

Linguistic Distortion of Hate Speech in the Age of Abundance

Sri Pamungkas¹, Ayatullah Muhammadin Al Fath²

^{1,2,3}Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan Ilmu Pendidikan PGRI, Pacitan, Indonesia

Article Info

Page : 28-32

ISSN : XXXX-XXX

Corresponding Author

Sri Pamungkas,

STKIP PGRI Pacitan

Email:sripamungkas18@gmail.com

Abstract

The utilization of technology in the era of abundance needs to be balanced with intelligence in managing diction so as not to cause intrigue in society. Cybercrime, including cyber bullying, cannot be separated from the use of language in social media. Language that is used unwisely and even tends to occur linguistic deviations makes the communication building ineffective and even leads to disharmony. This research is important because hate speech, including on social media, has long-term effects that can affect mental, emotional, and physical health. The nature of this research is descriptive by choosing the listening method in providing data. Meanwhile, the data analysis method uses Pratley's ethnographic method, including domain analysis, taxonomy, cultural components and themes. Linguistic deviation in this study is in the form of language forms that are meaningfully and culturally unacceptable. The diction that appears as a form of linguistic deviation refers to insults, slander, divide and conquer, inciting and the like.

Keyword:

Linguistic deviation, hate speech, social media

1. INTRODUCTION

Entering the era of Abundance requires more energy and knowledge to be more thoughtful, including in terms of using language. The era of abundances (abundance) is characterized by a free/sharing economy so that everything is abundant and minimal cost, as predicted by Peter Diamandis, Co-Founder of Singularity University. The world is at hand because with just a small device, humans can travel the world, search for information and even interact with colleagues around the world. In terms of interaction, of course, the language factor cannot be separated. If in the past the proverb of your mouth was known, entering this era of abundance has shifted, if knowledge related to language ethics is lacking then not only your mouth is your harimaumu but also your finger is your harimaumu. Social media is increasingly swift and access is so fast that it makes it easier for humans to find information and even provide comments. But unfortunately, this technological sophistication has not been accompanied by good language attitudes, as evidenced by the many reports related to hate speech that appear on social media until they enter the realm of law. The expression of hate speech that is built through diction, sentences and supported by mimicry and pantomime is evidence of underestimating the function of language. The concept of good language, by using language according to the situation and conditions, has begun to be widely ignored. In the case of hate speech, the form of language chosen is a form of language that is unacceptable in society because of the sense of language that contains provocation, insults, defames, pits, and even slanders. The wave of digitalization is unstoppable, marked by the presence of various social media. Social media has also become the backbone as a means of communication in this digital century (Ministry of Trade, 2014: 43). The high number of users of social media content makes it easier for people to communicate. Communication is the process of conveying thoughts or feelings by one person to another using symbols that are meaningful to both parties, in certain situations, using certain media to change the attitudes or behavior of one or a number of people so as to cause certain expected effects (Effendy, 2003: 13). Everyone is free to communicate in various contexts, whether physical, psychological, or social, because the communication process does not occur in an empty space. Therefore, communication as a means of life has

several functions, namely as a means of control, motivation, information and as a means of emotional disclosure (Robbins, 2006: 310-311). The language used as a means of communication on social media is in the public domain. Humans freely post pictures, sayings, excerpts of talks, news and even comment on various things posted by others. Comments given using language media sometimes unconsciously hurt other people, groups or even society at large. It causes the relationship between writers and readers to be reciprocal, able, and easy to comment on each other. Starting with sarcasm, then giving each other comments that are increasingly uncontrolled on certain individuals, even the emergence of hate speech. The hate speech stimulates each other.

If it continues, the effect will affect a person in a short time to a long time. Linguistic intelligence needs to be considered, especially in terms of good and correct Indonesian language. Everyone is free to use words and it is not even wrong, but using any word requires analysis. Therefore, a person's linguistic intelligence shows his ability to manage diction and emotions according to the context of the situation. This hate speech contradicts the concept of language politeness as an indicator of linguistic intelligence, as well as communication ethics. Ethics is awareness and knowledge about good and bad behavior or actions taken by humans (Kemendag, 2014: 37). Ethics can be seen in the way netizens (active users of social media) speak. The absence of a filter or filter of consideration of good and bad values is the beginning of the disaster of social media abuse in the gadget era. Currently, there are many cases of hate speech such as insults, defamation, blasphemy, provoking and even spreading false news (hoaxes) in various social media applications. The use of inappropriate language in the public sphere causes public confusion. Arguments through the media will continue by bringing up unacceptable forms of language into new problems in the life of the era of abundance like today. Therefore, this research focuses on the discussion of hate speech aimed at institutions or organizations/communities.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is a qualitative research that is ethnographic in nature because it is in contact with individuals who have human or community interactions related to certain socio-cultural developments based on the theories adopted. The ethnographic method was chosen to explore in-depth information which according to Spradley (2007) aims to (a) understand the human family, which plays a role in informing theories of cultural ties, helping to understand complex societies; (b) aimed at serving humans, namely presenting problem solving for problems in society not just science for science. The ethnographic method in this article is focused on understanding the context (local and specific cultural elements), with the target achievement being an understanding of whether or not an utterance is acceptable in a public domain. The data used in this research are words, phrases, and clauses and sentences. The linguistic data in question is the word choice data chosen by a communicator in a public domain that leads to hate speech. The method of data provision in this research uses the listening method. The techniques applied include tapping and recording techniques, listening and recording techniques. The data analysis technique in this study uses a four-step analysis as expressed by Spradley (2007) which includes: 1) domain analysis, 2) taxonomy analysis, 3) componential analysis, and 4) cultural values analysis.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Hate speech expressed by a speaker can be directed at an individual or a group or institution. The delivery strategy is very unique, some are delivered vulgarly, some are delivered by personifying the identity attached to an institution. Each speaker has their own way or strategy in expressing their opinion, but inadvertently offends someone or even an institution that eventually ignites the anger of their interlocutors or members of institutions including institutions and communities where they are based. Data "PAMTER is said to be great, after being stabbed by a dagger, it can't be overcome. Let's comment who participated in PAMTER. Then what is the plan after the chairman was stabbed to death? I am an ordinary citizen who can pray" Lingual form in the form of a sentence "PAMTER is said to be great, after all, stabbed by a dagger, you can't overcome it. Let's comment who participated in PAMTER. Then what is the plan after the chairman is stabbed to death? I am an ordinary citizen who can pray" is a declarative sentence in the form of satire, with the first clause PAMTER said to be great containing diction or word choice that praises, but in the second clause Iha stabbed by a dagger aja kok kok can not overcome, is a clause that is meaningfully contradictory to the previous clause. The second clause tends to use pejorative diction with the use of the lingual form cannot overcome. The first sentence, PAMTER is said to be great, but when stabbed by a dagger, how come you can't overcome it, in

linguistics it is categorized as a form of indirect satire sentence. Satire sentences usually aim to express dislike, disagreement, and tend to be contradictory towards a person or group. Second sentence. Let's comment who joins PAMTER, contains a challenging meaning to invite or invitation to comment, so that PAMTER members comment. The sentence is reinforced by the next sentence, So what is the plan after the chairman was stabbed to death? The sentence also contains provocation and undermines others. Lingual form in the form of a sentence "PAMTER is said to be great, after all, stabbed by a dagger, you can't overcome it. Let's comment who participated in PAMTER.

Then what is the plan after the chairman is stabbed to death? I am an ordinary citizen who can pray" is a declarative sentence in the form of satire, with the first clause PAMTER said to be great containing diction or word choice that praises, but in the second clause Iha stabbed by a dagger aja kok kok can not overcome, is a clause that is meaningfully contradictory to the previous clause. The second clause tends to use pejorative diction with the use of the lingual form cannot overcome. The first sentence, PAMTER is said to be great, but when stabbed by a dagger, why can't you overcome it, in linguistics is categorized as an indirect form of satire sentence. Satire sentences usually aim to express dislike, disagreement, and tend to be contradictory towards a person or group. Second sentence. Let's comment who joins PAMTER, contains a challenging meaning to invite or invitation to comment, so that PAMTER members comment. The sentence is reinforced by the next sentence, So what is the plan after the chairman was stabbed to death? The sentence also contains provocation and undermines others. The sentence What is the plan after the chairman is stabbed to death? It is a rhetorical sentence form, which is a sentence that does not actually require an answer but serves to satirize. Rhetorical sentences often contain a question that actually contains an insinuation that is delivered specifically to mock. This uniform has become a political whore dog, - this uniform also kills the nation's children who speak the truth, - this uniform has also become a protector of Chinese financiers who seize the land rights of the Indonesian people, - this uniform also slanders the ulama accused of being terrorists, - this uniform is a traitor to the Indonesian nation. Based on the choice of words or diction chosen linguistically far from language politeness. The sense of hatred can be observed from the choice of words used, namely dogs, prostitutes, killing, seizing, slandering, and traitors contain provocative words which in the KBBI means stimulating to act; inciting. When referring to the diction that builds the sentences above, there is a tendency to insult or defamation, which is an act or way to attack honor or good name by alleging something with the clear intention of making it public. It's just that the subject who does or what the author means is not conveyed explicitly or actually (person/institution) but the author replaces it with this uniform phrase. In this case, the writer uses the personification language style, which gives the impression that inanimate objects (this uniform) seem to have lives and have properties as written in a series of sentences. It should be noted that the personification language style or *majas* is usually used with a specific purpose, namely to make the reader more emotionally provoked.

The synecdoche language style used in these sentences gives the impression that the subject (this uniform) personified by the writer seems to have the same nature, character and behavior. All those who are 'in uniform' as in the context in which the diction appears are considered to have the same nature. With an image with a photo of police officers in the background accompanied by the words "This uniform is the dog of political prostitutes, - this uniform is also the one who. This uniform also kills the nation's children who voice the truth, - this uniform is also a protector of Chinese financiers who seize the land rights of the Indonesian people, - this uniform also slanders the ulama accused of being terrorists, - this uniform is the traitor to the Indonesian nation " Based on the data above, the speaker (the author of the message on social media) does not explicitly mention who is meant, neither individuals nor institutions. Who is meant in speech is usually positioned as the subject, which is usually at the beginning of the sentence. However, in the sentences above, the speaker chooses the phrase this uniform as the subject, combined with diction that makes this uniform as if it were a living object. This uniform is personified as if it is capable of doing things as written, namely being a political whore dog, who kills the nation's children who speak the truth, being a protector of the Chinese financiers who seize the land rights of the Indonesian people, who slander the ulama accused of being terrorists, traitors to the Indonesian nation. Based on the choice of words or diction chosen linguistically far from language politeness. The sense of hatred can be observed from the choice of words used, namely dogs, prostitutes, killing, seizing, slandering, and traitors contain provocative words which in the KBBI means stimulating to act; inciting. When referring to the diction that builds the sentences above, there is a tendency to insult or defame, which is an act or method of attacking honor or good name by alleging something with the clear intention of making it public. It's just that the subject who does or what the author means is not conveyed explicitly or actually (person/institution) but the author replaces it with this uniform phrase. In this

case, the writer uses the personification language style, which gives the impression that an inanimate object (this uniform) seems to have a life and has properties as written in a series of sentences. It should be noted that the personification language style or *majas* is usually used with a specific purpose, namely to make the reader more emotionally provoked.

The synecdoche style used in these sentences gives the impression that the subject (this uniform) personified by the writer seems to have the same nature, character and behavior. The writer does not explicitly mention who is being referred to, neither individuals nor institutions. Who is meant in speech is usually positioned as the subject, which is usually at the beginning of the sentence. However, in the sentences above, the author chooses the phrase *this uniform* as the subject, combined with diction that makes *this uniform* seem like a living object. *This uniform* personified to be as if capable of doing things as written, namely being a political whore dog, who kills the nation's children who speak the truth, being a protector of the Chinese financiers who seize the land rights of the Indonesian people, who slander the *ulama* accused of being terrorists, traitors to the Indonesian nation. The author does not directly (explicitly) refer to individuals or institutions even though behind the sentences written there is a picture similar to a member of the police. In this case, the writer uses figurative language. Figurative language is usually studied in linguistics called semantics. Semantics is the study of meaning that studies the relationship between linguistic signs or lingual signs and the things they signify. The writer based on the data above uses subjects instead of people or institutions but with this figurative form of uniform. The writer is trying to convey his message with the personification language style. Personification language style is a language style that makes inanimate objects as if they have the properties and abilities of living things. In that case, it is as if the uniform is capable of being a prostitute, killing, protecting, robbing, slandering, and betraying. In addition to using the personification language style, the sentence writer also uses hyperbole, which is expressing something in an exaggerated and even absurd way. This can be seen from the bombastic word choice. The synecdoche style *totem pro parte* is also listed in the sentence written by the writer. *Totem pro parte* is a language style that displays the whole to point to some objects/situations. In this case, the Sentence Writer conveys that '*this uniform*' is all considered to have the same character or nature. In addition to semantics, the approach used is pragmatics.

Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, which involves interpreting what people mean in a particular context and how that context affects what is said. In pragmatics there is implicature, which is the intention contained in the utterance. In conveying the *maxims*, speakers and speech partners should obey the implicature. *maxims*, which are principles that must be adhered to in interaction. However, when examined from the words or sentences that are arranged far from the principles of politeness and less acceptable in the speech community, because they contain utterances that make uncomfortable. Based on the data written by the author, based on the study of linguistics, it is included in illocutionary speech acts. Illocutionary speech acts (TT) are language acts identified with explicit perpetrator sentences, except that the intended perpetrator is implied by the writer. Illocutionary action is the pressure or power of the will of others which is revealed by verbs: to order, force, dictate and so on. In the data above there are several forms of speech acts, as follows (1) The existence of expressive speech acts in the category of cursing. This can be observed from the choice of words used, namely dog. The function of expressive speech act of cursing category in pragmatics is to express anger or emotion. Therefore, this speech is rude and uncontrolled so that the speaker does not care about the feelings of the person he is cursing (2) Expressive speech in the category of insult, for example with the presence of the vocabulary of prostitutes. The function of insulting expressive speech is to humiliate, defame or offend the speech partner. Therefore, this speech is demeaning to the people who are insulted because this speech is intended for someone or something that is hated by the speaker (3) Expressive speech in the category of blame, for example, with diction as well as phrases or clauses that refer to the fault being committed by '*this uniform*'. The lingual forms of killing the nation's children, protecting Chinese financiers, depriving rights, slandering scholars, traitors to the nation refer to the expressive speech of the blame category. In pragmatics, expressive speech in the blame category has the function of wanting to blame certain parties. Therefore, this speech is usually a strong rebuke or accusation

4. CONCLUSION

Diction or sentences in interacting with other people, whether aimed at individuals or institutions or communities, should be chosen with the right diction and contain positive taste values. The positive taste value of the diction chosen gives a harmonious effect and vice versa. The constructed meaning of diction determines the intention of a speech, which is to give a good or bad effect or image.

REFERENCES

- Djajasudarma, Fatimah. 2008. *Semantics 2: Understanding the Science of Meaning*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Effendy, O. U. 2003. *Communication Science, Theory, and Philosophy*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- National Police Chief. 2015. *Handling of Hate Speech*. Chief of Police Circular Letter Number SE/06/X/2015. Jakarta.
- Ministry of Trade. 2014. *Social Media Optimization Guide for the Ministry of Trade*. Trade (1st ed.). (L. H. Hariqo Wibawa Satria, Ed.) Jakarta: Center for Public Relations.
- Robbin, Stephen D. 2006. *Organizational Behavior*. Volume One. Prenhalindo Persada. Jakarta.
- Soesilo, R. 1991. *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana dan Komentar Lengkap Pasal demi Pasal*. Bogor: Politea.
- Spradley, James P. 2007. *Ethnographic Methods*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Sumarlam, et al. (2017). *Understanding and Studying Pragmatics*. Solo: Bukukatta.
- Suwandi, Sarwiji. 2011. *Semantics Introduction to the Study of Meaning*. Yogyakarta: Media Perkasa.
- Ullmann, Stephen. 2007. *Introduction to Semantics*. Yogyakarta: Student Library
- Vidya, Prahassacitta. 2017. "Hate Speech and Emotionalization of Law", cited from <http://business-law.binus.ac.id/2017/08/3iujaran-kebencian-dan-emotionalization-of-low/#>. Diakses on 7 December 2019 at 06.10