

A Hate and Provocative Speech Act in Social Media: A Forensic Linguistics Study

Sarifuddin¹, Tadjuddin Maknun¹, Ery Iswary^{1*}

¹Faculty of Cultural Science, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia

*Correspondence: ery.iswary@unhas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to: (1) explain the types of provocative speech acts of Natalius Pigai on YouTube social media, (2) explain the forms of provocative speech acts on YouTube social media. The data in this study are languages that are supposed to contain provocative criminal acts on YouTube social media. The data source in this study is the social media YouTube. The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative method, data collection techniques in the form of viewing and documentation. The data were analyzed using the steps of (1) identifying, (2) classifying, and (3) analyzing. The results of this study indicate that: Natalis Pigai's utterances on social media contain literal indirect speech acts, while locutionary speech acts use declarative locutions, expressive illocutions, and get hearer to think about perlocutions (make the interlocutor think about). These statements violate the Criminal Code, Article 160 and Article 161 regarding sedition. Keywords: provocative speech acts, social media, forensic linguistics.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Published September 30th 2021



KEYWORDS

Provocative Speech, Social Media, Forensic Linguistics

ARTICLE LICENCE

© 2021 Universitas Hasanuddin
Under the license CC BY-SA
4.0



1. Introduction

Technological developments make a person communicate with many people at the same time. People are increasingly dependent on getting information quickly through social media accounts such as youtube, facebook, twitter, path, whatsapp, blackberry messenger, line, etc. A number of these social media provide various kinds of convenience in communicating with various features embedded in them. On the other hand, information and communication technology also has a negative impact which causes the emergence of new crimes by using internet sites as their mode of operation which is called cyber crime (Hamuddin, et al., 2020). This has an impact on social life, such as hate speech, incitement/provocation, defamation, fake news, violence and sexual harassment so that this is not in accordance with the function of language. Solan & Tiersma in Sholihatini (2019: 50) state that language crimes can be committed with various kinds of speech acts. The act of speaking in different ways can serve the purpose of encouraging or persuading another person to commit a crime. A crime is not only committing an illegal act, but a person can be punished for inviting, ordering/asking, persuading, or encouraging others to do something (crimes that harm others), in other words this is called the crime of sedition Hamuddin, ET AL., (2019). The use of social media must be accompanied by intelligence in communicating on social media because the potential for violating the law on social media is very vulnerable, especially in the interaction space. Based on the aspect of its function, the language used as a communication tool often experiences semantic and pragmatic errors. Errors or impoliteness in language can drag speakers into the realm of law. One of the criminal acts that occur in misusing information on social media is incitement/provocation.

According to Pusat Bahasa in Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia (2008), provocation is taking action to arouse people's hearts to be angry (against, rebel, and so on). In the Criminal Code, provocation is contained in Articles 160 and 161.

Every year there are cases of incitement that occur on social media. This proves that language can prove a crime that can be proven through the framework of forensic linguistic

studies. Linguists use linguistics to help deal with legal cases. The linguistic science used is forensic linguistics.

Forensic linguistics according to McMenamin (2002: 4) is a scientific study of language applied for forensic purposes and legal statements. Meanwhile, according to Olsson (2004: 3) forensic linguistics is the relationship between language, crime, and the law which includes law enforcement, legal issues, legislation, disputes or legal processes, even disputes that have the potential to involve several violations of the law aimed at get a legal solution.

Olsson (2004) states that the forensic linguistics is the application of linguistics to legal issues. That is, in the application of forensic linguistics, many have to do with linguistic evidence for legal purposes. For example, the study of the language of the legislation, the language of the trial, the interrogation by the police of people suspected of committing crimes and even the analysis of voice recordings of conversations for the sake of investigation.

This study focuses on the case of incitement/provocation of Natalius Pigai that occurred on social media. Speeches containing incitement/provocation were analyzed using forensic linguistic theory as a grand theory with pragmatic studies (types and forms of speech acts). The results of the analysis were reviewed based on the Criminal Code to find a juridical effect on initiating/provocation on social media.

2. Theoretical Background

The development of forensic linguistics in Indonesia is marked by an awareness of the importance of language elements in an investigation at the police station. Forensic linguistics entered Indonesia in the 1980s-1990s. The application of linguistics in the legal field is used in resolving cases of defamation, threats, extortion, murder, disputes, plagiarism, corruption and so on (Susanto, 2017: 15).

The presence of forensic linguistics in the legal world helps in examining the speech that appears with the speech contexts that support it. In this regard, the task of linguists is very necessary in analyzing the things that are in this linguistic aspect. However, linguists cannot determine the type of punishment given to the defendant because this is something that is outside of language.

Forensic linguistics according to Coulthard and Johnson (2010: 50) applies linguistic theories in linguistic events involved in legal processes, both in the form of legal products, interactions in judicial processes, and in interactions between individuals that result in certain legal impacts. The applied linguistic theories include grammar theory, conversation, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, speech acts, descriptive linguistic theories and techniques, such as phonetics and phonology, lexis, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, and text analysis.

Olsson (2004: 3) forensic linguistics is the relationship between language, crime, and the law which includes law enforcement, legal issues, legislation, disputes or legal processes, even disputes that have the potential to involve several violations of the law aimed at getting a resolution. law. Forensic linguistics applies linguistic theories in a linguistic event that involves a legal process (Subyantoro, 2019). Therefore, forensic linguistics is a linguistic study related to the investigation of violations of the law. Saletovic and Kisicek in Santoso, (2013) state that forensic linguistics is a branch of applied linguistics that examines interactions, language, crime, and law. That is, forensic linguistics combines linguistics with law, examines the relationship between language and enforcement, problems, disputes or processes in law and legislation that have the potential to involve a number of violations of the law or the need to obtain legal remedies.

Pragmatics is the study of linguistics which studies the relations between language and its speech context (Weda, et al., 2021). The context of the speech in question has been grammatized and codified in such a way that it cannot be separated from its linguistic structure at all.

According to Leech (1983: 15) pragmatics is the study of meaning conveyed by speakers (writers) and interpreted by listeners (readers). This discipline has a lot to do with the analysis of

what people mean and what they say. Pragmatics also examines behavior that is motivated by conversational goals, helping the speech partner interpret or interpret the speaker's utterance intent. According to Verhaar (2016: 14) pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that discusses the structure of language as a means of communication between speakers and listeners, and as a reference to language signs in extralingual matters being discussed.

Searle in his book *Speech Acts Essay in The Philosophy of Language* (Yule, 1996: 78) states that pragmatically there are three forms of action that can be realized by a speaker, namely locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary act. The following is an explanation of the three speech acts.

Locutions are speech acts to express something. This speech act is referred to as The Act of Saying Something, Wijana, (1996: 17). Nadar (2009:14) states that an illocutionary speech act is an action that the speaker wants to achieve when he says something and can be an act of stating a promise, apologizing, threatening, predicting, ordering, asking and so on. According to Chaer and Agustina (2012: 53) perlocutionary speech acts are speech acts that relate to the presence of other people's speech in connection with non-linguistic attitudes and behavior of others.

Crimes are not only illegal acts, but a person can be punished for inviting, ordering/asking, persuading, or encouraging others to do something (crimes that harm others), in other words this is called the crime of sedition, Solan and Tiersma in Sholihatin, (2019: 51). The act of inciting is regulated in Article 160 of the Criminal Code which reads as follows:

Barangsiapa dimuka umum dengan lisan atau tulisan menghasut supaya melakukan perbuatan pidana, melakukan kekerasan terhadap penguasa umum atau tidak menuruti baik ketentuan undang-undang maupun perintah jabatan yang diberikan berdasar ketentuan undang-undang, diancam dengan pidana penjara paling lama enam tahun atau pidana denda paling banyak empat ribu lima ratus rupiah.

Whoever in public orally or in writing incites to commit a criminal act, commits violence against a public authority or does not comply with both the provisions of the law and the order of office given based on the provisions of the law, is threatened with a maximum imprisonment of six years or a fine at most four thousand five hundred rupiah.

Furthermore, Article 161 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code reads:

Barang siapa menyiarkan, mempertunjukkan atau menempelkan di muka umum tulisan yang menghasut supaya melakukan perbuatan pidana, menentang penguasa umum dengan kekerasan, atau menentang sesuatu hal lain seperti tersebut dalam pasal di atas, dengan maksud supaya isi yang menghasut diketahui atau lebih diketahui oleh umum, diancam dengan pidana penjara paling lama empat tahun atau pidana denda paling banyak empat ribu lima ratus rupiah.

Anyone who broadcasts, displays or puts up a writing in public which incites to commit a criminal act, opposes the general authorities by force, or opposes something else as referred to in the article above, with the intention that the content that incites is known or is better known by the public, be punished by a maximum imprisonment of four years or a maximum fine of four thousand five hundred rupiahs

Language crimes often occur on social media. Van Dijk (Nasrullah, 2015) states that social media is a media platform that focuses on the existence of users who facilitate users in activities and collaboration. Therefore, social media can be seen as an online medium (facilitator) that strengthens the relationship between users as well as a social bond. Meanwhile, according to Suhariyanto (2011: 2) social media is an online media, which supports social interaction where users can easily adapt, share, and create content. Social media is very diverse, so people can access it easily and use it for social interaction.

Social media is called online social networking because social media has social power that greatly influences public opinion that develops in society. The existence of social media is basically a form that is not much different from the existence and workings of computers (Rahman, et al., 2019).

Recognition, communication, and cooperation can be analogous to how computers work which also form a system as there is a system between individuals and society, (Suhariyanto, 2011: 3).

3. Methodology

This research is a type of descriptive research with a qualitative approach. The data of this research is the language that contains the provocative speech acts of Natalius Pigai (NP) on the social media YouTube, while the source of the data in this study is the social media YouTube. The technique used in collecting data is a look-see and documentation method. The data analysis technique uses the steps of identifying, classifying, and analyzing.

4. Finding and Discussion

The finding and discussion above are considered on discourse context as in the following:

Discourse conte : Natalius Pigai on Democracy System in Indonesia	
Topic	: Indonesia President must from certain region in Indone
Speech	NP: <i>"Sekarang Presiden satu daerah, satu pulau (Jawa) Wakil Presiden satu pulau (Jawa). Terus sekarang yang berasal dari luar pulau (Jawa) apa babu gitu? Sampai kapan mau jadi babu?"</i>
	R: <i>"Jadi babu? Jadi, menurut kakak kalau presiden dan wakil presidennya satu pulau, dianggap di luar (pulau) itu babu gitu?"</i>
	NP: <i>"Eh bro, tunjuk pulau yang empat tahun bro. Memang orang Sumatera tidak bisa jadi presiden? Orang Sulawesi tidak bisa jadi presiden?"</i>

4.1 Speech Acts

Sentences in speech are literal indirect speech acts. Direct non-literal speech acts are speech acts that occur when the speaker uses a sentence according to the mode but the speaker does not use words that are actually meaningful in accordance with the intent of the speech. That is, the words used by the speaker are not in accordance with the intent of the utterance.

The sentence reads "Now the President is one region, one island (Java) and the Vice President is one island (Java). So now those who come from outside the island (Java) are called *babu* like? How long do you want to be a slave?" The meaning of the speech is that now those who are president and vice president in Indonesia are from the island of Java so that people from outside the island of Java are only errands. The speaker also questioned how long people from outside Java could only serve as errands so that they could not become president.

At the end of the sentence, there is a question mark which is an interrogative sentence. However, the interrogative sentence is not meant to simply ask a question. The real meaning is ordering or ordering the interlocutor to explain and analyze the meaning of the speech. This is supported by the question asked again by the interviewer about the meaning of the sentence spoken by the speaker. At the end of the speech, the speaker again does not answer the first question, but gives a question that has the same meaning as the first question, but uses a different sentence.

4.2 Kind of Speech Acts

A speech act is a theory that focuses on how to use language in communicating the speaker's intentions and purposes and the purpose of using language. This study uses Searle's speech act analysis of 5 provocative utterances on YouTube social media that can lead to criminal

acts. These utterances are classified based on the form of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts.

The above statement contains a dialogue between the interviewer and Natalius Pigai, an activist of Human Rights from 2012-2017 from Papua. The forms of speech act in the above speech are:

a. Locution

In the dialogue, Pigai uses declarative locutions to tell the interviewer that: "Now the president is one region, one island (Java) and vice president is one island (Java). Pigai assumes that people from outside Java are *babu*. The above utterance is also a locutionary question spoken by Natalius Pigai to the interviewer in relation to one another. The function of the interrogative sentence is to dig deeper information about being a *babu* which is often spoken by Natalius Pigai.

b. Illocution

The form of illocutionary speech acts in the above speech is an expressive illocutionary act. Expressive speech acts are speech acts intended by the speaker so that the speech is interpreted as an evaluation of the things mentioned in the speech. Expressive speech forms are: praising, thanking, criticizing, complaining, blaming, congratulating, and flattering.

The speech above is an expressive speech act because the speech is critical of the democratic system in Indonesia because the president and vice president are from Java. The speaker also said that people from outside Java were considered a *babu*.

c. Perlocutionary

The form of the perlocutionary speech act in the above speech is get the hearer to think about (making the interlocutor think about). In the speech spoken by Natalius Pigai has perlocutionary (get hearer to think about). Natalius Pigai's statement, which criticized the democratic system in Indonesia, then stated that the president and vice president came from the island of Java, so that people outside of Java were considered *babus*. The utterance made the speech partner, the interviewer, repeat Pigai's statement by saying "So *babu*? So, according to you, if the president and vice president are on the same island, it's considered a *babu* outside (the island)?" Pigai's utterance makes the interlocutor think about the meaning of the speech intended by the speaker.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of data analysis, it was found that Natalis Pigai's utterances on social media contained literal indirect speech acts, while locutionary speech acts used declarative locutions, expressive illocutions, and perlocutions (get the hearer to think about).

Such speech is considered a form of provocative/incitement that can cause feelings of hatred or hostility to certain individuals and/or community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group. The information is widely circulated through social media, especially YouTube so that it can be categorized as having committed a crime. acts against the law by spreading information that can provoke/incite.

References

- Chaer, A. (2014). *Linguistik Umum Edisi Revisi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Chaer, A. (2012). *Linguistik Umum : Edisi Revisi / Abdul Chaer*.
- Coulthard, M dan A. Johnson. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Hamuddin, B., Syahdan, S., Rahman, F., Rianita, D., & Derin, T. (2019). Do They Truly Intend to Harm Their Friends?: The Motives Beyond Cyberbullying among University Students. *International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning (IJCBPL)*, 9(4), 32-44.

- Hamuddin, B., Rahman, F., Pammu, A., Sanusi Baso, Y., & Derin, T. (2020). Cyberbullying Among EFL Students'blogging Activities: Motives And Proposed Solutions. *Teaching English with Technology*, 20(2), 3-20.
- Leech, G. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman
- McMenamin. (2002). *Forensic Stylistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Nadar, F.X. (2009). *Pragmatik & Penelitian pragmatik*. Graha Ilmu.
- Nasrullah, R. (2015). *Media Sosial; Perspektif Komunikasi, Budaya, dan Sositologi*. Bandung : Simbiosis Rekatama Media.
- Olsson, J. (2004). *Forensic Linguistics (second edition)*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Pusat Bahasa. (2008). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Rahman, F., Abbas, A., Hasyim, M., Rahman, F., Abbas, A., & Hasyim, M. (2019). Facebook Group as Media of Learning Writing in ESP Context: A Case Study at Hasanuddin University. *Asian EFL Journal Research Articles*, 26(6.1), 153-167.
- Santoso, I. (2013). *Mengenal Linguistik Forensik: Linguis sebagai Saksi Ahli*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Sholihatin, E. (2019). *Linguistik Forensik dan Kejahatan Berbahasa*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Subyantoro. (2019). Linguistik Forensik: Sumbangsih Kajian Bahasa dalam Penegakan Hukum. *ADIL Indonesia Jurnal*, 1(1), 36-50.
- Suhariyanto. (2011). *Komunikasi dalam Media Massa*. Bandung: Simbiosis Rekatama Media.
- Susanto. (2017). Potensi dan Tantangan Forensik Linguistik di Indonesia. *ILSIA*, (3), 5–7.
- Verhaar, J. W. M. (2016). *Asas-asas linguistik umum*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Weda, S., Atmowardoyo, H., Rahman, F., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2021). Linguistic aspects in intercultural communication (IC) practices at a higher education institution in Indonesia. *Eroupean Language Scientific Journal*, 14, 2-6.
- Wijana, I Dewa Putu. (1996). *Dasar-dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press