



Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

## **Narrating Silence: Discursive Erasure of Trauma in Rape FIRs, A Forensic Linguistic Discourse Analysis**

**Abdul Sattar**

M.Phil English Scholar, The University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad.

Email: Abdulsattargujjar58@gmail.com

**Tooba Tehrim**

Ph.D Scholar (English Linguistics), University of Education, Lahore & Lecturer English, Baba Guru Nanak University, Nankana Sahib Email: toobatehrim3@gmail.com

**Ayesha Arif**

BS English, University of Punjab, Lahore

### **ABSTRACT**

*This study examines the discursive construction and erasure of trauma in rape First Information Reports (FIRs) through the lens of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Drawing on Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model, the research analyzes a purposive sample of FIRs from Pakistan to explore how linguistic and institutional practices shape the representation of sexual violence. The analysis operates at the levels of textual features, discursive processes, and broader social structures. Findings reveal that FIR discourse systematically transforms deeply personal experiences of violence into depersonalized legal narratives. At the textual level, the frequent use of passive constructions, legalistic vocabulary, and narrative compression obscures agency and sanitizes violence. At the level of discursive practice, victim narratives are re-voiced and reformulated within institutional frameworks, resulting in the suppression of subjective experience. At the social level, these patterns reflect and reinforce broader ideological commitments to legal neutrality and socio-cultural constraints surrounding the articulation of sexual trauma. The study argues that trauma in FIRs is not merely underrepresented but discursively erased through structured linguistic and institutional mechanisms. By foregrounding the concept of "narrated silence," this research contributes to the intersection of forensic linguistics and critical discourse studies, highlighting the need for more victim-centered approaches in legal documentation practices.*

**Keywords:** *Critical Discourse Analysis, Discursive Erasure, Trauma Representation, Forensic Linguistics*

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **Background of the Study**

Language is not a neutral medium of communication; rather, it is a powerful social practice that constructs, regulates, and sometimes distorts reality. In legal and institutional contexts, language plays a decisive role in shaping how events are recorded, interpreted, and ultimately legitimized. Any inaccuracy or ambiguity in the use of language can affect the course and enforcement of justice. On that basis, forensic linguistics was born, which is the application of linguistic theory and methods to



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

analyze the use of language in a legal context, whether in the form of legal documents, testimony, interrogations, or writings by perpetrators of criminal acts (Ahmed, 2021; Naznin et al., 2022). One such critical site of institutional discourse is the First Information Report (FIR), which serves as the foundational legal document in criminal cases, including cases of sexual violence such as rape.

In cases of rape, FIRs are expected to document survivors' accounts of trauma with accuracy, sensitivity, and legal clarity. However, emerging scholarship in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) suggests that institutional narratives often transform lived experiences into depersonalized, sanitized, or fragmented accounts. This transformation may result in what can be termed as *discursive erasure*, where the emotional, psychological, and embodied dimensions of trauma are linguistically minimized or silenced.

Gueboudj et al. (2025) emphasize that forensic linguistics is interdisciplinary, as it bridges language and law and relates to other branches of linguistics, including sociolinguistics. Language reflects culture and is influenced by the socio-cultural environment. The two influence each other, and language becomes the main medium of human expression and interaction (Arsanti & Setiana, 2020; Rijal, 2018; Setiaji & Mursalin, 2023). Meanwhile, Nababan (1993) explains that culture can be understood as a communication system used by society to build cooperation, form unity, and maintain human survival. In legal cases, human behavior is also reflected in language. In patriarchal socio-legal contexts, such as South Asia, FIR discourse is often shaped by institutional power, cultural norms, and ideological assumptions about gender, morality, and honor. Consequently, survivors' voices may be filtered through bureaucratic language that obscures agency, weakens emotional intensity, and shifts focus from the survivor's trauma to procedural descriptions.

The researchers conducted this study because they found key evidence in the form of language, similar to previous studies, namely in murder cases using a forensic linguistic approach by (Jahara et al., 2022; Wicaksana, 2023; Yuliastuti et al., 2023). This study, investigates how linguistic choices in rape FIRs contribute to the representation and/or suppression of trauma. It draws on Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis to examine textual features, discursive practices, and socio-cultural structures embedded in FIR narratives.

### **Problem Statement**

Despite the legal requirement to accurately document survivors' accounts in rape FIRs, there is a growing concern that institutional language often fails to fully represent the emotional and psychological reality of sexual violence. Instead, FIRs may reflect patterns of linguistic suppression, including passive constructions, nominalization, omission of agency, and euphemistic expressions.

This raises a critical issue to what extent does institutional discourse in rape FIRs contribute to the silencing or distortion of trauma narratives? The problem is not merely linguistic but ideological, as it reflects deeper power asymmetries between law enforcement institutions and survivors of sexual violence.

### **Research Objectives**

The study aims to:

Analyze the linguistic representation of trauma in rape FIRs using Critical Discourse Analysis.

Identify discursive strategies that contribute to the erasure or minimization of survivor narratives.

Examine how institutional power influences the construction of rape narratives in FIRs.



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

### Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

How trauma is linguistically represented or silenced in rape FIRs?

What discursive strategies are used to construct or erase survivor experiences?

How does institutional language reflect power relations in rape reporting?

### Significance of the Study

This research is significant in multiple ways. First, it contributes to the field of Critical Discourse Analysis by extending its application to legal discourse in the context of sexual violence. Second, it highlights how institutional language can function as a mechanism of silencing, thereby contributing to broader discussions on linguistic justice and gendered power structures. Moreover, the study has practical implications for legal reform and police training by emphasizing the need for more accurate and survivor-centered documentation practices. It also contributes to feminist linguistic scholarship by uncovering how patriarchal ideologies are reproduced through bureaucratic language.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a multidisciplinary approach to studying language as a form of social practice. It examines how discourse reproduces or challenges power, dominance, and inequality in society. According to Fairclough, discourse is not only a reflection of social structures but also a medium through which these structures are constructed and maintained.

Fairclough's three-dimensional model text, discursive practice, and social practice provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing how language operates at micro and macro levels. At the textual level, CDA focuses on linguistic features such as vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and modality. At the discursive level, it explores processes of production and interpretation. At the social level, it connects discourse to broader ideological and institutional structures. Lillyani et al (2025), discover identity markers through hidden discourse of a criminal and influence of society on his behavior. In legal discourse, CDA has been widely used to explore how language legitimizes authority and marginalizes certain voices, particularly those of vulnerable groups. Tehrim et al (2026), highlight the application of Grice Maxims on murder FIRs. As Hutton (2018) emphasizes, selection of language creates meanings in legal settings.

### Legal Discourse and Institutional Language

Legal discourse is characterized by formal, technical, and highly institutionalized language. It is often perceived as objective and neutral; however, CDA scholars argue that legal language is deeply ideological. It reflects institutional power and often prioritizes procedural clarity over experiential truth.

In police documentation such as FIRs, language tends to be standardized and bureaucratic. This standardization may lead to the reduction of complex human experiences into simplified legal categories. Research has shown that such linguistic practices often result in the omission of emotional and psychological dimensions of crime, particularly in cases involving sexual violence. Studies in forensic linguistics suggest that institutional writing frequently employs passive constructions and nominalizations, which obscure agency and responsibility. For example, instead of clearly identifying perpetrators and survivors, legal texts may present events in detached and depersonalized forms.



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

### **Trauma and Its Linguistic Representation**

According to a study by Kredens (2016), the interrogators demonstrated a knowledge of the interpreter's analysis in resolving the discrepancy between the violent act and the linguistic data. A linguist's assistance in understanding an acknowledgment as well as interpreting a declaration that may have meant lost unintentionally is very beneficial to the interrogators (Correa, 2013). Trauma, particularly sexual trauma, is not only a psychological experience but also a linguistic challenge. Survivors often struggle to articulate traumatic events due to their fragmented, non-linear, and emotionally overwhelming nature. When such experiences are translated into institutional language, there is a risk of distortion or erasure. Shanza et al (2026) analyze trauma in women through literary analysis of a novel. Trauma theory suggests that traumatic memory resists coherent narrative structure. As a result, when institutions attempt to formalize trauma into written records, the original emotional intensity is often lost. In legal contexts, this may result in what scholars describe as "narrative flattening," where complex experiences are reduced to procedural statements. In rape cases, this issue becomes more critical because survivors' testimonies are mediated through police officers who transform spoken narratives into written FIRs. This mediation introduces institutional filters that can suppress emotional expression and agency.

### **Feminist Approaches to Language and Gendered Violence**

Feminist linguistics provides an important lens for understanding how language reproduces gender inequality. Scholars argue that institutional discourse often reflects patriarchal ideologies that normalize male dominance and marginalize female voices. In the context of sexual violence, feminist CDA highlights how legal systems may unconsciously reproduce victim-blaming narratives or minimize the severity of assault through linguistic choices. The representation of women in legal discourse is often shaped by cultural notions of honor, shame, and morality.

Research indicates that rape narratives in institutional settings frequently undergo reframing, where focus shifts from the act of violence to contextual or behavioral aspects of the survivor. This shift contributes to the silencing of trauma and reinforces structural inequality.

### **Discourse, Power, and Ideology**

Foucault's theory of discourse emphasizes the relationship between knowledge, power, and language. According to this perspective, institutions such as the legal system do not merely describe reality but actively construct it through discourse. In FIRs, power is exercised through language by defining what is considered relevant, credible, or legally significant. This process often results in the exclusion of subjective emotional experiences, particularly those of marginalized individuals. Ideology operates subtly through lexical choices, syntactic structures, and narrative organization. In rape FIRs, ideological assumptions about gender roles and victimhood may influence how events are recorded and interpreted.

### **Research Gap**

Although considerable research exists on Critical Discourse Analysis and legal language, there is limited scholarly attention to the specific discursive mechanisms through which trauma is erased in rape FIRs. Most existing studies focus either on legal reform or on general discourse analysis of courtroom language, rather than on police documentation as an initial site of narrative construction. Furthermore, there is a lack of research



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

examining how linguistic features in FIRs contribute to the silencing of survivors' emotional and psychological experiences. This study addresses this gap by applying Fairclough's CDA model to analyze the discursive erasure of trauma in rape FIRs within a socio-cultural context.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Research Design**

The study employs a qualitative research design as it focuses on interpreting meaning, ideology, and power embedded in language. Qualitative design is suitable because the objective is not statistical generalization but deep textual and contextual interpretation of discourse. The research is exploratory and interpretive in nature, aiming to uncover hidden ideological structures within institutional legal language.

#### **Theoretical Framework**

This study is grounded in Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model, which operates on three interrelated dimensions:

#### **Textual Level (Micro-Level Analysis)**

This level focuses on linguistic features of FIRs, including:

- Lexical choices (word selection)
- Grammar (active/passive voice)
- Modality (certainty, obligation, possibility)
- Nominalization (turning actions into nouns)
- Transitivity patterns (agency and responsibility)

#### **Discursive Practice (Meso-Level Analysis)**

This level examines:

- How FIRs are produced (police documentation process)
- How survivor speech is transformed into written text
- Intertextuality (legal templates, procedural formats)
- Interpretation and mediation by law enforcement officers

#### **Social Practice (Macro-Level Analysis)**

This level connects discourse to broader social structures:

- Patriarchal ideology
- Institutional power of police/legal system
- Cultural narratives of honor, shame, and gender
- Societal attitudes toward sexual violence

#### **Data Collection**

##### **Corpus Selection**

The data consists of **selected rape FIRs** obtained from legal archives, police documentation. A purposive sampling technique is used.

##### **Sample Size**

- 10 to 15 FIRs (depending on availability and saturation point)
- Each FIR is treated as a separate discourse unit

#### **Ethical Considerations**

- All FIRs are anonymized
- No personal identifiers (names, addresses) are disclosed



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

Data is used strictly for academic purposes

Sensitivity toward survivors' trauma is maintained throughout analysis

### Data Analysis Method

The study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) using Fairclough's model.

#### Step 1: Textual Analysis

Each FIR is analyzed for:

Passive vs active constructions

Lexical mitigation (e.g., "alleged," "reportedly")

Agency deletion

Emotional suppression

Narrative fragmentation

#### Step 2: Discursive Practice Analysis

Transformation of oral testimony into written FIRs

Role of police officers as discourse mediators

Institutional formatting and legal templates

Interdiscursive mixing (legal + bureaucratic discourse)

#### Step 3: Social Practice Analysis

Ideological representation of gender

Power asymmetry between state and survivor

Cultural normalization of silence

Institutional reproduction of patriarchal discourse

## DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

### FIR 1

#### Textual Analysis (Description)

At the textual level, the FIR is constructed through a highly bureaucratic and legalistic register, which compresses the victim's traumatic experience into formalized and repetitive phrasing. Expressions such as "*Section 376 PPC*" and "*initial information*" foreground legal categorization over lived experience. The victim's narrative, although present, is fragmented and interrupted by administrative insertions, thereby reducing emotional continuity.

Lexically, the FIR employs euphemistic and indirect references to rape, such as "*non-consensual act*" and "*illegal sexual conduct*," instead of explicitly naming sexual violence. This lexical strategy functions to sanitize the brutality of the act and diminish its experiential intensity. Similarly, verbs describing violence appear in generalized forms, such as "*at gunpoint... forcibly*," which indicate coercion but lack detailed representation of physical and psychological suffering.

Pronoun usage and naming patterns also reflect asymmetrical representation. The accused is repeatedly identified through stigmatizing descriptors such as "*deviant, alcoholic, hooligan-type person*," whereas the victim is consistently referred to as "complainant," an institutional label that replaces personal identity. This shift from personal to procedural identity signals depersonalization. Syntactically, the FIR frequently relies on passive and agent-backgrounding constructions, for example: "*the complainant was... forcibly subjected at gunpoint...*" Here, the grammatical structure foregrounds the victim as the object of action while backgrounding the perpetrator's agency. This contributes to the linguistic



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

marginalization of both trauma and accountability.

### **Discursive Practice (Interpretation)**

At the level of discursive practice, the FIR demonstrates how the victim's original account is recontextualized through police mediation into a standardized legal narrative. The statement begins with a formal appeal but quickly transitions into a reported and structured version of events, indicating that the police officer has reformulated the narrative into institutional discourse.

The FIR shows clear intertextuality, combining the complainant's account with legal codes, procedural phrasing, and institutional formatting. Narrative segments such as the time, place, and method of enticement are embedded within administrative structures, which interrupt narrative flow and convert lived experience into evidentiary data.

Moreover, the FIR reflects selective inclusion and exclusion. While threats such as "*you will be killed if you make noise*" are included, there is minimal elaboration on emotional trauma, fear, or psychological aftermath. This indicates a filtering process in which institutional relevance overrides experiential depth.

Another key feature is indirect narration. The victim's voice is not reproduced verbatim but paraphrased, creating a distance between speaker and text. This reflects institutional gatekeeping, where police mediate narrative legitimacy and determine how events are officially represented.

### **Social Practice (Explanation)**

At the level of social practice, the FIR reflects broader patriarchal and institutional ideologies embedded in legal discourse. The repeated emphasis on threats and coercion highlights the normalization of violence as a controlling mechanism. However, the linguistic framing does not critically interrogate this violence; instead, it presents it as a neutral factual occurrence.

The representation of the accused through stigmatizing labels such as "*hooligan-type person*" individualizes the crime as deviant behavior rather than situating it within structural patterns of gender-based violence. This shifts attention away from systemic issues and frames the act as an isolated moral failure rather than a social problem.

Furthermore, the FIR reflects institutional power asymmetry, where the victim must formally request justice, as seen in expressions equivalent to "*it is requested that a case be registered and justice be provided.*" This positions the victim as dependent on institutional authority, reinforcing hierarchical relations between citizen and state.

Finally, procedural closing statements such as "*case be registered and investigation be initiated*" reassert bureaucratic control. The transformation of lived trauma into administrative procedure demonstrates how legal discourse regulates, filters, and partially erases subjective suffering. In Fairclough's terms, the FIR functions as a discursive site where institutional power is both enacted and reproduced through language.

## **FIR 2**

### **Textual Analysis (Description)**

At the textual level, the FIR is constructed using highly legalistic, formal, and institutionalized language, which prioritizes procedural clarity over emotional expression. The survivor (complainant) is primarily represented through relational identity markers such as "*wife of Muhammad Ashfaq,*" reducing her individuality to her marital status. The lexical choices such as "*rape,*" "*illicit sexual intercourse,*" and



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

*“threatened to kill her”* frame the incident within rigid legal terminology rather than experiential narration. Additionally, passive constructions and agent-backgrounding are evident for example, *“the complainant was taken to the house”* and *“she was made to sit in the car and then dropped off,”* where the perpetrators’ agency is partially obscured. The repetition of phrases like “accused number 1” further bureaucratizes the narrative, transforming a violent personal experience into a categorized legal event.

### **Discursive Practice (Interpretation)**

At the level of discursive practice, the FIR reflects how institutional processes mediate and reconstruct the survivor’s voice. The narrative is not a direct account but a police-transcribed version, evident from phrases like *“this application was presented before me”* and *“the contents are evident from the application.”* This indicates that the survivor’s testimony is filtered through police authority, resulting in standardization and a reduction of subjective detail. The sequence of events phone call, abduction, assault, threat, and release is structured in a linear, report-like format, aligning with bureaucratic expectations rather than the fragmented nature of trauma narration. Furthermore, the inclusion of logistical details (locations such as Chenab Chowk and Canal Road, and the vehicle description GLI) suggests a prioritization of evidentiary coherence over emotional depth.

### **Social Practice (Explanation)**

At the social level, the FIR reflects broader power relations, gender norms, and institutional ideologies within Pakistani society. The erasure of the survivor’s emotional and psychological state demonstrates how legal discourse marginalizes trauma, privileging “objective facts” over lived experience. The emphasis on *threats* (*“if you disclose the incident, you will be killed”*) reinforces a socio-cultural context of silencing and fear, where victims are discouraged from reporting violence. Moreover, the representation of the accused as *“the accused persons”* within a structured legal framework reflects the state’s attempt to regulate and formalize violence, yet simultaneously contributes to the depersonalization of the crime. This aligns with Fairclough’s notion that discourse both reflects and reproduces institutional power and social inequality, particularly in gendered contexts of sexual violence.

## **FIR 3**

### **Textual Analysis (Description)**

At the textual level, this FIR is again dominated by legal-bureaucratic discourse, where the survivor is linguistically constructed through relational and generalized identifiers such as *“Amara, wife of Mohsin Ali”* and *“approximately 40 years of age.”* This reflects categorization over personalization. The lexical choices *“beaten,” “rape by force,”* and *“attempted to raise alarm”* indicate violence, yet remain formulaic and standardized, lacking descriptive depth of trauma.

The structure relies heavily on active attribution of the accused, e.g., *“Irfan, son of Idrees, opened the door and entered inside,”* which is slightly more direct compared to the previous FIR. However, experiential silence persists, as the survivor’s emotional or psychological state is completely absent. Additionally, the repeated legal phrasing (*“application for the purpose of registration of a case,” “application of Section 376 PPC”*) reinforces the transformation of lived experience into a codified legal narrative.



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

### **Discursive Practice (Interpretation)**

This FIR clearly demonstrates the institutional mediation of the survivor's voice. The narrative is framed through police reporting structures, as seen in phrases like "this application was presented before me" and "the contents of the application and the circumstances indicate." The survivor's account is reconstructed into a linear, cause-and-effect sequence: entry → isolation → violence → lack of help → legal request.

Unlike spontaneous trauma narration, which is often fragmented, this FIR exhibits discursive smoothing, aligning the account with institutional expectations of clarity and evidence. The mention that "no one else was present nearby" introduces a justificatory discourse, subtly anticipating doubt and reinforcing credibility this is a key discursive strategy in rape FIRs.

### **Social Practice (Explanation)**

At the social level, the FIR reflects gendered vulnerability within private/domestic spaces. The fact that the assault occurs when "the complainant was alone at home" highlights a broader societal discourse in which women's safety is implicitly tied to the presence or absence of others thus reinforcing patriarchal protection narratives.

The absence of emotional expression again signals the institutional erasure of trauma, where legal systems prioritize verifiable actions over subjective suffering. Moreover, the need to explicitly state resistance ("*she attempted to raise alarm*") reflects a socio-legal expectation that victims must demonstrate active non-consent, which is deeply embedded in rape discourse in Pakistan.

This aligns with Fairclough's idea that discourse reproduces power structures, where institutions control the narrative form, and victims are required to conform to established norms of credibility.

## **DISCUSSION**

The analysis focuses on how linguistic choices in FIRs contribute to the construction, suppression, and institutional framing of survivors' trauma. The chapter is structured around three analytical dimensions: (1) textual analysis, (2) discursive practice, and (3) social practice. The aim is to identify recurring discursive patterns that reflect how legal language transforms lived traumatic experiences into bureaucratic records, often resulting in what this study conceptualizes as *discursive erasure of trauma*. At the textual level, FIRs demonstrate a consistent use of formalized, legalistic, and impersonal language. This linguistic register prioritizes legal classification over experiential narration. FIRs frequently use legal codes and technical terminology such as: Under Section 376 PPC, Initial report, and Unknown accused. These lexical choices replace emotional and experiential descriptions with juridical categorization.

"The complainant stated that she was subjected to rape by force, and the offence was registered under Section 376 of the Pakistan Penal Code." Here, the emotional intensity of "rape by force" is immediately followed by legal codification, reducing the narrative into procedural labeling. The complainant was subjected to rape." A dominant linguistic feature across FIRs is the use of passive voice, which obscures agency. This construction removes the perpetrator from the sentence, focusing on the act rather than the actor. The absence of explicit agency contributes to what Fairclough terms *grammatical suppression of responsibility*. "The complainant stated that she was going home afterwards the incident occurrence and a case was registered." Victim narratives are often fragmented and interrupted by procedural insertions. The ellipsis-like structure shows discontinuity in the survivor's account, where lived experience is interrupted by



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

institutional narration. The survivor's narrative is not directly recorded but is mediated through police officers' reinterpretation. This results in *secondary narration*, where meaning is filtered through institutional expectations. A key finding is the tension between *human narrative discourse* (trauma, fear, violence) and *legal discourse* (*codification, neutrality, objectivity*). This interdiscursivity results in emotional dilution, where trauma is reframed as procedural information.

The findings demonstrate that FIRs are not neutral legal documents but ideologically structured texts that transform lived trauma into administrative discourse. Through lexical suppression, passive constructions, and institutional mediation, FIRs systematically reduce survivor agency. Fairclough's model reveals that this is not merely a linguistic issue but a reflection of broader socio-legal power structures that prioritize bureaucratic efficiency over narrative authenticity. The recurring pattern of fragmentation and euphemism indicates a consistent *discursive erasure of trauma*, where the survivor's voice is filtered, minimized, and reorganized into legal terminology.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study establishes that rape FIRs are not neutral documentary records but ideologically structured texts shaped by institutional discourse practices. Through linguistic strategies such as passive construction, euphemization, fragmentation, and legal codification, FIRs contribute to the partial or complete erasure of survivor trauma from the written record. The analysis confirms that this erasure is not necessarily intentional at the individual level but is embedded within systemic legal and administrative discourse structures that prioritize procedural efficiency over narrative authenticity.

Based on these findings, several recommendations are proposed. At the institutional level, it is recommended that police personnel be provided with trauma-informed training to ensure more sensitive and accurate handling of survivor narratives. Efforts should be made to incorporate verbatim or near-verbatim recording practices in FIR documentation to preserve the authenticity of lived experiences. Gender-sensitive reporting mechanisms, including the availability of trained female officers, should also be strengthened to encourage more open disclosure by survivors. At the legal and policy level, FIR drafting procedures should be revised to allow greater narrative flexibility while maintaining legal clarity, ensuring that survivor voices are not excessively filtered or restructured. The incorporation of human-rights-based and victim-centered language frameworks is also essential to make legal documentation more inclusive and representative.

From a linguistic perspective, there is a need to raise awareness among legal practitioners and law enforcement officers regarding the impact of passive voice, euphemistic language, and excessive legal jargon on the representation of trauma. Training in forensic linguistics and critical discourse awareness should be integrated into police training curricula to promote more responsible language use. Active voice constructions should be encouraged to clearly identify agency, and unnecessary linguistic abstraction should be minimized in initial reporting stages. Finally, at the social level, broader awareness campaigns are necessary to reduce stigma surrounding the reporting of sexual violence and to promote collaboration between legal institutions and women protection organizations.

Overall, this study highlights the critical role of language in shaping justice processes and emphasizes that meaningful legal reform must include not only procedural changes but also discursive and linguistic awareness. Future research may expand this work by incorporating larger datasets, cross-regional comparisons, or alternative CDA



## Vol. 4 No. 4 (April) (2026)

frameworks to further explore how institutional language constructs and constrains the representation of trauma in legal contexts.

### References

- Ahmed, H. R. (2021). The role of forensic linguistics in crime investigation: Uses in legal proceedings. *Anglisticum Journal*, 10(2), 23–31.
- Applying Grice's maxims to FIR (First Information Report): A forensic linguistic analysis of murder cases. (2026). *Qualitative Research Journal for Social Studies*, 3(1), 493–501. <https://doi.org/10.63878/qrjs887>
- Arsanti, M., & Setiana, L. N. (2020). Pudarnya pesona bahasa Indonesia di media sosial (Sebuah kajian sosiolinguistik penggunaan bahasa Indonesia). *Lingua Franca: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 4(1), 1–12.
- Correa, M. (2013). Forensic linguistics: An overview of the intersection and interaction of language and law. *Studies About Languages*, 23, 94–100. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.23.5020>
- Gueboudj, S., Bareche, K., & Bouregba, A. (2025, May). *Sociolinguistics and forensic linguistics: What relationship?*
- Hutton, L. (2018). Analyzing judicial language: A discourse analysis approach. *Linguistic Analysis in Law*, 10(1), 23–39.
- Jahara, J., Munirah, M., & Syamsuri, A. S. (2022). Application statement analysis conversation of the murder case at the Makassar District Court (forensic linguistics). *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 8(2), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.8.2.5435.110-118>
- Kredens, K. (2016). Forensic linguistics in police investigations. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of forensic linguistics* (pp. xxx–xxx). Routledge.
- Lailiyani, P. N., Suswandi, I., & Zahra, T. Y. Z. (2025). The implementation of forensic linguistics in a premeditated murder case in Malang. *Humanis*, 29(4), 480–494.
- Naznin, S., Bashir, B., & Khan, F. (2022). The importance of forensic language in law. *Competitive Social Sciences Research Journal (CSSRJ)*, 3(2), 801–809.
- Rijal, S. (2018). Budaya agraris dalam konsep idiom bahasa Indonesia: Kajian antropolinguistik. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 1(1), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v1i1.8>
- Tariq, S., Sattar, A., & Tehrim, T. (2026). Narrating trauma and empowerment: A literary analysis of “Someone Like Her” by Awais Khan. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 9(1), 692–697.
- Tehrim, T., Irfan, H., & Khan, S. (2026). Meditation to meaning: A genre-based analysis of spiritual poetic discourse in *A Soul's Meditation*. *Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review*, 4(2), 82–101.
- Wicaksana, S. D. (2023). Kajian linguistik forensik dalam penyidikan kasus pembunuhan Engeline. *Humanis: Journal of Arts and Humanities*.
- Yuliastuti, E., Aini, M. R., & Sukaito, Y. (2023). Forensic linguistics as a scientific study in the field of law and justice. *Humanis*, 8(1), 33–41.