

Types of Defamation Speech Acts on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in 2017-2019

Adibatina Hidayatillah [✉], Subyantoro Subyantoro, Haryadi Haryadi

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

27 May 2021

Accepted:

21 June 2021

Published:

30 August 2021

Keywords:

types of speech act;
defamation; social
media

Abstract

Nowadays, technological advances make it easier for us to access many things. Technology, especially the internet, can be easily accessed so that everyone can use it without exception. Social media, which is the outcome of technological advances, certainly has some negative impacts. One of the most common impacts, especially in Indonesia, is the defamation speech act. This study discusses the types of defamation speech acts on social media in the 2017-2019 period. It is qualitative descriptive research employing a theoretical approach namely forensic pragmatics. The data in this study were speeches suspected to contain elements of defamation on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in 2017-2019 and violated the ITE Law Article 27 paragraph (3) which has pragmatic power in the form of speech and the type of impoliteness strategy. The data in this study were collected utilizing screenshots of posts on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in 2017-2019 containing elements of defamation and violating the ITE Law Article 27 paragraph (3). This study applied the observation method. The equivalent method was used to analyze the data. The results of this study show that 43.34% of the defamation speech acts are in the form of assertive illocutionary speech act, 40% of expressive illocutionary speech act, 10% of directive illocutionary act, and 33.33% commissive and declarative illocutionary speech act.

[✉] Correspondence address:

Gedung A Kampus Pascasarjana UUNES

Jl. Kelud Utara III Semarang 50237

E-mail: adibatinahidayati@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The technology that is getting more advanced certainly has various impacts nowadays. The impacts can be both positive and negative. With the internet, advances in information technology can be operated by using electronic media such as computers or cellphones (Gultom, Elisatris, Didik, 2005; Ahmad, 2012). Technology, especially social media, is something that almost all mankind has, regardless of any group (Wahyudi & Sukmasari, 2018). Thus, the negative impacts coming from the advancement of technology are not easy to prevent.

The technology along with the internet today can be accessed very easily by the wider community. Many criminal acts also often arise on the internet, especially on social media. Kaplan & Haenlein (2010) stated that social media is the meeting of two concepts, namely Web 2.0 and User Generated Content (UGC). Social media allows users to co-create content and share it with other users around the world (Ružić, 2009). Social media has also positive impacts on its users, yet on the other hand, it can be detrimental or have negative impacts and can be easily used by someone who is not responsible (Partodihardjo, 2010). Actions of technological crimes, known as cybercrimes, are quite familiar to us. Those are pornography, hackers, account breaches, and even defamation are common on news channels. These crimes are certainly very distressing for the public. Among these technology-based crimes, defamation is one of the most talked-about topics in Indonesia. Thus, the use of language certainly cannot be separated from the socio-cultural factors of the speaking community (Yuliyanti et al., 2020).

Defamation on social media can be reported by the victim to the police on charges of violating Article 27 paragraph (3) of Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (UU ITE) because the speech is suspected to contain elements of insult and defamation of the self-esteem of the victim. Projodikoro (1967) explained that each

individual has a different sense of honor from one another so that it is not easy for legal officials to determine when an insult happens. What is merely a concrete limitation of the accusation is that this criminal act of defamation can only be sued on trial on a complaint of a defamed person. Defamation speech acts in conversations on social media show that speakers want their interlocutors to be embarrassed in public (Sholihatin, 2020).

To understand speech in interactions, Austin (1962) in Speech Act Theory describes speech acts as communicative acts in which the speaker acts through utterances in a certain context. Austin assumed that saying something means does something and that speech act can be divided into three actions: locution, illocution, and perlocution (Yuliyanti et al., 2020; Domaneschi et al., 2017; Lee, 2016; Oishi, 2006). Searle extends the concept of speech acts in Austin and outlines the theory of speech acts by identifying the conditions needed for the realization of speech acts. Consequently, the successful execution of speech acts depends on whether the constituent conditions are met and realized in a contextually appropriate manner. Searle also proposes an illocutionary classification that includes: assertive action, directive action, commissive action, expressive action, and declarative action (Licea-Haquet et al., 2019; Liu, 2011; Searle, 1979). Feelings of humiliation in the object of insulting a speech do not need to be proven in court because one's honor is seen as low in the eyes of others depending on the personal nature of the object of humiliation (Lamintang dan Samosir, 1993). Speech in the criminal act of defamation is typical speech. On the other hand, social media is currently a crucial alternative communication in the life of Indonesian people to socialize, update news, discuss things, and do business. The internet network is now growing and developing in all areas so that almost all people can easily access social media. The increasing use of social media in everyday life certainly has the opportunity for more and more speech to emerge through it (Supriyono et al., 2020).

Freedom of speech alongside the ITE Law is a hot topic among Indonesian people. Pros and cons are everywhere. Therefore, this study aims to explore these problems. It will discuss the speech act forms of defamation on social media in the 2017-2019 period.

METHODS

Both theoretical and methodological approaches are used in this research. The theoretical approach applied is a forensic pragmatic approach, while the methodological approach applied is a qualitative approach and descriptive approach. The data in this study are in the form of speech acts that are suspected to contain elements of defamation which are said to have pragmatic power in the form of speech and the type of impoliteness strategy by netizens on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in 2017-2019. The speech was chosen because it was considered interesting to be examined and was suspected of containing elements of defamation and violating Article 27 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law. The data were collected by screenshotting the posts on various social media. The observation method was employed in this research (Sudaryanto, 2015). From the observation, the author obtained 30 posts containing defamation on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook during 2017-2019. The data analysis method in this study is a stage where the researcher tries to deal directly with the problems contained in the data (Sudaryanto, 1993). The analysis used in this study was the equivalent method. The results of this study were presented using informal data presentation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The speech act is an utterance containing a certain meaning. Each speech act has its types which can be divided into several categories. The act of illocution is known as the act of doing something. Searle classified illocutionary speech acts into five types of speech acts where each type has a communicative function namely

assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative (Rahardi, 2017) (Nisa, K., & Manaf, 2021).

Assertive Defamation Illocution

(1) SPEECH : “Bagi yg tau keberadaan pasutri ini,tlg infonya ya..mereka penipu ulung.dan tdk ada itikad baik untuk menyelesaikan hutang piutangnya.sdh bnyk korbannya.trmsuk saya.mohon hati2 buat smuanya.jgn terpedaya dgn cara mereka memelas untuk cari simpati”.

CONTEXT : TWITTER ACCOUNT @HULK_IDN WRITES AN ANNOUNCEMENT STATING THAT @GRACE_NAT ASKED THE HULK TO RAISE THE ISSUE OF GRACE AND AHOK RELATIONSHIP

Based on the data above, the speech is an assertive act functioned as acknowledging. The speaker of @hulk_idn admitted that it was Grace who told him to raise the issue of her relationship with Ahok so that the popularity of the Indonesian Solidarity Party (PSI) would increase. The speaker also mentioned that now Grace had betrayed him for leaking Grace and Ahok's scandal videos. Speakers think that Grace herself is degrading the women. The speech is defamatory because the speaker provokes the public not to believe in Grace.

Based on the results of the analysis, speech uttered by the account of @hulk_idn is an assertive speech act functioned as acknowledging which is marked by the sentence “isu hubungan grace dan Ahok untuk naikkan popularitas PSI”, the speech act incites the public because the speaker does not include valid evidence or data so that the speech can be concluded as defamation.

(2) SPEECH : “Bagi yg tau keberadaan pasutri ini,tlg infonya ya..mereka penipu ulung.dan tdk ada itikad baik untuk menyelesaikan hutang piutangnya.sdh bnyk korbannya.trmsuk saya.mohon hati2 buat

smuanya.jgn terpedaya dgn cara mereka memelas untuk cari simpati.”

CONTEXT: SPEAKER @LILIKSRISUGIYANTI UPDATES A PHOTO WITH A CAPTION THAT ANNOUNCES THERE IS A COUPLE THAT HAS DECEIVED HER AND CALLED EVERYONE TO BE CAREFUL FOR THEM.

Based on the data above, the speech is an assertive speech act functioned as reporting. Speaker of @lilikrisugiyanti reported a husband and wife who were considered to have deceived her. In the speech, the speaker stated that the couple did not have good intentions to apologize to her and solve their debt problems. The speakers also incited the public not to believe in the couple because according to the speaker, they were deceivers who had deceived many victims, including herself. The speaker also conveyed that the couple cheated in a pitiful way to seek sympathy. The speech is defamatory because the speaker incites the public not to believe in someone without being accompanied by valid evidence or data.

Based on the results of the analysis, speech by @lilikrisugiyati is included in assertive speech act functioned as reporting. This is indicated by the phrase “mereka penipu ulung.dan tdk ada itikad baik untuk menyelesaikan hutang piutangnya.sdh bnyk korbannya.trmsuk saya.mohon hati2 buat smuanya.jgn terpedaya dgn cara mereka memelas untuk cari simpati”. The speech includes reporting because the speaker describes it in detail, but the speech is included in the seductive speech because the speaker spreads accusations without valid evidence.

These results indicate that the assertive illocution of defamation with the function of giving witness is mostly used by speakers on social media. The factor behind this is that speakers try to testify as convincingly as possible so that the public can be influenced by the negative opinions of speakers aimed at the interlocutors. This is reinforced by the situation put forward by Subyantoro (2019) that language is important and as a practical tool for creating

laws in the society which then makes assumptions to readers (speech partners). As in speech (3) where the speech by Ahmad Dhani directly stated that Ahok was a religious blasphemmer.

Directive Defamation Illocution

(3) SPEECH : Punya anak dulu x.” “Bu udh jual diri ya skrg pantes olahraga gt amat laki u miskin si,, obral brp smlm 5jt ya gm.”

Caption: “Berkata yang tidak pantas tanpa berpikir apa setiap perkataan harus di pertanggung jawabkan. Saya sangat tidak ingin buang waktu saya Dan perkarakan setiap komentar tetapi dalam perkataan anda ini saya rasa mulut anda perlu kembali di ajarkan etika berbicara. Sampai bertemu di kantor polisi ya mba @yasminemercy”

CONTEXT: SPEAKER SENDS A MESSAGE TO @SHANDYAULIA'S INSTAGRAM ACCOUNT ASKING @SHANDYAULIA TO HAVE HER FIRST CHILDREN AND ACCUSING @SHANDYAULIA OF SELLING HERSELF FOR 5 MILLION.

Based on the results of data analysis, @yasminemercy's speech is a directive speech act. The speech is in the form of ordering. In this speech, the speaker impolitely instructs @shandyaulia, namely telling her to have children first in an inappropriate situation. The speaker has also insulted @shandyaulia by saying that @shandyaulia sold herself for IDR 5,000,000.

Based on the results of the analysis, the speech is included in the illocutionary speech act of the directive in the form of orders marked with the sentence. “Punya anak dulu x.” “Bu udh jual diri ya skrg pantes olahraga gt amat laki u miskin si,, obral brp smlm 5jt ya gm.” This speech includes directive speech because the speaker asks the interlocutor to do what she orders but in a harsh manner and gives insinuations to sensitive things toward the life of the interlocutor.

(4) SPEECH : “Wirang org gila emang dia siapa. Kita hny percaya ama Allah. Wirang cuma cari nama biar tenar.”

CONTEXT : SPEAKER (@WARDAHGALUH) COMMENTS THE IMAGE FROM (@NUR.MAMA) ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF THE WIRANG FORTUNE-TELLING AYU TING TING AT TELEVISION EVENTS. IN THE SENDING OF THE PICTURE, IT IS WRITTEN THAT THE PREDICTION OF THE WIRANG ABOUT OF AYU TING-TING IS FAKE.

Based on the results of data analysis, the speech of @wardahgaluh speakers is a directive illocutionary speech act. The speech is a directive in the form of accusing. The speaker alleged that Wirang was a crazy man because his predictions were deemed untrue. In KBBI (Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia) crazy is insane. In this case, the speaker considers that Wirang is insane. The speaker does not believe Wirang's predictions, which are only considered as public lies. The speaker also thought that Wirang only wanted to get famous with his predictions which were considered to be false. The speaker also invites readers not to believe Wirang's predictions, she invites readers to believe only in Allah.

Based on the results of the analysis, the speech is a directive illocutionary speech act in the form of accusing. It is marked by the sentence “Wirang org gila emang dia siapa. Kita hny percaya ama Allah. Wirang cuma cari nama biar tenar”. In that sentence, the speaker said that the interlocutor was a crazy man and the things that he did only to seek popularity.

We can conclude from the above results that the directive defamation illocution is frequently used by speakers to give direction. In its realization, it is to instruct the interlocutors to obey what the speaker wants, as in speech (4) which is as if the speaker orders the interlocutor to isolate and give social sanctions to people who are said to have insulted religion. This is in line with the research conducted by Djanggih & Qamar (2018), stating that when the judge gives a sentence, the judge also sees the cultural values

that exist in society, which means that the community plays an important role in decision making.

Expressive Defamation Illocution

(5) SPEECH : “Maaf...kgk useh melotot gitu keles.... tuh kota lo banjir kgk usah sok sibuk ngurusin kota org bu...lo keder kan bu kota lo kena jg ma banjir... makan tuh cebong2 yg baru netes

Anies: Kenapa mbak kok mrengut?

Risma: Surabaya banjir Mas

A: Santai, Mbak., itu slah saya... Saya yg tanggung jawab

R: Trus sy harus ngapain mas?

A: biar sy yg beresin... Mbak kan udah 10 tahun jadi Walikota. Sekarang tinggal ngatur lalu lintas di

CONTEXT : FACEBOOK ACCOUNT ZIKRIA DZATIL UPLOADING PHOTOS OF THE MAYOR OF SURABAYA (TRI RISMAHARINI) AND THE GOVERNOR OF DKI JAKARTA (ANIES BASWEDAN) WITH CRITIQUES TO TRI RISMAHARINI THAT IS CONSIDERED UNDERMINING HER.

Based on the data above, Zikria Dzatil's speech is an expressive speech act functioned as a critique. The speaker criticized the mayor of Surabaya for being unable to cope with floods and told her not to be too busy taking care of other cities because his city still could not handle flooding. The speech is an expression of the speaker's disappointment towards the Surabaya mayor who is deemed unable to cope with the floods. The speech slandered the good name of government officials because it accused and slandered them without any valid data or evidence and incited all citizens to stop believing in Tri Rismaharini's government.

Based on the results of the analysis, the speech is an expressive speech act functioned as a critique. This is evidenced by “kgk useh melotot gitu keles.... tuh kota lo banjir kgk usah sok sibuk ngurusin kota org bu...lo keder kan bu kota lo kena jg ma banjir... makan tuh cebong2

yg baru netes” and “Mbak kan udah 10 tahun jadi Walikota. Sekarang tinggal ngatur lalu lintas di”. This speech is included as criticizing because the speaker criticized the results of the interlocutor’s performance as the mayor of Surabaya by saying that she had not yet been able to solve problems in Surabaya City during her reign, such as floods.

(6) SPEECH : “Haloooo selamat malam @bpjskesehatan_ri yang terhormat @jokowi @jusufkalla @prabowo @aniesbaswedan apakah etis sebuah lembaga seperti @bpjskesehatan_ri yg menunggak pembayara ke rsud-rsud mengadakan acara seperti ini? Dinner bpjs, fasilitas, luar biasa,. di saat teman2 tenga kesehatn yg mengabdikan hanya untuk menolong sesama sedang menekan erat kantongnya karena gaji yg belum turun karena @bpjskesahatan_ri menunggak pembayaran, mereka @bpjskesehatan_ri sedang berfoya-foya di ...”

CONTEXT: INSTAGRAM ACCOUNT @IFKARBIRRI UPLOADING A PHOTO OF BILLS AT A HOTEL IN JAKARTA BY WRITING THAT SUCH BILLS ARE BILLS FROM EVENTS HANDLED BY THE BPJS KESEHATAN.

Based on the data above, the speech is an expressive illocutionary speech act functioned as a critique. The speech is spoken by the speaker to criticize the government agencies, namely BPJS Kesehatan. He expressed his disappointment because the BPJS Kesehatan was suspected of holding an event with a large budget. According to the speaker, the BPJS is still in arrears in payment fees at various hospitals, but instead organizes events using a very large budget. The speaker deeply regrets what BPJS Kesehatan has done. When health workers are devoted to helping others and are struggling for the cost of living because their salaries have not been given due to BPJS Kesehatan which is in arrears of payments. The speaker provoked the public to join in accusing BPJS Kesehatan of using very large budgets for useless activities. The speaker has accused

without valid evidence. Thus, the speech is considered defamation because it has insulted the reputation of the institution.

Based on the results of the analysis, the speech is included in expressive illocutionary speech act functioned as critique. This is indicated by “apakah etis sebuah lembaga seperti @bpjskesehatan_ri yg menunggak pembayara ke rsud-rsud mengadakan acara seperti ini? Dinner bpjs, fasilitas, luar biasa,. di saat teman2 tenga kesehatn yg mengabdikan hanya untuk menolong sesama sedang menekan erat kantongnya karena gaji yg belum turun karena @bpjskesahatan_ri menunggak pembayaran, mereka @bpjskesehatan_ri sedang berfoya-foya”. The speech includes a speech act of criticism because the speaker conveyed criticism to the government institution that is considered to be having fun where there is an important issue that has not been yet resolved by the institution.

The expressive defamation illocution is mostly used to criticize. This is because many people prefer to express their dislike using critique. It is possibly done to look more polite because the public considers the interlocutors being criticized are in a higher position than the speakers themselves. This can be seen in the speech (27) where the public criticized Ussy who is a public figure. This is possible because nowadays there are more and more cases of insults and defamations on social media which then makes people think twice before posting something on social media, after all, the good intentions of criticizing sometimes become a boomerang for them (Kusno, 2015). The expressive pragmatic function of complaining is that speakers are bound by speech to express psychological attitudes which are intended so that their speech is interpreted as an evaluation that is uttered by the speakers (Safrihady & Mardikantoro, 2017).

Commissive Defamation Illocution

(7) SPEECH : Dedy: “Coba aja tanya ke kalbis bener gak dulu da kampus

namanya STIE KALBE di jalan s parman yg sekarang udah tiada.”

Accuser: “Diem aja masalah pelecehan giliran kampus diklarifikasi. Emang bangsat lo.” “Gue udah cek, lo gausa ngajarin gue. Ajarin penis lo, bau.”

Dedy: “Aku bener bener stop utk jawab kamu, krn percuma. Orang yang tidak suka sama kita tdk memerlukan penjelasan kita.”

Accuser: “PREDATOR KONTOL”

Caption: “Gasuka sama lo? Woy. Lo predator, terus minta disukain? Lo pikir lo gebetan gue?”

CONTEXT: THE SPEAKER (REVINA VT) AND THE INTERLOCUTOR (DEDY SUSANTO PJ) ARE CONFLICTING ABOUT THE CASE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT WHICH DEDY SUSANTO IS CONSIDERED TO BE THE SUSPECT.

Based on the results of the analysis, the speech from Revina VT is a commissive illocutionary speech act. It is a commissive in the form of swearing because speakers make swears by using harsh words to the interlocutor, Dedy Susanto PJ. The conversation happened because the speaker did not trust the interlocutor regarding their tertiary educational background which was considered manipulative by the speaker. However, apart from these problems, the speaker also expressed her frustration because the interlocutor only clarified the issue of educational background, the issue of harassment which was considered important was ignored by him. The speaker also insulted him by calling the genitals of the interlocutor stinky and calling the interlocutor the predatory dick. In the Indonesian Dictionary, predator means animals that eat other animals, but in the phrases spoken by the speaker, predatory dick means predators of the genitals intending to satisfy their desires.

Based on the data analysis, the speech is a commissive illocutionary act in the form of swearing. This is evidenced by the phrase "stinky penis" and "predatory dick". The speech act includes a swear speech act because the speaker

uttered harsh words and even swore involving human's vital organs.

Based on the results of the analysis, the commissive defamation illocution has one speech and it functions as swearing. The speech is speech (29). Mills (2003) states that speakers using harsh words or words that are less polite are assumed to have intended to commit immodesty to be rude. As is the case with the speaker in speech (29) who is assumed to have the intention to speak harshly so that he/she can defame the interlocutors.

Declarative Defamation Illocution

(8) SPEECH: “Betina anjing gak punya moral. Followers situ banyak anak2 yg masih labil. Dasar janda laknat semoga karma secepat nya datang buat anak perempuan kamu ya di perkosa tu rame2 Amin amin yr’a.”

CONTEXT: THE SPEAKER COMMENTS A POST FROM @DENADA ABOUT HER ATTITUDE AS IMMORAL AND GIVES BAD PRAYERS FOR HER CHILDREN.

Based on the results of the analysis above, the speech from @leza_zulkify account is a declarative illocutionary speech act because the speech aims to pray for bad things which are marked with the sentence “I hope karma comes as soon as possible for your daughter, raped by many people amin amin yra.” This sentence is a prayer sentence that is bad for @denada. The speech from @leza_zulkify also insulted @denada with the words “female dog” and “cursed widow.” The word female is a calling for a female animal, while the phrase female dog means a female dog (in this case it has a negative meaning when used to criticize someone). In the online Indonesian Dictionary, widow means a woman who is no longer married because of a divorce or because her husband has died, while curse means a cursed person. The phrase “cursed widow” means a cursed woman who has no husband anymore.

Defamation in the form of insulting is a false accusation of honor or a person's good

name based on ethnicity, religion, religious sect, beliefs, race, color, ethnicity, inter-group, diffable, gender, or sexual orientation. It is also in the form of incitement to discrimination, violence, or hostility. In the speech, the speakers argue that Denada is an immoral cursed widow by marking Denada as a “female dog” and “cursed widow”. This speech clearly contains an insult because the speaker has defamed @denada, so the speech can be concluded as a form of insulting defamation.

Based on the results of the analysis, the declarative defamation illocution has one speech and it functions as deciding. The speech is speech (30). It is most likely that it has become the intention of the speaker to say impolite

words and even pray for bad and inappropriate to the interlocutor’s children. As stated by Mills (2003), if a speaker uses harsh words or words that are not polite, the speaker may have intended to commit acts of impoliteness to be rude. If the speech acts of verbal exchanges are studied and the level of politeness is measured, the court will be able to confirm the pain or harm to the speakers’ words (Carney, 2014). It is as in the case of the speaker in speech (30) who is assumed to have the intention to speak harshly so that they can defame the interlocutors.

The speech act forms of defamation on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in 2017-2019 are presented in the following table.

Table 1. The speech act forms of defamation on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in 2017-2019.

No	Speech Act Forms of Defamation	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Assertive	13	43,34%
2.	Directive	3	10%
3.	Expressive	12	40%
4.	Commissive	1	3,33%
5.	Declarative	1	3,33%
Total Number		30	100%

Based on the data analysis in table 1, it can be seen that defamation speech acts on social media in 2017-2019 are mostly assertive illocutionary acts found by 43.34%, followed by expressive illocutionary acts by 40%, then directive illocutionary acts by 10%, and the least are commissive and declarative illocutionary acts by 33.33%.

CONCLUSION

The findings on the analysis of defamation speech act on Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook are divided into several categories namely assertive speech act (in the form of acknowledging and reporting), directive (in the form of ordering and accusing), expressive (in the form of criticizing), commissive (in the form of swearing or using harsh words to the interlocutors), and declarative (in the form of deciding).

On the other hand, it is known that in Indonesia, there are still many defamation speeches. In this study, there are 30 samples of defamation speech data on social media in 2017-2019, namely types of defamation speech acts with details: 13 assertive defamation illocution, 3 directive defamation illocution, and 12 expressive defamation illocution, 1 commissive defamation illocution, and 1 declarative defamation illocution. The assertive illocutionary speech act is the most dominant defamation speech act on social media Instagram, Twitter, and Facebook in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writers thank Prof. Dr. Fathur Rokhman, M.Hum, Rector of Universitas Negeri Semarang and Prof. Dr. Agus Nuryatin, M.Pd, Director of Pascasarjana Universitas

Negeri Semarang who have provided opportunities to conduct this scientific study

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, A. (2012). Perkembangan Teknologi Komunikasi Dan Informasi. *Dakwah Tabligh*, 13, 137–149.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things with Words*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839429693-021>
- Carney, T. (2014). Being (im)polite: A forensic linguistic approach to interpreting a hate speech case. *Language Matters*, 45(3), 325–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10228195.2014.959545>
- Djanggih, H., & Qamar, N. (2018). Penerapan Teori-Teori Kriminologi dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan Siber [Implementation of Criminological Theories in Cyber Crime Prevention]. *Pandecta: Research Law Journal*, 13(1), 10–23.
- Domaneschi, F., Passarelli, M., & Chiorri, C. (2017). Facial expressions and speech acts: experimental evidence on the role of the upper face as an illocutionary force indicating device in language comprehension. *Cognitive Processing*, 18(3), 285–306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-017-0809-6>
- Gultom, Elisatris, Didik, M. (2005). *CYBER LAW Aspek Hukum Teknologi Informasi*. PT Refika Aditama.
- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>
- Kusno, A. (2015). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kesopanan pada Kasus Delik Penghinaan dan Pencemaran Nama Baik. Seminar Nasional PRASASTI II “Kajian Pragmatik Dalam Berbagai Bidang,” 88–93.
- Lamintang dan C. Djisman Samosir. (1993). *Delik-Delik Khusus*. Tarsito.
- Lee, E. L. (2016). *Language and Culture*. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.26>
- Licea-Haquet, G. L., Velásquez-Upegui, E. P., Holtgraves, T., & Giordano, M. (2019). Speech act recognition in Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 141, 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.12.013>
- Liu, S. (2011). An experimental study of the classification and recognition of Chinese speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1801–1817. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.031>
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nisa, K., & Manaf, N. A. (2021). Analysis of Illocutionary Speech Acts on Student's Social Media Post and Comments. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 10(1), 62–67.
- Oishi, E. (2006). Austin's Speech Act Theory and the Speech Situation. *Esercizi Filosofici*, 1–14. <http://www2.units.it/eserfilo/art106/oishi106.pdf>
- Partodihardjo S. (2010). *Kenali Narkoba dan Musuhi Penyalahgunaannya*. Esensi.
- Projodikoro, W. (1967). *Tindak-tindak Pidana Tertentu di Indonesia*. Bandung: PT. Eresco. PT. Eresco.
- Rahardi, D. R. (2017). Perilaku pengguna dan informasi hoax di media sosial. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 5(1), 58–70.
- Ružič, P. (2009). *Rural tourism*. Institute for Agriculture and Tourism Poreč.
- Safrihady, S., & Mardikantoro, H. B. (2017). *Jenis dan Fungsi Pragmatis Tindak Tutur*

- Masyarakat Melayu Dialek Sambas di Kota Singkawang. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 312. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/14766>
- Searle, J. (1979). A classification of illocutionary Acts. In: *Language in society* 5. Lang. Soc, 5, 1–24.
- Sholihatin, E. (2020). an Analysis of Illocutionary and Perlocutionary Speech Act in Defamation Texts. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 7(1), 49. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v7i1.1438>
- Subyantoro. (2019). Linguistik Forensik: Sumbangsih Kajian Bahasa dalam Penegakan HUKUM. *ADIL Indonesia Journal*, 1(1), 36–50.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa (Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik)*. Duta Wacana University Press.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Supriyono, A. Y., Zulaeha, I., & Yuniawan, T. (2020). The Humanist Expressive Speech Acts of Journalists in the Covid-19 Outbreak. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(3), 264–272. <https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v9i3.41945>
- Wahyudi & Sukmasari. (2018). Teknologi dan Kehidupan Masyarakat. *Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi*, 3(1), 13–24. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/227634-teknologi-dan-kehidupan-masyarakat-7686df94.pdf>
- Yuliyanti, T., Subyantoro, S., & Pristiwati, R. (2020). Form of Hate Speech Comments on Najwa Shihab Youtube Channels in The General Election Campaign of President and Vice President of The Republic of Indonesia 2019. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(3), 254–263.