



WWJMRD2021; 7(12):120-126  
www.wwjmr.com

*International Journal  
Peer Reviewed Journal  
Refereed Journal  
Indexed Journal*

*Impact Factor SJIF 2017:  
5.182 2018: 5.51, (ISI) 2020-  
2021: 1.361*

*E-ISSN: 2454-6615*

**DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/HYRKX**

**Muhammad Fauzan**

muhammadfauzan.2020@stud  
ent.uny.ac.id

Indonesian Language and  
Literature Education, Master  
Study Program Yogyakarta  
State University, Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia

**Teguh Setiawan**

teguh\_setiawan@uny.ac.id

Indonesian Language and  
Literature Education, Master  
Study Program Yogyakarta  
State University, Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia

**Correspondence:**

**Muhammad Fauzan**

muhammadfauzan.2020@stud  
ent.uny.ac.id

Indonesian Language and  
Literature Education, Master  
Study Program Yogyakarta  
State University, Yogyakarta,  
Indonesia

## Acts of Hate Speech in News on Twitter Related to COVID-19

**Muhammad Fauzan, Teguh Setiawan**

**Abstract**

Legal cases that occur in today's society are more often found in cyberspace, which is on social media. Hate speech is still often found on social media, especially Twitter. COVID-19 pandemic has caused all activities to be paralyzed. The government has made a policy for all people to work from home. Start working from home, worship from home, and study from home. All activities that cause crowds are cancelled. There are some people who feel that the policies related to COVID-19 are not optimal. This gives rise to conflicting opinions and sometimes causes disputes in them. These opinions often lead to hate speech, resulting in legal violations. This study aims to analyse hate speech acts along with the speech events behind the netizens posting their comments on Twitter social media. The research method used is descriptive qualitative. The data source is in the form of netizens' hate speech in the Twitter comment column related to the COVID-19 news.

**Keywords:** hate speech, forensic linguistics, speech events, speech acts, COVID-19.

### 1. Introduction

Humans interact with each other using language. Almost all human activities cannot be separated from language. Masinambouw [in Chaer, 2014:6] considered that the language system functions as a means of human interaction in society. Language interaction in society is very complex. This complexity sometimes leads to misunderstandings. Misunderstandings begin when one party thinks he is using language in an appropriate context, but turns out to be misinterpreted by the other party. Lack of a comprehensive understanding of using language as an interaction process sometimes also causes many problems. Problems that occur in language sometimes result in legal violations. The role of language can also be used to address these problems. Language is also considered to have an important role for the implementation of a fair law. According to [Subyantoro, 2017:3], the role of language is needed to awaken and cultivate human awareness in creating and enforcing the law. The science of linguistics related to law is forensic linguistics.

Forensic linguistics is the application of linguistics to certain social domains, namely legal forums. Furthermore [Olsson, 2008:3] said that forensic linguistics is a combination of language, crime and law. The legal domains are law enforcement, judicial matters, laws, disputes, and the need to seek legal remedies. [Olsson, 2008:4] also stated that forensic linguistics can be used in cases or legal proceedings and personal disputes between parties which at a later stage can result in legal violations. Meanwhile, [Coulthard & Johnson, 2007:5] revealed several important points in forensic linguistics. These points include the language of legal documents, the language of police and law enforcement, interviews with children and vulnerable witnesses in the legal system, courtroom interactions, linguistic evidence and testimony of expert witnesses in the courtroom, authorship and plagiarism, as well as forensic phonetics and speaker identification. Furthermore [Coulthard & Johnson, 2010] explained that linguistic theory that can be applied in the legal realm includes the theory of grammar, conversation, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, speech acts, descriptive linguistic theories and techniques, phonetics and phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, discourse and text analysis.

In recent years, cybercrime has often occurred. Ease of accessing information is not

accompanied by good filters. There is a lot of information circulating in cyberspace. People can easily find the information they need. Social media is a means of distributing various information. One of the most widely used social media is Twitter. Every Twitter user feels free to express their feelings and thoughts on their account. Twitter users can write their tweets about anything, both on their own timelines and tweets in other people's posts. Fellow Twitter users can exchange information with each other through their tweets. Currently, there is a lot of news information related to the corona virus. Various media are busy uploading news about the corona virus. This then raised a lot of opinions from fellow Twitter users. There are Twitter users who feel that the government in handling the pandemic has been optimal and there are also those who feel that it is not optimal. The high interaction among Twitter users can trigger negative opinions. Interactions carried out on Twitter are not always in the form of positive speech, some are negative. These negative utterances sometimes cause disputes between other Twitter users. These negative utterances often lead to hate speech, resulting in legal violations. A person who commits hate speech is caused because that person has a different opinion and does not take sides with other people or something he is attacking with the crime of language.

According to [Sholihatin, 2019:38], language crimes are speeches both oral and written that are contrary to the rule of law and can harm others such as killing character, damaging reputation or good name, attacking honour, making others feel ashamed, creating public trouble for information, false or propaganda, creating fear because of threats, and so on. This is in line with [Mc Whorter, 2014:151] which said that the language a person speaks shapes the way a person views the world. This means that information in language crimes that a person receives will form a mindset that ultimately gives birth to negative opinions. If one is carried away by negative opinions in the crime of language, then one can hate other people. When these fellow people hate each other, their hearts and minds will be filled with anger which will lead to hate speech.

According to [Ahnaf & Suhadi, 2014] speech can be said to be hateful if the speech expresses feelings of hatred or intolerance that are extreme and those feelings are directed to other individuals or groups based on identities such as race and sexual orientation. This is in line with Robert Post [in Hare & Weinstein, 2009:123] hate speech as speech expressing hatred or intolerance of other social groups, especially on the basis of race or sexuality. Further Robert Post [in Hare & Weinstein, 2009:127] says "speech that is formulated in a way that insult, offends or degrade". It can be concluded that hate speech is speech that shows hatred or intolerance towards individuals or groups based on ethnicity, religion, and race. Hate speech also contains actions that can attack the honor of others such as insults, petty insults, defamatory accusations, and various other forms.

In Indonesia, there is a legal basis that regulates language crimes, especially hate speech. The legal basis is contained in Article 45 paragraph (2) of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law. The article reads "Every person intentionally and without rights disseminates information aimed at causing hatred or hostility to certain individuals and/or community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race and intergroup". Another legal basis that regulates hate

speech is Article 156. The article reads "Anyone who publicly expresses feelings of hostility, hatred, or demeans one or several groups of the Indonesian population, shall be punished with imprisonment for a maximum of four years or a fine of up to Rp 4,500 high."

According to [Suryani et al., 2021], a person's speech can be done verbally or in writing. If done orally, the utterance is carried out directly between the speaker and the speech partner with certain aims and objectives. If the utterance is done through writing, it means that the speaker writes certain intentions and goals to the speech partner. Speech acts are actions taken by the speaker to the speech partner through an utterance. A person's speech contains a certain communication function. Austin [in Chaer, 2010:27] divided speech acts in the form of performative sentences, namely, locutionary speech acts, perlocutionary speech acts and illocutionary speech acts. Locutionary speech acts are utterances that produce a meaningful linguistic expression. Perlocutionary speech acts are utterances that have an influence on the interlocutor. An illocutionary speech act is an utterance of doing something with a specific purpose and function.

Searle [in Leech, 1993:163] classified illocutionary speech acts into five kinds of speech forms, each of which has a communicative function. First, assertive speech acts are types of speech acts that state the truth of the propositions expressed. For example, the speech states, proposes, boasts, complains, expresses opinions, and reports. Second, directive speech acts are types of speech acts that aim to produce an effect in the form of actions taken by the speaker to the speech partner. Directive speech acts can also be called speech which states that the speech partner does something. For example, is the speech of ordering, commanding, begging, demanding, and giving advice. Third, commissive speech acts are types of speech acts that are tied to an action in the future. For example, the speech of promises, threats, rejection and pledges. Fourth, expressive speech acts are types of speech acts that reveal the psychological attitude of the speaker to a situation. Expressive speech can reflect psychological statements and can be in the form of expressions of joy, difficulty, joy, hatred, pleasure and misery. Fifth, declaratory speech acts are types of speech acts that relate the contents of the speech to reality. Searle [Leech, 1993:164] revealed that this declaration utterance falls into a special category, because the utterance is usually done by someone who in an institutional frame of reference is authorized to do so. For example, the utterance of firing, appointing and punishing.

Context refers to the time and situation of the speech. Context is also often considered as the cause and reason for communication. Context cannot be separated from the interpretation of the meaning of the speech. Leech [in Rohmadi, 2010:28] revealed that the essence of context is all background knowledge that is understood together by the speaker and the speech partner. Violations of the law against language crimes often occur due to misinterpretation of the context. Context can also be a means of clarifying the meaning in speech events.

Dell Hymes [in Rohmadi, 2010:30] also said that there are several conditions in speech events. First, settings or scenes. Settings relate to the time and place where the speech takes place, while the scene relates to the situation of place and time or the psychological situation of the

speaker. Second, participants relate to the parties involved in the speech, both speakers and speech partners, greeters and addressees, as well as senders and recipients. Third, ends is related to the purpose of the speech. Fourth, act sequence is related to the form and content of the utterance used by the speaker. Fifth, the key relates to the way and spirit of the speaker in conveying the message. Sixth, instrumentalises are related to the means of language used, both spoken, written, sign and so on. Seventh, norm of interaction and interpretation relates to norms or rules in interacting. Eighth, genre is related to the form of message narration. For example, in the form of poetry, prayer, prose, insults, orations and so on.

## 2. Research Methods

The research method used is descriptive qualitative. The data source is in the form of netizens' hate speech in news from various mass media on twitter related to COVID-19. The first stage of the analysis of this research is to identify

the form of speech data. The second stage of this research analysis is to identify speech events based on Dell Hymes' theory. Data collection techniques in this study are documentation and note-taking techniques. Documentation techniques include collecting screenshots of netizens' comments on Twitter related to hate speech. The note-taking technique is used to record matters relevant to the research theme.

## 3. Results & Discussion

The hate speech contexts found fall into several categories. These categories include the categories of insults, defamation, provoking, and spreading false news.

### 3.1 News in the Mass Media on the Gelora News @geloraco Twitter Account. The News Headline is "Malaysian Politicians Surprise Indonesia's Corona Cases Drop."



Fig. 1: Screenshot on the Gelora News Twitter Account @geloraco.

A twitter user chirped on a news post by the mass media, Gelora News. The tweet reads, "In Indonesia, it is not that Covid gone down, but test and contact tracing have been reduced as if Covid in Indonesia can be overcome, even though it is a lie. All for the sake of imaging the @jokowi regime @KemenkesRI."

The twitter user seemed to know that the test and close contact tracing of Covid-19 cases were reduced or designed in such a way. In fact, the government conducts tests and traces of close contacts of Covid-19 patients every day. The government is aggressively carrying out 3T efforts, which are testing, tracing, and treating, so that the corona in Indonesia can be resolved and social life returns to normal. The speech on figure one is a category of hate speech, insults and defamation. The utterance is included in the

form of expressive illocutionary speech. The utterance is an expression of the psychological attitude of the speaker because of anger and disappointment with the current situation. The speaker's utterance shows an attitude of hatred towards the President and the Ministry of Health which is indicated by the speaker marking the twitter account of the President and the Ministry of Health directly. The utterance is also included in the category of defamation. The speaker gives an opinion to the public that the corona case in Indonesia can be managed in such a way. This is shown in the sentence "All for the sake of imaging the regime". The speaker's utterance is not accompanied by definite evidence or data, so that the speaker's utterance could cause disputes among other twitter users.

**Table 1:** Speaking Analysis.

Settings or scene	The setting is on Twitter. The scene is the psychological situation of speakers who were disappointed and upset with government policies related to COVID-19.
Participant	The speakers are Twitter users who wrote hate speech. The speech partners are fellow Twitter users.
Ends	The speaker expressed his hatred to the public with the intent and purpose of insulting, attacking the honor and degrading the good name of the President and the Ministry of Health.
Act sequence	Hate speech leading to insults and defamation.
Key	Expressive hate category.
Instrumentalises	Writing.
Norm of interaction	Interpretation.
Genre	Insults.

**3.2 News in the Mass Media on the Detikcom @detikcom Twitter Account. The News Headline is**

**“Malaysia Surprised Corona in Indonesia Dropped Drastically Faster.”**



**Fig. 2:** Screenshot on Detikcom Twitter Account @detikcom

A twitter user chirped on Detikcom’s mass media news post. The tweet reads, “Testing is abolished, and news is controlled, it is important so that PPKM is considered successful.”

The twitter user’s utterances are not following the data and reality in the field. The actual data and reality are that the government, through the Covid-19 task force, is intensively carrying out 3T efforts to cut off the spread of the corona virus. News in various mass media also said that the ratio of positive corona cases in Indonesia was the lowest during the pandemic.

The hate speech on figure two is a hate speech in the category of provoking and spreading fake news. The utterance is included in the form of assertive illocutionary speech. The utterance is a statement from the speaker which tends to be subjective. The statement from the

speaker is relative, meaning that the speaker states the utterance is not based on real evidence or data but is based on guessing feelings. This is indicated by the word "kan", which means that the speaker is still not sure of his statement but immediately makes a statement to the public. The speaker's statement can trigger disputes among other twitter users, because the speaker makes a statement that is not in accordance with the real conditions in the field. Data in the field shows that the daily positive ratio in Indonesia is only 2.14% as of Monday, September 13, 2021 [CNN Indonesia, 2021]. The speaker's utterances that do not match the data can also be said to be a category of spreading false news. The spread of fake news not only contains lies, but also spreads hatred, slander and distrust of the government.

**Table 2:** Speaking Analysis.

Settings or scene	The setting is on Twitter. The scene is the psychological situation of the speaker who speculated on his statement.
Participant	The speakers are twitter users who did hate speech. The speech partners are fellow Twitter users.
Ends	The speakers gave statements to the public with the intent and purpose of provoking and spreading false news
Act sequence	Hate speech that leads to acts of provocation and spreading false news.
Key	Statements making assertive category.
Instrumentalises	Writing.
Norm of interaction	Interpretation.
Genre	Spreading fake news.

**3.3 News in the Mass Media on the CNN Indonesia @CNNIndonesia Twitter Account. The News Headline**

**is “Wamenkes: The Spread of Corona Varian Mu is not As Good As Delta.”**



**Fig. 3:** Screenshot on CNN Indonesia’s Twitter Account @CNNIndonesia

A twitter user chirped on a CNN Indonesia mass media news post. The tweet reads, “Start with arrogance first. The stupid habit of the official.”

The twitter user’s utterance attempted to undermine the good name of the Deputy Minister of Health by using words that show intolerance and are extreme. According to the results of laboratory tests, the Mu variant has resistance to vaccine conditions. The Deputy Minister of Health also said that the Mu variant had not been detected in Indonesia so far. This is based on genome sequencing test on seven thousand Covid-19 specimens in Indonesia.

The hate speech on figure three is a hate speech in the category of insult and defamation. The utterance is

included in the form of expressive illocutionary speech. The utterance is an expression of the psychological attitude of the speaker because of anger and disappointment at the statement from the Deputy Minister of Health. The speaker's utterance shows an attitude of hatred towards the Deputy Minister of Health by attacking his honour and good name. This is marked by the speaker's utterance "Kebiasaan pejabat oon". The word *oon* is an abbreviation of the word *bloon*. According to the online KBBI, *bloon* has the meaning of stupid. The utterance is also included in the category of defamation. The speaker tried to bring down the good name of the Deputy Minister of Health with his statement.

**Table 3:** Speaking Analysis.

Settings or scene	<b>The setting is on Twitter.</b> <b>The scene is the psychological situation of speakers who were angry and disappointed at the statement from the Deputy Minister of Health.</b>
Participant	The speakers are Twitter users who did hate speech. The speech partners are fellow Twitter users.
Ends	The speaker expressed his hatred to the public with the intent and purpose of insulting and defaming the Deputy Minister of Health.
Act sequence	Hate speech leading to insults and defamation.
Key	Expressive hate category.
Instrumentalises	Writing.
Norm of interaction	Interpretation.
Genre	Insults.

**3.4 News in the Mass Media on the Indonesia Today @idtodayco Twitter Account. The News Headline is**

**“Jokowi Confirms That Covid-19 Will Not Disappear Shortly.”**



**Fig. 4:** Screenshot on the Indonesia Today Twitter Account @idtodayco

A twitter user chirped on a news post from the mass media Indonesia Today. The tweet reads, “Because he really wants three periods to be allowed to use his stupid mind.” The twitter user’s words tried to defame and bring down the good name of the President. Through the Coordinating Minister for Maritime Affairs and Investment, the President said that “And we need to prepare ourselves to live with Covid-19. Because this Covid-19 will turn from a pandemic to an endemic.” The President said that so people are prepared to live side by side with Covid-19, which will turn from a pandemic to an endemic. The government continues to use the 3T strategy and strengthens the 5M protocol to the maximum so that community activities can return to normal.

The hate speech on picture four is a hate speech in the

category of insult and defamation. The utterance is included in the form of expressive illocutionary speech. The utterance is an expression of the speaker's psychological attitude because of anger and disappointment at the statement from the President. The speaker's utterance shows an attitude of hatred towards the President which is indicated by the speaker using the phrase "akal gobloke". This phrase is not appropriate to use to express opinions in a good and correct way. The word "goblok" in Javanese means stupid, so when interpreted the phrase means using stupid reason. The right phrase to use to express an opinion is reason. Speakers use the phrase "akal gobloke" with the aim of attacking the honour, discrediting and defaming the President.

**Table 4:** Speaking Analysis.

<b>Setiings or scene</b>	<b>The setting is on Twitter. The scene is the psychological situation of speakers who were angry and disappointed by President statement.</b>
Participant	The speakers are twitter users who did hate speech. The speech partners are fellow Twitter users.
Ends	Speakers expressed their hatred to the public with the intent and purpose of insulting, attacking honour and degrading and defaming the President.
Act sequence	Hate speech leading to insults and defamation.
Key	Expressive hate category.
Instrumentalises	Writing.
Norm of interaction	Interpretation.
Genre	Insults and Scolding.

**4. Conclusion**

Based on the research data, hate speech is categorized as insulting, defamation, provoking and spreading false news. The forms of hate speech that are categorized as insults and defamation are included in expressive illocutionary speech. The form of hate speech that is categorized as provoking

and spreading false news is included in assertive illocutionary speech. Hate speech made by some twitter users can lead to negative utterances that give bad opinions. These bad opinions can sometimes lead to disputes among other twitter users.

## 5. Acknowledgments

Following the publishing of this article, we would like to take this opportunity to thank you for Dr. Drs. Teguh Setiawan, M.Hum., for your effort and expertise as a in guiding. Your help enabled us to meet the scheduled time and maintain the standards journals.

## References

1. Ahnaf, M. I., & Suhadi. (2014). Isu-isu Kunci Ujaran Kebencian ( Hate Speech ): Implikasinya terhadap Gerakan Sosial Membangun Toleransi. *Jurnal Harmoni*, 13(3), 153–164.
2. Chaer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Rineka Cipta.
3. Chaer, A. (2014). *Linguistik Umum (Revisi)*. Rineka Cipta.
4. CNNIndonesia. (2021). Rasio Positif Covid RI Terendah Selama Pandemi, 2,14 Persen. <https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20210915020524-20-694373/rasio-positif-covid-ri-terendah-selama-pandemi-214-persen> (Diakses pada 19 September 2021)
5. Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2007). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. Routledge.
6. Coulthard, M., & Johnson, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. Routledge.
7. Hare, I., & Weinstein, J. (2009). *Extreme Speech and Democracy*. Oxford University Press Inc.
8. Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip Prinsip Pragmatik*. UI-Press.
9. Mc Whorter, J. H. (2014). *The Language Hoax: Why World Looks the Same in Any Language Hardcover*. Oxford University Press.
10. Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic Linguistics: Second Edition*. Cromwell Press.
11. Rohmadi, M. (2010). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Analisis*. Yuma Pustaka.
12. Sholihatin, E. (2019). *Linguistik Forensik dan Kejahatan Berbahasa*. Pustaka Pelajar.
13. Subyantoro. (2017). *Linguistik Forensik: Sebuah Pengantar*. Farishma Indonesia.
14. Suryani, Y., Istianingrum, R., & Hanik, S. U. (2021). Linguistik Forensik Ujaran Kebencian terhadap Artis Aurel Hermansyah di Media Sosial Instagram. *Jurnal Belajar Bahasa*, 6(1), 107–118. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32528/bb.v6i1.4167>