

## PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

### THE ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS AND COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN POLICE INTERVIEW

*Maya Lisa Aryanti*

University of Widyatama, Indonesia

E-mail: [maya.lisa@widyatama.ac.id](mailto:maya.lisa@widyatama.ac.id)

**Maya Lisa Aryanti. The Analysis Of Questions And Answers And Cooperative Principle In Police Interview-- Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(10), 3318-3333. ISSN 1567-214x**

**Keywords: Question Types, Answer Types, Cooperative Principles.**

#### **ABSTRACT**

Interviewing is one of police officer procedures to dig information from suspect. The case in which interview in police context is conducted are different. Therefore, in this paper, the case is limited. The case taken for the data in this paper is a drug case. In the process of interviewing drug cases, the police will use certain types of questions to obtain information related to the drug case (for example: the origin of the drugs, how drugs were obtained, where to get them and so on). This research is conducted to describe question types used by the police in investigative interview process of drug cases, to find out what type of answer was expressed by the perpetrator in the interview process, to find out the relationship between preference format and the answer given by suspects, and to find out how the principle of cooperation was applied in the interview process in drug cases. Precisely, the writer is interested to know how question and answer can be formatted in linguistic viewpoint, how preference format works and how they are related to cooperation principle. The theories of Pragmatics will be used to describe speech exchange and cooperative principles. The linguistic method used in this paper is qualitative method where category relation is underlined. The results of this research concern to what kind of questions used by police to retrieve information from the suspect, how the suspects answer the questions of the police, how preference format can be related to the answer given by suspects, and how the cooperative principles work in the interview.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In carrying out their duties as law enforcers, police officers carry out a series of procedures including conducting interviews with witnesses where the results of the interviews will determine the status of the witnesses and obtain information related to the suspect. Studying the interview strategy applied by

the police is interesting because by studying the question structure in the interview process that is included into general information seeking and investigative one can be identified.

In the process of interviewing drug cases, the police will use certain types of questions to obtain information related to the drug case (for example: the origin of the drugs, how drugs were obtained, where to get them and so on). This research is conducted to describe question types used by the police in investigative interview process of drug cases, to find out what type of answer was expressed by the perpetrator in the interview process and to find out how the principle of cooperation was applied in the interview process in drug cases. Precisely, the writer is interested to know how question and answer can be formatted in linguistic viewpoint, how preference format works and how they are related to cooperation principle. The linguistic method used in this paper is qualitative method where category relation is underlined.

The data source that will be used in the research is the BAP. The Criminal Procedure Report (BAP) of the suspect can be used as a valid source of data because the suspect's investigation report has a strong legal basis. This is in accordance with the contents of KUHAP CHAPTER VIII concerning Minutes of Article 75 paragraph (1) letter (a) concerning an official report made for each action concerning the examination of a suspect (KUHAP: 666). The contents of the BAP of the suspect can be accounted for in accordance with Article 117 paragraph (2) which states that in the event that the suspect provides information about what he has actually done in connection with the criminal act he is suspected of, the investigator shall record it in the minutes as carefully as possible in accordance with the words used by the suspect himself (KUHAP: 680) and in accordance with the contents of Article 118 paragraph (1) which states that the suspect's and / or witness's testimony is recorded in an official report signed by the investigator and by the person giving the information after they have approved the contents (KUHAP: 680). Furthermore, Article 121 (KUHAP: 681) states that the investigator, in the power of his official oath, shall immediately make an official report dated and containing the criminal act suspected, stating the time, place and condition at the time the crime was committed, the name and place of residence of the suspect and or witnesses, their statements, notes regarding deeds and / or objects as well as anything deemed necessary for the purpose of solving a case.

From linguistic point of view, the opinion of Streeck and Kallmeyer (2001) and Heydon (2019) can be used as a basis to make the Criminal Report of the Suspect as a data source. Streeck and Kallmeyer (2001) state that among activities guided by rules that are often carried out along with social interactions are activities that involve writing inscriptions, making diagrams, calculating, and others. Recently inscription has received a great deal of attention, especially among ethnographers engaged in applied science.

Each constructed system of inscription - for example, alphabetical writing, arithmetic, technical drawings have its own constitutive and regulative rules (D 'Andrade (1984) in Streeck (2001)) which allow and describe understandable expressions that can be formed from the components of the system. However, when these rule systems are used in social interaction, they often give way to local considerations and a symbolization of needs, available expressions given local interpretations, instead of 'conclusive' interpretations' of independent rules of the 'system' context.

Heydon (2019) states that it is possible to use police interview transcriptions that appear in court trial recordings or police interview records that are in the public domain (these police interview notes are published in the media from time to time). She also stated that by using scripts for both the interviewer and the interviewee, many variables that might normally produce confusing results, for example different lengths of turns, could be controlled through the number of experiments that were running (Heydon, 2019). The opinions of Streeck and Kallmeyer (2001) and Heydon (2019) above were used because the suspect's Criminal Report was formed due to oral-written-oral interactions. The theories that will be used to study the methods and techniques for presenting the results of data analysis are the theories developed by Sugiyono (2009) and Conrad et al. (2020).

Sugiyono (2009) states that in qualitative research, data display can be done in the form of a brief description (narrative text), graphs, matrices, charts, relationships among categories, networks, charts, flowcharts et cetera.

In term of conversational analysis, Conrad et al. (2020) describe the procedures for display data for research related to conversation analysis. Conrad et al. (2020) state that conversation analysis uses a detailed set of conventions to transcribe features of spoken language, including the characteristics of pauses and intonation to whisper and even clear sound and it can be recognized by the voice of a person when he is smiling. The finished transcription provides enough detail that the reader can almost hear the sound of the original conversation much like a musician reading a sheet music page. Since transcribing formal speech in this way must be conducted intensively and long-term and requires special training, it is difficult to use large data sets. However, more importantly, conversation analysts are interested in the way spoken language is organized and how speakers build an interaction together. This means that conversation analysts are less likely to be interested in studying the measurement of statistical relationships among variables and much more interested in understanding and interpreting how specific types of interactions are expressed.

Based on the two theories above, it can be concluded that the results of data analysis for conversation analysis studies can be used by relying on brief descriptions and relationship among categories. Characteristics of spoken language and conventions can be presented by making a narration. To find

new findings, the relationship among the studied variables can be done by pointing out relationship among categories.

Heydon (2019) describes data analysis methods based on interviews. Heydon offers two ways, namely simultaneous and inductive. Simultaneous data analysis is carried out when the data is collected; the researcher simultaneously captures what is being discussed (general statements from participants) into their notes. Inductive data analysis is obtained by transcribing data from the interview, broken down into units that can be arranged and codified based on common themes or propositions (Minichiello et al., 2008 in Heydon, 2019).

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The used theory is related to the pattern of the set of questions and answers which is basically closely related to adjacency pairs. The theory regarding the type of question is taken from the second article written by Lindawati (2016) and was entitled Indonesian Interrogative Sentences: A Study of Forms and Functions. The data taken in this article are interrogative sentences obtained from other people's theses. Oxburgh et al. (2010) compile theories about the types of questions. The data also comes from academic articles compiled by other people and makes taxonomy of questions based on these literature studies.

In police interviews, there are various types of questions used by the police. In general, in interrogation, there are three types of questioning methods used to interview witnesses. The first type is information seeking questions. The second type is accusing questions and the third type is neutral questions.

According to Maley and Fahey in Berk-Seligson (2009), question is divided into two. They are information seeking questions and confirmation seeking questions.

### ***Information seeking questions***

In a courtroom context, these questions predominate in direct examination and are rarely used in cross-examination where control over the witnesses being examined is important for examining attorneys.

### ***Confirmation seeking questions***

These questions allow lawyers to act as story-tellers in the judicial process. This type of question includes questions that are declarative sentence type with or without question tags and polar interrogatives (e.g: 'yes/no questions', e.g: 'Did you see her body?', 'Were you inside the car at the time?' or 'Are you afraid of him?')

The forms of question types above are elaborated more clearly through theory quotation quoted and explained by Oxburgh (2010) as stated below:

Newbury and Johnson (2006) develop taxonomy of information seeking questions and confirmation seeking questions by using the finding result of Gibbons (2003) as the basis. Newbury and Johnson (2006) also show the difference of question forms and sentence construction in two categories above can be more limited if the questions are included into information seeking one or use force or threat if the questions are included into seeking confirmation question. In their analysis, questions that are included into wh-questions tend to be viewed as types of information seeking questions yet with part of the question function may limit question topic.

For example, the question 'When were you there?' is a question that has a very limited scope in terms of seeking information. In another alternative example, a bare declarative form such as: "You were there," would fall into the category of forcing or pressing confirmation-seeking questions. However, if the declarative sentence is used along with a request for agreement such as: "You were there, would you accept that?" the sentence falls into the category of seeking confirmation but the question is not too compelling or stressful in nature Newbury and Johnson (2006). Under the Newbury and Johnson (2006) categorization scheme, on the example of confirmation seeking question used above, when the prefix 'Can I put it to you' is added, the pressure level will increase.

Oxburgh (2010) states that during the initial police interview training it is important to train police officers in the formation of specific questions and also to demonstrate typical forms for open functional information seeking question types. In the form of the most direct open seeking information questions, questions like this are most easily formed by prefixing the words TED (Tell, Explain, Describe). Interviewers can be trained to come up with additional strategies to achieve the same functional goals.

Furthermore, Oxburgh (2010: 57) also adds that it is very possible for the interviewer to ask other appropriate questions using the 'Wh-' form (for example 'What did you see?' or by using a facilitator, or perhaps by using echo questions. One example of echo questions taken from a recent UK statement is as follows:

Witness: I went into the house.

Interviewer:....went into the house.

Witness: [long description of what the witness saw and did]

The use of echo or facilitators as open questions is effective in several contexts, such as this one, and can be used as a strategic questioning procedure but in other contexts, echo questions may function more as close questions.

Witness: I went there.

Interviewer: You went there?

Witness: Yes

Hence, the use of echo questions gives more emphasis on reliance of experience and capability of the interviewers. A single consequence of this observation is that there will be a good training policy if TED questions remain in use. It is crucial that the interviewers have confidence and competency in using TED questions and 5WH (who, what, when, where, why and how) questions before they continue using other forms of questions.

Examples of open questions and closed questions are illustrated clearly and understandably by Houtkoop-Steenstra (1997).

### *Examples of open questions*

Do you ever come across things that you would really like to do better, or things that you find difficult?

If so, what are these things? (Probe if necessary):

-e.g. problems with reading (writing, speaking, listening, doing sums): do you find that difficult?

-Standing up for yourself, having the courage to have you say: do you ever find that difficult?

### *Examples of close questions*

- a) Do you ever do this? Or do you ever come across this? (yes/no)
- b) How well do you know this (or: can you do this)? (well/reasonably well/badly)
- c) How important is it for you to learn more about this in a course? (very important/ not that important/not important)

Gordon and Fleisher (2006) states that relevant questions are closed-ended questions and are in direct contact with the problem that is under investigation and must be answered in a direct way, usually in the form of Yes or No. The questions can be used into direct involvement, second or indirect involvement, or knowledge of the tragic events.

Lindawati (2016) classifies Indonesian interrogatives into six points based on what is being stated, what is being requested, and how those questions are formed. The six types of interrogatives are: first, informative questions. For examples: Who is sick? (Siapa yang sakit? or Yang sakit siapa?), what illness do you suffer from? (Anda sakit apa?). Second, polar interrogative. For example: You are sick or not? Are you sick or not? (Anda sakit atau tidak?), 'You get a stomachache or headache? Do you get a stomachache or headache?

(‘Anda sakit perut atau kepala?’), ‘You get a stomache, headache, or something else? Do you get a stomache, headache, or other illness?’ (Anda sakit perut atau kepala, atau yang lain?). Third, yes/no questions. For examples, ‘Sick?’ (Sakit?), ‘You are sick? Are you sick?’ (Anda sakit?), ‘Are you sick?’ (Apa anda sakit? or Apakah anda sakit?), Are you sick? (‘Sakitkah anda?’), ‘Is it you that are sick?’ Is it you who are sick?’ (‘Andakah yang sakit?’). Fourth, tag questions. For examples, ‘You are sick, are you?’ ‘You are sick, aren’t you?’ (‘Anda sakit ya?’), ‘You are sick, right?’ ‘You are sick, aren’t you?’ (‘Anda sakit kan?’), ‘You are sick, aren’t you?’ (‘Anda sakit bukan?’), ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?’ (Anda sakit nggak?’), ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?’ (‘Anda sakit tidak?’), ‘You are sick or not?’ Are you sick or not?’ (‘Anda sakit atau tidak?’), ‘Aren’t you sick?’ (‘Bukankah Anda sakit?’), Aren’t you sick? (‘Bukannya Anda sakit?’), ‘Someone says you are sick? Someone says that you are sick. Are you?’ (‘Katanya Anda sakit?’). Fifth, rhetorical questions. For examples, ‘Who wants to get sick?’ Who wants to be sick?’ (‘Siapa yang mau sakit?’), ‘Who does not want to be healthy?’ (‘Siapa yang tidak mau sehat?’). Sixth, negative interrogative sentences. For examples, ‘Who is not sick?’ (‘Siapa yang tidak sakit?’), ‘Are you not sick?’ (‘Apakah Anda tidak sakit?’), ‘You are not sick, are you?’ (‘Anda tidak sakit kan?’), ‘You are not sick huh?’ or ‘You are not sick, are you?’ (‘Anda tidak sakit ya?’), ‘You are not sick, are you?’ (‘Anda tidak sakit to?’), ‘Aren’t you not sick?’ (‘Bukankah Anda tidak sakit?’), ‘Aren’t you not sick?’ (‘Bukannya Anda tidak sakit?’), ‘Someone says you are not sick? Someone says that you are not sick. Aren’t you?’ (‘Katanya Anda tidak sakit?’)

Theories related to types of answers are taken from theories compiled by Levinson (1983), Mey (2001), Harland and Bull (2016).

Harland and Bull (2016) classify the responses of the suspects into five categories. They are unclear/complex, relevant, no comment, silent and challenging.

Levinson (1983) illustrate the relationship between content and format in adjacency pair through the second part as follows:

The first part of adjacency pairs is request, offer/invite or invitation (Mey 2001), opinion/evaluation, questions and accusation. Meanwhile, second parts have two categories. They are preferred category of response and dispreferred category of response. The preferred category of response encompasses accepting, receiving, agreeing expected answers and rejection. The dispreferred category of response encompasses rejection, disagreement, unexpected answers and admission (or non admission).

Levinson (1983) describes the setting of preferences (preference organization) with regard to adjacency pairs as follows:

The main idea in this case is that not all the potential second parts of the first part of an adjacency pair stand alone: this is because there is a level that applies as an alternative form, such as at least one preferred category of answer in the adjacency pair response) and one dispreferred category of response. The structural content is closely related to the linguistic concept of markedness. In essence, the answer category that accepts second is classified as unmarked - the answer category that accepts second occurs as a simpler turn structure; in contrast, the second category of unacceptable answers are characterized by various types of structural complexity.

Therefore, the second category of unacceptable answers was delivered in the same way: (a) after some significant delay; (b) with multiple displays indicating the status of an unacceptable answer category, often with the particle well; (c) with some computation of reasons why the second category of acceptable answers cannot be carried out. For now, a set of constructive examples will suffice to illustrate the content of the structure:

(24) Wootton, in press

Child: Could you .hh could you put on the light for my .hh room

Father: Yep

(25) 176B

C: Um I wondered if there's any chance of seeing you tomorrow sometime (0.5) morning or before the seminar (1.0)

R: Ah um (.) I doubt it

C: Uhm huh

R: The reason is I'm seeing Elizabeth

In example (24) agreeing a request is done without obvious delay with minimal marking agreement components Yep. In contrast, in example (25), rejecting request to make meeting appointment is done after a one second delay, after advance pause components (ah um, micro-pause (.)), by non-minimal turns (compared I doubt it with No), followed by explanations or reasons because of the occurring difficulties.

In fact, rejection of requests is normally done in a complex way (marked way). Therefore, we can say that giving consent or agreeing falls into the second acceptable (or acceptable for short) category of requests while rejection falls into the second (or unacceptable) category of being unacceptable. The following is a general pattern: in contrast to the direct and simple nature of acceptance, acceptance is delayed and contains additional components of the complex; and second specific types such as request rejection, bid rejection, disapproval after evaluative assessment, etc. are systematically marked as unacceptable categories.

The relevance of the preference setting is that by categorizing the second set as preferred and dispreferred, this arrangement allows the essence of the adjacency pair to continue to represent a fixed set of expectations despite the



existence of many second alternative formations for most types of the first part.

Mey (2001) states that preference is a form of speech that has levels. The level of 'acceptance-rejection' from structurally simpler to structurally more complex implies that one must work harder, using more linguistic sources of 'No' to a request than say 'Yes'.

Markedness is a term that is more suitable to describe a situation where someone needs to have a lot of supporting material or background after saying 'No' to get the impression that someone not only refuses to take the requested action, but 'No' exclusivity exists due to circumstances beyond one's control which must then be explained. This explanation takes time and requires more effort - something that may surface such as signs of hesitation, pauses, false starts, repair and so on.

A marked sequence is structurally richer and more complex than unmarked sequence (often referred to 'default'): this is how we act when there is no other explanation. Marked behaviors such as begin a turn (start a conversation), speak in a very slow rhythm, stop in the midst of utterance, does not continue speaking when the speaker has a chance to speak, etc need to be announced before all of the behaviors above occur. Further, these behaviors are included into dispreferred because those behaviors need efforts at user part which usually cause noticeable difference from preferred or acceptable ones. For the same reason, finally, the dispreferred behaviors often have low level of effectiveness.

Some features mentioned above also appear in other contexts where dispreferred responses appear. The easiest noticeable feature is pauses (self interruption on oneself is very possible to be followed by self-repairs with or without explanation, for example, 'what I really want to say is, er, yes...'), 'false starts' mentioned earlier, repetitions, wordiness, and also prosodic features, for examples: speed of delivery, stress, intonation, irregular breathing both breathe in and breathe out; even probably extralinguistic features such as flushing, trembling and the like. "Repetitive and reliable patterns" from the relationship between two domains: preference and conducted 'action type' is found. Therefore, for example, in offer or invite cases, an acceptance (an action of accepting something) exists in the preferred format while normal refusal is in dispreferred format.

Someone always say that types of opening and certain responses are always and obviously preferred while other types are usually of course more or less dispreferred. Complex responses which contain too much information (such as in request-reject cases), or show suspicious intentions or undesirable one by extending silence or breath heavily which is obvious and will not support gradual establishment of a conversation.

Theories related to cooperative principles are taken from Levinson (1983) who discusses conversational maxims whose theories were compiled by Grice.

Cooperative principles which is also recognized by terminology maxims of conversation in conversation analysis study is one of crucial aspects because if cooperative principles are not established well then the occurring conversation will face many obstacles which may cause the conversation become aimless, dull or even short life.

Levinson (1983) states that Grice identifies four basic maxim guidelines or general principles which are the basic of the effectiveness of cooperative language use simultaneously stating general cooperative principles. These principles are stated below:

### *Cooperative principles*

Make your contribution as it is required, this contribution phase occurs with acceptable intention or the flow of talk exchange in which you are involved.

### *The maxim of quality*

Try to make your contribution true, more specifically, do not say something which you consider wrong and do not say something without strong evidence.

### *The maxim of quantity*

Make your contribution as informative as it is needed for current intention in conversation and do not make your contribution more informative than it is needed.

### *The maxim of relevance*

Make your contribution relevant

### *The maxim of manner*

Your contribution must be understandable and accurate, and most importantly, avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, be brief and orderly.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The data is taken from BAP. The data is divided based on adjacency pairs question-answer format.

### *Data 1 (sequence 1)*

Police: Bagaimana kondisi kesehatan Saudara secara umum: Pendengaran, Penglihatan, Kejiwaan, saat dilakukan pemeriksaan sekarang ini?

Suspect: Saya dalam kondisi sehat, penglihatan normal tidak berkaca mata, pendengaran normal, kejiwaan baik.

### *Analysis*

The type of question used by the police in the interview process in the drug case above is an open question type in the form of informative question sentences that seek information about the suspect's general condition. The above informative question begins with the word "Bagaimana (How)...."

The type of answer expressed by the suspect in the interview process is the type of answer that is expected or accepted because the suspect directly explains his personal condition. The suspects in this sequence answer police questions according to the form of the questions posed, relevant, understandable and concise. Therefore, the suspects did not violate the principle of cooperation in the interview process. In this sequence, the type of police question influences the type of answer the suspect gives. The type of question that is given by the police is an open-ended question that seeks information about his condition while being interviewed, which of course makes the suspect feel free to give clear and non-controversial answers.

The suspect's relevant answer does not violate the principle of cooperation. Thus, in this sequence, the type of question affects the type of answer. Because the type of answer submitted is acceptable, the principle of cooperation is not violated and it can be said that there is an influence between the type of question asked by the police, the answer given by the suspect, and the principle of cooperation on the simultaneous interview process in drug cases. The effect is that the interview process can be continued. This can be seen with the second sequence with a different question formation.

### *Data 2 (sequence 2)*

Police: Saat ini saudara dilakukan pemeriksaan sebagai Tersangka dalam perkara penyalahgunaan Narkotika Gol I jenis bukan tanaman dengan berat melebihi 5 (lima) gram, bersediakah saudara dilakukan pemeriksaan sekarang ini dan memberikan keterangan dengan sebenar-benarnya?

Suspect: Saya bersedia untuk dilakukan pemeriksaan dan bersedia memberikan keterangan dengan sebenar-benarnya.

### *Analysis*

The type of question above belongs to the type of open question that is seeking confirmation. The question above is included in the open type question because in the interrogative sentence there is an interrogative sentence formation that asks for approval which is preceded by a word "Would you please....(Bersediakah.....)"

The type of answer expressed by the suspect in the interview process is the type of answer that is expected or accepted because the suspect directly states his willingness to be examined and provides the best possible information. Thus, in the answers given by the suspicion of the cooperation principle, nothing was violated.

In this sequence, the open question type makes the suspects give an acceptable answer where the answer fulfills the maxims of the principle of cooperation.

### **Data 3 (Sequence 3)**

Police: Terhadap perkara yang dipersangkakan kepada saudara sekarang ini, selama dilakukan pemeriksaan apakah saudara perlu didampingi Advokat / penasehat Hukum, kalau saudara menunjuk Advokat / penasehat hukum, sebutkan nama serta alamat dan dari Biro Hukum mana yang akan mendampingi saudara?

Suspect: ‘Dalam pemeriksaan saya saat sekarang ini saya menggunakan Advokat / Penasehat Hukum, saya menggunakan jasa Haryo Indraqsho, SH.,dkk yang beralamat di Jalan Diponegoro nomor 25 Denpasar, Bali.’

### **Analysis**

The type of question used by the police in the interview process on drug cases is an open question type. There are two types of open questions in this sequence. The first is an informative question form that begins with a word “What (apakah)” which encourages the suspect to provide information regarding his / her need for legal counsel. Second, the form of questions Tell, Explain, Describe. The second question form starts with the word “mention (sebutkan)” which is included into “Tell (Ceritakan)” where the suspect is expected to inform the police about the name and the address of his Legal Bureau.

The type of answer expressed by the suspects is the type of answer that is accepted. Because, the answers given are relevant to the questions asked and the answers are given directly without any obstacles. In this sequence, the principle of cooperation is not violated.

Based on the association analysis of the relationship between the type of question, the type of answer, and the principle of cooperation in the above sequence the type of question influences simultaneously the type of answer and the cooperative principles.

### **Data 4 (sequence 4)**

Police: ‘Selama hidup saudara apakah pernah terlibat dalam perkara pidana, bila pernah jelaskan dalam perkara APA?’

Suspect: ‘Selama hidup saya tidak pernah terlibat tindak pidana.’

### *Analysis*

The type of question used by the police is a closed question type in the form of informative questions (WH Questions) that begins with the word 'what (apakah)' and the type of open question that is included in the TED (Tell, Explain, Describe) question forms starting with 'Explain (Jelaskan).' The type of answer expressed by the suspects is an acceptable type of answer because the structure of the answer is not complicated and includes a form of direct answer. Thus, the principle of cooperation in this sequence is well established. Based on the association analysis of the relationship between the type of question, the type of answer, and the principle of cooperation in the above sequence, the type of question influences simultaneously the type of answer and the principle of cooperation.

### *Data 5 (sequence 5)*

Police: 'Ceritakan secara singkat tentang Riwayat hidup saudara sejak lahir hingga sekarang?'

Suspect: 'Saya lahir di Sidney, 25 Maret 1979 dari Ibu saya bernama RITA YEN dan Bapak bernama MARIO YEN dan saya anak tunggal dan saya sudah memiliki istri yang bernama MICHELLE XIONG.'

### *Analysis*

Open question type which is in a form of TED (Tell, Explain, Describe) questions begins with 'Tell (Ceritakan).'

The type of answer expressed by the suspects in this sequence belongs to the type of answer that is acceptable and relevant. Thus, the maxims contained in the principle of cooperation in this sequence are fulfilled.

Based on the association analysis of the relationship between the type of question, the type of answer, and the principle of cooperation in the above sequence, the type of question influences simultaneously the type of answer and the cooperative principles.

### *Data 6 (sequence 6)*

Police: 'Apa pekerjaan atau profesi saudara?'

Suspect: 'Saya sehari-hari bekerja sebagai pemilik minimarket" MERYES MART" di Melbourne, Australia.'

### *Analysis*

The type of question used is an open question type. The type of answer expressed by the suspects is the type of answer that is acceptable because the

suspects answer the question directly and not in circles. Therefore, the principle of cooperation is not violated.

***Data 7 (sequence 7)***

Police: 'Selain bekerja sebagai pemilik minimarket, apakah saudara mempunyai pekerjaan lain? jelaskan.'

Suspect: 'Tidak ada.'

***Analysis***

Question type used by the police is a close question which is in a form of informative questions (WH-questions) initiated by "What (apakah)" and an open question taking form of TED (Tell, Explain, Describe) question indicated by the word 'Explain (jelaskan).'

The answer type expressed by the suspect is preferred one because the suspect answer the questions directly and briefly. There is no violation in the application of cooperative principles.

***Data 8 (sequence 8)***

Police: 'Mengertikah saudara saat ini dilakukan pemeriksaan oleh penyidik, kalau mengerti dalam perkara apa? jelaskan.'

Suspect: 'Saya mengerti bahwa sekarang sedang dilakukan pemeriksaan oleh penyidik, tetapi saya tidak mengerti dalam perkara apa'

***Analysis***

The first type of question is closed question type because the form of the question used is yes/no questions initiated by "Do you understand that..... (mengertikah)." This type of question is later on followed by two questions: an open question in a form of probing questions "if you understand, in which case? (kalau mengerti dalam perkara apa)" and in a form of TED (Tell, Explain, Describe) question initiated by 'Explain (jelaskan).'

Answer type expressed by the suspect is a preferred answer. Therefore, violation on cooperative principles does not exist. The type of question, the type of answer, and the application of the principle of cooperation had a simultaneous effect on the interview process.

***Data 9 (sequence 9)***

Police: 'Kapan dan dimana saudara ditangkap oleh Petugas Polri?'

Suspect: 'Saya ditangkap oleh Petugas Polri pada hari Selasa tanggal 13 Oktober 2009 di villa lalu lalang jalan pantai Batu Bolong kawasan Canggu kabupaten Badung.'

### *Analysis*

Question type utilized by the police is an open question in a form of informative (WH) questions initiated by 'when (kapan)' and 'where (dimana)'. The answer type expressed by the suspect is preferred one because the suspect answers those questions in detail and in accordance to the form of the questions. Therefore, there is no violation on cooperative principles.

The type of question, the type of answer, and the application of the cooperative principle are influential simultaneously.

### *Data 10 (sequence 10)*

Police: 'Benarkah barang bukti berupa 1 (satu) bungkus plastik berisi Narkotika Gol I jenis Heroin (ditunjukkan penyidik dihadapan tersangka) milik saudara? jelaskan.'

Suspect: 'Barang itu bukan milik saya. Saya tidak mengetahui kepemilikan benda tersebut.'

### *Analysis*

There are two types of questions used by the police in this sequence. The first question type is a close question whose function is to seek information and is in a form of yes/no questions initiated by 'Is it true that....(benarkah....)'. The second question type is open question which is included into a TED (Tell, Explain, Describe) question initiated with 'Explain (jelaskan).'

The type of the answer expressed by the suspect is preferred one because the suspect answers the question without delays and this makes cooperative principles remain in its line.

The type of question, the type of answer, and the application of the cooperative principle work simultaneously.

## **CONCLUSION**

The questions used by police to interview the suspects are mostly open questions even though there are some close questions and open-close questions. The answers given by the suspect are categorized as preferred ones because the answers can be related to the questions and they are relevant. Cooperative principles remain in tact because the suspect answers accordingly. In this interview, types of questions, types of answers and cooperative principles relate to each others and give simultaneous effects on the interview process.

## REFERENCES

- Berk-Seligson. 2009. *Coerced Confessions: The Discourse of Bilingual Police Interrogations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- Conrad et al. 2020. *The Cambridge Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon and Fleisher. 2006. *Effective Interviewing and Interrogation Techniques*. United Kingdom: Elsevier Inc.
- Griffiths, Patrick. 2006. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press.Ltd.
- Leahy-Harland, S., & Bull, R. (2017). Police strategies and suspect responses in real-life serious crime interviews. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 32(2), 138-151.
- Heydon, Georgina. 2019. *Researching Forensic Linguistics: Approaches and Applications*. Routledge.
- H. Houtkoop-Steenstra, 1997. Being friendly in survey interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28, 591-623.
- Lindawati. 2016. Indonesian Interrogative Sentences: A Study of Forms and Functions. *Humaniora*, 28(3), 348-357.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2005. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Oxburgh, G. E., Myklebust, T., & Grant, T. (2010). The question of question types in police interviews: A review of the literature from a psychological and linguistic perspective. *International Journal of Speech, Language & the Law*, 17(1).
- Streeck and Kallmeyer. 2001. Interaction by Inscription. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 465-490.
- Sugiyono. 2007. *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Kitab Lengkap KUHP, KUHAPer, KUHP, KUHA, KUHD. *Kodifikasi Lengkap Hukum Indonesia. Seri Perundang-undangan*. Penerbit Pustaka Yustisia. 2013.