Students' Linguistic Knowledge in Comprehending Defamation Text

[1]**Nana Raihana Askurny,** [2]**Syihabuddin Syihabuddin**

[1]Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Indonesia

[2]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

Abstract
This study is aimed to find out how students' linguistic knowledge to comprehend defamation text. Defamation is defined as misuse of language to humiliate other person. The researcher took 75 students of sixth semester, of English Education study program, of Unversitas Raja Ali Haji, Tanjungpinag, as the research participant. This research employed qualitative design with aaplying calculation to assert the result. The data was collected by a set of questions which consists of 13 multiple choice questions. The validiy test had been conducted before the data gathering. The linguistic knowledge in this study were limited with semantic and pragmatic. The result shows that semantic and pragmatic knowledge of the students were not adequate, which means that, the students need to develop their knowledge of linguistic by improving their text comprehension.

Keywords
Linguistic knowledge
Comprehension
Defamation Text

Students' Linguistic Knowledge in Comprehending Defamation Text

Introduction

Considering the recent situation of social interaction, in which language use frequently place people into mis-conduct, such as hoax news, scams, defamation, and so on, this study attempts to observe and find out how the students utilize linguistic knowledge towards these issues. Internet and society are two matters which cannot be separated in the recent life. People build society by internet media, called by social media. People talk, share, communicate, work, and collaborate, through social media. Then, misconduct of language use while interacting could not be avoided. One of the most occurred in social media is defamation. Defamation normally transmitted by electronic devices and internet media by using language to mock, libel, or disgrace other people virtual-publicly, whether intentionally or unintentionally.

In Indonesia, at the beginning of year 2022, Indonesia Police (Polri) had proceeded 162 defamation cases, which means that defamation arises 37% than year 2021 (Pusiknas Bareskrim Mabes Polri, 2022). Therefore, the researcher views defamation case is the matter to discuss in terms of language study. Students who took study in English Education Study Program (Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, PBI) had been lectured 'Introduction to Linguistics' subject. By that subject, students studied language and linguistic as a system of language. Defamation uses language to insult somebody, by the linguistic knowledge; Phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantic and pragmatic, the students are expected to comprehend defamation as language issues. Moreover, this study attempts to activate the society norms and values of the students.

In language study, a student needs to know about language system since they study English, that are linguistic elements or aspects. Linguistic aspects related to implicit system of language that people recognize while they are speaking or writing through language. People who study English, will identify the knowledge of formulation of expression like when somebody says "thank you", the reply should be "You are welcome", for instance. In addition, the internal rules or what should be prescripted inside the language, the people, EFL student, respectively notice the knowledge subject aggrement of first, second, and third person in English. Moreover, explicit knowledge regards to the knowledge about language, analytical and metalingual . Accordance with this, the ability to analyze language refers to the competene to examine language structure and metalanguage, and these must be learnt by instruction and or observation (Lang & Zhang, n.d.) .

Defamation is the act of language use to humiliate other people, and defamation is part of study of forensic linguistic. Students within this research didn't study forensic linguistic as a specific subject. Even so, students are motivated to apply their linguistic knowledge, in comprehending defamation text. Introduction to linguistic, as the obligatory subject for the students taught in English, hence, the knowledge of language gained by the students are in in the second language setting. The skill which are expected from the students is how they construct meaning by reading defamation text by using their knowledge of language. Language comprises meaning in a construction. To obtain the meaning, student needs to have proper skills of reading, when the meaning is served in a reading text. By reading, interaction between the text, reader, and text, was ultimate process in comprehending meaning (Albashtawi et al., 2016). Regarding this, three major components relates to successful comprehension, that are; (a) decoding (to refine linguistic code which carries information directly from print, such as sounds, letter, and word; (b) text-information building (consolidating the implies information into phrases, sentences, and paragraphs); and (c) reader-model construction (synthesizing the jumbled text information with preceding knowledge). And the last, reader-model construction, defines individual in understanding text structure, frame-working the concept, to organize and interpret newly experience which comes across (Koda, 2007).

Defamation itself is to assign whether the allegedly offensive language constitutes an assertion, a warning, an opinion, a question or an accusation, as long as those were made public, either orally or in written form. Defamation which is displayed in printing or writing, like emails, letters, books, newspapers, and so on, are recognized as a libel. Whereas, defamation which is spoken, in a speech, sermon, or public presentation by oral, are acknowledged as slander (Shuy, 2010). To serve defamation text to the students supposed to deal with three dimensions, that are pedagogy, linguistic knowledge, and forensic linguistic, and defamation case.

Language learning is the learning of language itself, such as theory, system, grammar, and so on, and as well as to learn other contents that delivered by language. Then, this is called by CLIL (Content and Language Integrated learning). CLIL drag from prevailing bilingual model, in order to fit in a specific content in language learning. This highlighting the concept and context of variants, such as exposure range to the language, linguistic knowledge of learners, subject discipline or the content, and the extent to which a CLIL program is more content-oriented, or language-oriented (Coyle, 2015) .

In Europe, recently, research and pedagogy discuss about the integration of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in bilingual education context. The research which integrates content and language leraning had been widely a trend of discussion in now. Thus, linguistic is exercised to increase language skill and as well as to cultivate the content (Gajo, 2007). Next, this such research get broadly applied, for instance, the research of how L2 learners practiced their morphological awareness, vocabulary knowledge, and build semantic foundation in reading comprehension, has been accomplished to see the role of linguistic knowledge in language classroom(Zhang & Koda, 2018) . In addition, a deployed strategy has been provoked to overcome insufficient linguistic knowledge of college students, in order to improve academic reading comprehension (Albashtawi et al., 2016) . In ESP, like English for Science Subject, the significance of language knowledge such as; vocabulary, grammar, and genre text were seriously applicable (Cahyadin et al., 2022) .

Linguistic aspects additionally, has been intensively applied in other field of teaching. Such as, the research which introduces linguistic knowledge through SentiLARE model for sentiment understanding. In this research, linguistic knowledge was exposed for deletion-based sentence compression, for neural work (Ke et al., 2019). Then, exploring the selective usage of linguistic features when conducting visual analysis, in order to suggest the possible gate mechanism in the predicted compression (Zhao et al., 2018).

Defamation has been widely researched from the perspective of linguistic. Lingusitic working tool, impolite theory, was employed to examine defamation. It was precisely to evidencing action offence inlaw, moreover to provide language experts with sociopragmatic aspect of categorization of offence (Nieto & Nieto, 2020) . Speech act of accusation has been used to examine how different forms of defamatory statements are perceived and what kind of relationship exists between the recipients's interpretation of different forms of defamatory utterances and the speaker's perceived responsibility (Sungbom Lee, 2012) . The Searle's pragmatic theory; *locution, illocution, and perlocution*, has been applied to the case of a hate and provocative speech act in social media (Maknun & Iswary, 2021) . Next, the study of lexical semantic and pragmatic coincidely, be practiced to analyze defamation case which occurred in facebook (Mintowati, 2016) . Corpus based study on word and meaning had been practiced in a phrase-lexical enginge, which is named by *ConcGram 1.0.* This engine was completely work to expose several results, such as judgment's predominant words and meanings in defamation case report, phraseological profile of defamation defencing, justification, and malice utterance (Cheng et al., 2016) . Linguistic knowledge practically employed in research of language teaching learning, and other fields, as described previously, but, for relating it with defamation text; forensic linguistic respectively, in the language teaching learning has not been discussed.

College students who take English education program in a university are assumed has been taught some subjects which are associated with language system study, such as 'Introduction to Linguistics', 'Phonetic and Phonology', and 'English Translation'. Therefore, the researchers believe that students hold linguistic knowledge. The inquiry of this research is how the students' linguistic knowledge in comprehending defamation text. The objective of this study is to awaken students' awareness about current society phenomenon, and to encourage them to comprehend defamation text by using their linguistic knowledge.

Method

This study be intended to find out linguistic knowledge to comprehend defamation text. This study developed a set of questions to gathered linguistic knowledge of the students, in terms of vocabulary, semantic, and pragmatic aspect. It consists of fivteen questions which contain the linguistic three aspects that implied in defamation text. Those questions were delivered in English, in which, some of the questions are defamation text in Bahasa Indonesia, considering they are EFL students who originally speak and live in Indonesia. The research participants of this study were 75 students, of sixth semester, of English Education Program, academic year 2021/2022 of Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, in Tanjungpinang. They have selected because they have studied some subjects which are associated with linguistic knowledge, that are 'introduction to linguistics', 'English

Phonetic', 'Vocabulary Building', and 'English Translation'. Thus, they were assumed have satisfactory knowledge of linguistic. Questionnaire and survey were developed on one sheet, and administered to the 75 students in the online classroom. Students required to answer those questions in 45 minutes.

Qualitative descriptive is employed within this study. Qualitative study considers human thought and behaviour in social context and covers awide range of phenomena in order to understand and appreciate them thoroughly (Daniel, 2016). Inductive reasoning in qualitative research, based on constructivism, is more relevant to develop theories or models. Theoretically, this approach, when conducted with phenomena rebuilding is able to acquire a fresh value and explicit understanding of the phenomena (Park et al., 2020) . Remembering that linguistic knowledge across students to comprehend defamation text is a fresh value, to further developing theory or model, inductive reasoning is more appropriate for this study.

A set of questions has been employed as the instrument. This is used for gathering the data about students' linguistic knowledge towards defamation text. Numbers or quantitative data which are obtained by this isntrument, would be the significant information for the researcher to analyze and reconstruct the phenomena. Even numbering data is remained debatable to be implemented in qualitative research, however, numerical data which were provided, such as in observation distribution, number of instansces of event or statement, would be beneficial to acquire conclusion by considering potential challenges (Maxwell, 2010). In addition, numbers becomes crucial to obtain specific justification of the inquiry (Neale et al., 2014). Moreover, the reaseacher should consider numbers in qualitative research, considering that qualitative is not to generalization, two possible tendencies need to anticipate that are; 1) numbers control to escalate meaning to the key findings; and 2) numbers could misinterpret the limitation of a small sample size to gain conclusion (Chivanga, 2016). There were 13 questions were available to be answered by the students. The frequency of correct answer, median, and mean are developed to explain the inquiry descriptively by the researcher. Before administering the questionnaire, the validity test has been exercised.

Results

Validity Test

This research applied a set of questions or a questionnaire in gathering data. The data were the collected answer from the participant which about students's linguistic knowledge toward defamation text. There are 14 questions before available for the participants, but, after doing the validity test, there 13 questions are selected based on the validity. By involving 75 students, the validity was calculated by using Microsoft Excel, each question item validity could be obtained. The value of R Product Moment table for 75 participants was 0,227, with significant level 0,5. Then each R calculated from each question item was compared to 0, 227, if the R calculated is bigger than R table (0,227), the question item is valid. thefore the researcher attain the validity of each number, as follows;

Table 1. Validity Test

Question item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
R Calculate	0,32	0,32	0,44	0,51	0,43	0,45	0,28	0,37	0,48	0,42	0,46	0,43	0,31	0,09
R table	0,227 is for all item to be compared with R Calculated													
R Cal > R Tab							VALID							Not Val

Interpretation of Linguistic Knowledge Based On Percentage Correct Answer Criteria

This study comes to the lastest discussion. As mentioned above that this study is aimed to find out linguistic knowledge of the students to comprehend defamation text. We already found the percentage of each question item from each aspect of three aspects within the questionnaire, that are; defamation understanding, semantic, and pragmatic aspect. The obtained data was percentage of correct responnses or answers of each question number, therefore the researcher developed and adopted the criteria that has been employed by other researcher in analyzing and discussing Percentage of Average Score (Br. Karo et al., 2019) . But, in this study, the researcher uses the criteria to categorize critieria based on the Percentage of Correct Answers. The following criteria, such as 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Enough', 'Fair', and 'Unsatisfied' would be practiced to elaborate the level of linguistic knowledge in comprehending defamation text. In this research, 'percentage of average score' or 'PAS' like in the previous study, have been adjusted to 'Percentage of Correct Answer' or PRS. Further, the following criteria level which is practiced in this study as described as follows;

$$90\% \leq PAS \leq 100\% = Excellent$$
$$80\% \leq PAS \leq 90\% = Good$$
$$70\% \leq PAS \leq 80\% = Enough$$
$$60\% \leq PAS \leq 70\% = Fair$$
$$0\% \ \ \leq PAS \leq 60\% = Unsatisfied$$

Frequency of Correct Answer

Research participant, at any question, each correct answer presumes one point, while, zero point for incorrect answer.. The questionnaire comprises brief points of view of defamation text (question number,1, 2, and 3), semantic knowledge (question number 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10), and pragmatic knowledge (question number 4, 11, 12, and 13).

1. The answer frequency of *Defamation understanding* (Question number, 1, 2, and 3). As the students are actively as social indivual, who normally interact with people by language use, these questions were commited to find out their knowledge upon defamation. These questions were required students'points of view, or brief understanding toward defamation text. The result is described as follows;

Table 2. Table of Correct Answer of Defamation Understanding

Question Number	Total Correct Of 75 Responses	Frequncy	Criteria
1	55	73%	Enough
2	48	64%	Fair
3	57	76%	Enough

2. The Frequency of Semantic Knowledge across defamation text. This study, essentially is aimed to reveal students' linguistic knowledge within defamation text. Based on the several literature review which had been elaborated previously, it might seen that semantic aspect is the generally employed to investigate forenslic linguistic case, defamation, respectively. This questionnaire consists of six questions of semantic aspect that are question number 5, 6, 7, 8, 9,10, and 11. The result of semantic knowledge would be decribed as follows;

Table 3. Table of Semantic Knowledge of Defamation Text

Question Number	Total Correct of 75 Responses	Frequency	Criteria
5	40	53%	Unsatisfied
6	50	67%	Fair
7	66	88%	Good
8	39	52%	Unsatisfied
9	30	40%	Unsatisfied
10	23	31%	Unsatisfied
11	44	59%	Unsatisfied

3. Pragmatic studies how speaker' utterances be interpreted to the listeners through the conversation context. Somehow, humiliating conduct normally happened in a conversation setting, moreover, nowadays, social media becomes a substantial setting to do a conversation. Therefore, this study also inserts pragmatic aspects within questionnaire, that are in question number 4,11,12, and 13. The presentation of pragmatic knowledge towards defamation would be described in the next table;

Table 4. Table of Pragmatic Knowledge of DefamationText

Question Number	Total Correct Of 75 Responses	Frequency	Criteria
4	58	77%	Enough
12	49	65%	Fair
13	24	32%	Unsatisfied

4. The Recapitulation of Data Collection of Linguistic Knowledge Towards DefamationText. At this section, the researcher provides the recapitulation of all the question items which were succeeded to answer by the research participants (the Students). In the following table, the researcher display the result of all the items based on the criteria that has been developed obove.

Table 5 Criteria of Correct Responses based on Each Aspect

Aspect	Frequency			
	Unsatisfied	Fair	Enoguh	Good
Defamation	-	1	2	-
Semantic	5	1	-	1
Pragmatic	1	1	1	-

Discussion

Defamation Text and Validity of Test
This reaserch is aimed to examine linguistic knowledge of the students upon defamation text. Text, what is meant here, is the composisition of words to syntactically in sending meaning. Fleisher (2015) defines that a text has two meaning, that are; (1) text as the representation of experience, text is analyzed in systematic elicitation technique, in which elements within the text are treated as part of culture, for then, the relationship between those parts need to be inspected from words to sign system; and (2) text as the analysis object to conduct conversation, narrative, parole, or grammatical analyses(Zifana et al., 2018) .
Therefore, in this study, defamation text was constructed orderly in a sentence, then served in multiple choice question. In the online test document, the researcher attached an article about defamation to arouse participant experience and knowledge. After reading that text for ten minutes, the participant were required to answer the questions. Before administering the set of questions, the researcher conducted validity test. From the result of validity test, from 14 questions only one question which is not valid, question number 14. Thus, for analyzing, question number 14 was omitted.

Student Knowledge Data
Data collection and calculation above is proficient to explore the language phenomena elaboratively. As mentioned earlier that this study is aimed to find out students' linguistic knowledge if they encounter or being served by defamation text. Defamation, as we know as the matter of language use by a speaker, in the society

which is offensive to point someone. Therefore, this needs to be discussed through question items within the questionnaire. From the data presentation there are three knowledge has been gathered, that are about defamation text understanding, semantic and pragmatic knowledge. But, before conducting the comprehensible result, the criteria of knowledge in this study need to be clarified. The discussion of those will be dicussed as follows.

Defamation Understanding

Before disclosing students' linguistic knowledge across defamation text, defamation understanding should be clarified formerly. Understanding, in the context of teaching learning, was presumed to something with a cognitive phenomenon. Students are able to process information by their perspective. Receiving the stimulus, encoding, storing, and, then expected to retrieve information (Mampouw et al., 2016). Something, here, means defamation as a concept. Soedjadi (2000) determines concept is an abstract idea can be used to classify or clarify a group of objects (Safarati & Rahma, 2020). Obtaining studnets' defamation understanding by displaying a text which discussed about defamation was suggestive to stimulate students' cognitive in processing their knowledge.

The data presentation of students' defamation understanding explains this analysis. By administering three questions; number 1, 2, and 3, it may be discussed that in average, the students accomplish a adequate performance, whose exceed 50% of frequency of the correct answers. In the question number 1, students know that defamation is the action to humiliate, disgrace, and insult other people. Then, through the question number 2, it is viewed that a defamation normally applied by text, picture and gesture. Last, in the question number 3, showed that students recognize that a defamation conduct is delivered not solely by the text, but also the media of transmitting. By using the level of criteria before, it might seen that for this aspect, the result were enough, fair , and enough. From the three question items, the two shows 'enough' criteria.

Students' Linguistic Knowledge: Semantic Aspect

As stated previously, research respondents are the students of high education who have studied some subjects which associated with linguistic. One of linguistic aspect that widely employed in forensic linguistic examination, is semantic. Semantic is the study of word meaning. Semantics performs how language is used to represent meaning. Each word holds one specific literal meaning, therefore, in terms of linguistic, semantic attempts to explain how the speakers and hearers could to encode and decode the such literal meaning (Stringer, 2019). There were six questions, such as, number 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, from the questionnaire to reveal student's knowledge of semantic in order to comprehend defamation text. Lexical, grammatical semantic, and connotative meaning aspects are selecting materials to set in the questionnaire.

The questions which requires knowledge of lexical and grammatical semantic, are presented by number 5, 6, and 11. The data shows that lexical and grammatical knowledge of the students are moderate, for obtaining 53 %, 67%, and 77% of total correct answer. The three numbers presented satisfied percentage, which is bigger than 50%, thus, it means that more than half of all participants were able to answer correctly. By examining the result, the researcher needs to deeply discuss question number 11 which obtains 77% of frequency. Question number 11 supplied four sentences of positive and negative meaning lexically and grammaticaly. The correct selection option contained literal semantic aspect, that is the word 'gate' implied meaning as well as what dictionary served, whereas the other three implied grammatical meaning. Question number six also presented the less-high percentage number, 67%. This question demanded knowledge of lexical semantic of word negative meaning. Lexical semantic defines meaning at the lexicon meaning, or what dictionary has defined. Whereas, grammatical semantic outlines the meaning existence at the grammatical level (morphology and syntax) (Amin, 2021). It might be seen that the students able to employ their linguistic knowledge, respectively lexical and grammatical semantic aspect, even though at upper-moderate level. In addition, it describes that students have a satisfactory comprehension to compose word syntactically and sufficient competence in grammar aspect either English or Bahasa Indonesia.

Students' knowledge of connotation and denotation of word meaning, from the result, views moderate achievement. Question number 7, 8, 9, and 10 are the representation of connotation and denotation knowledge. From the result, the highest percentage is reached by question number 7 with 88% of all correct answer, even so, it is not followed by question number 8 with 52%, number 9 with 40%, then number 10 with 31%. Denotation is a word's literal meaning or the "dictionary definition. Whereas, connotation defined as an outer idea within a word, literally, that is developed to express rhetorical or emotional feelings (Chandra Sekhar Rao, 2017).

From this description, overall, the students still represent satisfactory knowledge about literal and figurative meaning. In consequence, the researcher presumes that the students would be susceptive with meaning that delivered by other people through language, since lately, the use of rhetorical feelings frequently sent in communication context. Five question items of seven described 'Unsatisfied' criteria, the other two were distincted by 'fair', and 'good'.

Students' Linguistic Knowledge: Pragmatic Aspect

The final linguistic knowledge that searched in this study is pragmatic. Besides semantic, pragmatic also the study of meaning interpretation between speaker and listener based on the conversation context. In paragmatic, people involve themselves by including their diversity of goals, purpose, and the action of the speaker, into the given intended meaning in order to understand (Siddiqui, 2018). In the other words, pragmatic explains how litener attempts to discover what speaker's meaning, in which the addressee (listener) and addresser (speaker) are included in the same context. Question number 4, 12, and 13 were the application of pragmatic knowledge upon defamation text. From the data result, it might discovered that question number 13 preceeds with 65%, then followed by number 12 with 59%, and the last is number 4 with 32%. Then, according to the criteria previously developed, the researcher collated the criteria of the three such as; 'good', 'fair', and 'unsatisfied' In the context of EFL teaching learning context, the students' knowledge of pragmatic is forcefully required. The requirement of language learner on pragmatic is fully implied, they should improve the competence in executing speech acts, express and construe non-literal meaning, discourse and politeness function for knowledge of culture. Communication over online or internet media has much more advanced a new culture of civilization. Facebook, WattsApps, Twitter, Instagram, Youtube, are broadly used by the society (Setyawan & Wiraatmaja, 2018) .Therefore, the researcher sets in social media context within the questions, by considering that nowadays, people are much more presence in the internet media rather than conventional.

In question number 13, the researcher set the defamation text in Facebook conversation context, while WhatsApp in number 4. By the result it views that students' linguistic knowledge are highly-familiar with conversation context in Facebook as presented by the result of question number 13. This number describes how defamation means disgracing people in the face of other members in a group or society. Disgracing would solely become 'a mock', when there are not other people except the speaker and listener. Furhermore, this question designates the reflection of student's intensity in online media with their comprehension of facebook conversation context.

Meanwhile, WhatsApp implementation was existed within question number 4, unfortunately, it shows only 32% of all participants answer correctly. The researcher in responding phenomena in question number 4, attemps to see this comprehensively. Hence, the researcher presumes that in question number 4, the participants were tricked by several options which seemly correct, yet, there is only one correct option. The correct option of this question, requires a summary of the other displayed correct answers. Here, the researcher strongly advocates that students need to practice their reading skill to improve text comprehension. Meanwhile, question number 12 showed 59% of all the partcipants (75 students) were able to respond this question correctly. The percentage does not show whether good or not result. However, 59% is not the bad number for interpretation towards the result. The question is aimed to evoke students upon defamation with using pragmatic knowledge, but the result explains that the students being hesitated with the word '*psk*', abbreviation of '*pekerja seks komersial*', or 'prostitute' meaning on to lexical semantic aspect rather than pragmatic. The question number 12 provided as follows:

Question number 12

By using pragmatic, considering participant and conversation context, which of the text below that is aimed to defame somebody:

a. He does not realize that his mother is a prostitute
b. Some prostitutes recived health counseling
c. The police officer drags some prostitutes who operate at the Ramadhan evening
d. A Prostitute, can you believe her?

People with proper knowledge of pragmatic, are obviously able to comprehend this text in terms of pragmatic. But, the not few of the students got confused and assumed this question by semantic perspective. Therefore, at

overall, students' pragmatic knowledge is high-moderate, as seen that two questions showed high-mid percentage of correct answer presentation (65% and 59%). Regarding with one question which does not imply adequate percentage of correct answer, the researcher considers this, as minimum ability of the students in reading text. Comprehension in this study is the process to understand, to get idea and information of available text. Reading and comprehnsion, so far, are only defined in the form of genre text, such as narrative, descriptive, and so on. By this research the concept of comprension is expected achieved.

Conclusion

This research is aimed to find out students' linguistic knowledge in comprehending defamation text. Students in this study were university students of semester sixth, of English education Program, who had studied some subjects, which are related to linguistic. The subjects are 'English Phonetic', 'Introduction to Linguistic', 'Vocabulary Building', and 'Sociolinguistic in ELT'. Therefore, the researcher believe that they need to imporove their knowledge of linguistic. Defamation is defined as a language misuse to humiliate other people, so therefore, this research attempts to investigate how the students employ their linguistic knowledge to comprehend defamation text. After conducting data collection and analysis, the researcher conclude that students do have not adequate linguistic knowledge, (semantic and pragmatic) to comprehend defamation text. Moreover, the students' text reading comprehension remains to be improved. Since the result have described that the questions wich present low percentage of frequency of correct answer, were the text which needs text reading ability. This research limits the participant on the students who study EFL in Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Hai. Moreover the defamation texts which are provided within the questionnaire, solely related to the conversation text in the daily life, either through online or offline media of communication.

Conclusively, after accomplishing this research, the reasercher recommend that English as Foreign Language teaching learning, need to answer the authentic challenge which come across to the students' daily life. As we know, they live mostly, now, in the virtual circumstance. The lack of linguistic knowledge and the absence of consciousness of social being, could lead them in to dangerous situation. It is strongly suggest those students able to employ their linguistic knowledge for broader other life contexts, not only for themselves, but also to their nearest people in their boundary. In addition, concept of reading comprehension should not be scoped with text genre analysis, alike conservative culture of ELT. Some texts in the real life, sometimes, were not included in those conventional genre texts, however, those real texts are frequently appear in students' life.

References

Albashtawi, A. H., Jaganathan, P., & Singh, M. (2016). Linguistic Knowledge Aspects in Academic Reading: Challenges and Deployed Strategies by English-Major Undergraduates at a Jordanian Institution of Higher Education. *Higher Education Studies*, *6*(3), 61. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v6n3p61

Amin, K. F. (2021). Multicultural Education Disclosure Of The Meaning Of Sentences In A Discourse In The Media On-Line As An Alleged Defamation Case: Forensic Linguistic Studies. *Multicultural Education*, *7*(4), 180–186. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4706111

Br. Karo, S. E., Solin, M., & Adisaputera, A. (2019). Development of Rubric of Attitude Assessment of Writing Explanation Text Based on Information Literacy on 11th Grade Students of Vocational High School Pencawan Medan. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, *2*(4), 338–354. https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v2i4.521

Cahyadin, W., Martisa, E., & Yasin, Y. (2022). Analyzing Students' Needs for Syllabus Design of English For Science Corresponding Email Article's History Analyzing Students' Needs for Syllabus Design of English For Science. *Ethical Lingua*, *9*(1), 2022. https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.334

Chandra Sekhar Rao, V. (2017). A Brief Study of Words Used in Denotation and Connotation. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, *1*(1). http://www.jrspelt.com

Cheng, L., Cheng, W., & Li, J. (2016). Defamation case law in Hong Kong: A corpus-based study. *Semiotica*, *2016*(208), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1515/sem-2015-0114

Chivanga, S. Y. (2016). Qualitative Research Methodology and Numbers. *Journal of Social Sciences*, *47*(2), 119–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2016.11893551

Coyle, D. (2015). Analyzing Classroom Language in CLIL. In M. Bigelow & J. Ennser-Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics* . Routledge.

Daniel, E. (2016). The Usefulness of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches and Methods in Researching Problem-Solving Ability in Science Education Curriculum. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(15). www.iiste.org

Gajo, L. (2007). Linguistic knowledge and subject knowledge: How does bilingualism contribute to subject development? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *10*(5), 563–581. https://doi.org/10.2167/beb460.0

Ke, P., Ji, H., Liu, S., Zhu, X., & Huang, M. (2019). *SentiLARE: Sentiment-Aware Language Representation Learning with Linguistic Knowledge*. http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.02493

Koda, K. (2007). Reading and Language Learning: Crosslinguistic Constraints on Second Language Reading Development. *Language Learning Research Club*, *57*, 1–44.

Lang, P., & Zhang, R. (n.d.). *li182 Studies in Language and Communication Linguistic Insights Investigating Linguistic Knowledge of a Second Language*.

Maknun, T., & Iswary, E. (2021). A Hate and Provocative Speech Act in Social Media: A Forensic Linguistics Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *4*, 2021. https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v4i3.18196

Mampouw, H. L., Lukito, A. A., & Suwarsono, S. (2016). Student's Understanding of Graph Based on Information-Processing. In *International Journal of Active Learning* (Issue 1). http://aseanjournals.com

Maxwell, J. A. (2010). Using numbers in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(6), 475–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364740

Mintowati, M. (2016). PENCEMARAN NAMA BAIK: KAJIAN LINGUISTIK FORENSIK. *Paramasastra*, *3*(2). https://doi.org/10.26740/parama.v3i2.1525

Neale, J., Miller, P., & West, R. (2014). Reporting quantitative information in qualitative research: Guidance for authors and reviewers. In *Addiction* (Vol. 109, Issue 2, pp. 175–176). https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12408

Nieto, V. G., & Nieto, G. (2020). Defamation as a Language Crime-A Sociopragmatic Approach to Defamation Cases in the High Courts of Justice of Spain Courts of Justice of Spain. *International Journal of Language & Law*, *9*, 303–350. https://doi.org/10.14762/jll.2020.001

Park, D., Irwan Bahrudin, F., & Han, J. (2020). CIRCULAR REASONING FOR THE EVOLUTION OF RESEARCH THROUGH A STRATEGIC CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES. In *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods* (Vol. 8, Issue 3).

Pusiknas Bareskrim Mabes Polri. (2022, January 19). *Kasus Pencemaran Nama Baik Meningkat*. Https://Pusiknas.Polri.Go.Id/Detail_artikel/Kasus_pencemaran_nama_baik_meningkat.

Safarati, N., & Rahma, R. (2020). Analysis of Students' Understanding of Concepts on Momentum and Impulse Material Using Research-Based Learning (RBL) Models. *Indonesian Review of Physics*, *3*(1), 19. https://doi.org/10.12928/irip.v3i1.1944

Setyawan, R., & Wiraatmaja, T. (2018). THE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC CONTEXT IN TOEFL TEST SIMULATION ON LISTENING SECTION. *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature & Lingistic*, *5*(2), 45–57.

Shuy, R. W. (2010). *THE LANGUAGE OF DEFAMATION CASES*. Oxford University Press. https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195391329.001.0001/acprof-9780195391329

Siddiqui, A. (2018). "The principle features of English Pragmatics in applied linguistics." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *9*(2), 77. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.2p.77

Stringer, D. (2019). Lexical semantics: Relativity and transfer. In *Applied Linguistics for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners* (pp. 180–203). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8467-4.ch007

Sungbom Lee. (2012). A Pragmatic Analysis of Defamation and Slanderous Remarks. *Korean Journal of Linguistics*, *37*(2), 401–416. https://doi.org/10.18855/lisoko.2012.37.2.008

Zhang, H., & Koda, K. (2018). Vocabulary knowledge and morphological awareness in Chinese as a heritage language (CHL) reading comprehension ability. *Reading and Writing*, *31*(1), 53–74. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-017-9773-x

Zhao, Y., Shen, X., Senuma, H., & Aizawa, A. (2018). A comprehensive study: Sentence compression with linguistic knowledge-enhanced gated neural network. *Data and Knowledge Engineering*, *117*, 307–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.datak.2018.05.007

Zifana, M., Lukmana, I., & Sudana, D. (2018). *Narrative Texts in Three Copies of Court Decisions of Defamation Cases*. 239–245. https://doi.org/10.5220/0007165202390245