



## LINGUISTIC ACCURACY IN INVESTIGATION REPORTS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW THROUGH A FORENSIC LINGUISTICS APPROACH IN SARA-RELATED CASES

Ira Anisa Purawinangun, Ifan Iskandar, Miftahulhairah Anwar

Universitas Negeri Jakarta

[ira\\_9906922019@mhs.unj.ac.id](mailto:ira_9906922019@mhs.unj.ac.id), [ifaniskandar@unj.ac.id](mailto:ifaniskandar@unj.ac.id),

[miftahulhairah@unj.ac.id](mailto:miftahulhairah@unj.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

Investigation Report (BAP) is a legal document that contains the results of the investigation report of witnesses, suspects, or experts in a legal case. The accuracy of language in BAP is a fundamental aspect because it can affect the interpretation of judges and legal decisions. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to identify the linguistic challenges that often arise in BAP as well as provide solutions based on forensic linguistic theory to improve the clarity and objectivity of the legal document. The methodology involves a systematic review of relevant literature on forensic linguistics, linguistic analysis in legal documents, and the application of pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic theories in the case of SARA. The results of the study are expected to show that linguistic errors in BAP—both morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic—have the potential to cause confusion in the interpretation of legal facts and can affect the outcome of the decision. Therefore, the development of an appropriate language model in the BAP is very necessary to ensure justice, reduce bias, and improve the quality of legal communication in the judicial process.

Keywords: BAP language, forensic linguistics, SARA, legal documents, pragmatics

### INTRODUCTION

Official Investigation Reports (Berita Acara Pemeriksaan-BAP) are the backbone of the justice system in Indonesia. As official legal documents, BAPs (for witnesses, suspects, complainants, or experts) form the basis for judges' considerations in making decisions. Therefore, linguistic accuracy in BAPs is a fundamental aspect that cannot be ignored. Errors or ambiguities in language formulation can lead to mistaken interpretations of legal facts. Such misinterpretations can affect the fairness of judgments (Tamrin et al., 2022; Warami, 2022).

In legal cases, a precise understanding of language becomes more complex given the deep implications of every word. Studies on linguistic accuracy in legal documents are relevant, especially with the development of forensic linguistics. This approach focuses on in-depth analysis of language use in legal contexts to uncover hidden meanings, identify ambiguities, and verify the authenticity of a statement (Dong & Zhang, 2023). The importance of this analysis is increasingly felt in cases related to Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup Relations (SARA), where linguistic sensitivity can trigger or alleviate potential social conflict. SARA cases often involve hate speech or differing interpretations of a statement, making them fertile ground for forensic linguistic analysis (Kusnod et al., 2022).

Previous research on forensic linguistics can be categorized into three main themes. First, forensic linguistics and legal discourse, which includes analysis of hate speech on social media by Harahap & Siregar (2022), public discourse analysis of legal decisions in the Sarah Halimi case by Makouar (2024), and the application of forensic linguistics in investigations by Lee (2025). Second, detection of fraud and false testimony, which includes studies by Christiansen (2021) on linguistic indicators of fraud, and Igorevna (2023) on the challenges of analyzing false testimony. Third, technology in forensic linguistics, with research by Sigona & Grimaldi (2023) examining automated speaker recognition systems to improve accuracy in forensic identification, and Wickramasekara et al. (2024) discussing the potential of large language models in improving the efficiency of digital forensic investigations. Although these studies provide important insights, the main gap is the lack of in-depth study on linguistic accuracy in Official Investigation Reports (BAP), especially in SARA cases involving sensitive language that can affect legal interpretation.

The novelty of this research lies in the more focused application of forensic linguistics to BAPs in a legal context, which has not been widely applied in previous research. This study aims to identify common linguistic errors in BAPs—in morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects—and to provide solutions based on forensic linguistic theory to improve the clarity and objectivity of these legal documents. The development of an appropriate linguistic model for BAPs is expected to reduce bias, improve accuracy, and ensure fairness in the judicial process, thereby improving the quality of legal communication to be more transparent and accurate.

Despite the recognized urgency of language accuracy in BAPs, linguistic challenges that can hinder the objectivity and clarity of these documents are still often found. These problems can manifest at various linguistic levels, from morphological errors (word forms), syntactic errors (sentence structure), semantic errors (meaning of words or phrases), to pragmatic errors (principles of conversational cooperation). These errors risk causing confusion in the interpretation of legal facts and affecting trial outcomes.

Given this urgency, this research aims to systematically identify common linguistic challenges in BAPs, particularly in cases related to SARA. Furthermore, this research also seeks to provide solutions based on forensic linguistic theory to enhance clarity, objectivity, and fairness in the drafting of BAPs. By using a systematic review approach to relevant literature, as well as an in-depth analysis of pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic aspects, this research is expected to contribute to the development of a more appropriate linguistic model for BAPs, so that justice can be upheld, bias can be reduced, and the quality of legal communication in the judicial process can be improved.

## **METHOD**

This research uses a qualitative approach with a systematic review (Creswell & Creswell, 2017; Nightingale, 2009). This means the study will structurally examine relevant literature to identify and analyze linguistic challenges in Official Investigation Reports (BAP), especially in cases related to Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup Relations (SARA). This approach was chosen to integrate findings from various previous studies on forensic linguistics, linguistic analysis in legal documents, and the application of linguistic theories (pragmatics, syntax, semantics) in legal contexts.

The data collection process involves searching academic databases and scientific journals focusing on forensic linguistics, legal language analysis, and SARA case studies



in Indonesia. Literature inclusion criteria explicitly cover publications discussing morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic errors in legal documents, as well as the role of forensic linguistics in investigations and judicial processes. The results of previous research will form the basis for analysis to identify research gaps and support arguments regarding the urgency of linguistic accuracy in BAPs.

Data analysis will be conducted using a forensic linguistic approach, which involves a careful investigation report of language use in BAP samples. The analysis will focus on identifying errors at the morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels, including cooperative principles. The findings from this analysis will then be used to formulate recommendations for an appropriate linguistic model for drafting BAPs in SARA cases, aiming to enhance clarity, objectivity, and fairness in the judicial process.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This discussion delves into the various linguistic challenges frequently encountered in drafting Official Investigation Reports (BAP), especially in cases involving Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup Relations (SARA) issues. Given the BAP's vital role as a legal document in investigation and trial processes, the accuracy and objectivity of its language are crucial.

The analysis will focus on errors occurring at the morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels, exploring how these errors can influence the interpretation of legal facts and impact the fairness of judgments. Furthermore, this section will highlight the critical role of forensic linguistics as a solution to enhance BAP quality and will outline the foundational concept of a more effective linguistic model to minimize bias and ambiguity in legal communication.

### **Linguistic Challenges in Official Investigation Reports (BAP) in SARA Cases**

As legal documents used in investigation and trial processes, Official Investigation Reports (BAP) are meant to accurately portray legal facts. In cases involving Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup Relations (SARA), errors in language use within a BAP can potentially worsen the legal situation. Therefore, a linguistic analysis of the language in BAPs becomes crucial to ensure these documents are not only accurate and objective, but also admissible as valid evidence in court. This discussion will review the linguistic challenges often found in drafting BAPs, encompassing morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects.

The image below is an excerpt from an Official Investigation Report (BAP) used in a legal investigation related to defamation and information involving SARA. In this BAP, various questions and answers involving witnesses or suspects are carefully recorded by the investigator. In this section, the investigator extracts information related to existing evidence, such as conversations in a WhatsApp group suspected of containing insults to someone's good name. The use of language in this BAP is fundamental because every detail, whether a witness statement or presented evidence, will influence the ongoing legal process.

5.	Bagaimana cara sdr melihat postingan terkait dugaan tindak pidana Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik yang memiliki muatan penghinaan dan atau pencemaran nama baik yang sdr alami? Jelaskan-----
-----	5. Saya diperlihatkan langsung melalui Screen shot WA Grup Forum Relawan <b>NE</b> dari saudara <b>JS</b> -----
6.	Apakah sdr mengetahui dan bergabung dengan Grup Whatsapp atas nama Forum Relawan NE? jelaskan-----
-----	6. Saya baru mengetahui Grup WA tersebut saat JS memberitahukan ke saya dan saya tidak bergabung di Grup WA tersebut-----
7	Diperlihatkan bukti screenshoot kepada korban terkait grup Whatsapp atas nama Forum Relawan <b>NE</b> , sebagaimana screenshoot terlampir  Pertanyaan: Perkataan apa pada postingan tersebut yang sdr anggap penghinaan dan mencemarkan nama baik sdr? jelaskan-----
-----	7. Perlu saya jelaskan bahwa dalam postingan tersebut saya dianggap berhianat, faktanya adalah NU ingin meminjam uang sebesar Rp. 20.000.000.000,00 (dua puluh miliar) ke saya untuk pemenangan dirinya dalam pilkada kabupaten Serang, setelah di cek jaminannya oleh saudara IG ternyata jaminannya hanya AJB bukan sertifikat, dan yang berbentuk sertifikat tidak sesuai nilainya dengan nominal peminjamannya. Terkait Proses Pilkada Kabupaten Serang, saudara IG yang banyak berperan karena dia adalah ketua DPC Partai G Kabupaten Serang. Perlu saya jelaskan faktanya bahwa terkait uang saksi, saya bantu dengan cara memberikan pinjaman dengan nominal sebesar Rp. 613.000.000,00 (enam ratus tiga belas juta rupiah) yang melakukan transaksi tersebut adalah saudara IG dengan HS ayah dari saudara NU. Kata-kata saya dibayar berapa oleh Dinasty merupakan penghinaan dan pencemaran nama baik saya hal tersebut tidak sesuai dengan faktanya yaitu justru saya membantu memberikan pinjaman uang untuk saksi sebanyak 3.065 TPS-----
8	Apakah sdr mengetahui terkait siapa yang menuliskan tulisan tersebut diatas dengan menyebutkan nama sdr? Jelaskan-----
-----	8. Sesuai dengan Screen shot di WA Grup namanya KA dengan nomor telepon 0816177*****-----
09	Apakah sdr mengetahui apa maksud dan tujuan dari tulisan pada grup Whatsapp sebagaimana terlampir dibawah jelaskan-----
-----	09. Pada Prinsipnya tulisan yang tersebar di Grup WA Relawan NE merupakan Pencemaran dan Penghinaan terhadap diri saya dan Partai G, terkait maksud dan tujuannya saya kurang paham tapi asumsi saya ingin mengkambing hitamkan saya penyebab kekalahan NE di pilkada kabupaten Serang-----

Figure 1. Fragment of the Minutes of Investigation Report

Linguistic analysis in the Official Investigation Report (BAP) is essential to ensure its admissibility as valid evidence in court. BAP drafting must adhere to proper linguistic rules so that the information conveyed is clear and unambiguous. In this context, linguistic analysis can be conducted through four main aspects: morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Each aspect plays a role in maintaining the accuracy, consistency, and clarity of the information recorded in the BAP. In turn, a clear BAP will form the foundation for justice and truth in judicial proceedings. By analyzing errors or potential biases in these four aspects, we can understand how language can affect the course of legal proceedings, especially in cases involving sensitive issues like SARA.

### 1. Morphological Analysis in BAP Drafting

Morphological issues refer to errors in word formation or inconsistencies in terminology that can lead to interpretive confusion. For example, in a SARA BAP case related to online defamation, inconsistency was found in referring to digital evidence, such as using "sreenshoot" instead of the correct "screenshot." Similar errors also appear in verb formation like "mengkambing hitamkan" which should be "mengambinghitamkan" (to scapegoat).



These morphological errors carry risks in a legal context. BAPs containing morphological inconsistencies can trigger debates in court regarding the document's validity. For instance, the use of non-standard or misspelled terms can be exploited by defense lawyers to question the accuracy of the BAP document and affect its credibility as legal evidence. Therefore, it's crucial for investigators to ensure every word in the BAP follows correct and standard morphological rules to avoid potential misunderstandings.

## 2. Syntactic Analysis in BAP Drafting

Syntax refers to the sentence structure used in the BAP. Good sentence structure ensures the clarity and precision of information conveyed in legal documents. However, BAPs often contain long and complex sentences with many clauses that are not properly separated. The use of overly long and poorly structured sentences can obscure the intended meaning. For example, combining too much information in one sentence without proper punctuation forces readers—be it judges, prosecutors, or lawyers—to slowly unravel the information, opening room for multiple interpretations.

These syntactic errors can also arise from the improper use of punctuation, such as long dashes (-----), which lack clear syntactic function. In the BAP context, this can create an impression that some information is missing or not properly recorded, which could become an argument by interested parties to doubt the validity of the BAP's content.

Moreover, in some parts of the BAP, facts, assumptions, and opinions are often mixed within a single sentence without clear separation. For instance, statements like "*saya kurang paham*" (I don't quite understand) or "*asumsi saya*" (my assumption) create ambiguity in understanding the actual statement. In the legal realm, testimonies or statements in a BAP must be based on verifiable facts and should not mix personal opinions or speculations. If this occurs, defense lawyers can leverage it to invalidate the document's credibility on the grounds that the statements lack a clear basis.

## 3. Semantic Analysis in BAP Drafting

The semantic aspect in a BAP relates to the meaning of words and phrases used. The use of ambiguous or unclear terms can open doors for various interpretations, potentially causing confusion in court. In BAPs related to SARA cases, terms that can have multiple meanings depending on the perspective used are often found, such as the term "*berhianat*" (betray). If this term is not clearly explained in the BAP's context, there can be differing understandings among those reading the document.

Semantic errors in BAPs also frequently occur in the use of non-standard or misspelled terms, such as "*Dinasty*" instead of the correct "*Dinasti* (in Indonesian)". Although seemingly trivial, in a legal context, every term must have a clear meaning to avoid opening room for debates that could disadvantage the parties involved, especially if these semantic errors concern names or terms relevant to the identity of the parties in the case.

Mixing facts and opinions is also a common semantic problem. In some BAP sentences, witnesses or suspects combine facts with personal assumptions, as in the statement, "*Asumsi saya ini ingin menggambarkan saya sebagai penyebab kekalahan*" (My assumption is this wants to portray me as the cause of the defeat). Such statements are problematic in the legal sphere because statements in a BAP must have a clear and verifiable basis.

#### 4. Pragmatic Analysis - Cooperative Principles in BAP Drafting

Pragmatics in BAPs refers to the manner of information delivery and whether the communication between the investigator and the witness/suspect adheres to the cooperative principles that should exist in legal communication. These cooperative principles, popularized by Grice (1975), emphasize that information provided must be truthful (maxim of quality), sufficient (maxim of quantity), relevant (maxim of relevance), and delivered clearly (maxim of manner). In SARA BAP cases, violations of these principles are often found, which can affect the clarity and accuracy of the information presented. For example:

- a. The maxim of quality is violated when a witness provides information that is more assumed than factually demonstrable. Statements like "*Saya kurang paham, tetapi asumsi saya ini ingin menggambarkan saya sebagai penyebab kekalahan*" (I don't quite understand, but my assumption is this wants to portray me as the cause of the defeat) indicate that the information provided is not based on strong facts. This can become a loophole for defense lawyers to question the BAP's accuracy and credibility.
- b. The maxim of quantity is also violated when statements in the BAP are too long and contain many irrelevant details. For example, the statement: "*Faktanya adalah NU ingin meminjam uang sebesar Rp. 20.000.000.000,00 (dua puluh miliar) ke saya untuk pemenangan dirinya dalam Pilkada Kabupaten Serang, setelah dicek jaminannya oleh saudara IG ternyata jaminannya hanya AJB bukan sertifikat, dan yang berbentuk sertifikat tidak sesuai nilainya dengan nominal meminjamannya.*" (The fact is NU wanted to borrow Rp. 20,000,000,000.00 (twenty billion rupiah) from me for his victory in the Serang Regency Pilkada, after brother IG checked the collateral, it turned out the collateral was only an AJB not a certificate, and the certificate-shaped one did not match its value with the loan amount.) The presentation of excessive or unnecessary information can make it difficult for judges or prosecutors to understand the core message, slow down the legal process, and even potentially obscure the actual facts.
- c. The maxim of relevance is generally met in BAPs, but there are some sections where witnesses provide answers that are slightly rambling or contain speculation. Investigators must ensure that every answer remains focused on the question asked to avoid information that is out of context with the case. For example, in one statement: "*Perlu saya jelaskan bahwa dalam postingan tersebut saya dianggap berkhianat, faktanya adalah NU ingin meminjam uang sebesar Rp. 20.000.000.000,00 (dua puluh miliar) ke saya untuk pemenangan dirinya dalam Pilkada Kabupaten Serang, setelah dicek jaminannya oleh saudara IG ternyata jaminannya hanya AJB bukan sertifikat, dan yang berbentuk sertifikat tidak sesuai nilainya dengan nominal meminjamannya.*" (I need to explain that in that post I was considered to have betrayed, the fact is NU wanted to borrow Rp. 20,000,000,000.00 (twenty billion rupiah) from me for his victory in the Serang Regency Pilkada, after brother IG checked the collateral, it turned out the collateral was only an AJB not a certificate, and the certificate-shaped one did not match its value with the loan amount.)

This sentence is long and lacks clear pauses, which can make it difficult to understand in one reading. If information in a BAP is difficult to comprehend, it can become a problem in court, as prosecutors, judges, or lawyers may struggle to interpret the document's contents. Therefore, all information in a BAP should be structured in shorter, clearer, and more concise sentences.

### The Role of Forensic Linguistics in Improving BAP Accuracy

The application of forensic linguistics can help identify and reduce linguistic bias in BAP. Forensic linguistics can be used to analyze linguistic aspects, such as morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, that exist in BAP. Thus, forensic linguistics serves to ensure that the preparation of BAP is more objective, structured, and free from excessive or biased interpretations that are detrimental to one party.

Various studies have shown that errors in the preparation of BAP, both in terms of interview techniques and word choice, can lead to biases that are detrimental to one party. Some of the findings from related research are as follows:

Table 1. Previous Research on the Preparation of BAP from the Linguistic Aspect

No	Research Identity	Result
1	Panggabean & Sinar. 2018. Presupposition of Investigators in Investigative Interviews (A Forensic Linguistic Study in Drafting Official Investigation Reports)	This research found that investigators' presuppositions often influence how they interpret answers from interrogated subjects, which can lead to bias in BAP drafting. This includes how investigators unconsciously select information that aligns with their initial suspicions, potentially leading to misinterpretations or inaccurate conclusions about the case.
2	Bachari. 2018. Application of Investigative Interviewing Linked to the Evidentiary Power of Official Investigation Reports in the Indonesian Criminal Justice System	This research revealed that using proper, evidence-based investigative interviewing techniques can enhance the accuracy and reliability of information contained in BAPs. This can strengthen the evidentiary value of BAPs in legal proceedings, helping judges and juries make fairer and fact-based decisions.
3	Akbar & Razak. 2023. Conversational Implicature in BAP Cases of Alleged Premeditated Murder in Makassar	This research found that violations of conversational maxims (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner) frequently occur in BAP drafting. These violations can lead to ambiguity, misunderstanding, and potential bias in the interpretation of legal information. The analysis emphasizes the importance of clarity, accuracy, and relevance in legal communication to ensure that information conveyed in BAPs can be relied upon as evidence in legal proceedings.
4	Hasibuan. 2020. Legal Consequences of Revoking Witness Official Investigation Reports in Narcotics Criminal Acts in Court	This research explored the legal consequences of revoking witness BAPs in narcotics cases, including circumstances where such revocation is denied by the judge because the content is deemed untrue, leading to the BAP not being considered strong evidence. This case refers to situations where information contained in a witness's BAP is re-examined in court and deemed inaccurate or inconsistent with the actual facts.
5	Sumantri et al. 2021. Judges' Considerations Regarding Legal Provisions for Revocation of Defendant Testimony	The rejection of the BAP by defendant Dwi Riyanto alias Mbahe, who was deemed to possess and provide narcotics. Defendant Dwi Riyanto alias Mbahe Bin Welas stated that all contents of the BAP were untrue because the defendant felt he had never committed a narcotics offense.
6	Rasyidi. 2017. Legality of Investigators as Witnesses in Court Examinations of Narcotics Criminal Acts	Rasyidi's research results indicate that the strength of a BAP as evidence in court is crucial because a BAP can be the basis for a judge's decision in a case. A BAP deemed invalid or weak, either because its content is considered inaccurate or because the investigation process did not meet legal standards (e.g., coercion or duress against a witness or suspect), can reduce the reliability of the BAP as dependable evidence in court.

Panggabean & Sinar (2018) highlight that investigators' presuppositions often influence how they interpret subjects' answers, potentially leading to bias in BAP drafting. This bias occurs when investigators favor information that aligns with their

initial assumptions rather than objective facts. Bachari (2018) indicates that proper, evidence-based investigative interviewing techniques can enhance the accuracy of information in BAPs. However, frequently, improper techniques are used, which reduces the BAP's reliability as legal evidence.

Akbar & Razak (2023) found frequent violations of conversational principles (quality, quantity, relevance, and manner) in BAP drafting. These violations cause ambiguity, obscuring the intended meaning and worsening the quality of information within the BAP. Hasibuan (2020) revealed that witnesses or defendants often revoke BAPs if they feel the recorded information is inaccurate. If a BAP is deemed invalid or weak, it cannot be relied upon in court, which can harm the parties involved in the case.

In cases involving SARA issues, the accuracy and objectivity of BAPs become even more crucial. The language used in a BAP must objectively reflect the facts without exacerbating existing social tensions. Using forensic linguistics to analyze the language in BAPs can identify potential biases and ensure BAP drafting adheres to proper linguistic rules.

Coulthard et al. (2016) emphasize that forensic linguistics plays a role in identifying errors in word choice and sentence structure that can cause bias or double meanings. In a legal context, especially in SARA cases, errors in word choice or inappropriate terminology can risk worsening social tensions and undermining justice in the legal process.

Cases involving SARA often have high sensitivity, so word choice in BAPs must be done carefully. In defamation or slander cases related to SARA, every phrase and term used in the BAP must clearly and objectively represent the facts, without adding to existing social tensions or conflicts. Even small errors in word choice or the use of ambiguous terms can open the door to misinterpretation, potentially leading to unjust legal decisions. Therefore, forensic linguistics is necessary to ensure that BAPs not only meet applicable linguistic standards but are also objective and free from bias that could disadvantage the parties involved.

The application of forensic linguistics in BAP drafting is a fundamental step to improve accuracy, objectivity, and transparency in legal processes. By analyzing every linguistic aspect in a BAP, from morphology and syntax to pragmatics, forensic linguistics helps ensure that the information conveyed in the BAP is reliable and free from bias that could affect justice.

In SARA cases, where language errors can exacerbate social tensions, the application of forensic linguistics becomes even more critical. By ensuring that every word and sentence in a BAP is carefully chosen and structured, we can reduce the potential for misinterpretation and harmful bias. Ultimately, the use of forensic linguistics can create a more just, transparent, and objective judicial process.

### **Design for Developing a Linguistic Model for BAP in SARA Cases**

The linguistic model developed for Official Investigation Reports (BAP) in SARA cases aims to provide clear, objective, and accurate guidance for drafting legal documents. Given that BAPs serve as crucial evidence in judicial proceedings, this model will also ensure that BAP documents are well-understood by all parties involved in the legal process, such as judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and those being examined. This approach is based on linguistic principles that will ensure every word and sentence used in the BAP has a clear and relevant meaning, leaving no room for biased or unjust interpretations.



The primary goal of this model is to reduce the risk of misinterpretation in cases involving sensitive issues like SARA by introducing a standard for BAP drafting. This process also includes forensic linguistic (FL) analysis as the foundation of the linguistic model to minimize subjectivity in BAP drafting and ensure that the language used is neutral and does not unfairly influence the legal process.

## 1. Key Components of the Linguistic Model for BAP in SARA Cases

The developed linguistic model includes four main components to consider when drafting BAPs in SARA cases: morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, based on forensic linguistics as per Coulthard & Johnson (2010). Each component is used in BAP drafting as an effort to meet the expected standards of objectivity and clarity.

- a. **Morphology** Morphology in the linguistic model for SARA case BAPs will focus on the consistent use of legal terms with specific technical meanings. Standardizing terminology is key to avoiding inconsistencies in referring to legal terms. For example, terms frequently appearing in SARA cases such as "defamation" or "discrimination" must be used consistently and in accordance with applicable legal definitions. This model also avoids errors in word formation or misspellings that can cause confusion in the interpretation of legal facts. Consistency in prefixes and suffixes is also important to maintain accuracy in conveyed meaning.
- b. **Syntax** The sentence structure used in BAPs influences the clarity of the information presented. In drafting BAPs for SARA cases, a clear sentence structure with a Subject-Predicate-Object-Adverbial (SPOA) pattern will avoid ambiguity and make the information easier to understand. Furthermore, active voice is preferred due to its more assertive and clear meaning. Avoiding excessive complex sentences will also reduce comprehension difficulties in BAPs, especially in a legal context that demands precision and readability.
- c. **Semantics** Every meaning of a word, phrase, and sentence in the linguistic model for SARA case BAPs must have contextual accuracy in accordance with applicable legal regulations. The use of words or phrases with double meanings must be avoided to minimize the risk of misinterpretation. Discourse cohesion and coherence are also important in BAPs to ensure that statements in the document do not contradict each other and consistently form a clear and accountable narrative.
- d. **Pragmatics** The cooperative principles adopted in the linguistic model for BAPs must adhere to Grice's four main maxims—Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner. The principle of neutrality must also be applied in BAP drafting to avoid subjective diction that leads to bias and unfounded assumptions. Using language that is not misleading is another important aspect of pragmatic principles. Investigators must be careful not to steer witnesses or suspects toward desired answers, but rather to allow them the freedom to provide accurate information.

## 2. BAP Drafting Procedure Based on the Linguistic Model

Adjusting the linguistic format and structure is the first step in the BAP drafting procedure based on the linguistic model. Every sentence must be carefully constructed, prioritizing clarity and accuracy. By using forensic linguistic analysis, potential ambiguities in the BAP can be detected and corrected before the document is used in court. Linguistic editing and validation also involve linguistic experts to ensure that the linguistic model designed for BAP writing meets appropriate linguistic standards.

### **3. Model Implementation and Evaluation**

To effectively implement this model, training for investigators on applying language in BAP drafting is crucial. Intensive discussions with these investigators will help in identifying and avoiding linguistic biases and ensuring that every drafted sentence has a clear and objective meaning. Evaluation by legal practitioners will also be an important part of the model's implementation to ensure that this linguistic model can be well-applied in judicial practice.

### **4. Advantages of the Linguistic Model for BAP in SARA Cases**

Applying the linguistic model in drafting BAPs for SARA cases offers several key advantages, including:

- a. **Reduced Interpretation Errors:** Linguistic standardization reduces the risk of multiple interpretations in BAPs, ensuring that the information conveyed is more precise and clear.
- b. **Increased Legal Transparency:** The use of clear and objective language enhances the transparency of the legal process, allowing all parties to better understand the content of the legal document.
- c. **Facilitated Document Digitization:** Linguistic standardization simplifies the implementation of technology in legal document analysis, including the use of software to check for accuracy and consistency.
- d. **Minimized Linguistic Bias:** This model helps prevent distortions in the presentation of legal facts that can arise from the use of non-neutral or biased language.

By applying this linguistic model, it is hoped that BAP drafting in SARA cases will become more standardized, objective, and support the creation of a fairer judicial system. Through the development and application of this linguistic model, BAPs are also expected to become more reliable and trustworthy legal documents in judicial proceedings, especially in SARA cases.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study highlights the urgency of linguistic accuracy in the Investigation Report (BAP), especially in cases of Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup (SARA). Any potential language errors can exacerbate social tensions and affect justice. The results of the in-depth analysis show that linguistic challenges, both at the morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels, often arise in BAP and have the potential to cause confusion in the interpretation of legal facts. The application of forensic linguistics offers solutions to identify and reduce linguistic bias and ensure that BAPs are structured in a more objective and structured manner.

Addressing language challenges in BAP systematically requires more than awareness; Comprehensive language models are needed to develop and implement them. These models in addition to serving as a practical guide for investigators, also open up opportunities for further research in the field of forensic linguistics. Future studies may focus on developing prototypes of language models specific to different types of legal cases, to testing the effectiveness of existing models through broader analysis of the BAP corpus. Thus, continuous efforts in designing and validating language models will be an important foundation to improve the quality of legal communication and ensure justice in the Indonesian justice system.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was powerfully enabled by the Indonesian Education Scholarship (BPI) of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Technology (Kemdikti Saintek), the Center for Higher Education Funding and Assessment (PPAPT), and the Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) from the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia (Kemenkeu RI). The successful completion of this study is a testament to the invaluable and dedicated support provided by PPAPT, LPDP, and BPI, whose trust was instrumental.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Harahap, Y. S., & Siregar, N. (2022). A Forensic linguistic Approach to interpreting a hate speech case on social media. *VISION*, 18(1), 58-65.
- Christiansen, T. (2021). Linguistics and deception detection (DD): a work in progress. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 66, 169-200.
- Sigona, F., & Grimaldi, M. (2024). Validation of an ECAPA-TDNN system for Forensic Automatic Speaker Recognition under case work conditions. *Speech Communication*, 158, 103045.
- Wickramasekara, A., Breitingger, F., & Scanlon, M. (2025). Exploring the potential of large language models for improving digital forensic investigation efficiency. *Forensic Science International: Digital Investigation*, 52, 301859.
- Makouar, N. (2024). Public Discourse on Criminal Responsibility and Its Impact on Political-Legal Decisions: Analysing the (Re-) Appropriation of the Language of Law in the Sarah Halimi Case. *Languages*, 9(10), 313.
- Igorevna, G. E. (2021). The Challenges of Forensic Linguistic Analysis of False Testimony. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*.
- Lee, S. (2025, 24 Mei). *Linguistic Forensics in Practice: Real-World Applications and Case Studies*. Number Analytics. Source: <https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/linguistic-forensics-in-practice>
- Tamrin, T., Nursyamsi, N., & Karsana, D. (2022). Komparasi Hasil Kajian Linguistik Forensik Antara Paradigma Lama Dan Paradigma Baru Terhadap Penanganan Kasus Penghinaan Dan/Atau Pencemaran Nama Baik Melalui Media Sosial Di Polda Sulawesi Tengah. *Prosiding Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya (KOLITA)*, 20(20), 201-211.
- Warami, H. (2022). Kejahatan Bahasa di Wilayah Hukum Papua Barat: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 11(1), 76-93.
- Dong, X., & Zhang, Y. (2023). An Overview of Legal Language. *On the Standardization of Chinese Legislative Language*, 13-26.
- Kusno, A., Arifin, M. B., & Mulawarman, W. G. (2022). Pengungkapan Muatan Ujaran Kebencian Berdasarkan Kesukuan Pada Bahasa Sebagai Alat Bukti Hukum: Analisis Linguistik Forensik (Disclosure of Hate Speaking Based on Ethnicity on Language As Legal Evidence: Forensic Linguistic Analysis). *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pembelajarannya*, 12(2), 235-251.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Syntax and semantics*, 3, 43-58.
- Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A., (2010). *An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence*. Routledge.
- Panggabean, P. & Sinar, T.S. (2018). Praanggapan Penyidik Dalam Interviu Investigatif (Kajian Linguistik Forensik Dalam Penyusunan Berita Acara Pemeriksaan). *The*

- 11th International Workshop And Conference Of Asean Studies In Linguistics, Islamic And Arabic Education, Social Sciences And Educational Technology.*
- Bachari, A. D. (2018). *Penerapan Wawancara Investigatif Dikaitkan Dengan Daya Bukti Berita Acara Pemeriksaan Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana di Indonesia* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia).
- Akbar, A., & Razak, N. K. (2023). Conversational Implicature pada Berita Acara Pemeriksaan Kasus Dugaan Pembunuhan Berencana di Makassar Tinjauan Linguistik Forensik. *Lingue: Jurnal Bahasa, Budaya, dan Sastra*, 5(1), 41-51.
- Hasibuan, P., Girsang, S. B. R., Harefa, E. J., Simamora, J., & Manullang, H. (2020). Akibat Hukum Pencabutan Berita Acara Pemeriksaan Saksi Di Depan Persidangan Dalam Tindak Pidana Narkotika (Studi Putusan Nomor 201/Pid. Sus/2018/PN Simalungun). *Nommensen Journal of Legal Opinion*, 129-138.
- Sumantri, A., Bidar, A.S., & Alfiani, N. (2021). Pertimbangan Hakim Terhadap Ketentuan Hukumataspencabutan Keterangan Terdakwa (Studi Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Sragen No. 199/Pid.Sus/2019/PN.Srg). *Rechstaat Nieuw*. 6(1) 29-42
- Rasyidi, A. F. (2017). Legalitas Penyidik sebagai Saksi dalam Pemeriksaan Persidangan Tindak Pidana Narkotika (Analisis Pertimbangan Hakim dalam Putusan Mahkamah Agung Nomor: 454 K/PID. SUS/2011, 1531 K/PID. SUS/2010, dan 2588 K/PID. SUS/2010). *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 16(3), 353-369.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Nightingale, A. (2009). A guide to systematic literature reviews. *Surgery (Oxford)*, 27(9), 381-384.