is key to the art of interrogation. Interrogations are conducted by police in an effort to seek confessions and develop details about crime (Heuback, 2009:1).

Gibbons (2004) describes the importance of studies of language and the law generally, and police interviews in particular for applied linguistics, because the law is such an important and influential institution, and because it is packed with language problems. Most of our common everyday activities are carried out within a legal frame.

Moreover, Momeni (2011) clarifies legal language is a widespread issue in forensic area, which covers the language of police, language of lawyers, language of judges and prosecutors, language of witness etc. Cao (2010) says that police interview embedded in police genre is a sub-branch of legal talk. As we see there are some linguistic features in legal talk, it is also expected to see some linguistic features in police interview.

The purpose of the speakers is to make the suspects in criminal cases to have said or agreed to something that they have not (Shuy, 2005). Shuy’s studies examine how unfair conversational strategies can be used in criminal strategies. The suspect is made have agreed to or participated in the past illegal activities.
During the police interrogation, some suspects may eventually break down and admit to crimes that they never actually committed. This is generally referred to as the false confession (Leo and Ofshe, 1997).

There are some cases, for instance, when the police put the suspects into prison due to their lack of knowledge of purposed questions (Walsh, 2010). Ket San, a citizen of Sambas in West Kalimantan, was forced to sign the confession of being guilty to keep two pills of ecstasy with him when he was caught by the police on the way home in 2009 (Detiknews, 2014). He tried to convince the police that the pills did not belong to him, yet the police insisted on his keeping the pills. The latest example is a sixty three-year-old woman, Asyani, was sent to prison as the suspect of stealing two pieces of teak wood trunk of PT Perhutani (Kompas, 2015). However, there were some successfully cases done by police such as investigating the death of an eight year old girl called Angeline, and Namaona Denis (Malawi), Marcho Archer Cardoso Moreira (Brazil), Daniel Enemuo (Nigeria), Ang Kiem Soei (Belanda), Tran Thi Bich Hanh (Vietnam), dan Rani Andriani (WNI). Dan juga tahap II (28/4), yaitu: Myuran Sukumaran (Australia), Andrew Chan (Australia), Martin Anderson (Ghana), Raheem Agbaje (Nigeria), Sylvester Obiekwe Nwolise (Nigeria), Okwudili Oyatanze (Nigeria), Rodrigo Gularte (Brazil), and Zainal Abidin (WNI) of drug crimes. All of the drug criminals mentioned above were sentenced to put to death.

There are several conversational strategies can be used in criminal strategies. They are ambiguity, blocking the target’s words, hit and run, ignoring the target when he says no, and scripting strategies (Shuy: 2005). This study will seek to answer which strategies are used in certain situations. Cognitive
complexity and verbal aggressiveness will also be looked at to determine whether
the two have a relationship to successful interrogations. Since there is a direct
relationship between cognitive complexity and communication effectiveness
(Delia), it can be expected that officers with a high level of cognitive complexity
are successful at interrogating. However, many people assume that officers that
interrogate are verbally aggressive, yet people who are especially aggressive have
lower communication skills (Infante, Trebing, Shepherd & Seeds, 1984).

Based on the above phenomena, it can be concluded that there are
problems in police interrogation, namely: how the conversation is managed, what
conversational strategies are used by the police, and if cognitive complexity and
verbal aggressiveness impact the interrogation.

To expound the above idea, the researcher decided to focus on analyzing
interrogations between police officers and persons suspected of having committed
crimes in the basis of conversational strategies and cognitive complexity. The
researcher uses Roger W. Shuy for her main theoretical framework and some
more from others such as Jessie Delia for cognitive complexity. Besides, our
knowledge about police interrogation in Indonesia is currently very limited. This
lack of knowledge makes the study of police interrogation an important and
worthwhile endeavor. The setting was focused on the analysis of spoken language
between police officers and persons suspected of having committed crime in
Indonesia police institution, specifically in Medan.
1.2 The Problems of the Study

The problems of the study are formulated as the following:

1. What types of conversational strategies are used in police interrogation?
2. How are the conversational strategies used by the police?
3. Why are the conversational strategies used by the police the way they are?

1.3 The Objectives of the Study

In line with the problems of the study, the objectives of the study are

1. To identify types of conversational strategies in the police interrogation.
2. To describe how the conversational strategies used by the police.
3. To elaborate the reasons why the conversational strategies are used by the police the way they are.

1.4 The Scope of the Study

This study applies the Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson’s Conversation Analysis, Shuy’s conversational strategies, and some more from others such as Jessie Delia for cognitive complexity. The analysis is aimed at investigating the conversational strategies such as ambiguity, blocking the target’s words, hit and run, ignoring the target when he says no, and scripting strategies in the police interrogation in POLRESTA MEDAN Sumatera Utara.
1.5 The Significance of the Study

The findings will be expected to be worthwhile theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the findings will broaden the horizons to the application of Conversational Strategies and Conversation Analysis (CA) with reference to spoken form. Practically, the findings can be utilized for the literature to conduct further research in more various contexts. They are as follows:

1. The junior students of LTBI get the benefit of studying of conversational strategies in legal language. The legal language is presented in a framework of the analysis of police interrogation. The application of analytical tools to the data consists of police–suspect interactions and is combined to reveal assumptions to underlying the police approach. The analytical tools are drawn from conversational strategies and conversation analysis. It is hoped that the application of these analytical tools is powerful in the study of conversation.

2. Teachers at school are very close to society to transfer knowledge. By knowing legal language, they can teach students the norms of righteousness and the consequences of disobeying. They can apply question-answer strategy. They teach the students to listen and think questions critically before answering. Since the language of law is not the mother tongue in Indonesia, lecturers and curriculum designers are responsible for teaching English to law students. They themselves may have trouble in understanding the cognitive complexity of legal documents, and the linguistic realization of that complexity. Once understood, training students to master it is a pedagogical challenge. Teachers may also need to train law students in oral interactive techniques to master the power laden language of the court. There are also ethical issues involved in both the
promulgation of this register that excludes so many ordinary people, particularly second language speakers, and in training people to use language to manipulate and distort the testimony of others. Lawyers, law students, legislative translators and legal interpreters are all users of English for Legal Purposes (ELP) but their language learning needs will differ depending upon their communicative purposes and learning contexts. Moreover, these factors influence decisions about the professional background and knowledge base required by language educators in this field. ELP is part of the English for Specific Purposes branch of Applied Linguistics.

3. Police realize the first information gathering stage from a suspect is interrogation. The aim of interrogation is to get successful fulfillment of institutional requirement in which they will have the confession sign of being guilty from suspects. It is crucial to the successful prosecution of a defendant that the confession is voluntary and not a product of threats or physical violence and that any written confession is a true and accurate record of the suspect’s words during the interrogation.

4. Meanwhile, the society, as citizens, get aware of the kind of linguistic unfairness that can land people in prison or turn into a very serious matter—the loss of one’s freedom—or even worse. Citizens are hoped to be independent, and critical towards the information they obtain and share.