

Improving Public Literacy in Hate Speech Cases on Social Media as an Effort to Mitigate Legal and Social Impacts

Ahmad Khoironi Arianto

Faculty of Humanities, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

Djatmika

Faculty of Humanities, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

Riyadi Santosa

Faculty of Humanities, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

Henry Yustanto

Faculty of Humanities, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract—Hate speech does not receive serious attention from the community, so hate speech cases often recur. This research seeks to explain the forms and types of potentially criminal speech, especially insults on social media, as well as the mindset developed by insult perpetrators. This research uses a qualitative method that focuses on one issue of defamation. The data source is a copy of the final decision of a defamation case. The data was collected from the Supreme Court website using the observation method. The data was analyzed using pragmatics to interpret the intention of the offender's speech. This study found that the form of insults can be in the form of accusations, curses, a combination of accusations and curses, and ridicule. Furthermore, insults contain violations of maxims in pragmatics, namely violations of the maxim of quality, maxim of wisdom, and maxim of agreement. From a legal perspective, such speech can be prosecuted if it is done intentionally, contains accusations, is disseminated to the public, contains swear words, and defames the victim. Therefore, social media users need to know the dangers of insults, one of which is through insult case literacy. The pattern of behavior shows that speakers focus on Emphasizing their bad things, eliminating their good things, emphasizing their good things, and eliminating our bad things.

Index Terms—literacy, hate speech, social media, pragmatics, law

I. INTRODUCTION

Technological advancement is like two sides of a coin (Anne & Wylie, 2014). The first side can be used to make communication more effective and efficient and the second side can be used to enable hate speech in society. Social media is a technological product that is often misused (Wahyudi & Sukmasari, 2014). Anonymity is used as a weapon by a group of people to launch hate speech (Tazkiyah, 2021). In general, the perpetrators of hate speech do not realize the impact of demeaning other parties. They do not realize the criminal potential that looms over hate speech.

Social media users can post various content, both in the form of writing, images, and videos freely. These posts can be accessed by other social media users anywhere and anytime as long as they are connected to the internet network (Cahyono, 2016). This condition is often misused by some people to vent emotions, spread fake news, or insult other parties. This attitude is considered to be demeaning, degrading, and damaging the dignity of others in public. Victims who feel aggrieved by such posts can report the perpetrators for defamation or insult. People know that hate speech will have a negative impact, but they do not realize that hate speech is often used in social communication.

Hate speech is any behavior that is defamatory, insulting, libelous, unpleasant, inciting, provoking, and spreading false news that results in acts of discrimination or violence that lead to social conflict; and aims to ignite hatred and incite individuals or groups of people consisting of several aspects, namely religion, race, tribe, religious sect, skin color, gender, ethnicity, disability, and sexual orientation (Mangantibe, 2016; Timofeeva, 2002; Nockleby, 2000; Weber, 2000). In line with this understanding, Komnas HAM Indonesia states that hate speech is any act of hatred either directly or indirectly against ethnicity, religion, religious sect, belief, race, class, skin color, ethnicity, gender, disability, and sexual orientation that aims to discriminate. Hate speech can cause violence, casualties, and/or social conflict in various forms.

Speech that encourages hatred is considered harmful and extremely detrimental to its victims (Reddy, 2002; Rosenfeld, 2003; Waldron, 2012). Psychologically, hate speech is hurtful and causes emotional distress in others (Alexander, 2000). The perpetrator demeans the victim by using profanity, insults, slander, and others that can damage

reputation that makes a person or several people treated according to their reputation in society.

Referring to the Circular Letter of the Indonesian National Police Chief Number SE/6/X/2015 on Handling Hate Speech: SE/6/X/2015 on the Handling of Hate Speech mentions several things related to hate speech, including the form, object, distribution media, and handling procedures. There are seven types of hate speech, namely insult, defamation, libel, unpleasant behavior, provocation, incitement, and spreading false news. The speech has an impact on acts of discrimination, violence, loss of life, and/or social conflict. This research focuses on one of the hate speeches, namely defamation.

Insult in the *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (Big Indonesian Dictionary) means the process, manner, or act of demeaning, offending, or bringing down the good name of another person. The act of demeaning another person by using words that offend, accuse, or swear so that the person is considered worthless. In the Legal Dictionary (Simorangkir & Prasetyo, 2008), defamation is defined as a deliberate attack on honor or good name orally or in writing for public knowledge. Both dictionaries highlight the notion of defamation as a deliberate act of attacking another person's honor through accusations or insults either in writing or orally. This definition is the same as the definition of defamation in criminal law formulated in Chapter XVI of the Criminal Code. Defamation is defined as an attack on a person's honor and good name that causes shame. The honor that is attacked is honor in the realm of good name, not in the sexual realm (Soesilo, 1981).

In the digital era, the phenomenon of defamation occurs massively. Therefore, legal norms were created, one of which regulates insults in electronic media. To minimize insults in cyberspace, laws and regulations governing information and electronic transactions were promulgated on April 21, 2008. However, instead of decreasing, hate speech cases are increasing. According to the Supreme Court's decision data, there is an increasing trend, namely in 2016 there were 20 cases, 2017 there were 74 cases, 2018 there were 187 cases, 2019 there were 285 cases, and 2020 there were 326 cases. The most reported cases were defamation-related crimes at 45% followed by other hate speech crimes at 22%. The percentage shows that insult-related crimes tend to be more dominant than other hate speech crimes. This trend indicates that there is a pattern of people's habit of denigrating others on social media. The demeaning attitude of others can be observed through certain polarization so that there will be an appearance of insults, targets of insults, and ways of committing potentially criminal insults.

The phenomenon of insults and hate speech occurs because some people do not realize that their opinions will get mixed reactions. Not a few have led to legal reporting. The expression of hatred that is realized by using language, of course, needs the consideration of linguists. In their consideration, linguists need to understand linguistics. Based on his knowledge, a case can be clearly shown whether it contains certain hatred or not. In the end, the linguist's testimony can be taken into consideration by the judge in deciding the case. Therefore, language literacy for insult cases needs to be done as an effort for oneself and society in general to avoid the potential for criminality and wider horizontal conflict.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies focusing on insults have been conducted through various approaches, one of which is through pragmatics. Pragmatic research in analyzing hate speech on social media focuses on illocutionary speech acts (Karjo, 2016; Ningrum et al., 2018), which focuses on the types of hate speech (Kurniasih, 2019; Permatasari, 2018), and which focuses on politeness strategies (Kusno, 2016; Hartini et al., 2020), which focuses on the principle of cooperation (Budiawan & Rawinda, 2016). However, these studies limited the data sources to only some social media so that the full phenomenon was not obtained. In the study, criticism was categorized into hate speech, resulting in data confusion. Pragmatically, these studies are still conducted partially. No research has been found that focuses on pragmatic aspects such as illocutionary acts, violations of politeness principles, and violations of cooperation principles simultaneously. Research on insults is found on the web and blogs (Gitari, 2016). However, the focus of the study is still on semantic analysis. Context is not prioritized in interpreting the expression so that its validity is doubtful.

Departing from the review of previous research, there are research gaps that need to be examined more deeply. This space exists because the previous approach still emphasizes partial analysis. In terms of language and law, the above research has also not explained the characteristics of speech that can be classified as unlawful from a linguistic perspective. In addition, the behavior patterns of insult perpetrators have also not been scientifically explained. Therefore, this study seeks to explain the forms and types of insults that have criminal potential from a linguistic and legal perspective as well as the behavior patterns of insult perpetrators that are scientifically examined.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study used a qualitative approach. The approach is defined as a social reality research process (Strauss & Corbin, 2003) conducted naturally through words (Creswell, 1998) in the context of events (Blaxter et al., 2001). In data collection, humans are used as research instruments to produce in-depth meaning (Sugiyono, 2013) and social reality is plural, holistic, and formed together with the environment (Santosa, 2021).

This research utilizes a case study. A case study is defined as research conducted using an in-depth examination of something, whether an individual, setting, bookkeeping, document storage, or even a particular event (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Yin, 2013). Yin (2013) adds that the presence of context in case studies is considered important for obtaining

empirical knowledge. The case study used is a multiple case study that focuses on one issue of insults by using several cases on social media.

The cases observed in this study are cases of defamation related to the COVID-19 pandemic, especially those that occurred on social media and have been found guilty by the court through court decisions that have permanent legal force (*inkrah*). The data source in this research is a copy of the case decision found on the Supreme Court website. The copies are in the form of court decision files throughout Indonesia containing criminal cases of defamation related to the COVID-19 pandemic on social media. The data of this study are all utterances containing insults against COVID-19 in the copy of the finalized verdict. The data is obtained by searching the search menu by entering several keywords into <https://putusan3.mahkamahagung.go.id/>.

Based on the type of research and data sources that have been mentioned, the data collection method in this study is the observation method. The observation method is carried out in research related to human behavior (Sugiyono, 2013). This behavior is related to the phenomenon of people socializing through online media. In its implementation, the observation method is supported by basic tapping techniques and recording techniques. The tapping technique is used to tap someone's language use. The use of language in question can be oral and written (Kesuma, 2007). The absence of the researcher directly in the formation and emergence of prospective data is a description of the free tapping technique. The researcher acts as an observer of the formation of prospective data from linguistic events that are outside of him (Sudaryanto, 1993).

In analyzing the data, this study uses a pragmatic framework. In language studies, pragmatics is defined as the study of speech situations (Leech, 1983) in the relationship between language and context which is the basis for explaining language understanding (Levinson, 1983). The focus studied in pragmatics is the acquisition of meaning (Kreidler, 1998; Yule, 1996; Kroeger, 2019) based on the context of speech (Mey, 1993).

The study of insults on social media will be difficult to understand without involving pragmatics. This is in line with the view that to explain whether an utterance contains insulting elements or not requires expertise in pragmatics or other relevant fields (Suhandano, 2017). Insulting speech is part of language use in communication so pragmatics can be applied to find the meaning behind the speech.

In understanding meaning, pragmatics is supported by the use of context. The context determines whether an utterance contains insults or not. In addition, the meaning of insult can also be observed in the form of speech that deviates or deviates from the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness. When the speaker provides information that is not factual, exaggerated, out of context, or ambiguous, then there is an implicature that the speaker wants to convey behind the inaccurate information. Therefore, insulting speech has a close relationship with two principles in pragmatics, namely the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness.

The principle of cooperation is an idea born from an English philosopher named Herbert Paul Grice. He believes that a person should contribute to the conversation according to the need, the level of conversation, and according to the purpose of the conversation (Grice, 1975). A speaker will consider his interlocutor willing to cooperate if the speaker contributes to the purpose of communication according to the rules (Leech, 1983). The principle of cooperation initiated by Grice is considered capable of presenting efficient, rational, and cooperative communication by fulfilling the following four maxims.

- a. Quantity Maxim, speakers must convey information according to the needs of their speech. Speakers should avoid giving too much information.
- b. Quality Maxim, speakers provide correct information and do not provide information that cannot be proven.
- c. Relevance Maxim, speakers provide relevant information in accordance with the issues discussed.
- d. Manner Maxim, speakers avoid expressions that are unclear, not confusing, not prolonged, not forced, and coherent.

The maxims of politeness principle are communication rules to express politeness (Leech, 1983). Leech's politeness rests on four points, namely (1) loss and gain, (2) agreement, (3) praise, and (4) sympathy/antipathy. Leech uses these four points to illustrate the following six maxims of politeness.

- a. Tact Maxim, each participant of the Speech must minimize the harm to others or maximize the benefit to others. In the tactmaxim, there is a tendency that the longer a person's speech is, the greater the person's desire to be polite to the interlocutor.
- b. Generosity Maxim, each participant is obliged to minimize their benefits and maximize their losses.
- c. Approbation Maxim, A speaker should minimize disrespect for others and maximize respect for others.
- d. Modesty Maxim, each participant seeks to minimize self-esteem and maximize self-disrespect.
- e. Agreement Maxim, each speaker minimizes disagreement with others and maximizes agreement between them.
- f. Sympathy Maxim, each speech participant must minimize antipathy and maximize sympathy for others

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

This section describes the research findings related to pragmatics. The first description relates to insulting speech that violates the principle of *gotong royong* and the next description relates to insulting speech that violates the principle of

politeness. Both violations are in the context of insults related to the COVID-19 pandemic on social media in Indonesia. In the next section, the findings will be discussed to find the phenomenon of insults during the COVID-19 pandemic as community learning to be able to mitigate conflict.

A. *Violation of the Cooperation Principle*

(a). *Quantity Maxim*

A. Context: The speaker reads a post "Apparatus urges NTB residents to pray Eid al-Fitr at home". The speaker opposes the government's policy of limiting activities outside the home. Speakers do not agree if the Eid prayer is done in their homes.

Speech: In Lombok, most mosques have been opened, but only for residents. They are still closed to the public. This appeal has a point because the ruler wants to become Dajal.

The quantity maxim requires the speaker to deliver an informative speech without the need to add or subtract to fit what is needed in the speech. In the above speech, the post read by the speakers only contains an appeal to the public to perform Eid prayers at home. The speakers responded to the call with two sentences. The first sentence contains an agreement that during the pandemic the mosque is only used by residents. In the next sentence, speakers refer to the ruler as dajal. The mention shows that there is additional information that is not needed in the context, thus violating the maxim of quantity.

(b). *Quality Maxim*

B. Context: The speaker is watching a story about the arrival of foreign workers to Indonesia during the COVID19 outbreak. The speaker considers that there is an injustice committed by the government against the community and foreign workers.

Speech: Simultaneously, tonight the police raided several places in Jakarta related to CORONA. Chinese people entered Indonesia without being raided.

The maxim of quality requires speakers to provide information that is in accordance with the circumstances or facts that occur. In the above utterance, the speaker informs that the Chinese came without going through a raid. Every foreigner or Indonesian citizen who comes from abroad must go through a health check to prevent the spread of the virus. This shows that what the speaker said is not true so that his speech violates the maxim of quality.

(c). *Relevance Maxim*

C. Context: Speakers read online news about Papua entitled "COVID-19 Task Force Officers Disperse Traders". The speaker did not accept the news and made the following post.

Speech: MURDER OF TWO CHILDREN IN TIMIKA AND INTAN JAYA CHIEF ACTOR OF PAPUA, PAUL WATERPAU.

This maxim relates to the appropriateness of speech to the context being discussed. Speakers must provide the right information so that communication can run well. In the above speech, the news was related to the dismissal of traders in the market, but the response given by the speaker was related to the killing of actors that occurred in Papua. The response is considered not correlated with the previous title so that it implies that the speaker wants to divert the issue in order to create a bad image of the police in the eyes of the public.

(d). *Manner Maxim*

D. Context: Cops are just bullshit, dick, and dogs. Come here, I'm relaxing here.

Speech: Cops are just bullshit, dick, and dogs. Come here, I'm relaxing here.

This maxim asks speakers to provide information that is clear, coherent, and unambiguous so that the communication that is built runs smoothly. However, not everyone can comply with these rules. In the above utterance, the speaker responds to the actions of the police on patrol by calling them talkative, dicks, and dogs. The speaker does not explain the reason for the designation addressed to the police so that it is considered ambiguous and unclear.

B. *Violation of the Politeness Principle*

(a). *Tact Maxim*

E. Context: Speakers heard the news that the government raised electricity rates to the public during COVID-19. Speakers feel disappointed because the government is considered insensitive to the conditions of the community.

Speech: The State Electricity Company is raising electricity tariffs secretly.

This maxim asks speakers to deliver speech that is wise so that it contains politeness. The wisdom that is built seeks to benefit others. In the above utterance, the speaker is less wise because he accuses the State Electricity Company (PLN) as a state-owned electricity company of raising tariffs without prior notice. In fact, there is no increase in electricity so the information is detrimental to the state electricity company.

(b). *Approbation Maxim*

F. Context: The speaker is disappointed because he was fired from his job during COVID-19.

Speech: This is a photo of the suspected OWNER AND DIRECTOR of BLACK BER GUINNESS. They are the perpetrators of unilateral dismissal without going through the correct process and violating the law. Dismissal without severance pay is cruel and barbaric. After we were fired, they recruited new employees. crazy!!!

This proverb requires speakers to praise others so that their speech is considered polite. However, not everyone can give compliments. In the above speech, the speaker more often hurls curses at the company owner who fired him. Cruel, barbaric, and crazy speech does not contain praise as expected in this maxim so that the speaker is considered to violate the maxim

(c). *Agreement Maxim*

G. Context: The speaker reads an online news entitled "South Sulawesi Police Also Pursuing Provocateurs of Rapid Test Rejection." The speaker included a photo of the South Sulawesi Regional Police Chief.

Speech: May the Chief of Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Kapolri) contract the corona virus with his men. Bury the Kapolri along with his 7 descendants who are fraudsters and extortionists of the nation.

This maxim asks speakers to agree with the conversation being discussed. Differences of opinion will lead to disputes so they should be avoided. In the speech above, the speaker responds to news reports about police actions that will arrest provocateurs. Offended by the news, the speaker then gave a speech that contained bad wishes and accusations. This condition indicates that the speaker disagrees with the news and then insults the police.

(d). *Sympathy Maxim*

H. Context: The speaker watches the news about the death of the mother of the President of the Republic of Indonesia. The speaker attributes the death to the COVID-19 virus.

Speech: May the child follow soon. amen.

As the name implies, this maxim requires speakers to add sympathy to others so as to create politeness in speaking. However, in the above speech, the speaker did not apply politeness in sympathizing. When hearing the news of his death, the speaker prayed for the death of one more family. This lack of sympathy triggers conflict because it is considered impolite.

DISCUSSION

The findings above are some utterances on social media that have criminal potential. The utterances in the data are considered to contain hate speech, especially insults against other people or parties. Speakers do not realize that their speech can offend the feelings and dignity of others in public. At first glance, words such as murderer, liar, and dog seem demeaning. However, there needs to be scientific evidence through theoretical analysis to strengthen this assumption. Therefore, the following description of Pragmatics will reveal the meaning of the utterance. Insults from a legal point of view are explained as a reflection and learning for the community to avoid insulting practices.

Humans are social creatures who cannot be separated from interactions with other humans. Language as a medium of communication is an important part of interaction. Therefore, speech must be delivered effectively, efficiently, contextually, easily understood, concisely, and concisely so as to create good two-way cooperation. The principle of cooperation is present for the success of such communication.

In its implementation, communication does not always run perfectly. Speakers also often violate the principle of cooperation in communication. Violations of the principle of cooperation can occur both intentionally and unintentionally. Participants' misunderstanding of the principle of cooperation causes unintentional violations. Deliberate conditions in this case are carried out by speakers because they contain certain intentions and objectives. Intentional violations are also a strategy to clarify meaning in the hope that certain assumptions are taken from the conversation.

Uncooperative attitudes in communication lead to implicatures that speakers want to convey, one of which is contempt. Speakers who provide information that is not in accordance with the facts, excessive, irrelevant, and unclear are considered intentionally to show their hatred for certain parties. For example, A) the term *dajal* addressed to the police is considered excessive. The speaker gives a bad nickname that is not needed in the speech. In addition to being excessive in its statement, the designation is considered to be less informative so that it offends other parties. The speaker provides enough information in the first sentence that the mosque is only for residents. The information has fulfilled the maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. However, the appearance of the second sentence has damaged communication, causing the speaker to face the law.

In example B), the speaker does not provide strong evidence of foreigners entering Indonesia during the pandemic freely. If there is supporting evidence, the post can be considered a fact. The speaker does not check the truth of the information so he does not know the validity of the information. Information that does not match the facts can result in offending the dignity of others.

The maxim of relevance asks speakers to contribute according to the context of their speech. If the information is not appropriate, the interaction becomes unacceptable and creates uncooperative conditions. In example C), there is a mismatch of information from the speaker. The news about the police closing down buying and selling activities in the market was responded by the speaker with information about the murder of the head of the Papua regional police. The answer given is not in accordance with the existing context.

Example D) contains a violation of the maxim of manner. The speaker is considered to give unclear information, which

damages cooperative communication. When the police were conducting routine patrols of COVID-19, the speaker referred to the police as dogs, dicks, and whores. The speech contains taboo terms and is unclear. The speaker equates the police with something low in the eyes of the community so that it tarnishes the good name of the institution.

Grice's principle of cooperation describes the ideal conditions for achieving the desired goal. However, speakers do not always apply the principle of cooperation in communicating with a specific purpose. That is, if there is a deviation, there is a certain implication that the speaker wants to achieve; if the implication is not achieved, the speaker deliberately does not carry out cooperative communication. A man will generally say that his girlfriend has an ideal stomach even though he knows she has started to gain weight. If the maxim of quality is applied, the interlocutor may be offended. Therefore, the speech participants not only use the cooperative principle but also heed the principle of politeness. Politeness plays an important role in explaining and perfecting the cooperative principle.

Politeness and politeness are often linked and considered to be similar. However, there are differences between the two. Politeness relates to attitude, while politeness relates to speech. Bowing when passing someone is a reflection of politeness, while greeting is an example of politeness. The application of politeness can represent the behavior of someone who is wise, generous, much praised, humble, reduces arguments, and fosters sympathy. However, not everyone can be polite, so misunderstandings often occur that lead to conflict due to derogatory remarks.

In example E, the utterance is considered unwise because the speaker creates a framing that puts down the other party. The information does not contain the truth, thus harming the victim. Disadvantage and discretion are closely related. Actions that dehumanize, offend, and provide false news can be considered as unwise actions because they are not careful in taking actions that harm the dignity of others. Imprudent speakers prioritize themselves over others.

Criticizing speech often appears in insulting speech. Insults are made through words that contain reproaches to others. The words shown in example F such as cruel, barbaric, savage, and crazy contain criticism of the company owner. The words not only demean the dignity of the owner, but also harm the company by lowering its marketability. The victim reported the perpetrator to the police.

Humiliation can also come through rejecting the opinions of others. Rejection accompanied by invalid information can damage the victim's reputation. In example G, the speaker rejects the police action to arrest the rapid test provocateurs. The rejection was accompanied by accusations that the Indonesian police chief committed extortion and fraud. Based on the fake news, the perpetrator was arrested for disturbing the community.

Remarks that do not show sympathy for other people's circumstances can also be considered a form of insult. This is reflected in example H. The speaker commented on the news of the death of the President's mother by wishing bad luck to the president. This indicates that the speaker has hatred for the president and the information he conveyed can be interpreted by the public as the president is a party who should be criticized for his crimes. The statement is considered to have injured the dignity of the head of state and deserves to be brought to court.

If you pay attention, some insulting utterances do not only contain one maxim violation. The utterances often contain two or three violations, which further strengthens the speaker's hatred towards others. For example A, the utterance police want to be dajal not only violates the maxim of quantity because it exaggerates information, but also contains violations of the maxim of quality because the speaker does not contain facts, the maxim of wisdom because it does not contain facts, the maxim of agreement because it rejects the police statement, and the maxim of praise because it calls the police a devil.

In example B, the speech of Chinese citizens who were not raided not only violates the maxim of quality because it contains accusations against the government but also violates the maxim of wisdom because the speech causes the level of public trust in the police to decrease. The utterance in example C that the Kapolda Papua is the perpetrator of the murder also contains a violation of the maxim of relevance, but also the maxim of quality because the speaker has no evidence that corroborates the information, and the maxim of wisdom because it harms the good name of the police institution. In example D, the utterance calling the police as dogs and bastards not only violates the maxim of praise, but also violates the maxim of quality, the maxim of agreement, and the maxim of wisdom.

From these examples, it can be concluded that the violation of the principle of cooperation is related to the violation of the principle of politeness in interaction. There is a close relationship between the maxim of quality, the maxim of wisdom, the maxim of agreement, and the maxim of praise. Speakers who provide information that does not match the facts will certainly have an impact on the other party. In addition, if the speaker conveys insults, it will seem that the speech is demeaning to the other party. If examined closely, the emergence of insults in social media posts is due to differences of opinion between the government as an executive agency and the social media user community. Various government policies in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic are considered detrimental to the community and favorable to the private sector. Therefore, the community vented their rejection through social media in the hope that the community and the government would hear them. The difference of opinion is characterized by words that do not match reality and many criticisms that harm other parties.

Potentially criminal speech depends on the context in which it occurs. The surrounding context can be in the form of who the speaker is, who the interlocutor is, the conditions and situation of the speech, the closeness between speakers, and the lingual form of the speech. Criticizing speech does not become an insult if there is a close relationship between the speakers. The criticism is sometimes used as a sign of closeness between the speaker and the speech partner. The utterance Your mouth smells of diesel fuel and would have legal consequences if uttered in the past when satirizing the

ruler. Cultural context also influences insulting speech. Censure is considered demeaning in some cultures, but in other cultures, it is considered an honor or a sign of intimacy. Therefore, it is necessary to have a good understanding of the context to ascertain whether an utterance is insulting or not.

Looking back at the examples above, it is possible to formulate potentially criminal utterances. In speech A and speech D, there are similarities in the type of insult, namely insulting by cursing the other party. The curse is characterized by the lingual markers *dajal* and nonsense. The speaker is a citizen and the opponent is the police. The two do not have a close relationship so it can be assumed that the speaker is insulting. In speeches B, C, E, and G also have the same type of insult, namely the act of accusing. The speaker provides information that has no supporting evidence so that the information is invalid and has no facts. In this example, the lingual units used as lingual markers of accusation are raids, murderers, salary increases, fraudsters, and blackmailers. Linguistically, the markers *raids* and *raising* do not have a bad meaning, but if the context states that the police did not conduct raids on Chinese citizens and the government secretly raised electricity, it certainly has a negative meaning. The absence of evidence that shows the truth of these remarks makes speakers accuse the government and the police. In example F, the speaker not only accuses but also swears. Through the one-sided and cruel lingual marker, the speaker is considered to make an accusation, while the crazy and barbaric lingual marker shows the speaker's criticism of the other party. Because the speech does not contain concrete facts, the speaker is considered to make accusations. Linguistic markers are crazy and barbaric in Indonesian culture and in the context of speakers who are victims who are harmed by the company, both markers are classified as insulting by swearing. In example H, the speaker does not accuse or swear. The speech does not contain lingual markers that imply both actions, but the speaker is considered to have insulted. The utterance that caused the speaker to face the law was that his son would soon follow. The context is that the speaker hopes that the president will die soon, as well as his mother. This means that the president should be unsympathetic even in a grieving situation because of his indifference to the people. Therefore, people have the right to hate him.

The Criminal Code (KUHP) has explained the articles related to defamation. However, understanding legal language is not as easy as understanding academic language. Therefore, there is an attempt to briefly describe the meaning of the articles in the Criminal Code (14). Defamation in the Criminal Code is found in Chapter II on Criminal Offenses of Insulting the Dignity of the President and Vice President, Chapter V on Criminal Offenses Against Public Order, and Chapter XVI on Insult. In Chapter II, Articles 134 and 137 specifically discuss insults against the president and vice president. Deliberate insults against the president and vice president can be defined as any action that attacks the good name, dignity and honor of the president or vice president (14). Insults against the president and his deputy are not included in the offense of complaint so there is no need for a complaint from the insulted party. CHAPTER V Article 155 on hatred against the government and Article 156 on hatred against groups of the population of the State of Indonesia. Initially, it must be proven that insults against the government, groups, and religions cause hatred among the public. However, due to the complexity of the evidence, the formal formulation was changed to state that the important condition in the article is that the act is committed in public (14). Thus, insulting the government, groups, and religious entities on social media is punishable because social media is now consumed by the public. CHAPTER XVI Article 310 relates to blasphemy, including accusations and slander; and Article 315 to minor insults. This article specifically applies to individuals who are victims of insults. The act of blasphemy is committed by accusing someone of committing a certain act to be broadcast to the public (14). Mild insult is not done by accusing but emphasizes the use of swear words to damage the honor of the other party. Thus, the act of accusing is subject to Article 310, and the act of cursing and mocking may be subject to Article 315. Referring to the above explanation, insult can be defined as an act of humiliating another person or group in public so as to cause harm, such as loss of dignity and horizontal conflict. The keywords found in the act of humiliation are degrading, humiliating, harming, and conflict. These three keywords appear in the acts of accusing, swearing, and mocking.

Hate speech is highly subjective. An utterance can mean an insult, but for some other people it is considered a normal utterance. Therefore, people need to know and understand potentially criminal speech. Public awareness needs to be built so as not to fall into wider conflicts such as disputes. To realize the importance of hate speech, the community needs to be properly and consistently coached to minimize the impact of insults. One of the things that can be taught to the community is the need to be wise in using social media so that people can reduce posts that offend other parties. A simple remark can be interpreted as an insult to another person. Therefore, people need to pay attention to every post on social media. Does the post offend, belittle, or demean others? People need to position themselves as readers of posts so that they can feel the meaning that is being conveyed. Not only the public needs to learn, the government as an executive body that produces laws and regulations also needs to limit the definition of insult so that it is not misinterpreted by interested parties. The police, as the party handling the case, need to be equipped with linguistic knowledge so that they can interpret the utterances that contain insults or not. The police are also obliged to ask for help from linguists in interpreting the utterances in the case so that a case of insult can be clear without being lame on one side.

Patterns of insulting behavior

This pattern of insult speaker behavior is in line with van Dijk's (2000) opinion that the use of vocabulary and sentences represents a positive or negative image. The negative image is given to the other party, while the positive image is attached to the speaker. This is also in accordance with van Dijk's (2000) ideology development strategy: 1) Emphasize their bad things, 2) Reduce the emphasis on their good things, 3) Emphasize our good things, and 4) Deemphasize our bad things.

The first two strategies describe the image of the other party, while the last two strategies are used by speakers to perceive a positive image of themselves. Reducing or eliminating information related to the speaker's self may be a strategy to hide the speaker's self-image. This condition is in line with van Dijk's (1998) opinion.

Martin and Rose (2007) explain the concept of ideology by using the terms antagonist, protagonist, left, and right. These terms are used as models to explore political change. Protagonists are people who try to solve problems, while antagonists are people who try to create problems. The left is the group that has the power to gain and the right is the group that has the power to lose. Thus, it can be formulated that the right antagonist is the party that raises the issue or problem unilaterally and is the holder of power so that it tries to maintain its power; The left antagonist is the party that opposes the presence of an issue or problem unilaterally and does not hold hegemonic power. Right protagonists are parties who view an issue from various angles, good or bad, to support the existence of the issue or maintain the status quo. Left protagonists are those who view the issue as a problem that varies in good and bad and reject or oppose the existence of the issue. Based on this opposition, a power profile can be created for those who are absolutely against, absolutely for, against based on good and bad perspectives, and in favor based on good and bad perspectives.

Moving on from Martin and Rose's (2007) concept of ideology, it can be explained that every speaker of insults related to the COVID-19 pandemic on social media adheres to a left-wing antagonistic ideology. The speaker tries to create problems through hate posts on social media related to the COVID-19 pandemic, which of course targets the government. Speakers create negative framing to attract public participation to agree with the issues raised by the speaker. If successful, a larger concept will be raised to seize power with the narrative that the government has failed to overcome the pandemic and is not in favor of the little people. Leftist antagonistic ideology also appears in one-sided thinking without seeing the goodness of others. Speakers only see that everything the other party does is wrong and there is no element of truth or the positive side. In this way the speaker tries to emphasize the negatives against the other party without considering the good and only focuses on one point of view, which is the absolute fault of the other party, in this case the government and its staff.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the research objectives, findings and discussion, the conclusion that can be formulated is that the principle of cooperation in pragmatics and the principle of politeness are interrelated so that they complement each other. The maxim of quality that requires speakers to contribute according to the facts is related to the maxim of wisdom. Speakers who throw accusations are of course detrimental to their victims. In speech, the violation of maxims does not only consist of one type, but can contain several violations of maxims that reinforce the existence of insults. Insults are often expressed by violating all principles of cooperation, but only some insults use violations of politeness principles. Speakers do not violate the maxim of generosity and the maxim of humility. Insulting speech tends to negate the positive side of the speaker in the hope that the public will focus more on the victim.

There are four types of insults that people need to avoid using social media. The types of insults are accusing, swearing, accusing and swearing, and mocking. Accusing speech contains lingual markers containing accusations without evidence, swearing contains insulting expressions with reproachful words, a combination of accusing and swearing contains accusatory expressions and swearing expressions, and mockery contains expressions insulting the dignity of others without accusations and swearing. All four types are acts that degrade and offend others, thus defaming the victim.

In criminal law, especially the article on insults (Article 310 & Article 315), it is stated that the conditions for insults can be subject to legal sanctions, namely being done intentionally, containing accusations, disseminated in public, containing swear words, and humiliating the victim's good name. Speech posted on social media is certainly done consciously so it is considered intentional. If the speaker cannot prove the truth of his/her speech, he/she is considered to be accused without any basis. Posts on social media can be read by everyone so that they contain publicity. Accusations that cannot be proven certainly harm the dignity of others in society.

People need to understand that social media is public property so that every post must be uploaded carefully so as not to offend others. People also need literacy assistance to better understand the types of speech that can be categorized as insults and hate speech. These efforts are made to mitigate the occurrence of discourse wars in virtual media and horizontal conflicts in the real world

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander, L. J. (2000). *Freedom of speech* (Vol. 1). London: Ashgate Pub Ltd.
- [2] Anne, W. M., & Judith W. (2014). Social Media a Double-Edged Sword. *Accountancy Ireland*, 46, 32-34.
- [3] Blaxter, L., Christina H., & Malcolm T. (2001). *How to research second edition*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- [4] Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. London: Allyn and Bacon.
- [5] Budiawan, R. Y. S., & Rawinda F. M. (2016). Kajian linguistik forensik: Kontroversi tuturan artis zaskia gotik dalam kasus penghinaan lambang negara [Forensic linguistic study: Controversy over artist Zaskia Gotik's speech in the case of insulting state symbols]. In *Seminar Internasional Isu-isu Mutakhir dalam Kajian Bahasa dan Sastra* [International Seminar on Latest Issues in Language and Literature Studies], 1—15.
- [6] Cahyono, A. S. (2016). Pengaruh media sosial terhadap perubahan sosial masyarakat di Indonesia [The influence of social media

- on social change in Indonesian society]. *Jurnal Publiciana*, 9(1), 140-157.
- [7] Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five tradition*. London: Sage Publications.
- [8] Gitari, N. D., Zuping Z., Damien H., & Long J. (2015). A lexicon-based approach for hate speech detection. *International Journal of Multimedia and Ubiquitous Engineering*, 10(4), 215—230. <https://doi.org/10.14257/ijmue.2015.10.4.21>
- [9] Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics, 3 speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- [10] Hartini, L., Aceng R. S., & Dadang S. (2020). Linguistik forensik terhadap perbuatan tidak menyenangkan di media sosial (kajian pragmatik) [Forensic linguistics of unpleasant actions on social media (pragmatic studies)]. *Jurnal Deiksis*, 12(3), 259—269. <https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v12i03.5416>
- [11] Karjo, C. H. (2016). Identifying hate speech in tweets. In *Prosiding Seminar Tahunan Linguistik (SETALI 2016)* [Proceedings of the Annual Seminar on Linguistics (SETALI 2016)]. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. Retrieved December 3, 2023, from <https://repository.upi.edu/28438/>
- [12] Kesuma, T. M. J. (2007). *Pengantar metode penelitian bahasa* [Introduction to language research methods]. Yogyakarta: Carasvatibooks.
- [13] Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing English semantic*. London: Routledge.
- [14] Kroeger, P. R. (2019). *Analyzing meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics. Second corrected and slightly revised edition*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- [15] Kurniasih, D. (2019). Ujaran kebencian di ruang publik: Analisis pragmatik pada data pusat studi agama dan perdamaian PSAP solo raya [Hate speech in public spaces: Pragmatic analysis of data from the PSAP Solo Raya Center for Religion and Peace Studies]. *Jurnal Studi Agama Islam dan Masyarakat*, 15(1), 49—57. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jsam.v15i1.1153>
- [16] Kusno, A. (2016). Bentuk-bentuk pelanggaran prinsip kesopanan dalam ceramah keagamaan [Forms of violation of the principle of politeness in religious lectures]. *Jurnal LiNGUA*, 11(2), 103—115. <https://doi.org/10.18860/ling.v11i2.3502>
- [17] Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [18] Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813313>
- [19] Mangantibe, V. (2016). Ujaran kebencian dalam surat edaran kapolri nomor: se/6/x/2015 tentang penanganan ucapan kebencian [Hate speech in the National Police Chief's circular number: se/6/x/2015 concerning handling hate speech]. *Jurnal Lex Crimen*, 5(1), 159—162. <https://doi.org/10.31599/jkn.v1i3.30>
- [20] Mey, L. J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- [21] Ningrum, D. J., Suryadi, & Dian E. C. W. (2018). Kajian ujaran kebencian di media sosial [Study of hate speech on social media]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Korpus*, 2(3), 241—25.
- [22] Nockleby, J. T. (2000). *Hate speech*. New York: Macmillan.
- [23] Permatasari, D. I. (2019). *Tindak tutur ilokusi ujaran kebencian Facebook tahun 2017-2019* [Illocutionary speech acts of Facebook hate speech in 2017-2019]. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.
- [24] Reddy, V. (2002). Perverts and sodomites: Homophobia as hate speech in Africa. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 20(3), 163—175. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073610209486308>
- [25] Rosenfeld, M. (2003). Hate speech in constitutional jurisprudence: A comparative analysis. *Cardozo Law Review*, 24, 1523—1567. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.265939>
- [26] Santosa, R. (2021). *Dasar-dasar metode penelitian kualitas kebahasaan* [Basics of linguistic quality research methods]. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- [27] Simorangkir, R. T. E., & Prasetyo. (2008). *Kamus hukum* [Legal dictionary]. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- [28] Soesilo, R. (1981). *Pokok-pokok hukum pidana, peraturan umum dan delik-delik khusus* [The main points of criminal law, general regulations and special offenses]. Bogor: Politea.
- [29] Strauss, A., & Corbin J. (2003). *Dasar-dasar penelitian kualitatif* [Basics of qualitative research]. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- [30] Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa* [Methods and various techniques of language analysis]. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- [31] Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitas, kualitas, dan r&d* [Educational research methods approach quantity, quality, and R&D]. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- [32] Suhandano. (2017). Linguistik forensik kesaksian ilmu bahasa dalam sidang pengadilan. In *Seminar Nasional Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, 1(1), 20—29.
- [33] Tazkiyah, I., Fadillah A. R., Kusuma F. W., Siswantoro M. F., & Cahyono S. A. (2021). Peran anonimitas terhadap cyberbullying pada media sosial [The role of anonymity in cyberbullying on social media]. In *Prosiding Seminar SITASI*. Retrieved December 4, 2023, from <https://sitasi.upnjatim.ac.id/index.php/sitasi/article/view/74>
- [34] Timofeeva, Y. A. (2002). *Hate speech online: Restricted or protected-comparison of regulations in the United States and Germany*. Germany: J. Transnat'l L. & Pol'y.
- [35] Wahyudi, H. S., & Sukmasari M. P. (2014). Teknologi dan Kehidupan Masyarakat [Technology and Community Life]. *Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi*, 3(1), 13 – 24.
- [36] Waldron, J. (2012). *The harm in hate speech*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674065086>
- [37] Weber, L. (2002). *Marketing to social web: How digital customer communities build your business*. USA: Willey Inc.
- [38] Yin, R. K. (2013). *Studi kasus desain & metode* [Case study design & methods]. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [39] Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.



Ahmad Khoironi Arianto graduated from Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University, Yogyakarta Indonesia, 2011 (Bachelor of Humanities) and Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta Indonesia, 2013 (Master of Linguistics). Currently pursuing his doctoral degree at Sebelas Maret University (UNS), Surakarta, Indonesia. His research interests include Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In addition, he is a young expert at the Language Development and Development Agency, Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia.



Djatmika graduated from Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia, 1990 (Bachelor in English); Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia, 1998 (Masters in Linguistics); Eleven March University, Surakarta, Indonesia, 2008 (Doctor of Linguistics). Pursuing and writing studies on Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, especially the application of functional systemic linguistics and genre based approaches, as well as children's language acquisition. Was inaugurated as a professor of discourse analysis in 2011.



Riyadi Santosa graduated from Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia, 1985 (Bachelor in English); University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia, 1993 (Master of Education); Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia, 2010 (Ph.D. Linguistics). Interest in the study of genre- based discourse analysis and linguistic scientific research methodologies. Was inaugurated asa professor of Functional Systemic Linguistics in 2015.



Henry Yustanto graduated from Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia, 1988 (Bachelor in Indonesian); University of Essex, England, 2001 (Masters of Education); Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia, 2018 (Doctor of Linguistics). Interest in language studies, especially phonetics and phonology in Indonesian and Javanese.