Pragmatic Discourse in Legal Drama: Analyzing Cross Examination Strategies in 'The Lincoln Lawyer'

Aatiqa Shahzadi
aatiqa514@gmail.com
MS Scholar, Department of English, Govt. College Women University Sialkot, Pakistan

Iram Rubab

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Govt. College Women University, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: * **Aatiqa Shahzadi** (aatiqa514@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT
This study aims to explore the pragmatic strategies used by the lawyers, during cross examination, either for desired answers or seeking truth. In this regard, fictional courtroom cross examination scenes of two seasons of An American legal drama series 'The Lincoln Lawyer' have been taken. Qualitative research approach is used for this research. Data was gathered through purposive sampling methods, eight courtroom scenes of cross examination from season one and nine scenes from season two have been taken. Data has been analyzed through the analytical framework proposed by Gibbons'(2003), 'Person targeted and Idea targeted pragmatic strategies'. Findings of this research reveal that person targeted strategies play a critical role to control the situation and attain suitable answers. This study emphasizes the use of pragmatic strategies, will serve as a contribution in the existing body of knowledge on pragmatics and legal linguistics.
Keywords: Legal linguistics, Pragmatic strategies, Cross examination, Drama fiction, Gibbons' pragmatic strategies.

INTRODUCTION
Law and legal language, due to specific terminology, often hinders common man's understanding. Moreover, linguistic strategies used by lawyers and legal experts during court room trials are unknown for the witnesses. Courtroom interactions happened among lawyers, jury, judge, witness, etc. every stakeholder desires to get suitable information that performs well in their interest, for such purpose they usually manipulate the existing fact and truth. Real time access to such courtroom proceedings are not in everyone's hand yet fictional depictions use for such purpose. The portrayal of interrogation techniques in fictional courtroom settings can inform discussions about media literacy and its implications for societal perceptions of law enforcement and legal procedures. However, the extent to which these pragmatic strategies accurately reflect real-life interrogation practices and their impact on audience perceptions of legal discourse and the criminal justice system remains understudied. Hence, the current study is under taken to uncover the layers involves for the understanding of legal system.

The reason behind these courtroom practices is to attain the suitable information weather by manipulating the circumstances presented by the witness or by taking control of conversation, during witness' testimony, to shape the narrative understand courtroom examination and how attorneys structure their questions in cross examinations. Fictional courtroom settings in legal dramas present nearest possible scenario of the courtroom. This research focuses on the Pragmatics aspect of questions asked by law experts, during courtroom cross examination of fictional settings. The portrayal of interrogation scenes in legal dramas often relies on the strategic use of pragmatic strategies, such as presupposition, implicative, and indirect speech acts, to enhance dramatic tension and convey character motivations. However, the extent to which these pragmatic strategies accurately reflect real-life interrogation practices and their impact on audience perceptions of legal discourse and the criminal justice system remains understudied. Hence, the current study is under taken to uncover the layers involve for the understanding of legal system.

Cross Examination is a crucial aspect of Interrogation, serving as a primary means to extract information, establish facts, and ensure justice. However, the effectiveness and ethical implications of interrogation techniques have been subject to scrutiny, particularly regarding the role of pragmatic strategies. Pragmatic strategies encompass linguistic and communicative tactics employed to achieve specific goals in discourse. Law and legal system is developed by the use of language that's the reason when laymen call for witness during court proceedings, people encounter language issues due to complexities involved in courtroom interactions. During courtroom examinations, language in the form of questions play a vital role in shaping the narratives. It reveals linguistic exploitations for the achievement of legal goals. Legal discourse involves some extra-linguistic factors, which makes it necessary to analyze it in two aspects: language and context. The area that is associated for this particular field is called Pragmatics which means text serves the specific linguistic purpose of aligning the author's intentions and his utterances. Similarly, legal discourse occurs in different genres, one such genre is cross-examination. This stage of examination involved carefully designed questions to engage witnesses and sometimes judges in the interrogation process by counsels. This leads to convolution in the form of questions response typology. The aim of the attorney is to get the nearest truth from the witness called for testimony by the opposite party. Questions used as weapons to challenge the statements by the stakeholders of trial included witness and accused (Najafi, 2020).

Furthermore, to understand courtroom examination and how attorneys structure their questions in cross examination, this research focuses on the Pragmatics aspect of questions asked during cross examination of fictional setting. To understand courtroom examination and how attorneys structure their questions in cross examination, this research focuses on the Pragmatics aspect of questions asked during cross examination of fictional setting in American legal drama series.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Danet (1980) declares that "law would not exist without language". Law and language have strange relationships as understanding of law is deeply rooted in the understanding of language (Sanni, 2022). Legal communication seems to be scary by ordinary language users due to non-standard constructions, unconventional grammatical rules, passive forms and nominalization (Sanni, 2022). In this regard, several researchers have executed different researches in domain of interrogation strategies carried out during cross examination in courtroom trials. Savchuk (2018) focuses on the communication interactions in courtrooms and strategies in language behaviors of lawyers during judicial discourse. Findings reveal that linguistic features used in judicial speeches are distinct and defined. Scholarship on linguistic pragmatics and media studies provides a theoretical foundation for analyzing the portrayal of interrogation in legal dramas. Previous research on linguistic strategies in film and television, such as implicative, presupposition, and indirect speech acts, offers insights into how these techniques are employed to create dramatic tension and convey character intentions. Examples of specialized television series include legal dramas, typically set in courtrooms or law firms, and medical dramas, primarily situated in hospitals and featuring extraordinary or uncommon medical cases within a narrative framework. These genres stand apart from others like family dramas or sitcoms due to the specific communicative contexts they depict.

Cooke (1995) relates the strategic questioning, in courtrooms proceedings, used by the law experts (lawyers during examinations) as a foundation to nullify or dishonor answerer's sworn statements. It, additionally, stands against answerer's personal trustworthiness. Ashfaq & Rubab (2024) explored the rhetorical patterns and communicative intensions behind the suicide notes used in Pakistani TV dramas through genre analysis. Tasneem (2024) explored the power dynamics in fictional courtroom settings for the critical discourse analysis of language used in cross-examinations of Pakistani dramas. Authors of legal and medical dramas, if they aim for realism in portraying lawyers or surgeons at work, must necessarily consider the intricacies of professional practices, procedures, and the unique expressions of the characters they craft. Therefore, understanding the characteristics of these genres requires a multimodal analysis, which encompasses the description of images and the interactions among images, scripts, and sounds. Additionally, there's a need for a more profound examination of elements within television series that are often regarded as 'secondary' and are undervalued both by scholars and audiences. Ullah and Rehman (2024), using quantitative research

approach, analyzed the questioning strategies in Pakistani courtrooms, employed during the cross examinations.

Gibbons (2003) made a fizzy distribution between pragmatic strategies of person targeted and Idea targeted situations. First strategy (Person targeted) deals with tactics to target the witness for the purpose of discrediting the testimony in the court. Second strategy (Idea targeted) depicted as manipulating the chain of events for one's benefits. Person Targeted strategies challenge the credibility of the witness, character assassination is also included in it. While Idea targeted strategies challenge the content provided by the other party as well as disregard the answers by witness (Najafi, 2021).

Table 1.1 *Pragmatic strategies in using questioning forms by Gibbons (2003)*

Person-Targeted strategy	Idea-Targeted strategy
Status manipulation	Vocabulary choice
Address forms	Hedging
Personal pronoun	Repetition
Contrast	Reformulation
Distorting modality and the infallibility	Reformulation as a speech act label
Accommodation	Presupposition
Turn taking	Natural narrative structure
Exploiting bias	Negative suggestions
	Three-part structure
	Evaluative third parts
	Interruption

Research Questions

- What kind of pragmatic strategies do influence the interrogators to choose one form of questions over other during cross-examinations?

METHODOLOGY

This paper involves qualitative research design by using the framework proposed by Gibbons (2003), a model of pragmatic strategies as idea targeted and person targeted to help get suitable answers by the witness during cross examinations in the courtroom. Researcher uses purposive sampling and takes selected episodes of two seasons of legal drama 'The Lincoln Lawyer' are taken on the bases of cross examination scenes in a courtroom. Being a public property, the dialogues are taken form the series at Netflix. Utilizing a qualitative content analysis approach, specific episodes featuring interrogation sequences have to be selected for in-depth examination. Selected episodes containing cross examinations scenes form two seasons of this drama is taken as follows

Table: 1.2 *Selected Scenes from Season 1*

Episodes	Scenes	Cross-Examinations Duration
Episode#7	Scene 1	14:02-18:02
Lemming Number Seven	Scene 2	26:58-28:26
	Scene 1	08:12-09:43

Episode#8	Scene 2	14:04-16:08
The Magic Bullet Redux	Scene 3	27:27-27:57
	Scene 4	36:24-37:22
	Scene 5	42:06-42:17
Episode#9 The Uncanny Valley	Scene 1	17:06-23:00

Table: 1.3 *Selected Scenes from Season 2*

Episodes	Scenes	Cross-Examinations Duration
Episode#7 Cui Bono	Scene 1	25:41-34:12
	Scene 2	40:15-41:20
	Scene 1	04:47-05:22
Episode#8 Covenants and Stipulations	Scene 2	06:35-07:36
	Scene 3	21:20-22:26
	Scene 4	23:03-24:58
Episode#9 The Fifth Witness	Scene 1	10:52-13:12
	Scene 2	14:38-16:02
	Scene 3	20:42-21:42

DATA ANALYSIS

Data has been analyzed through Gibbons' (2003) model of pragmatic strategies as Person targeted and Idea targeted.

Analysis of cross examinations scenes of episode No. 7 'Lemming Number Seven'

Two witnesses are cross examined during two courtroom scenes.

Cross examination of witness 1 in scene 1

Mr. Haller: "Are you a trained psychologist, Deputy?" (Grossman, 2022, 16:54-16:56)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Haller: "Were you even though your probationary period?" (Grossman, 2022, 17:50-17:53)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Deputy Murray: "No, I was not." (Grossman, 2022, 17:54-17:56)

To conclude this scene, its eminent that if Mr. Haller started moving towards the most control questions in his pragmatic strategy of person targeted along with the idea targeted situation he may saves much of his time by getting the desired information from the witness but somehow, Mr. Haller leaves an impression that deputy is not worth mentioning witness in the following case. The gist of this cross examination was to target the person himself as incapable of any testimony so defense attorney, for this sake of using person targeted pragmatic strategy. During this scene, idea targeted strategies are missing especially reformulation technique to divert the chain of events.

Cross examination of witness 2 in scene 2

Mr. Haller: "Detective Kinder, at what point in the investigation … wasn't Lara Elliott, but Jan Rilz?" (Grossman, 2022, 26:48-26:56)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Detective Kinder: "At no point … the primary target." (Grossman, 2022, 26:58-27:03)

Mr. Haller: "Wait, so you never questioned … against him?" (Grossman, 2022, 27:03-27:11)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Golantz: "Objection, Your Honor. … Where is this going?" (Grossman, 2022, 27:11-27:14)

To conclude this scene Mr. Haller could not successfully create a strong doubt but to pave new ways for detective's finding. As defense cannot successfully attain any required information so Mr. Haller preserves the right to summon this witness again. For the purpose of getting suitable information in first sitting, attorney misses turn taking technique using person targeted strategy.

Findings of cross examinations scenes of Episode No. 8 'The Magic Bullet Redux'

Four witnesses are cross examined in five courtroom scenes.

2.1 Cross examination of witness 3 in scene 1

Mr. Haller: **"**In that email, … lunch with him?" (Alvarez, 2022, 08:30-08:33)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Ms. Patel: "I threw it out … we could bury the hatchet." (Alvarez, 2022, 08:33-08:38)

Mr. Haller: **"**Trevor never offered you that opportunity, did he?" (Alvarez, 2022, 09:32-09:34)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Ms. Patel: "Not in terms of a job. No" (Alvarez, 2022, 09:35-09:37)

To conclude, Mr. Haller succeeded in proving Miss Patel's witness as a grudge and opportunity against his client. Throughout the same defense uses a person targeted pragmatic strategy by exploring an element of corruption in Ms. Sonia Patel's testimony. Attorney in this cross examination exploiting biases in person targeted strategy while idea targeted strategies are missing.

Cross examination of witness 4 in scene 2

Mr. Haller: "Mr. Loomis, isn't it true … threw out your entire report?" (Alvarez, 2022, 14:26-14:31)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Loomis: "That was one … I've worked hundreds." (Alvarez, 2022, 14:31-14:34)

Mr. Haller: "Is this a copy of the report … thrown out by the court?" (Alvarez, 2022, 15:12-15:17)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Loomis: "Yeah" (Alvarez, 2022, 14:18)

To conclude this cross examination in which Mr. Haller consciously used person targeted pragmatic strategy to highlight a loop holes and an element of corruption in the previous case by Mr. Loomis. Mr. Haller's questions somehow diverted juries mind from current case to the previous one. Attorney uses reformulation technique to describe the whole event.

Cross examination of witness 5 in scene 3

Mr. Golantz: "Mr. Muniz, I'm sorry, but I'm just trying … Were any of the same deputies involved in the arrest of Mr. Whyms and Mr. Elliott?" (Alvarez, 2022, 27:27-27:38)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Muniz: "I don't think so. The two incidents … 12 hours apart." (Alvarez, 2022, 27:39-27:43)

Mr. Golantz: "So, are you aware … these two crimes?" (Alvarez, 2022, 27:44-27:48)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Muniz: "No, sir. I just shot … for Malibu." (Alvarez, 2022, 27:49-27:54)

To conclude the same, Mr. Golantz gets nothing out of it although he throws least controlling questions and ask about the opinion of witness. Mr. Golantz cannot gets suitable information by using each of two strategies as person targeted and Idea target pragmatic strategies. These strategies do not work accordingly if they are adopted randomly or without being thoughtful.

Cross examination of witness 2 in scene 4

Mr. Haller: "I said there was evidence … you knew nothing about this, correct?" (Alvarez, 2022, 36:34-36:42)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Detective Kinder: **"**That's correct." (Alvarez, 2022, 36:43)

Mr. Haller: "Now, tell me something, … wouldn't that be a strong lead you would normally investigate?" (Alvarez, 2022, 36:57-37:09)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy is used by asking tag question)

Detective Kinder: **"**Of course it would. But as I already testified, … until now." (Alvarez, 2022, 37:09-37:15)

To conclude this cross examination Mr. Haller does not satisfy the jury and detective Kinder to add some other potential accusers and the beneficiaries of the murder into this investigation so rather choosing specific strategy Mr. Haller shuffles between all person targeted and idea targeted pragmatic strategy, still stand nowhere near to prove his client not the only beneficiary of the murder.

Cross examination of witness 6 in scene 5

Mr. Golantz*:* "I have two questions … Did you kill Jan Rilz?" (Alvarez, 2022, 42:06-42:08)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Shavar: "Of course not." (Alvarez, 2022, 42:08-42:10)

Mr. Golantz**: "**Did you instruct … anyone to kill Jan Rilz?" (Alvarez, 2022, 42:11-42:14)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Shavar: "Absolutely not." (Alvarez, 2022, 42:15-42:16)

To conclude, Mr. Haller succeeded in proving Miss Patel's witness as a grudge and opportunity against his client. Throughout the same defense uses a person targeted pragmatic strategy by exploring an element of corruption in Ms. Sonia Patel's testimony, using more of controlling structure of questioning as tag questions and alternative questions.

Analysis of cross examinations scenes of Episode No. 9 'The Uncanny Valley'

In this episode, one witness is cross examined in one scene.

Cross examination of witness 7 in scene 1

Mr. Golantz**: "**Isn't it a fact that you were afraid … to protect herself financially?" (Alvarez, 2022, 20:22-20:29)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Haller: "Objection. Call for speculation." (Alvarez, 2022, 20:29-20:31)

Mr. Golantz**: "**And the fact that it … just a coincidence then?" (Alvarez, 2022, 22:46-22:50)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Haller: "Objections, argumentative" (Alvarez, 2022, 22:51)

To conclude this examination Mr. Golantz gets nothing out of this witness as he categorically denies any kind of link with the following murder trial and the murder as well. Mr. Golantz could get more out of it by interplaying between person targeted as well as Idea targeted pragmatic strategies asking more of controlling questions and getting suitable information.

Season-2

Analysis of cross examinations scenes of Episode No. 7 'Cui Bono'

In the following episode, two witnesses are cross examined by defense attorney Mickey Haller, during two scenes. Judge Teresa Medina is presiding over this murder trial.

Cross examination of witness 1 in scene 1

Mr. Haller: "Did you check Lisa … her mirrors broken?" (Stein, 2023, 26:26-26:31)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Detective O'Brien: "They were not." (Stein, 2023, 26:34-26:35)

Mr. Haller: "You had tunnel vision. You found an easy suspect, … distract you from that path." (Stein, 2023, 34:42-34:48)

(**Person targeted pragmatic strategy**)

Detective O'Brien: "No, no! I did not know about … letter. And if I had, I---" (Stein, 2023, 34:48-34:53)

To conclude the scene Mr. Haller throughout uses Idea targeted pragmatic strategy towards detective O'Brien and structural interplaying of questions between least controlling to the most controlling for getting his acquired information. Although detective could not totally aware of the other dimensions of victim's personal and professional life which hinders to get along. However, careful use of person targeted strategies provide way more to the attorney.

Cross examination of witness 2 in scene 2

Mr. Haller: "You said "technically" … not currently under investigation. Is there more to that story?" (Stein, 2023, 40:15-40:22)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Vasquez: "Alex Grant may not be currently under investigation … mean he is in the clear." (Stein, 2023, 40:26-40:30)

Mr. Haller: "Okay if Mitchell Bondurant were alive, … you might want to talk to about Alex Grant?" (Stein, 2023, 40:48-40:53)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

To conclude this scene, Mr. Haller cannot openly create any doubt in the minds of jury about the investigation taken place by FBI agent. As Mr. Haller uses Idea target pragmatic strategies but Miss Andrea's continuous objections create interruption and prevent the defense to attain his suitable answers. Prosecutor's interruptions have to tackle using alternative questions.

Analysis of cross examinations scenes of Episode 8 'Covenants and Stipulations'

In the following episode, four witnesses are cross examined during four scenes.

Cross examination of witness 3 in scene 1

Mr. Haller: "Many times, I am sure. … the hammer just shows up at the exact same time my client happens to be on trial for murder." (Stein, 2023, 05:08-05:20)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

To conclude the same Mr. Haller not thoroughly but somehow leaves a question on the reliability of the evidence using Idea targeted pragmatic strategy because the murder weapon was just found before the start of trial and not by the last six months. Attorney here signifies use of particular strategy at right time to fulfill the purpose of getting desired answers.

Cross examination of witness 1 in scene 2

Mr. Haller: "If your research was so thorough, … unnoticed for six months?" (Stein, 2023, 06:57-07:02)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Haller: "My apologies. But I'm curious, Detective, … we should not trust anything you say?" (Stein, 2023, 07:24-07:32)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

The first witness is called again for cross-examination, during their first interaction Mr. O'Brien found himself unaware of certain dimensions of investigation so during second attempt Mr. Haller uses both person targeted and Idea targeted pragmatic strategies to showcase Mr. O'Brien's investigation not worth mentioning and reliable because how come out of nowhere after 6 month of the murder, weapon was discovered, Ms. Andrea's objection for Mr. Haller to withdraw this witness. To counter the idea targeted strategy of interruption used by the prosecution, Defense attorney may get some more insight and reveal the truth.

Cross examination of witness 4 in scene 3

Mr. Haller: "The night you are referring … to the hospital that night because of a medical emergency and not because of an injury from a fight?" (Stein, 2023, 21:20-21:31)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Ms. Stern: "I never heard … any medical emergency." (Stein, 2023, 21:32-234)

Mr. Haller: "One point five million dollars. That's what it cost you … That's why you have a grudge against her. Isn't it?" (Stein, 2023, 22:15-22:22)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

This scene of cross examination between defense attorney Haller and Lisa Trammell's neighbor Miss Renee Stern, who proved a pivotal witness against Lisa. Being a neighbor of Lisa, Ms. Stern highlights Lisa's angry issues. Mr. Haller's cross examination takes this witness towards another dimension of personal gain for going against his client. They have some shared property and Mr. Haller uses person's targeted strategy to establish an impression about Ms. Stern as a beneficiary of Lisa proved guilty in the court and a grudge against her which pushed her to testify against her neighbor. Attorney uses person targeted strategies of exploitation of biasness.

Cross examination of witness 5 in scene 4

Mr. Haller: "Would you say … developers like Mr. Bondurant?" (Stein, 2023, 23:22-23:26)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Kim: "I deleted the rest." (Stein, 2023, 24:00-24:01)

Mr. Haller: "Mr. Kim, would you say … Ms. Trammell was just trying to defend herself?" (Stein, 2023, 25:23-25:43)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Kim: "I--Look, I know what I saw." (Stein, 2023, 24:44-24:47)

Throughout the examination Mr. Haller uses Idea targeted pragmatic strategy of portraying only that side of events which prove beneficiary to Mr. Kim and prosecution, moving towards the person targeted as an act of corruption by Mr. Kim for not describing the whole incident but going with the perception of prosecutor. Defense attorney uses visual effects that leads against the narrative of the witness as using person targeted as well as idea targeted pragmatic strategies.

Analyses of cross examinations scenes of Episode No. 9 'The Fifth Witness'

In the following episode, two witnesses are cross examined during two scenes.

Cross examination of witness 6 in scene 1

Ms. Andrea: "You seem to make a lot of enemies … who had a restraining order against you." (Humphrey, 2023, 10:52-10:57)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Ms. Trammell: "All I did was protest." (Humphrey, 2023, 10:57-10:59)

Ms. Andrea: "He had to get as far … as possible, huh?" (Humphrey, 2023, 12:55-12:58)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Haller: "Objection." (Humphrey, 2023, 12:58)

Ms. Trammell: "That piece of s*** was lucky to have me." (Humphrey, 2023, 12:59-13:01)

To include this scene, prosecutor gets nowhere near to link Lisa by the murder of Mr. Bondurant. Notwithstanding, she succeeded to show Lisa's short tempered nature and lose of self-control in the minds of jury. Prosecutor focuses more to exploit the evil side of witness rather to get the circumstances lead against the accused. Through this scene, researcher analyses that Idea targeted strategies are intensively missing during this cross examination.

Cross examination of witness 7 in scene 2

Ms. Andrea: "I am sure. But … crossed a line with you?" (Humphrey, 2023, 14:42-14:44)

(Person targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Morales: "No, I don't think so." (Humphrey, 2023, 14:52-14:53)

Ms. Andrea: "Enough to make you quit your job?" (Humphrey, 2023, 15:24-15:25)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Mr. Morales: "---didn't like the way … She just snapped at me." (Humphrey, 2023, 15:33-15:40)

This cross examination taken place between prosecuting attorney Andrea Freemann and Lisa Trammell's employee Rene Morales. Miss Andrea Freemann establishes an image of Lisa as anxious and furious Boss. Although his employee testify in another way, still Miss Freemann presents a social media conversation Mr. Morale about the upsetting behavior of Lisa, four years ago. Miss Andrea, despite Morale's confession that 4 years ago, that fight was just a spur of the moment still Miss Andrea was more convinced to prove Miss Lisa as a short tempered lady. Prosecutor uses, during this scene, person targeted strategies as infallibility trap while turn taking techniques are missing that elaborates the higher command on the conversation.

Cross examination of witness 8 in scene 3

Ms. Andrea: "Did you examine … scene yourself, Doctor Arslanian?" (Humphrey, 2023, 20:55-20:58)

(Idea targeted pragmatic strategy)

Dr. Arslanian: "No, but I did examine every police photo … Nothing he would have been staring up at." (Humphrey, 2023, 20:59-21:09)

In the following scene prosecutor attorney Ms. Andrea highlights the probability of Mr. Bondurant's killing by the hands of Ms. Trammell. During examination-in-chef, Dr. Arslanian proved it impossible for somebody with the height of Ms. Trammell to hit at the top of Mr. Bondurant's head. However, prosecutor attorney Ms. Andrea with same height shows the possibility of looking towards something on the sky instinctively putting his head towards the sky. Using Idea targeted pragmatic strategies, prosecutor ask more of controlling questions, creating mildest doubt against Ms. Trammell. Prosecutor misses the goal and unable to make guilty to accused by missing infallibility trap in person targeted strategy while in idea targeted strategies, negative suggestions are missing.

CONCLUSION

During cross examinations, the aim of a lawyer is to get appropriate answers to proof his client narrative, for such purpose attorneys use different strategies it can be pragmatic or structural strategies. This current study describe how attorneys in a fictional legal setting use different strategies to control the narrative and attain their desired information. From pragmatic strategies of person target, Lawyers of 'The Lincoln series' most of the time utilize accommodation turn taking and exploitation of biases while for Idea targeted situation they use pre-supposition, reformulation, negative suggestions and interruptions. Without carefully using the strategies, the cross examination does not always succeeded in his goal. However using others strategies within person targeted strategy like status manipulation, address form and personal pronoun creating a contrast and in Idea targeted situation vocabulary choices, hedges, repetition, three parts structure natural, for controlling the narrating of the other person. As for structural aspect of questions, attorneys of this series shuffle between leases to most controlling questioning strategies. However, the shuffling is random every time, careful choice of the structural formation of questions can help the lawyer to control the situation and acquired his expected answers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Prosecutors should throw their questions according to their pre-determined target, either they want to expose the person by hitting the person's targeted strategy by dishonoring the witness or the testimony, brought forth by the opposing party, as Idea targeted strategy.
- Attorneys should have asked questions more sort of controlling the situation in which they can get their suitable answers.
- Law students should train in a way to use every possible strategy related to their questioning structure; both grammatically and pragmatically for the sake of truth revealing or getting desired answer.

REFERENCES

Sanni, O. (2022). A review of legal language: A new direction for legal communication.
Academia Letters, Article 5746.

Gibbons, J. (1999). Language and the law. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 156-173.

Najafi, F. H. (2021). The Role of Pragmatic Strategies in Interrogation in Legal Discourse:
The Case of Shiraz. Journal of Language Horizons, 5(1), 221-236. doi: 10.22051/LGHOR.2020.32000.1330

Tasneem M. (2024) *A critical discourse analysis of language used in courtroom cross examination in Pakistani dramas*[Unpublished Master's dissertation] Govt. College Women University Sialkot.

Ashfaq, S. & Rubab, I. (2024). Genre Analysis of Suicide Notes in Pakistani TV Dramas: Unravelling Rhetorical Patterns and Communicative Intensions. International Journal of Academic Research for Humanities, 4(1), 11-18. https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.00000, 1065028

Cooke, M. (1995). Aboriginal evidence in the cross-cultural courtroom. In D. Eades (Ed.),
Language in evidence: Issues confronting Aboriginal and multicultural (pp. 55-96). University of New South Wales Press.

Danet, B. (1980). Language in the legal process. Law and Society Review, 14(3), 445- 564. https://doi.org/10.2307/3053192

Cooke, M. (1995). Aboriginal evidence in the cross-cultural courtroom. In D. Eades (Ed), Language in evidence: Issues confronting Aboriginal and multicultural (pp. 55-96). University of New South Wales Press.

Gibbons, J. (2003). Forensic linguistics: An introduction to language in the justice system. Blackwell.