



Is the *FCI* Effective as the Police Strategy in Interrogation?

^{1*}Nadhirah Muthi'ah , ²Eddy Setia , ³Rahmadsyah Rangkuti

^{1,2,3}English Postgraduate Program, University of Sumatera Utara, Indonesia
Jalan Dr. T. Mansur No.9, Medan, 20155

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: May 19, 2024

Revised : September 7, 2024

Accepted: October 9, 2024

Keywords:

Case Interrogation;

Cooperative Principle;

Forensic Conversational

Implicature;

Forensic Discourse Analysis;

Interrogation Video.

Conflict of interest:

None

Funding information:

None

Correspondence:

Nadhirah Muthi'ah

Muthinadhirah4@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The politeness, dignity, serenity, and tranquillity should be reflected by the investigator without violence during the interrogation process. This study aims to identify the Forensic Conversational Implicature (FCI) found in a police interrogation of a murder case. A qualitative method with a philosophical approach was used, and Forensic Discourse Analysis was used as an analytical framework. A documentation study method was used to collect the data in the form of an interrogation video obtained from the Explore with Us YouTube channel. Utterances that are indicated as implicature are the data taken from the interrogation video, particularly in murder cases that happened in the U.S. In analyzing the data, deductive content analysis was applied. The results show that two types of FCI are found in this study, with particularized conversational implicature as the most dominant since it requires certain background knowledge and context to understand the investigator's utterances. Meanwhile, generalized took second place as it does not require specific context knowledge to determine the additional conveyed meaning of several investigators' utterances. Moreover, the reasons behind the realization of CI are under two themes, namely, gaining trust and humanity.



© Nadhirah Muthi'ah, Eddy Setia, Rahmadsyah Rangkuti

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) international license.

How to cite (APA Style):

Muthi'ah, N., Setia, E., & Rangkuti, R. (2024). Is the FCI Effective as the Police Strategy in Interrogation?. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 9(2), 579-594. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v9i2.33882>

INTRODUCTION

It is well acknowledged that police investigations are the primary means used by the police to acquire admissions of misconduct (Baldwin, 1993). The investigation's primary goal is merged with additional goals, such

as finding stolen goods, clearing honest individuals, and addressing any related wrongdoings (Moston & Engelberg, 1993). However, the investigation often involves irregularities between investigators, witnesses and suspects. Witnesses and suspects often answer investigators' questions with inappropriate answers (Saletović & Kišiček, 2012). This is common because they do not want to admit they are committing criminal acts. However, the language used by the investigator while seeking information and confession significantly impacts how well the interrogation goes. To assist the procedure and succeed in the interrogation, the investigator's utterance should reflect politeness, dignity, serenity, and tranquillity (Gibbons, 2007). Therefore, the police devised a strategy, that is Conversational Implicatures, aiming to persuade the suspect to admit their guilt without violence during the interrogation process. Conversational implicature concerns how well the speaker and the listener grasp what is being stated. Conversational implicature is an implied or extra message that allows the listener to infer the true meaning from what is stated by using the rules of effective conversation interaction (Grice, 1975). Conversational implicature, which refers to implied or explicit meaning that appears in a conversation, is included in the scope of forensic linguistics, which focuses on applying linguistic principles in legal and judicial contexts.

Forensic Conversational implicatures in interrogation can be an important element in analyzing the information revealed by the subject of the interrogation. In the context of an interrogation, understanding implicatures can provide additional insight into a person's intentions, involvement, or honesty (Korta, 1997). Conversational implicatures can be helpful in exploring ambiguity in someone's statements.

Two types of Conversational Implicature according to Grice (1975):

Generalized Conversational Implicature

It occurs without needing a specific situation or setting (Grice, 1975). The specific context is unimportant in generalized conversational implicature (Chapman, 2005). A generalized conversational implicature may determine further transmitted meaning without needing specific context information. It happens when certain word forms that an utterance would typically carry – like implicatures or specific types of implicatures – occur. Generally speaking, generalized conversational implicature refers to more significant issues, especially those consistent with logic or logical constant conversation (Yule, 1996).

Particularized Conversational Implicature

It is based on specific context features. For further details, Levinson (2000) defines particularized conversational implicature as a type of conversational implicature requiring such a specific context. Particularized conversational implicature inferences are needed to determine the

transmitted meanings (Yule, 1996). In practising particularized conversational implicature, consideration should be given to the word's definition, cooperative principles and maxims, context, and any relevant details (Grice, 1975). The conversation is classified as a particular conversational implicature since it requires certain background knowledge and context to understand. This type of implicature always calculates the statement with special knowledge of any given context; however, most of the time, the conversation takes place in a very specific environment where locally known inferences are anticipated (Yule, 1996).

Moreover, the investigator has put up the interrogation setting to adhere to the cooperative principle, which might direct participants' behaviour throughout the conversation. The cooperative principle is essential for maintaining ethical standards and ensuring effective communication (Ward, 2006). The four maxims of conversation – quantity, quality, relevance, and manner – are obedience or violation in conversations based on cooperation (Grice, 1975). 1). Maxim of quantity: Speakers should provide as much information as required for the conversation, no more or less than that; 2). Maxim of quality: Speakers should provide information that is true and based on evidence, 3). Maxim of relevance: Speakers should only offer information that is relevant to the current discussion. 4). Maxim of manner: Speakers should present their points in an understandable, succinct, and organised manner.

When forensic linguistics is used to examine police interrogations, conversational implicatures – such as coercive statements, threats, purposeful coercion, and verbal and nonverbal acts of violence – have a "Symbolic Meaning," which denotes that they may be used to prove a crime without violating the law (Prapto, 2012). From the perspective of the symbolic meaning of legal language, forensic linguistic research of conversational implicature is an appealing subject of study because of public assumptions about the origins of violent acts during the police questioning process (Coulthard, et. al., 2017). Forensic conversational implicature is one tactic to prevent violence and end legal infractions or violations during questioning (Shuy, 2011). Investigators implement strategies that may contain implied meaning to persuade and encourage suspects and witnesses to tell the truth and make confessions (Saletović & Kišiček, 2012). By utilising the strategy during questioning, the procedure will go efficiently and effectively, making it more straightforward for investigators to get information. The conversational implicature fosters a kind and comfortable atmosphere that may make the suspect willing to provide truthful data to the investigator without feeling pressured, threatened, or intimidated (Gibbons, 2007). Relevant previous studies, such as in Safitri & Ambalegin (2023), identified the types and functions of conversational implicature, the theory of Grice

(1975), of character's utterances in the movie "Over the Moon". Descriptive qualitative research was applied. The result shows that the most occurrence types of conversational implicature are particularized than the generalized implicature.

Ines & Natsir (2023) classified and analyzed the types of conversational implicature that occurred in character's utterances in *The Interview* movie. The data came from the utterances written in the movie script. The result shows that the dominant type was generalised conversational implicature with 52,5%, while the particularised type took second place with 47,5%. The GCI was dominant because the character's utterances can still be understood easily, although they are conveyed implicitly.

Santoso and Apriyanto (2020) have recognised the significance of language discourse from the standpoint of the symbolic meaning of legal language. The data is a conversation that took place during an interrogation in a fraud and traffic case. Data is gathered using acquired transcription data, which is subsequently examined. The study's findings suggest that humanist communication may be achieved during police questioning by using conversational implicature instead of forceful methods. However, the study does not elaborate clearly on the types of conversational implicature applied during the interrogation.

Moreover, Cristina (2021) analyzed the type of conversational implicature found in *F.R.I.E.N.D.S.*, a famous American TV show. The theory used was Grice (1975). Qualitative research applies the interview method to collect data, the pragmatic identity method to analyse the data, and both formal and informal presentation methods to present the research result. The final result was the particularized conversational implicature appeared the most with 20 data, while the generalized conversational implicature appeared the least with only 10 data. This is because the utterances they conveyed need specific context to be understood by the audience.

Further, Satria, et al. (2022) investigated linguistic phenomena and forms of conversational implicatures using forensic linguistic studies. The study aimed to reveal the implicature of juvenile traffic violations during the interrogation process and speech acts and events from a forensic linguistics perspective. The result showed that teenagers who violate traffic regulations tend to cover up their mistakes by providing convoluted information which can be seen from the answers given to the police. During the interrogation process, many violations of Grice's cooperative principle. Despite that, the study only thoroughly explained the violation in cooperative principle instead of forensic conversational implicature.

Furthermore, Ade et al. (2021) investigated the types of conversational maxims (obedience and violations) by applying Grice's cooperative principle. The data were analyzed by using interactive models of Miles, Huberman,

and Saldana. The finding showed that during the investigative interviews, all of the maxims cooperative principle were occurred. It tends to be obeyed rather than violated. The obedience of the conversational maxim might be due to the power possessed by the police. However, the maxim violation still can be found in investigative interviews because the operation target tried to defend himself so that they would avoid the sanction. The study gives insight into applying the cooperative principle in investigative interviews. Still, there is no more explanation about conversational implicature applied in the investigation and the reason behind it.

Those previous studies give insight into the present study about ways to identify types of conversational implicature that occur in conversation. The similarities to the present study are in the use of Grice's (1975) theory of conversational implicature and Symbolic Meaning theory to identify the reason behind it. However, the present study's objectives and data differ from those of previous studies since the data taken from the interrogation of murder cases focused on the forensic discourse area.

This study aims to discuss thoroughly the forensic conversational implicature in police interrogation that began by identifying the FCI types that occurred in police utterances, describing the realisation of CI, and investigating the reason behind it by relating to the symbolic meaning perspective of legal language. Forensic conversational implicature has a vital role in unveiling the truth during interrogation. Knowing and understanding conversational implicature enhances the reader's ability to analyse interrogation practices critically, mainly how statements are interpreted and used in legal contexts. Further, it is filled with insights into the subtle techniques used during interrogations. This helps them better understand how information is elicited from suspects and witnesses and how conversational implicature plays on psychological principles, deepening their understanding of human communication and behaviour. This study aimed to investigate the strategy applied by the investigators during interrogation due to assumptions in public concerning the genesis of violent actions.

METHOD

Research Design

This research used a philosophical approach to deductive content analysis, namely discourse analysis. More specifically, the philosophical approach in this research involved applying a philosophical framework and theories to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of language used in police interrogations. Conversational implicature, as a concept, originates from the field of philosophy, particularly the philosophy of language. Philosopher H.P. Grice introduced it as part of his theory on how people communicate implicitly. The philosophical framework here is for deeply exploring

conversational implicature principles, including the ethical, epistemological, and linguistic dimensions. Moreover, Forensic Discourse Analysis (FDA) was used in this study as the analytical framework to analyze, describe, and investigate the data. FDA was applied as the analytical framework because interrogation is a verbal discourse in which the use of implicatures is often found to stimulate a response or create psychological pressure on the suspect. FDA is an interdisciplinary field investigating language and communication within legal settings, such as courtroom proceedings, police interviews, legal documents, and other contexts related to the legal system. The goal is to understand how language is used, how it can be interpreted, and its impact on legal processes.

Using an analytical framework here could complement the analysis, mainly when focusing on the systematic breakdown of how conversational implicature is applied in practice. The analytical framework provides detailed, structured insights, while the philosophical framework offers critical reflection and ethical considerations. By integrating both, the analysis will be more holistic, examining how conversational implicature is used in practice and considering why it matters and what it means in a broader context.

Data, Data Source and Procedures

The data of this study were transcripts that indicated conversational implicature during interrogation. The transcripts were obtained from the "Explore with Us" YouTube channel, originally from the United States, the data source. The data source is specified on criminal cases, particularly murder cases that happened in Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin, U.S, as the data sample due to it being one of the highest crime rates in the United States over time as indexed in the annual Uniform Crime Reports by Federal Bureau Investigation (FBI) and by annual National crime Victimization Surveys by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The data were taken from an interrogation video titled "13-Year-Old Murder Grandma for \$155", which happened in Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin, U.S. on September 18th, 2012, as the representation among other murder cases happened in the U.S. We chose the "Explore with Us" YouTube channel due to it is exceptionally reliable, credible, or recognised as authoritative in the forensic field, so that can ensure the analysis is based on high-quality and trustworthy information. Moreover, the channel consists of interrogation videos with a complete duration from beginning to end without any cuts, so we can explore, identify, and analyse the source thoroughly, leading to detailed insights that might be diluted if we used an uncomplete duration of video from another channel as the data source.

To collect the data, use documentation from the data sources with the following steps: 1.) Accessed to the interrogation channel through

youtube.com/@ExploreWithUs 2.) I clicked on the videos menu on the “Explore with Us” homepage. 3.) Observed the interrogation videos that focused only on murder cases. 4.) I listened to the conversation and manually transformed it into a transcript text.

Data Analysis Procedures

The implementation of the data analysis technique was deductive content analysis following the analytical framework of Forensic Discourse Analysis (FDA). Sequentially, there are three series of steps in analyzing the forensic conversational implicature in police interrogation, i.e., coding scheme development, data reduction, and data interpretation.

1. Coding scheme development

At this stage, we analysed the utterances of interrogation sessions in the “Explore with Us” YouTube channel through pre-coding and open coding. In pre-coding, we listened to the whole interrogation session in order to understand the content. The purpose is to get an overview of the context that emerges in the conversation.

The next is open coding. At this stage, we listened and read the transcript data repeatedly and coded the relevant units of analysis in the form of utterance based on (Grice, 1975) conversational implicature types, namely generalised and particularized conversational implicature. The distribution of FCI types will appear in a table consisting of the amount of each type (GCI and PCI) and calculated into percentages with the formula below:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{Data of each type}}{\text{Total data}} \times 100$$

2. Data Reduction

Data reduction involves classifying, transforming and simplifying large volumes of data into a more manageable, concise form without losing essential information. This step aims to reduce the complexity of the data while retaining the most relevant aspects for analysis. At this stage, after coding the data, we analyzed and interpreted the coded content to identify patterns, relationships, and themes based on the predefined categories. This process involves summarising and condensing the data to highlight key findings.

3. Data Interpretation

In the last stage, we interpreted the findings within the context of the chosen theoretical framework or categories. We discussed the implications of the findings by viewing them from the perspective of forensic linguistics in Conversational Implicature analysis, that is, Symbolic Meaning. This stage helps in knowing and understanding how police investigators make the suspect gradually more comfortable with telling the truth without any violence through appropriate language use.

FINDINGS

To answer the first research problem related to the types of forensic conversational implicature identified in murder case interrogation in Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin, U.S, by analysing the data and categorising them into types of conversational implicature, namely generalised conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature, and the maxims of cooperative principle.

1. Forensic Conversational Implicature Types

A summary of the findings on such sets is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Distribution of Forensic Conversational Implicature Types

Types of Conversational Implicature	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Generalized Conversational Implicature	46	35
Particularized Conversational Implicature	86	65
Total	132	100

Table 1 shows that types of forensic conversational implicature in *Explore with Us* video interrogation about murder cases are ample. The table displays that 132 forensic conversational implicatures are identified in a murder case interrogation video from the *Explore with Us* YouTube channel. Between the two types of conversational implicature, it concluded that Particularized Conversational Implicature occupies the most significant proportion. There are 86 data of particularised conversational implicature identified in U.S murder case interrogation with a proportion of 65%. The generalised conversational implicature takes the second place, finding 46 data with a proportion of 35%. The final results show a very significant difference in the frequency of data between the two forensic conversational implicature types above.

2. The Realization of Forensic Conversational Implicature in Murder Case Interrogation

In the second research problem related to the realisation of forensic conversational implicature in a murder case interrogation, we intend to describe the forensic conversational implicature types along with the maxim cooperative principles through police investigator utterance. The data will be identified with the bold excerpt for GCI type, underlined for PCI type, and italic for CP maxims.

- Generalized Conversational Implicature
 - a. Investigator: **We've been involved in a serious interrogation,**

okay? there's a lot of different people that have been talked to already about this serious investigation, and you're one of 'em that we wanted to talk to, hoping that you can clarify some things, okay?

Suspect : *Alright.*

In the data above, as labelled bold data shows, the investigator's utterance identified generalized conversational implicature by telling the seriousness of the situation and wanted the suspect to clarify some things related to the case. It is proved with suspect's respond labelled italic "*Alright*". Means that he understood what investigator said without need of special knowledge to interpret it. The investigator's utterance identified adhering maxim of manner as the suspect's response "*alright*" means that he understands with a clear answer, making it easier for the interrogator to follow the sequence of events or details being provided.

- b. Investigator: **Okay. Realizing that you have these rights, are you now willing to answer question or make a statement? Basically, listen to me and answer the questions so that we can hopefully clarify some things.**

Suspect : *Yeah.*

Further, as seen in data above, the bold label of investigator's utterance ensures that the suspect understood the rights that has been read and intends that the suspect is willing to clarify several things related to the case. Meanwhile, the suspect's respond labelled italic "*Yeah*" means that he clearly understood what investigator said. Those utterances above identified as generalized conversational implicature by saying something that is inferable without reference a feature of the context, which can be seen through suspect's respond to the investigator's utterance with relevant and focus on what investigator said means that the investigator has obeyed the maxim of manner.

- c. Investigator: **Okay, so what did you have that you attacked your great grandma with?**

Suspect : *It was like an ax looking thing*

Moreover, in data labelled bold above identified as generalized conversational implicature, by asking details about the evidence that suspect used to kill his great grandmother. The question can be clearly understood by the suspect since no special knowledge is required in investigator's context to be interpreted as obeying to maxim of quantity not asking too much that out of the context. It is shown by the suspect's respond "*It was like an ax looking*

thing" by provides honest and accurate information, avoiding deliberate falsehoods or attempts to mislead the interrogator.

- Particularized Conversational Implicature

- d. Investigator: Do you know anything at all about what may have happened to her? Have you heard anything? Do you know anything at all?

Suspect : *No, what happened?*

As in data labelled underline above, the investigator' questions identified as particularized conversational implicature, due to the specific context in the investigator's speech, that asked about the information of victim's detailed death and anything related to the case that the suspect knew. This implied that the investigator wanted to know the chronology of the case from the suspect's point of view, which the suspect definitely knew about it. In this particular context of investigator's utterance, the suspect needed additional knowledge to interpret the implied meaning of investigator's utterance by violating the maxim of quality. He lied and denied that he did not know anything about the case with saying "*No, what happened?*" to show that he was not involved.

- e. Investigator: Would there be any reason that somebody would say that they saw someone about your size height with that type of a haircut at your great-grandma's house?

Suspect : *I don't know*

Further, in data with underline label, the investigator' questions identified as PCI, due to the specific context in the investigator's speech, that asked about someone else saw the suspect with physical characteristics as the same as the suspect been at his great grandma's house on the day case occurred. This implied that the investigator wanted to see how the suspect reaction and provoked also put a bit intimidation on the suspect by telling him that someone else had seen him at the victim's house. This also to see whether he answer informative to the context of question or not. In this particular context of investigator's utterance, the suspect has already known to interpret the implied conveyed meaning of investigator's question by violating the maxim of quality, said "*I don't know*" to place him at safe position in the interrogation.

- f. Investigator: Would there be any reason at all that we've talked with people, and like I said, we've talked to a bunch of people and we're still talking to people, that anyone would say that you would've been at your grandma's, great-grandma's, I'm sorry.

Suspect : *No, I had no reason to. I mean, like, people would've known I was there, I wouldn't have just randomly been there.*

Moreover, in data with underline label above identified as PCI, due to the specific context in the investigator's speech, that asked about someone else saw the suspect been at his great grandma's house on the day case occurred. This implied that the investigator wanted to provoked and put a bit intimidation on the suspect by telling him that someone else had seen him at the victim's house. This also to see whether he answer relevant to the context of question or not. In this particular context of investigator's utterance, the suspect already had knowledge to interpret the implied conveyed meaning of investigator's question by violating the maxim of quality. The suspect being irrelevant and avoids answering questions directly related to the specific context of investigation, by saying everyone would have known he was there.

3. The Reasons of FCI Realized as It Is in Murder Case Interrogations.

In this part provides the interpretation of the participant's utterance and relate it to symbolic meaning in forensic linguistics. The utilisation of the FCI in police interrogation creates a relaxed and humane state of affairs. There are two reasons as the way it is under the themes as Gain Trust and Humanity. These themes involve subtle which often conveyed indirectly cues that reflect empathy, fairness, and respect for the suspect. These indicators can create a more cooperative atmosphere, where the suspect feels understood and respected, leading to a higher likelihood of truthful communication. The careful use of language that suggests shared humanity and trustworthiness is crucial in achieving effective and ethical interrogation outcomes.

• Theme 1: Gain Trust

The police investigators may build a relationship of trust based on humanitarian considerations. As in the data findings below.

Excerpt 1

Is there anything at all that you've talked to me about that you want to change your story and tell me the truth, or do you want to stay with what I consider a lot of lies? And you need to really think about this, okay. and you need to think about your future and you need think about the potential of being in front of the judge and saying, he straight out lied about absolutely everything, he never took any credit for anything and said that he had nothing to do with anything at all as far as great-grandma Olson. So, think about it for a second. Let me just make sure.

Excerpt 2

I want to clarify then, what you haven't been totally truthful about. I will sit here and listen to the truth, but I'm not gonna sit here and listen to a bunch of more lies, okay. I want you to tell me the truth of what happened. That's all

we're looking for is the truth. We don't want to pin something on somebody that doesn't deserve to have anything pinned on him or her or whatever. I want the truth and that's what we're going for here, okay. so, what do you wanna clarify and tell me the truth about it.

Gaining trust during police interrogation is multifaceted, aiming to enhance cooperation, obtain accurate and reliable information, and ensure that the interrogation process is ethical and effective. By fostering a trusting relationship, police officers can conduct interrogations that are more likely to yield truthful, detailed, and legally sound confessions or admissions, ultimately supporting the pursuit of justice.

- **Theme 2: Humanity**

The interrogation process will be eased by speeches that exude respect, dignity, and politeness rather than intimidation. As in the data findings below.

Excerpt 3

Okay. I think basically, I'm gonna give you one more chance to tell the truth, okay. I've already told you that we've talked with a lot of people, okay.

Excerpt 4

And we've had the state crime lab in, we have a lot of evidence. You know it's a video world nowadays. We have video evidence. We have a lot of stuff, okay? and I'll tell you right now, you're not telling me the truth.

Emphasizing humanity during police interrogation is to ensure that the suspect is treated with respect and dignity throughout the interrogation process. This includes avoiding any form of dehumanization, mistreatment, or abuse. moreover, helps in building trust and rapport with the suspect, making them more likely to open up and provide truthful information.

DISCUSSION

The first finding related to types of forensic conversational implicature identified in the police investigator's utterance during the murder case interrogation reveals that both types of CI are used with particularised conversational implicature as the dominant and followed by the generalised conversational implicature. In murder case interrogation, particularised conversational implicature tends to arise more frequently than generalised conversational implicature because the former is often tied to the specific context and content of the question. Interrogatives are typically used to seek specific information, and the response may carry implications beyond the literal meaning of the words used. These implications often depend on the context, making them "particularised." This also happened in Safitri & Ambalegin (2023) and Cristina's (2021) studies that the PCI was the dominant type that occurred in a movie, that the speaker's utterances may

indicate PCI since the audience needs specific context to understand the meaning of what they said.

Further, violation or obedience to conversational maxims is very influential in the smoothness of the interrogation process. According to the data found above, both the suspect and investigator violated and obeyed the conversational maxims in the same amount. This is because when the suspect tries to lie, the police apply an implicature strategy that makes it difficult for the suspect to lie again. As in Satria et al. (2022), many violations of the maxims happened since the suspect tends to cover up their mistakes by providing convoluted information, which can be seen from the answers given to the police. However, Ade et. al. (2021) tend to be obeyed rather than violated. It might be due to the power possessed by the police.

Moreover, the realisation of forensic conversational implicature in this study is related to the Symbolic Meaning of legal language in forensic linguistics. "Symbolic Meaning" refers to proving a crime without using forceful speech, threats, deliberate coercion, and verbal and nonverbal acts of violence to demonstrate a crime to break the law (Coulthard et al., 2017). There are so many assumptions in public concerning the genesis of violent actions during the police interrogation process. Due to its role, this perspective in legal language helps uncover meaning that may not be immediately apparent, supports better interpretation of situations, and identifies potential confusion or manipulation in communications relating to the justice system (Verhoeven, 2016). The result demonstrated that the investigator carried out implicatures in their speech under two themes: gain trust and humanity. In the data findings, gaining trust and upholding humanity is essential to ensure that the process is fair, ethical, and in accordance with legal principles and human rights (Gibbons, 2007). Therefore, the use of the conversational implicature fosters a kind and comfortable atmosphere that may make the suspect willing to provide truthful data to the investigator without feeling pressured, threatened, or intimidated, such as in all of the data above, the police investigator's utterances indicated as building a relationship of trust based on humanitarian considerations. The investigator positions themselves as someone who understands the suspect's situation by showing sympathy and care or starting casual conversations to create a comfortable atmosphere so the interrogation target begins to trust the investigating police (Leahy & Bull, 2017). Moreover, a humanist attitude can be demonstrated by avoiding using violent language or acts when speaking to or around the interrogating target.

CONCLUSION

The particularised conversational implicature tends to arise dominantly in the murder case interrogation than the generalised conversational implicature. It is a valuable tool in this strategic language, allowing interrogators to convey

meaning without directly stating it. This dominant type of CI arises when the police convey meaning beyond their words' literal or explicit meaning. However, the implicature is specific to the particular linguistic context during the interrogation process. Further, both investigator and suspect violated and obeyed the conversational maxims in the same amount, since whenever the suspect tries to lie, the police apply an implicature strategy that makes it difficult for the suspect to lie again. Lastly, the Symbolic Meaning perspective is the reason behind creating two themes: Gain Trust and Humanist. This is because it is one strategy for police investigators to avoid violence to stop legal infractions/violations while doing the interrogation. Investigators implement strategies that may contain implied meaning to persuade and encourage suspects and witnesses to tell the truth and make confessions. This study is limited to identifying, describing, and investigating the forensic conversational implicature along with the maxim cooperative principle and the reason behind it in Police Interrogation of murder cases by applying the FDA as the analytical framework. Further research on the same topic may expand the data source with other criminal cases to compare the findings and comprehend the use of conversational implicature in forensic areas. Moreover, the findings above may give insight to further researchers on how to apply forensic discourse analysis as a tool in real-world contexts, such as in investigative interviews, courtroom testimony, or language analysis for forensic purposes. Also, it gives knowledge in linguistics, pragmatics, and discourse analysis to better understand the language of the law and its applications.

REFERENCES

- Ade, F.S., Sumarsih., & Sri, M.M. (2021). Conversational Maxims of Operation Targets in Police Investigative Interviews. *Proceedings of the 6th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL 2021)*.
- Baldwin, J. (1993). Police interview techniques. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 33, 325-352.
- Chapman, Siobhan. (2005). *Paul Grice, Philosopher and Linguist*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & David, W. (2017). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics Language in Evidence (Second Ed)*. Routledge. doi:10.31826/9781463209674-001
- Cristina, Vivian. (2021). *Conversational Implicature Analysis in TV Show "F.R.I.E.N.D.S": Pragmatic Approach*. University Putera Batam.
- Gibbons, J. (2007). *Forensic Linguistics an Introduction to Language in The Justice System*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In *Studies in the Way of Words*

- (pp. 305–315). United Kingdom: Harvard University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/97802300058535>
- Grice, H. Paul. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ines & Natsir. (2023). An Analysis of Conversational Implicature in *The Interview* Movie. Indonesia.
- Korta, Kepa. (1997). Implicatures: Cancelability and Non-detachability. Research Gate report number: ILCLI-97-LIC-6.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11896-016-9207-8>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). Pragmatics, discourse analysis, stylistics and “The Celebrated Letter.”
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Presumptive Meanings the Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge. MA: MFF Press.
- Moston, S., & Engelberg, T. (1993). Police questioning techniques in tape Recorded interviews with criminal suspects. *Policing and Society*, 3(July). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.1993.9964670>
- Praptomo, B. I. (2012). *Bahasa, kekuasaan, dan kekerasan* (2nd ed.). Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Safitri, E., & Ambalegin. (2023). Conversational Implicature Types Used in the Movie “Over the Moon”. *E – Journal of English Language & Literature*. Vol. 12 (2).
- Saletović, L. M., & Kišiček, G. (2012). Contribution to the analysis of witness Statements in the croatian language. *Suvremena Lingvistika*, 38(73), 73–88
- Santoso, D.A.H., & Apriyanto, S. (2020) Pragmatic Implicature Analysis of Police Interrogation: Forensic Linguistics Analysis. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*. 24(6). DOI:10.37200/IJPR/V24I6/PR260009
- Satria, H., Darwis, M., & Kamsinah. (2022). Implikatur Percakapan Interogasi Terhadap saksi/Korban Penganiyaan: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, Vol. X (2)
- Shuy, R. W. (2011). *Applied Linguistics in the Legal Arena*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Verhoeven, W. J. (2016). The complex relationship between interrogation techniques, suspects Changing their statement and legal assistance. Evidence from a Dutch sample of police interviews. *Policing and Society*, 28(3), 308–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2016.1157594>
- Ward, Horn. (2006). *Implicature: The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Laurence R. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

THE AUTHORS

Nadhirah Muthi'ah is a freshly graduated student of English Postgraduate Program majoring in English language & linguistics in University of Sumatera Utara. She has also completed her bachelor degree in Islamic University of North Sumatera majoring in English Literature.

Eddy Setia is a lecturer of bachelor, master and doctoral program in University of Sumatera Utara focused on English teaching, language, culture, linguistics, applied linguistics, etc.

Rahmadsyah Rangkuti is a lecturer in University of Sumatera Utara that focused on Language, culture, linguistics, etc.