Fake News Analysis on Supreme Court Decisions Relating to Law No. 11 of 2008 From Linguistic Forensic Perspective

Husni Thamrin, Dadang Sudana, Andika Duta Bachari and R. Dian Dia-An Muniroh
Department of Linguistics, The School of Post Graduate
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to analysis speech act form and speech event of a person from forensic linguistic perspective who break the rule of Law No. 11 of 2008 about Information and Electronic Transactions, Article 28 Paragraph (2), "Intentionally and Without Right Spread Information Intended to Induce Hate Speech or Hostility towards Certain Individuals and/or Community Groups Based on Ethnicity, Religion, Race, Group, and Intergroup (SARA)." This study used a desvriptive qualitative method. The data of conversation text includes identification, classification, analysis, and discussion. Participant who became the object of this research was a 54-year-old man who was accused of spreading fake news. The form of speech act data analysis refers to the theory of Austin & Searle (1969), while speech events refer to Hymes (1972). The results of the research show that there are four speech acts, such as; assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. The results of the research on speech events found eight speech events, starting from setting & scene, participant, ending, action, instrumentality, key, norm, and genre.
Keywords: fake news; law; speech acts; forensic linguistics

Analisis Berita Bohong Terhadap Putusan Mahkamah Agung Terkait UU No. 11 Tahun 2008 dari Perspektif Linguistik Forensik

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui jenis tindak tutur dan peristiwa tutur dari perspektif linguistik forensik terhadap seorang terdakwa yang melanggar aturan Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik, Pasal 28 Ayat (2), "Dengan sengaja dan Tanpa Hak Menyebarluaskan Informasi yang Bertujuan Menimbulkan Ujaran Kebencian atau Permusuhan terhadap Individu dan/atau Kelompok Masyarakat Tertentu Berdasarkan Suku, Agama, Ras, Golongan, dan Antargolongan (SARA)." Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Data berupa teks percakapan meliputi identifikasi, klasifikasi, analisis, diskusi, dan interpretasi. Partisipan yang menjadi objek penelitian ini adalah seorang pria berusia 54 tahun, terdadakwa sebagai pelaku penyebaran berita bohong. Bentuk analisis data tindak tutur mengacu pada teori Austin & Searle (1969), sedangkan peristiwa tutur mengacu pada Hymes (1972). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada empat bentuk tindak tutur, seperti; asertif, direktif, ekspresif, komisif, dan deklaratif. Hasil penelitian peristiwa tutur ditemukan delapan peristiwa tutur, mulai dari latar & adegan, partisipan, akhir, tindakan, instrumentalitas, kunci, norma, dan genre.
Kata kunci: berita bohong; hukum; tindak tutur; linguistik forensik

INTRODUCTION

The sentence that's spoken by speaker can give a negative influence to hurt some people as the impact from communication process that spoken by someone to other person (Tayebi, et al., 2019; Subramanian, 2017). The Information development & communication on a social media can bring the influence to the effiective of communication (Chen, et al., 2020). All kind informations from around the world are easy to be accessed on platform tool of social media, for example; facebook & twitter (Annamalai, et al., 2022). The impact of arbitrary speaking on social media can become a result into defamation of a person due to the spread of fake news and forms of hate speech. However, things that are very sensitive as a result of talking or updating status on social media that can create chaos or peace in society are those related to ethnicity, religion, race and intergroup (Giachanou, et al 2022). Therefore, everyone must be very careful about posting statuses or comments on social media. They nust consider whether the sentences made or written can cause harm to themselves and become entangled in the legal realm (Yin & Zubiaga, 2022; Rakhsita, et al 202). Furthermore, if it is related to ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup that can cause damage and chaos in the midst of Indonesian society with various religions, ethnicities and cultures (Bruning, et al., 2020; Caroll et al., 2019; Wibowo & Yusoff, 2014).

If this continues, it will have an impact on security disturbances in the community, such as; happening a local riots in every district of Indonesia Island, even resulting the biggest riots in every part of Indonesia province that lead to a separation between ethnic groups in the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia (Ganari & Ismunarno, 2019; Agustiningsih, 2017). To avoid some events that can bring bad impact to divide the unity of Indonesian society, the government is quick to respond by making special laws regarding wise behavior in using social media. For that reason, so the teenagers, adults, and parents can act

politely to avoid mutual hostility and want to win on their own (Rahman & Najamuddin, 2010). 2020; Sirola, et al 2021; Kruzan, et al 2022). The implementation of ITE Law by the government for all social media users is due to the large number of unwise users in social media. The government's intention is to enforce the ITE Law with the aim of minimizing criminal acts in the cyber world.

The government's concrete actions through the Ministry of Communication and Information apply the ITE Law (Electronic Information and Transactions) which reads as follows; The article 27 paragraph 3 related to ITE Law states that it is prohibited for anyone to intentionally and without rights distribute and/or transmit and/or make accessible Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents that contain insults and/or defamation (Mulyadi & Gusfa, 2019; Arianto, et al 2020; Timur, et al 2020; Susilawati, et al 2022; Santosa, 2022). For this research is used Article 28 Paragraph (2), they are as follows; "Intentionally and Without Right Spread Information Intended To Induce Hate Speech Or Hostility towards Certain Individuals and/or Community Groups Based on Ethnicity, Religion, Group, and Intergroup. Next, the criminal provisions are regulated in Article 45A paragraph (2) of Law Number 19 of 2016 amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 which reads "Anyone who intentionally and without rights disseminates information aimed at causing hatred or hostility to individuals and/or groups. certain communities based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup (Hakim, et al 2018; Menkominfo, 2019; Mawaza & Kholil, 2020; Zifana, et al 2021; Rahmawati, et al, 2002; Syahid, et al, 2022).

With the enactment of the ITE Law relating to Hostility towards Certain Individuals and/or Community Groups Based on Ethnicity, Religion, Group, and Intergroup. So, everyone must speak with good sentences on social media so, it does not offend the religion of each of its adherents (Kusmanto, 2020; Palupi, et al 2019), for example mentioning the

procedures for worship. Likewise with ethnicity, it is not permissible to insult or demean small or large ethnic groups, such as saying in a harsh and hateful tone. We must maintain good speech when uploading sentences on social media, for example; instagram, facebook, whatsApp, and the other platform of social media (Yunita, et al 2021; Fadhli, et al 2020; Kadriu, et al 2022). Every speech context spoken by language speakers must have explicit and implicit meanings (Kusmanto, 2020; Palupi, et al 2019). Therefore, the use of language in a context is called pragmatic, but to know the contents of the context in depth, specific theory and explanation are needed in understanding the interpretation of the meaning uttered by the speaker (Sudana, 2007; Frank, 2016; Timmer, et al 2021; Willems & peleen, 2021). As we know that a context can becomes a medium for explaining the specific purpose or intention (Rosyidah, 2022; Aziz, 2021; Muniroh, 2021). The media as one thing of expression that can support a purpose clarity (co-text) into the certain situation connected to an event or "context" (Hassani, et al 2019; Mutmainah). Cotext is often said to be a cultural setting, namely things that culturally influence the origin of speech (Ardiyanti, et al 2022; Wahdaniah, et al 2021; Daulay, 2021), while context is often said to be a physical setting, namely the place of origin. the speech happened (Bachari, 2010; Ryan, 2022). It can be understood that context and cotext closely related in the form of one's speech can have explicit or implicit meanings depending on one's speech whether the speech means action or only literal meaning. All of context of speechs that spoken, there must be a sequence of event processs that happened arround the speech act activities.

Referring to the explanation above, regarding to kinds of speech acts in fake news of social media related to the judge's decision against the defendant who violated the ITE Law, especially those that caused Hate Speech or Hostility towards Certain Individuals and/or Community Groups Based on Ethnicity, Religion, Group, and Intergroup, as well as a series of speech events that have occurred on social media. It is understandable that fake news is a form of psychological violence known as a form of social terror carried out by someone through technology and information devices on social media aimed at a person or group. This action aims to create trouble, slander, spread false and hate news and on social media with the aim of being known by the public. The problem in this research is focused on the form of criminal acts of crime of fake news on social media that are carried out by social media users who have been charged with the ITE Law because they are proven to be causing trouble between groups. Thus, the main study objectives are as follows: (1) to analyze speech act types of fake news that occur between groups on social media that lead to trouble, (2) to show the occurrence of speech events that have legal implications from speech that causes trouble on social media.

There are several previous studies that have examined the Religion, Race & Intergroup on social media, for example (Andu, 2018) have conducted research on. "Effect of the Religion, Race & Intergroup Postings on Social Media as Friendship" with a focus on analysis of waluyo (2007) based interview assessments about the Religion, Race & Intergroup posts. The next research (Purwiantono & Aditya, 2020) on "Classification of the Religion, Race & Intergroup, Hoax and RADIKAL Sentiments on Social Media Posts Using Multinomial Text" focuses on the analysis of the type of text indicated by posts containing the Religion, Race & Intergroup, based on the linguistic computational of Web API (Application Programming Interface). Then (Sugiarto & Qurratulaini, 2020) research with the theme, "Criminal Potential of Cyber Crime in Meme: A Forensic Linguistic Study" focuses on analysis related to posts containing the Religion, Race & Intergroup that insults on presidential candidate memes which are studied from speech acts based on Yule (Yule, 2006).

The beginning of pragmatics established in the 1960s. Some of linguists who first had introduced pragmatics, They were Lakoff and Ross. Subsequently there was a significant pragmatics development from philosophers. Austin (1962), Searle (1969), and Grice (1975) were pragmatists and philoshopers. In the United State of America, the work of tAustin (1962) together with his student Searle (in the year of 1969 to 1975), had big contributed to the development of pragmatics. The work of Austin' is made of pragmatics pioneer with the title, *How to do things with words*. Austin, in his work, expresses the idea of constative speech and performative. Other significant idea discusses about acts of locutionary, illocutions, perlocutions, and speech power of illocutionary. Several pragmatic experts, such as: Searle (1969) had developed of Austin's thinking. He had initiated a speech acts theory which is made significant in studies of pragmatic. The unlimited number of speech acts are categorized refered to the function and meaning, like: representative, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative.

Speech act is speech meanings that have different functions from the utterances that have been uttered so that all these utterances are as if the form of an action (Bublitz and Norrick, 2011; Muniroh, 2013; Jhon, et al 2019; Marsili & Green, 2021). Speech acts are produced through real situations from the use of language in the human mind, not the result of thinking about things in depth as philosophers do (Sukarno, 2018; Khalisah & Anjarningsih, 2020; Shahi, et al 2022). For example, speech acts between sellers and buyers that occur naturally in bargaining for goods where both parties have the intention of being able to understand each other's meaningful speech so that in the end there is an agreement in terms of bargaining for a merchandise (Mey, 2004; Anshari & Gupta, 2021; Ludwig, 2019).

Referring to the concept of speech act, we will actually understand when someone is using language (speaking), then basically he is doing an action (Saifudin, 2019: House, et al 2021; Alghazo, et al 2021). Therefore, in pragmatics, speech is always seen as having an action dimension (speech act). It should be underlined that when speech is said to be an action (Meyer, et al 2013; Ouwehand, 2022), then the speech is never value-free because the speech is designed to achieve certain goals or purposes by the speaker (Bentley, 2020; Malanchuk, 2021). It is possible that the speech delivered by the speaker will be very likely to have a legal impact if the speech is felt by the interlocutor, for example, as an act that hurts (Bachari, 2010; Ardhianti & Indayani, 2022).

Speech act, according to Searle (in Rahardi, 2005; Sbisa, 2013; Saragih, et al 2019; Kaptiningrum, 2020) utters that, practically there are three form ofspeech acts, among others: (1) locutionary act is speech act consist of words, phrases, and sentences that has specific meaning inside them. This sentence is able to be said as saying something with the action. (2) The illocutionary act describes the action of to do thing with something which has a certain purpose and function. Speech act can be uttered as the action of doing thing or something. An utterance "my hand itches" uttered by the speaker is not solely purposed to give information to the hearer at the time, while a conversation is being spoken, itching is lodged in the speaker's hand, moreover the purpose of speaker wants the listener to take certain action connected to itching at the hand of speaker, such as the speaking partner to take and give a balm. (3) perlocutionary act is the growing action that impact to speaking partner. The speech act is named the act can affect to someone. Utterance of "itching my hands", for example, able to be used to grow the fear effect of the speaking partner. This fear arises, because of the activity of works speaker as a bouncer who in his daily life is very close to hitting and injuring other people.

Furthermore, Searle (1969:36 in Bachari 2017; Acheoah & Emike, 2017;) classifies the illocutionary speech acts into five kinds of speech forms, each of which

has a specific communicative function. The five forms of speech that show the communicative function are as follows; *Assertives*, namely speech forms that bind all speakers to the truth of the propositions expressed in their speech, for example *stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, and claiming. Directives*, namely the form of speech that is intended to influence the speech partner to take the desired action. Examples of directive speech are to order, to command, to request, to advise, and to recommend. *Expressives* is categorized as speech act to express psychological attitude from the speaker through a state of observation or evaluation. Examples of these utterances are to expres of thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, hating, praising, and condoling. *Commissives*, which are forms of speech that function to express promises or offers. Examples of this speech are promising, swearing, threatening and offering something. *Declarations*, namely the form of speech that connects the contents of the speech with the reality at hand. Examples of this utterance are resigning, dismissing, baptizing (christening), naming, appointing, excommunicating, and punishing (sentencing).

The speech act described above occur because there is a series of utterances known as speech events (Wortham, 2008; Hidayatullah & Romadhon, 2020; Najiyah, et al 2019). Speech act is part of speech events, and these events become part of speech situations. Speech situations are pleasant situations with speech, for example, learning, use, and so on. (Wi, 2019; Liana & Utomo, 2020;). A speech event is the occurrence or ongoing linguistic interaction in one or more forms of speech involving two parties, namely the speaker and the interlocutor, with one main utterance, in a certain time, place, and situation (Susanto, 2016; Muslihah & Suryadi, 2019). Speech events are the occurrence of linguistic interactions in one or more forms of speech involving two parties, namely the narrator and the speech partner with one main utterance, at a certain time and place (Chaer and Agustina, 2004; Johan, 2022). It can be understood that speech events can be communicative in concrete and abstract ways so that they are regulated by formal and non-formal speech rules (Xiang, et al 2020; Carolus, et al 2018). Speech events can be in the form of monologues and dialogues. For example, speech that occurs in social media (speech events) and occurs on WhatsApp and Facebook (speech situations) (Thamrin, et al 2020; Akyuwen, et al 2020).

A speech event must have a speech component. (Hymes 1980 in Marwan, 2018; Pishgadam, et al 2020; Zaghal, 2021) suggests that a speech event must fulfill eight speech components (SPEAKING). The following is an explanation and understanding of the eight speech components, namely; 1) Setting and scene, more physical, which includes the place and time of the speech. While the scene is a psychological setting that refers more to the psychological atmosphere that accompanies the event. Different places and times can lead to different situations. Speaking orally in a classroom in a crowded situation is certainly different from speaking in writing on social media in a crowded atmosphere. 2) Participants are the parties involved in the conversation, can be speakers and listeners, greeters and addressees, or senders and recipients of messages. 3) End, refers to the intent and purpose of the speech. Speech events that occur in the courtroom intend to resolve a case case; however, the participants in the speech event have different goals. The prosecutor wants to prove the defendant's guilt, the defense tries to prove that the defendant is innocent, while the judge tries to give a fair decision. 4) Act sequence, refers to the form of speech and the content of the speech. The form of speech relates to the words used, how they are used, and the relationship between what is said and the topic of conversation. The form of speech in public lectures, ordinary conversations, and social media has a different sequence of actions. Changes in speech topics in speech events will affect the choice of language. 5) Key (k, refers to the tone, manner, and spirit

in which a message is conveyed: happily, seriously, briefly, arrogantly, mockingly (insultingly), etc. This can also be shown by gestures, and the lengthening of vowels in words, feels more expressive, the tone shows a peak of irritation 6) Instrumentalities, refers to the language used, such as spoken, written, via telegram or telephone. Instrumentalities also refers to the speech code used, such as language, dialect, fragment, or register. 7) Norms of interaction and interpretation, refers to norms or rules in interacting. For example, those related to how to instruct, ask questions, and so on. Also refers to the norms of interpretation of the speech of the interlocutor. 8) Genre is meant to refer to the category or variety of language used. The forms are poetry, myths, fairy tales, proverbs, riddles, insults (curses), prayers, orations, lectures, trades, circulars, editorials, and so on.

We can understand that every speech that is spoken in oral form must have a background of the speech event where the incident took place. However, speech acts that have occurred must have implicit meanings that can only be understood by people who understand the meanings implied in them. Thus, every speech cannot be separated from speech events that occur simultaneously by the speaker and speech partner who communicate reciprocally.

METHOD
The method used in this study was qualitative and descriptive (Tracy, 2019; Heglar, 2017). The data source is in the form of a constitutional court decision that has been signed by a 54-year-old defendant who violates the ITE Law that corelated to etnicity and intergroup of hate speech that found on social media, Facebook. Therefore, this study was conducted qualitatively and descriptively through a process of identification and classification based on pragmatic theory of speech acts and speech events. The qualitative element of this study lies mainly in the classification of speech types. At the first step is to identify all speech data forms that show the existence of sentences which are included in the assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative categories on facebook. This research is done qualitatively by referring to the speech acts theory (Searle 1969). The second step is analyzing speech events refered to theory (Hymes 1972). The last step is sorting out the sentence data of speech acts and speech events by analyzing the data, reviewing it, and discussing it.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
In the first part, this section presents data on the findings of various forms of illocutionary speech acts that have been inkracht, in the form of court decisions posted by the suspect on Facebook social media in the form of hate speech containing SARA (Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup) data on hate speech expressed in groups. Facebook with the initials BHW is categorized as a 54 years old. The statement was posted on February 24, 2018 to March 14 2018, or at least around that time which was still in February 2018 to March 2018, at the Defendant's house in Ngepeng Hamlet, Bendosari Village, Sukoharjo, Central Java, in connection with Article 85 of the Criminal Procedure Code, based on the Supreme Court Decree of Indonesia Republic Number: 84/KMA/SK/V/2018 dated 02 May 2018 appointed the Semarang District Court to examine and adjudicate "Intentionally and Without Right to Disseminate Information Intended to Incite Hatred or Hostility Certain Individuals and/or Community Groups Based on Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup (SARA)" as referred to in Article 28 paragraph (2). The findings were analyzed based on speech acts based on Searle (1969). The findings and analysis of speech act data can be seen below.

Table 1; Result

Types of Speech Act	Data of Fake News (SARA) Cause Hatred &Riots	Law Impact
1. Directive	Post dated 1 March, 2018 ; Url:https://www.facebook.com/7454	5 years punishment
	"Tak usah pikirPanjang, Mereka adalah teroris yang merugikan negara, langsung tembak biar mampus pribumi pribumi bodoh Itu" ("Don't think a long, they are terrorists who are harming the country, shoot straight away to kill those stupid natives")	
2. Declarative	Post dated February 28, 2018 Url.https://www.facebook.com/5477	5 years punishment
	"Saatnya bumi, air, dan udara bersih dirampas … dan kita harus beli semuanya…??? Aku nangis sampai keluar air mata darah putih saudara. ("It's time for the earth, water, and clean air to be snatched away, and now we have to buy everything..??? I cried until tears came out of my white blood).	
3. Expressive	Post dated February 25, 2018 Url. https://www.facebook.com/6256	5 years Punishment
	"Awas,,,,ambulan disiapke,,,, Kalo cuma mau membuktikan bau itu beracun dan menyesakan, yo gak usah ikut pengajian di situ, bukan ilmu dan iman didapat, tapi umpatan dan penyesalan." (Watch out,,,, ambulance is ready, if you only want to prove the smell is poisonous and stifling, you don't have to take part in the recitation there, you don't get knowledge and faith, but curses and regrets.")	

4. Asertive   Post dated February 4, 2018
             Url: https://www.facebook.com/2567   5 years

                                                     punishment

> *Berlomba ramah investasi,, berlomba mencari Coorporate Social Responsibility, berlomba korupsi sana sini,,,dan apa yang bisa didapat dari rakyat,,, kesengsaraan,kebodohan, dan kemiskinan,,, berapa uang negara yang kalian berikan buat investor untuk membuat rakyat sengsara,?* (friendly investment competition, competing for Corporate Social Responsibility, corruption here and there, and what can be obtained from the people,,, misery, stupidity, and poverty,,, how much state money do you give to investors to make people miserable

Data: #1 Post dated March 1, 2018   (Directive data analysis)

> *"Tak usah pikirPanjang, Mereka adalah teroris yang merugikan negara, langsung tembak biar mampus pribumi pribumi bodoh Itu"*
> ("Don't think a long, they are terrorists who are harming the country, shoot straight away to kill those stupid natives")

Data 1: To answer the status written by the Facebook account with the initials S.A in the S.M. group. B.W said that , *"Tak usah berpikir panjang untuk mengatakan para tentara itu sebagai teroris yang merugikan Negara".* **("Don't think a long, they are terrorists who are harming the country, shoot straight away to kill those stupid natives.** The sentence stated by BW is a directive speech act, a rhetorical statement sentence, by saying,*"Tak usah pikir Panjang…"* **("Don't think a long")**. The sentence has the implication of suggesting or forcibly giving advice. The sentence that has implications with a specific purpose for readers on Facebook social media who are friends with BW that they don't need to think a lot, consider, and have interpretations of soldiers who don't side with the poor people. It is clear that the soldiers sided with the businessmen of non-indigenous descent. Then B.W said on sentence, *"…mereka adalah teroris yang merugikan negara"* **("They are terrorists who are harming the country")**. This sentence has the implication that the army, which should be on the side of the poor people, is instead on the side of entrepreneurs of non-indigenous descent who have a lot of wealth. Foreign investors can do anything with the wealth they have. Investors can buy and pay soldiers to run their business smoothly without interference from any party trying to hinder their business in Indonesia. Therefore, BW assesses that the army has sided with investors. He argued that the army should protect and help the poor people. BW considers that soldiers who side with foreign investors are the same as terrorists who make a lot of losses to the state for their actions defending entrepreneurs of non-indigenous descent. Next in the sentence,*"..langsung tembak biar mampus pribumi pribumi bodoh itu"* **("..shoot straight away to kill those stupid natives")**. The sentence is an exclamatory sentence or an imperative sentence, which states to give order to shoot dead on the

spot directly against the ranks of soldiers who defend the businessmen of non-indigenous descent. BW strongly criticized by blaspheming the soldiers to die soon. The soldiers are stupid native as helpers or losers for foreign businessmen. They are not on the side of the poor people who are full of suffering and misery. In the sentence stated by the owner of the B.W Facebook account, there are several implications for the actions he has taken; The first is a form of negative evaluation of the army ranks which are considered by BW to be like terrorists who have caused a lot of harm to the country due to the actions of the military which support ethnic Chinese entrepreneurs. Second, BW's assessment of soldiers is equated with terrorists as traitors and destroyers of the country's integrity. Thus, BW's assumption and assessment of soldiers as terrorists is truly a cruel accusation and does not match the actual facts. BW believes that the main task of the military is to guard and protect the common people from threats and arbitrary actions from foreign businessmen against the poor. However, on the contrary, BW thinks that the army is more in favor of non-indigenous entrepreneurs. Third; BW clearly insulted harshly and full of revenge for the actions of the army which were not in favor of the people. He said the army should defend and protect the common people who are being oppressed by foreign businessmen. then, BW ridiculed the soldiers by calling the stupid natives on the side of the Chinese ethnicity not on the side of the poor. BW's ridicule towards the army has crossed the line and does not appreciate that the mental and physical struggle of this army is actually aimed only at defending the defense of the Indonesian state and helping the common people.

Data: #2 Post dated Febuary 28, 2018 (Declarative data analysis)

> *"Saatnya bumi, air, dan udara bersih dirampas … dan kita harus beli semuanya…??? Aku nangis sampai keluar air mata darah putih saudara.*
> *("It's time, for the earth, water, and clean air* to be snatched away.... and now we have to buy everything..??? I cried until tears came out of my white blood).

From data 2, the owner of the Facebook account with the initials B.W said, *"Saatnya bumi, air, dan udara bersih dirampas… dan kita harus beli semuanya…? Aku nangis sampai keluar air mata darah putih saudara.* **(It's time for the earth, water, and clean air to be snatched away,,,, and now we have to buy everything..? I cried until tears came out of my white blood).** It is clear that the sentence is a category of declarative speech acts. In the speech that written by the owner of the Facebook account with the initials BW, there are three sentences that have different interpretations of meaning in their explanations. The first is the words Pertama, kata *"saatnya"* **(It's time for)** memiliki arti yang menandakan keterangan waktu awal mulanya kejadian suatu peristiwa yang sedang berlangsung. Kemudian pada kalimat, has a meaning that indicates the initial time of the occurrence of an ongoing event. Then in the sentence, *"..bumi, air, dan udara bersih telah dirampas"* **…the earth, water, and clean air to be snatched away)** is a directive sentence that has an interpretation of the assessment and comparison of the results of natural resources that have definitely been owned by the Indonesian people since ancient times. This is because they are located in

Indonesia and can be fully used and provide benefits to all Indonesian people.

However, after the non-native entrepreneurs are given freedom by the government with the rules set by government laws, the non-native entrepreneurs are free to fully manage them with the existence of binding regulations issued by the government. Because of this, BW has the implication that non-indigenous entrepreneurs have indirectly taken by force the abundant natural resource wealth on Indonesian soil and they have taken away the rights of the Indonesian people to be able to manage it and enjoy the results of natural resources which are duly utilized by the Indonesian people. The second, in sentence "…*dan kita harus beli semuanya…?*" **(…and now we have to buy everything..?)** is an interrogative sentence that is rhetorical in tone or does not require an answer. The implication of this sentence explains that the results of natural wealth originating from the earth, water and air have been controlled by non-indigenous entrepreneurs who fully manage the natural resources of Indonesia's earth. While the common people are miserable as employees and manual laborers. Thus, BW asked a rhetorical tone of question with the implication that the native Indonesian people must buy natural resources that come from their own homeland? It is logically unacceptable that we have to buy natural resources that are properly managed and enjoyed by the Indonesian people, not by non-indigenous entrepreneurs who make the most of the natural resources in Indonesia.

The third in sentence "*aku nangis sampai keluar air mata darah putih saudara*" **(I cried until tears came out of my white blood)** is a declarative sentence, in this case it is a statement about the deep sadness of the owner of the BW Facebook account, namely crying hyperbolically explaining that his crying was causing white blood to flow. This has the implication that Indonesia's abundant natural resources are taken for granted by non-indigenous entrepreneurs by obtaining the greatest profit which has an impact on the misery of the people who become manual laborers for these entrepreneurs. Common people who become servants in their own country, under the orders and power of foreign businessmen, that's why BW feels very sad for the misery and suffering of the Indonesian people who are in the grip of the orders and power of non-native businessmen in Indonesia. However, the sadness that he made viral on Facebook media was only to seek sympathy from readers so they could feel the sadness that BW was experiencing. Thus, BW has the intention to convey these sentences full of sorrow for what has happened to the poor common people, full of torment and suffering from foreign businessmen who come and do business in Indonesia.

Data: #3 Post dated February 25, 2018 (**Expressive data analysis**)

"*Awas,,,, ambulan disiapke,,,,*
Kalo cuma mau membuktikan bau itu beracun dan menyesakan, yo gak usah ikut pengajian di situ, bukan ilmu dan iman didapat, tapi umpatan dan penyesalan."
(Watch out,,,, ambulance is ready, if you only want to prove the smell is poisonous and stifling, you don't have to take part in the recitation there, you don't get knowledge and faith, but curses and regrets.")

From data 3, the owner of the Facebook account with the initials B.W said *"Awas,,,,ambulan disiapke,,,,kalo cuma mau membuktikan bau itu beracun dan menyesakan, yo gak usah ikut pengajian di situ, bukan ilmu dan iman didapat, tapi umpatan dan penyesalan."* **(Watch out,,,, ambulance is ready, if you only want to prove the smell is poisonous and stifling, you don't have to take part in the recitation there, you don't get knowledge and faith, but curses and regrets.** This sentence is an expressive speech act. At the beginning of the sentence there is the word, "Awas." **(beware)** which has the implication of calling attention to all readers who are friends with BW on his Facebook media account. Maybe BW also reminds all friends and readers on Facebook to be careful about poisons that can be deadly in a place or company owned by non-indigenous entrepreneurs, especially the warning is addressed to mothers who often conduct recitations at non-indigenous businessmen's places. Then, there are the words, *"ambulan disiapke"* **(ambulance is ready)** has the interpretation that when women are doing recitation in company buildings owned by non-natives. They are exposed to the smell of poison that spreads and results in poisoning or fainting for the women who are doing the recitation. Therefore, ambulance transportation facilities have been prepared to transport poisoned mothers to buildings owned by non-indigenous entrepreneurs. Next is a series of sentences *"..kalo cuma mau membuktikan bau itu beracun dan menyesakan..,yo gak usah ikut pengajian di situ"*. **(..if you only want to prove the smell is poisonous and stifling, you don't have to take part in the recitation there).** This sentence implies a cause and effect that occurs in the company area. Meanwhile, the phrases spoken by BW

meant to persuade local residents, especially mothers who used to conduct regular recitations at company buildings owned by non-indigenous entrepreneurs, so that they would no longer hold recitations at that location. The reason why there is no need to carry out the recitation at that place is due to the smell of poison that spreads around the company's location which can cause shortness of breath and even fatal things that can cause death. Therefore. BW tries in every possible way to create fake news and information against non-indigenous entrepreneurs so that all of its goals to defame non-indigenous entrepreneurs can be successful.

Then with the sentences *"…yo gak usah ikut pengajian di situ"* **(you don't have to take part in the recitation there)**. This sentence is to convince mothers who participate in conducting recitations in company buildings owned by non-indigenous people, emphatically saying there are no benefits for mothers attending recitations, this is for sure the owner of the BW Facebook account commenting on Muslim women who are participating in reading the Al-Quran. Then BW gave punishment to the mothers by making fun of the mothers who attended the recitation group. According to him, mothers who joined the recitation center were only to get appreciation and praise from non-indigenous entrepreneurs. BW said that it is not knowledge and faith that is gained through recitation but curses and regrets. It is understandable that the owner of the BW Facebook account clearly intends to ridicule and humiliate the mothers who attend the recitation as an act that invites condemnation from the surrounding community that they side with non-indigenous entrepreneurs and regret it.

Data: #4 Post dated February 4, 2018

(**Assertive data analysis**)

> *"Berlomba ramah investasi,, berlomba mencari Coorporate Social Responsibility, berlomba korupsi sana sini,,,dan apa yang bisa didapat dari rakyat,,, kesengsaraan,kebodohan, dan kemiskinan,,, berapa uang negara yang kalian berikan buat investor untuk membuat rakyat sengsara,?"* (friendly investment competition, competing for Corporate Social Responsibility, corruption here and there, and what can be obtained from the people,,, misery, stupidity, and poverty,,, how much state money do you give to investors to make people miserable)

Dari data 4; From data 4; B.W in his Facebook account explained that*, "Berlomba ramah investasi, berlomba mencari* Coorporate Social Responsibility (CSR)*, berlomba korupsi sana sini,,,dan apa yang bisa didapat dari rakyat,,, kesengsaraan,kebodohan, dan kemiskinan,,, berapa uang negara yang kalian berikan buat investor untuk membuat rakyat sengsara,?"* **(Friendly investment competition, competing for Corporate Social Responsibility, competing for corruption here and there, and what can be obtained from the people,,, misery, stupidity, and poverty,,, how much state money do you give to investors to make people miserable).** The sentences stated above are included as assertive speech acts. At the beginning of the sentence there is repetition of the word "Berlomba", the first reads, , *"Berlomba ramah investasi, berlomba mencari Coorporate Social Responsibility, berlomba korupsi sana sini,,"* **(Friendly investment competition, competing for Corporate Social Responsibility, corruption here and there..).** In the sentence, *"Berlomba ramah investasi"* **(Competing friendly for investment)** there is an interpretation of the meaning which states that foreign investors promise the government to be willing to take part in investing and invest their shares, helping the income of the surrounding community by having factories or companies established around the population's location so that it will open up jobs. new for the people who live around the factory. Even though the investments made by investors are to get big profits from the investments they make. Then in the sentence, "compete to find CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility)". This sentence has the implication that foreign investors are trying to get sympathy from the government and local residents whose area will be the company's establishment. The investors promised and argued that the company being established would be environmentally friendly and employ local people to work at the company as factory employees. However, in reality only a few local people were employed as factory employees with a note that the workers had to obey the rules of the factory.

The next sentences said, *"Berlomba korupsi sana sini,,,"*, **(Competing for corruption here and there…).** Sentences that have implications for government officials in charge of the factory location area. Officials are authorized to seek and select foreign entrepreneurs who can be invited to work together to provide large personal benefits in the form of finance for personal gain. They deliberately provide permits and procedures for foreign entrepreneurs to invest in their territory. This is done by local officials with the aim of obtaining large profits from foreign entrepreneurs who have invested in the area. In the next sentence BW says *",,,dan apa yang bisa didapat dari rakyat,,, kesengsaraan, kebodohan, dan kemiskinan,,,".* (…**and what can be obtained from the people,,, misery, stupidity, and poverty,,,).** As a result of the greed of the businessmen and local officials, the people have become poor and full of suffering. Poor people are deliberately treated as employees or factory

workers who have to work hard until the afternoon and evening with a small salary just enough to eat. They don't demand much for their rights as workers because they are stupid and poor. So, they only get misery from the treatment of the local government and foreign businessmen. Then BW, expressed his disappointment with the government with the sentence, "…*berapa uang negara yang kalian berikan buat investor untuk membuat rakyat sengsara,?*" (… **how much state money do you give to investors to make people miserable)**. Sentences that indicate a criticism of the local government in favor of foreign investors. They take huge profits from the crops and utilize the power of the indigenous people as factory workers. Residents around the factory who become laborers have to work hard for little pay without any welfare benefits.

From the utterances of the sentences put forward by BW in commenting on the government's attitude in favor of investors from the Chinese Ethnicity to invest in Indonesia. Both parties, both from the government and

ethnic Chinese businessmen, are competing for the greatest profit even though by way of corruption and oppressing the local people. With sentences full of complaints that the people have become poor and miserable as a result of the government's actions that side with the entrepreneurs, not the people, so that the people live under poverty and are full of misery.

In the second part, it presents an explanation of the findings of 4 speech act data (directive, declarative, expressive, and assertive) which are closely related to the form of illocutionary speech events on social media in the form of facebook expressed by participants based on Hymes (1972). Findings and data analysis of speech events can be seen below.

In the second part, it presents an explanation of the findings of 4 speech act data (directive, declarative, expressive, and assertive) which are closely related to the form of illocutionary speech events on social media in the form of facebook expressed by participants based on Hymes (1972). Findings and data analysis of speech events can be seen below.

Table 2: Results

Setting and scene	*Participants*	*Ends*	*Act sequence*	*Key*	*Instru-mentalities*	Norm	Genre
Social Media	Speaker	Post Hostility Certain Ethnic	Ethnic, Religion, intergroup (SARA)	Directive Declarative Expressive Assertive	Written text	Inter-pretation	hatred

From the 5 speech acts proposed by Searle (1969), there are only 4 speech acts (directive, declarative, expressive, and assertive) on BW's Facebook account. There is a relationship with speech events based on the SPEAKING category (Hymes 1972), the eight components of speech events, all of which have compatibility starting from the setting & scene taken from social media, participant is a speaker, end is hate/hostile posting, act sequence is in type of hate speech or well known as abbreviation of SARA , key is a speech act based on Searle

(1969) namely assertive, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. Then instrumentalities in written form, norms in the form of interpretation of the implicit meaning of speech. Finally, the genre of various types of language insults.

CONCLUSIONS
In the speech act research on facebook with the initials BW about fake news related to criminal law offenses in the form of a constitutional court decision, it was found that Searle (1969) based illocutionary speech

acts were assertive, directive, expressive, and declarative. From the four speech act data of the suspect, there are more dominant utterances, the first is the expressive form. All of them are implicitly filled with hatred and hostility to a certain person or group. While the speech events that occur in hate speech acts that contain SARA, are in accordance with the SPEAKING component proposed by Hymes, although there are differences in the types of speech acts uttered by speakers who spread hatred and mischief, but in essence all of these utterances are forms of illocutionary speech acts. which has an implicit meaning refers to speech in the imperative form. There are many factors that trigger hate and hostility utterances posted on social media, including on the basis of dislike for a person or group so that they try to highlight their existence so that they can be recognized by participants who are within the scope of the media so that they forget the ethics or social norms that apply in the community. the media community in using polite language does not offend and harm the privacy rights of others.

REFERENCES

Aldwairi, M., & Alwahedi, A. (2018). Detecting fake news in social media networks. *Procedia Computer Science, 141,* 215-222.

Ansari, S., & Gupta, S. (2021). Customer perception of the deceptiveness of online product reviews: A speech act theory perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, *57*, 102286.

Akyuwen, I., Sasabone, C., & Tabelessy, N. (2020). Ragam bahasa gaul dalam media sosial Facebook remaja negeri Passo kota Ambon. *Mirlam: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, *1*(1), 93-102.

Ardhianti, M., & Indayani, I. (2022). Tuturan yang berdampak hukum ditinjau dari elemen dan fungsi konteks kultural di media sosial Tik-Tok Indonesia. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, *8*(1), 143-159.

Acheoah, J. E. (2017). Searle's speech act theory: An integrative appraisal. *American Research Journal of English and Literature (ARJEL)*, 22-25.

Annamalai, N., Kabilan, M. K., & Soundrarajan, D. (2022). Smartphone apps as a motivating tool in English language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *12*(1).

Andu, C. P. (2018). Efek Postingan SARA di Media Sosial Terhadap Pertemanan. *KRITIS: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Hasanuddin*, 1-10.

Alghazo, S., Zemmour, S., Al Salem, M. N., & Alrashdan, I. (2021). A cross-cultural analysis of the speech act of congratulating in Kabyle and Jordanian Arabic. *Ampersand*, *8*, 100075.

Bachari, A.D., & Juansah, D.E. (2017). *Pragmatik: Analisis Penggunaan Bahasa.* Bandung: Prodi Linguistik SPS.

Bachari, A.D. (2010). Analisis Pragmatik Terhadap Tindak Tutur yang Berdampak Hukum. *Jurnal KIMLI.* Diakses dari; http://a-research.upi.edu/operator/upload/pro_2010_kimli_andika_dutha_bachari.pdf

Bachari, A.D. (2010). Analysis of form and theme of hate speech against President Joko Widodo on social media. *Prosiding AtlantisPress volume 257* ICOLITE 2018.

Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N.R. (2011). *Foundations of Pragmatics.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Bruning, P. F., Alge, B. J., & Lin, H. C. (2020). Social networks and social media: Understanding and managing influence vulnerability in a connected society. *Business Horizons*, *63*(6), 749-761.

Bentley, A. (2020). Social identity, group speech, and negotiated meaning. *Language & Communication*, *72*, 13-24.

Chaer, A., & Agustina, L. (2004). *Sosiolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal Edisi Revisi.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Chaer, A., & Agustina, L. (2010). *Sosiolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Carroll, C. L., Dangayach, N. S., Khan, R., Carlos, W. G., Harwayne-Gidansky, I., Grewal, H. S., ... & Wu, A. (2019). Lessons learned from web-and social media-based educational initiatives by pulmonary, critical care, and sleep societies. *Chest*, *155*(4), 671-679.

Chen, X., & Wei, S. (2020). The impact of social media use for communication and social exchange relationship on employee performance. *Journal of knowledge management*.

Febriyani. (2018) Analisis Faktor Penyebab Pelaku Melakukan Ujaran Kebencian dalam Media Sosial. Lampung: *Skripsi Unpublished*.

Franke, M., & J̈age, G. (2016). *Probabilistic Pragmatics, or Why Bayes' Rule is Probably Important for Pragmatics*. Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft. Diakses dari https://www.semanticscholar.org

Fadhli, M., Sufiyandi, S., & Wisman, W. (2020). Peningkatan Kesadaran Masyarakat dalam Menggunakan Bahasa yang Bijak di Media Sosial pada Era Digitalisasi. *Jurnal Abdi Pendidikan*, *1*(1), 25-31.

Ferahtia, A. (2021). See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www. researchgate. net/publication/350567414. Surface water quality assessment in semi-arid region (el hodna watershed, algeria) based on water quality index (WQI).

Giachanou, A., Ghanem, B., Ríssola, E. A., Rosso, P., Crestani, F., & Oberski, D. (2022). The impact of psycholinguistic patterns in discriminating between fake news spreaders and fact checkers. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, *138*, 101960.

Gunawan, W., Wirza, Y., & Holik, N. A. (2020). Textual construction of the hearing-impaired students' recount texts: A case of students with special needs in writing to mean. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 526-537.

Ganari, M. A. (2019). Pertanggungjawaban pidana terhadap penyebaran informasi suku agama ras dan antargolongan yang menimbulkan permusuhan dan kebencian. *Jurnal Hukum Pidana dan penanggulangan Kejahatan*, *8*(2), 187-194.

House, J., Kádár, D. Z., Liu, F., & Bi, Z. (2021). Altered speech act indication: A problem for foreign language learners?. *System*, *101*, 102554.

Heglar, L. E., & Cuevas, J. (2017). Qualitative methods, language, and science. Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 37(3), 183.

Harjono, M., & Suryadi, M. (2019). ketimpangan diglosik dalam peristiwa tutur masyarakat multilingual mesuji raya Sumatera Selatan. *Arkhais-Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, *10*(2), 109-116.

Hakim, L., Kusumasari, T. F., & Lubis, M. (2018, April). Text mining of UU-ITE implementation in Indonesia. In *Journal of physics: conference series* (Vol. 1007, No. 1, p. 012038). IOP Publishing.

John, P., Brooks, B., & Schriever, U. (2019). Speech acts in professional maritime discourse: A pragmatic risk analysis of bridge team communication directives and commissives in full-mission simulation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *140*, 12-21.

Johan, M. (2022). Peristiwa Tutur pada Tuturan Remaja Cadel Suatu Kajian Neuro-Morfologi. *Deiksis*, *14*(2), 175-183.

Kruzan, K. P., Williams, K. D., Meyerhoff, J., Yoo, D. W., O'Dwyer, L. C., De Choudhury, M., & Mohr, D. C. (2022). Social media-based interventions for adolescent and young adult mental health: A scoping review. *Internet Interventions*, 100578.

Kadriu, F., Murtezaj, D., Gashi, F., Ahmedi, L., Kurti, A., & Kastrati, Z. (2022). Human-annotated dataset for social media sentiment analysis for Albanian language. *Data in Brief*, *43*, 108436.

Khalisah, A., & Anjarningsih, H. Y. (2020). "Taking it for granted": The utilization of pragmatic aspects in entertainment news reporting on Instagram. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(3), 508-516.

Kaptiningrum, P. (2020). Analisis Tindak Tutur Lokusi, Ilokusi & Perlokusi pada Whatsapp Group Sivitas Akademika IBN Tegal. *LINGUA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, *17*(1), 95-102.

Ludwig, K. (2020). What are group speech acts?. *Language & Communication*, *70*, 46-58.

Leuwol, T. (2018). Penerapan Sanksi Pidana Terhadap Pelaku Cyber Crime yang Menyebarkan Isu Suku, Ras, Agama dan Antar Golongan (SARA) Melalui Media Sosial Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang ITE Nomor 19 Tahun 2016. *LEX CRIMEN*, *7*(2).

Menkominfo. (2019). Pasal 27 Ayat 3 UU ITE *Tidak Mungkin Dihapuskan.* Diunduh dari:https://kominfo.go.id/index

Muniroh, D. (2013). Follow-Up Responses To Refusals By Indonesian Learners of English As a Foreign Language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *2*(2), 281-293.

Meinert, J., Mirbabaie, M., Dungs, S., & Aker, A. (2018, July). Is it really fake?– Towards an understanding of fake news in social media communication. In *International Conference on Social Computing and Social Media* (pp. 484-497). Springer, Cham.

Mawaza, J. F., & Khalil, A. (2020). Masalah Sosial dan Kebijakan Publik di Indonesia (Studi Kasus UU ITE No. 19 Tahun 2016). *Journal of Governance Innovation*, *2*(1), 22-31.

Marwan, R. (2018). *Analisis Peristiwa Tutur Berdasarkan Komponen SPEAKING Dell Hymes.* Semarang: Prodi Bahasa Indonesia SPS UNESA

Mulyana. (2005). *Kajian Wacana: Teori, Metode & Aplikasi Prinsip-Prinsip Analisis Wacana.* Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.

Muharomah, I. A., & Mahmud, L. H. (2021). Bijak Berbahasa Dalam Media Sosial: Workshop Penerapan Literasi Dalam Media Sosial Di Pesantren Nafidatunnajah. *Jurnal Abdimas Adpi Sosial dan Humaniora*, *2*(4), 201-205.

Marsili, N., & Green, M. (2021). Assertion: A (partly) social speech act. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *181*, 17-28.

Mey, J.L. (2004). *Pragmatics an introduction.* United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

Najiyah, F., Mutiara, R. A., & Lestari, R. D. (2019). Peristiwa tutur berdasarkan aspek "speaking" dalam tayangan "katakana putus". *Parole Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, *2*(4), 507-514.

Ouwehand, K., de Nooijer, J., van Gog, T., & Paas, F. (2022). Action-speech and gesture-speech integration in younger and older adults: An event-related potential study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, *64*, 101100.

Purwiantono, F. E., & Aditya, A. (2020). Klasifikasi Sentimen Sara, Hoaks Dan Radikal Pada Postingan Media Sosial Menggunakan Algoritma Naive Bayes Multinomial Text. *Jurnal Tekno Kompak*, *14*(2), 68-73.

Purba, A. (2011). Tindak Tutur dan Peristiwa Tutur. *Pena: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *1*(1).

Rakshitha, K., Ramalingam, H. M., Pavithra, M., Advi, H. D., & Hegde, M. (2021). Sentimental analysis of Indian regional languages on social media. *Global Transitions Proceedings*, *2*(2), 414-420.

Rahmawati, N., Muslichatun, M., & Marizal, M. (2021). Kebebasan Berpendapat Terhadap Pemerintah Melalui Media Sosial Dalam Perspektif UU ITE. *Widya Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Kajian dan Penelitian Hukum*, *3*(1), 62-75.

Rahardi, K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia.* Jakarta: Erlanggahttps://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1034241.pdf.

Ryan, U. (2022). Solidarity acts in the context of language diversity:

Students' encounters with epistemological difference. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior, 66*, 100946.

Rahman, A., Nurlela, N., & Najamuddin, N. (2020). Penyuluhan Bijak Bermedia Sosial Pada Masyarakat di Desa Tarasu Kabupaten Bone Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Pengabdian UNDIKMA, 1*(2), 70-76.

Susanto, H. *(2016). Konteks Tutur, Situasi Tutur, Peristiwa Tutur, dan Tindak Tutur.* Diakses dari: https://bagawanabiyasa.wordpress.com

Sirola, A., Kaakinen, M., Savolainen, I., Paek, H. J., Zych, I., & Oksanen, A. (2021). Online identities and social influence in social media gambling exposure: A four-country study on young people. *Telematics and Informatics, 60*, 101582.

Samsonovich, A. V., Gudwin, R. R., & da Silva Simões, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Brain-Inspired Cognitive Architectures for Artificial Intelligence: BICA* AI 2020: Proceedings of the 11th Annual Meeting of the BICA Society* (Vol. 1310). Springer Nature.

Sarifudin. (2021). *Tindak Tutur Provokatif pada Media Sosial: Analisis Linguistik Forensik* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Hasanuddin).

Shahi, M. A. J., Gharagozloo, N., & Raissi, R. (2021). Investigating Teachers' Perceptions and Instructional Practices Regarding Form-Focused Instruction of Speech Acts in Iranian EFL Context.

Saifudin, A. (2019). Teori tindak tutur dalam studi linguistik pragmatik. *Lite: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya, 15*(1), 1-16.

Sugiarto, S., & Qurratulaini, R. (2020). Potensi Kriminal Cyber Crime pada Meme: Sebuah Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *Deiksis: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 7*(1), 46-57.

Sukarno, S. (2018). Politeness strategies, linguistic markers and social contexts in delivering requests in Javanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(3), 659-667.

Saragi, V., Nuratika, S., Fransiska, F., Yolanda, M., & Ardiyanti, N. (2019). A Review of Speech Act Theories Focusing on Searle (1969). *Elsya: Journal of English Language Studies, 1*(2), 61-68.

Syahid, A., Sudana, D., & Bachari, A. D. (2022). Perundungan siber (cyberbullying) bermuatan penistaan agama di media sosial yang berdampak hukum: kajian linguistik forensik. *Semantik, 11*(1), 17-32.

Subramanian, K. R. (2017). Influence of social media in interpersonal communication. *International Journal of Scientific Progress and Research, 38*(2), 70-75.

Sbisà, M., & Turner, K. (Eds.). (2013). *Pragmatics of speech actions* (Vol. 2). Walter de Gruyter.

Tracy, S. J. (2019). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. John Wiley & Sons.

Thamrin, H., Bachari, A. D., & Rusmana, E. (2019). Tindak Tutur Kebencian di Media Sosial Berkaitan Delik Hukum Pidana (Kajian Linguistik Forensik). In *Seminar Internasional Riksa Bahasa*.

Tayebi, S., Manesh, S., Khalili, M., & Sadi-Nezhad, S. (2019). The role of information systems in communication through social media. *International Journal of Data and Network Science, 3*(3), 245-268.

Zifana, M., Lukmana, I., & Sudana, D. (2021). The portrayal of defamation case defendant in court verdict. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 94-103.

Timmer, K., Costa, A., & Wodniecka, Z. (2021). The source of attention modulations in bilingual language contexts. *Brain and language, 223*, 105040.

Tawakol Gaber El-Zaghal, F. (2021). Fields of Text Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Study in light of applying Dell Hymes Speaking Model to Joe

Biden's speech on the Middle East (2021). *International Journal of Humanities and Language Research*, *4*(1), 1-39.

Utumo, A. P. Y. (2021). Analisis Situasi Tutur dalam Perbedaan Berkomunikasi Presiden Jokowi Melalui Cuplikan Video pada Channel Youtube Metrotvnews. *UNDAS: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian Bahasa dan Sastra*, *17*(2), 173-184.

Wi, M. (2019). *Etnografi Komunikasi.* Diakses dari: https://www.academia.edu/24765314/Etnografi_komunikasi?auto=download

Waluya, B. (2007). *Sosiologi (Menyelami Fenomena Sosial di Masyarakat).* Setia Purna Inves. Bandung.

Willems, R. M., & Peelen, M. V. (2021). How context changes the neural basis of perception and language. *IScience*, *24*(5), 102392.

Wortham, S. E. (2005). Socialization beyond the speech event. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, *15*(1), Xiang, X., Zheng, B., & Feng, D. (2020). Interpreting impoliteness and over-politeness: An investigation into interpreters' cognitive effort, coping strategies and their effects. Journal of Pragmatics, 169, 231-244.95-112.

Yin, W., & Zubiaga, A. (2022). Hidden behind the obvious: Misleading keywords and implicitly abusive language on social media. *Online Social Networks and Media*, *30*, 100210.