

## Forensic Linguistic Study on Cases of Hate Speech on Social Media

**Resa Jumiati<sup>1</sup>, Tadkiroatun Musfiroh<sup>2</sup>, Teguh Setiawan<sup>3</sup>**

Magister Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta<sup>1,2,3</sup>

resajumiati99@gmail.com

Received: DD/MM/YYYY

Revised: DD/MM/YYYY

Published: DD/MM/YYYY

### How to cite (in APA style):

Jumiati, Resa. Musfiroh, tadkiroatun. Setiawan, Teguh (2025). Forensic Linguistic Study on Cases of Hate Speech on Social Media. *IJFL (International Journal of Forensic Linguistic)*, 5(1), 1-7

Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/xxxxxjr.xx.xxx.Page>

**Abstract-** Hate speech refers to widespread verbal insults in cyberspace. This happens because most people consider comments and insults in cyberspace to be normal in public spaces. Based on these problems, researchers are interested in studying more deeply the cases of hate that have resulted in legal cases on social media. This research is qualitative research using descriptive analysis methods which aims to examine hatred of hatred on social media in the form of posts or comments which lead to legal cases. Data collection methods are carried out through several techniques. First, researchers searched for data through electronic media 'Google' and 'You-Tube'. The search keywords used were "Cases of Hate Speech on Social Media". The search was carried out on June 15, 2024 regarding these keywords. Second, the data collection technique continues with the observation method. The listening method is used to observe and listen to evidence that makes the suspect involved in a legal case. Then, the data was reprocessed using a verbatim technique. Meanwhile, the instruments used to collect data are human instruments. The data was analyzed semantically and pragmatically using the matching and matching method. The research results show that most cases of hate originate from posts or statuses uploaded directly to the owner/perpetrator's account. The data studied consisted of three cases which were analyzed using forensic linguistic studies. The results of the study show that the form of hatred that occurs is in the form of posts aimed at triggering other parties. Apart from that, there are those who deliberately carry out SARA actions. Therefore, the perpetrator is subject to a crime based on evidence from the witness who reported it.

**Keywords:** Hate Speech, Forensic Linguistics, and Social Media.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Hate speech, particularly through text messages, posts, or comments on social media, has been on the rise in recent years. Since 2018, 3,640

incidents of SARA-based hate speech have been handled online, according to the Ministry of Communication and Informatics (Kominfo) (Kominfo.go.id, 26/04/2021). A increasing issue,

especially in the political sphere, is hate speech, which is frequently classified as online harassment. An investigation by the Alliance of Indonesian Independent Universities and Monash University Indonesia Journalists highlighted a significant increase in hate speech targeting nine minority groups during the 2024 presidential and vice-presidential campaign (aji.or.id, 15/02/2024). Many individuals perceive aggressive comments and insults in cyberspace as a normal part of public discourse, leading to a lack of fear or hesitation in posting offensive remarks online. This normalization of online hostility contributes to the continuous spread of hate speech, as users feel emboldened to express extreme views without considering the consequences.

Despite legal repercussions, many perpetrators claim they did not intend to insult or spread hatred when confronted with legal action. This suggests a lack of awareness among social media users regarding what constitutes hate speech and its potential impact. Often, individuals do not fully grasp the legal implications of their online behavior, especially when engaging in heated discussions. Social media platforms further facilitate the rapid spread of offensive remarks, as users easily join in comment threads without critical reflection. Consequently, hate speech cases continue to surface, with only a small fraction leading to legal action, while the majority remain unaddressed (Triyanto, 2024: 566).

A notable recent case of hate speech involved a TikTok user with the initials AB, who was arrested for uploading a video containing hate speech directed towards Lukas Enembe's followers, the previous governor of Papua. Papuan internet users were incensed by his two-minute video, which garnered thousands of comments. Because of this, he was accused under Article 45A paragraph 2 together In accordance with Law Number 19 of 2016 about Information and Electronic Transactions, Article 28 paragraph 2, he was fined one billion rupiah or nine months in prison (RRI.co.id).

Speech acts like "insulting" or "defaming," which are classified as constative verdicts (Allan, 1986: 194) or constative confirmatives (Bach & Harnish, 1979: 42), are considered hate speech from a linguistic perspective.

Such speech acts contribute to what is known as a "language war," where language is used as a tool or weapon to attack individuals or groups based on their ideas, beliefs, or identities (Aziz, 2021: 19). The prevalence of hate speech on social media underscores the need for deeper linguistic analysis to understand its structure and implications.

Several studies have examined hate speech on social media, though differences in research focus and theoretical frameworks remain. For example, Imamah et al. (2023) analyzed threats and verbal abuse directed at feminists on Instagram using a forensic linguistic approach. Their study highlighted linguistic patterns in hate speech directed at Okky Madasari's Instagram account due to her support for Regulation Number 30 of 2021 by the Minister of Education and Culture pertaining to the Prevention and Handling of Sexual Violence (PPKS). While their research provided insights into linguistic evidence in online hate speech, broader gaps remain in examining the relationship between hate speech and legal prosecution.

Given the increasing prevalence of hate speech and the high usage of social media in Indonesia, legal frameworks such as Law Number 19 of 2016 aim to regulate and curb these offenses. However, understanding hate speech from a legal standpoint requires more than general linguistic analysis—it necessitates forensic linguistic expertise. Forensic linguistics plays a crucial role in examining hate speech cases by analyzing linguistic evidence that can be used in court proceedings (Coulthard & Johnson, 2010). Unlike general linguistic studies, forensic linguistics focuses on the legal implications of language use, making it essential in addressing hate speech that leads to legal action.

Building on this foundation, this research aims to explore hate speech cases that have resulted in legal proceedings from a forensic linguistic perspective. By analyzing the linguistic patterns of hate speech in social media posts and comments, this study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of how language functions as evidence in legal contexts. The research is titled "Forensic Linguistic Study of Hate Speech Cases on Social Media" and aims to identify the forms and characteristics of hate speech that have led to legal consequences.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS

This qualitative research employs a descriptive analysis method to examine online hate speech on social media, specifically posts or comments that result in legal cases.

The data collection process consists of multiple techniques. First, researchers searched for cases using electronic media sources such as Google and YouTube. The keyword used in the search was "Cases of Hate Speech on Social Media," conducted on June 15, 2024.

While numerous cases appeared in the search results, researchers applied selection criteria by focusing on the most recent cases from 2023. However, not all identified cases proceeded to legal action. To refine the dataset, only cases that had undergone legal proceedings and resulted in court decisions in 2023 were included for further study. Providing a clearer inclusion and exclusion criterion such as jurisdiction, type of speech, or legal basis would strengthen the methodological rigor. Additionally, reliance on Google and YouTube raises concerns about data reliability and replicability. Incorporating structured databases such as legal case archives, government reports, or court records would enhance data accuracy and credibility.

Second, the research employs an observation method. However, the description of this method requires further clarity. The study mentions "listening" as an observation technique used to analyze evidence leading to legal proceedings. It would be beneficial to specify whether court transcripts, case files, or official verdicts were reviewed. The data collection process included verbatim note-taking, and the study focused on three selected legal cases related to hate speech.

The primary research instrument is the researcher, following Moleong's (2013:168) definition of qualitative research, where the researcher serves as the planner, data collector, analyst, and interpreter. This role involves direct engagement in data collection, from

identifying cases to analyzing their legal and linguistic implications.

Data analysis was conducted using semantic and pragmatic approaches within the field of forensic linguistics. Semantic analysis helps uncover word meanings that may be ambiguous or misunderstood, especially in legal contexts (Aziz, 2021:5). Forensic linguists provide expert interpretations to assist investigators, judges, prosecutors, lawyers, witnesses, or victims in understanding the implications of specific expressions. However, hate speech analysis cannot rely solely on semantic interpretation. Expressions that appear negative or defamatory in a literal sense may have different implications depending on context, such as humor. Therefore, integrating a pragmatic perspective provides a more comprehensive analysis.

The research employed both the matching and agih methods, which are appropriate for forensic linguistic studies. The referential matching method, used in this study, determines meaning based on real-world references, while the agih method analyzes linguistic structures internally (Sudaryanto, 1993:14-15). These methods provide a structured framework for analyzing hate speech cases and their legal implications.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hate speech circulating on social media is very easy to track for reporting. This is because negative posts and comments that have been made easily go viral (a term for something that is quickly known by many people on the internet). In a moment, the post spread and became a topic of discussion among many groups. Thus, when someone creates content or makes negative comments that contain hate speech, the target party will easily find out, including taking reporting action. Especially if the perpetrator openly mentions the victim's name, even tagging the victim's account in his comments. The following is some research data in the form of hate speech which has resulted in the perpetrator being caught in a legal case.

Data 1:

Astaghfirullah, ini MASJID, Tapi mereka bilang di kandang babi\*. Saya tidak pernah diajarkan untuk bermusuhan dengan orang. Tapi jika agama saya dihina demi Allah saya tidak terima. Mana Dewan Masjid Indonesia, Semoga tidak tinggal diam. (Data was analyzed in Indonesian)

The hate speech in the case above was written as a post on Sinta MamaAzka's Facebook account. The perpetrator with the initials SMP was charged with intentionally breaking the law and lacking the authority to spread information that would incite hatred or animosity toward specific people and/or community groups on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity, and intergroup (SARA), as defined by The Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2016 about Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions, specifically Article 45A, paragraph (2).

The post was accompanied by a screenshot of a post from Opa Sea's Facebook account which wrote the sentence So di kandang babi ini. binatang zamua ngoni layani KUA which includes a photo of Suhardji Tontey, owner of the Opa Sea Facebook account, with the Al-Falah Mosque in Malalayang in the background. Netizens who saw the post immediately captured the layer and made the screenshot viral. The post from the owner of the Facebook account Sinta MamaAzka was posted on February 17 2023. The post contains the meaning/elements of hate speech because the sentence indirectly means provoking or arousing anger or inciting action or inviting the Indonesian Mosque Council not to remain silent. The post was proven to be aimed at the Indonesian Mosque Council and the Al Falah Mosque congregation who were friends with the perpetrator because in the post the perpetrator tagged 52 (fifty two) Facebook accounts including the Indonesian Mosque Council so that they would know that there had been a desecration at the Al Fallah Malalayang Mosque.

The perpetrator admitted that he had no intention of provoking, but could not remain silent when he saw Suhardji Tontey's post because he said

that the mosque was a pig's drum, so he made the action viral. In fact, the opposite happened, the post was actually reported because it was considered that the perpetrator's post was provocative and contained content that spread information containing hate speech and hostility between fellow believers. The meaning of provoking became even clearer because the owner of the Facebook account Sinta MamaAzka actually clarified the post of the owner of the Facebook account Opa Sea by writing the sentence in his post, namely " Astaghfirullah, ini MASJID. Tapi mereka bilang di kandang babi ..." "

Based on the court's decision, if this article was only spoken or written in person, it would not be a problem, but if it was written on social media. People who share the same religion as the status writer will directly be triggered to act because of the writer's writing. If examined using forensic linguistic studies, sentences Astaghfirullah, ini MASJID. Tapi mereka bilang di kandang babi. dan ... Mana Dewan Masjid Indonesia, Semoga tidak tinggal diam." is a provocative sentence because it can trigger the anger of people of the same religion as the author, namely Islam, when they see the post. Therefore, The offender faces penalties under Article 45A (1). According to Anyone who knowingly and without permission spreads false and misleading information that causes consumers to lose money on electronic transactions faces a maximum penalty of six (six) years in prison and/or a fine of IDR 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah), according to Article 28 paragraph (1). Furthermore, anybody who knowingly and unapprovedly spreads information meant to provoke animosity or hatred toward particular people and/or community groups on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity, and intergroup (SARA) faces a maximum penalty of Article 28 paragraph (2).

Data 2:

Bismillah, eh lupa. guys, Hari ini aku kayaknya dipecat dari kartu keluarga karena aku penasaran banget sama yang namanya kriuk babi ya. Jadi hari ini rukun iman udah aku langgar udah pasti di kartu keluargaku dicabut tapi aku cuma penasaran karena di tiktok ku banyak kriuk yaa, tapi kok makan kriuk babi aku merinding ya, kemarin makan dagingnya biasa aja. Kak lilu udah berapa kali makan babi? totalnya tiga kali ya. pertama di srilanka, waktu itu

aku ga sengaja makan, aku ga bisa bahasa inggris pok gitu kan, aku pikir pork itu tepok pok pok pok jadi waktu usiaku masih dua puluh empat tahun, terus abis makan babi aku tanya sama ex aku kan. eh masjid dimana? gaya gaya nanya masjid, udah makan (tertawa). Terus yang kedua kemaren ada acara di tempatnya non ya non, terus yang ketiga ini aku dengan kesadaran diri yaa. Cuma pengen rasain kek apa sih rasanya, kriuk babi yang rame di.... Ya Allah dipecat ini dari kartu keluarga. Kok rasanya kayak ini yaaa, kriuk babi kayak daging sapi yang dijemur yang keras ga seenak orang yang cerita di TikTok sih aku ya, kalo aku b ajaa, ya allah takut ada yang masuk puskesmas ni keluarga ku. Maafkan aku ya cuma konten kok.

The aforesaid hate speech data was carried out by the perpetrator uploading a 1:40 (one minute and forty seconds) video of eating pig kriuk to the tiktok account @lilumukherji, which was later viewed by 4.5 million users and the YouTube account @Linamukherjee which was then watched by 420,901 viewers. Syarif Hidayat as a netizen saw the video content and reported it on March 28 2023. Responding to this case, the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI) issued a fatwa from the Indonesian Ulema Council Number: 03/MUI-SS/IV/2023 dated April 12 202. Dr. Nurkhalis, M.Ag as Member of the Fatwa Commission of the Indonesian Ulema Council explained that the video of eating pork kriuk begins by saying the word "Bismillah" in conjunction with a haram item, which falls into the category of degrading, insulting and insulting the Islamic religion.

If analyzed linguistically, using the word 'Bismillah' to eat pork kriuk is a statement that is deliberately said to insult. This is because the perpetrator is a Muslim and knows about this. The perpetrator also made it clear in the next sentence that he had violated the pillars of faith. The perpetrator took the action and uttered the statement consciously and deliberately. This action will be responded to with hostility and hatred by followers of the Islamic religion because the sacred name of Allah is used to initiate something that is classified as a major sin from an Islamic religious perspective. Then, this action is classified as an act that denigrates the teachings of the Islamic religion because the perpetrator in the video, consciously, carried out an

act that is classified as a major sin in public and with the intention of spreading it.

Because he It was determined to have done an act that the Palembang District Court imposed a prison sentence of two the punishment Two hundred and fifty million rupiah (Rp 250,000,000) in fines was imposed for violating Article 28 paragraph (2) of the law, in conjunction with Article 45 A paragraph (2) of Republic of Indonesia Law No. 19 of 2016 Amendment to Republic of Indonesia Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning the offender. The sentence was shortened to two years while the offender was in interim incarceration with a mandate that they stay there, and three (three) months in prison will be substituted if the fine is not paid ITE. This violation was proven by forensic linguistic studies in terms of semantic and pragmatic analysis.

Data 3:

Carilah literatur-literatur sejarah dunia, ada enggak yang menyembah olloh subhanataala sebelum abad ke 7, enggak ada satupun enggak ada, samanya kalian sama tuhannya orang orang yang lain lah, agama agama yang lain, tuhannya baru ada tahun sekian, kalau tuhan yesus itu bapak yahudi yang menjelma jadi manusia, digua mana olloh yang baru ada diabad ke 7 mengaku ngaku menciptakan langit dan bumi, kurang ajar olloh ini, baru abad ke 7 baru ada, begu ganjang aja ada sekitar 250 tahun yang lalu ada begu ganjang, tidak pernah begu ganjang mengaku menciptakan langit dan bumi, gunduruwo baru dikenal sekitar 150 tahun, tidak pernah mengaku dia menciptakan langit dan bumi, kurang ajar olloh ini, dimana olloh sekarang ini, digua mana sekarang ya, olloh olloh gara gara kau banyak kali tersesat orang.

The data above is data on 3 hate speeches carried out by a perpetrator with the initial's RS using the YouTube channel Anak Batak. The action is carried out by carrying out livestreaming which can be watched by anyone who can access YouTube so that the livestreaming is automatically spread on You-Tube social media. The perpetrator did a live broadcast containing sentences about religious blasphemy. The video went viral on social

media and was reported by witnesses who saw the video.

The perpetrator was detained by investigators on 08 November 2022 for violating Article 45A (1). Every A maximum prison sentence will be imposed on anyone who willfully and unlawfully disseminates false and misleading information that causes consumers to lose money on electronic transactions as defined by Article 28 paragraph (1). 6 (six) years in prison and/or a maximum fine of IDR 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah); and (2) Anyone who willfully and unlawfully spreads information intended to incite hatred or animosity toward specific individuals and/or community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup (SARA) as defined in Article 28 paragraph (2) faces a maximum penalty of 6 (six) years in prison and/or a maximum fine of IDR 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

If examined using forensic linguistic studies, several sentences in the data above make the post entangled in a legal case. The sentence 'kurang ajar olloh ini' contains the meaning of blasphemy against the Islamic religion because it mentions the name 'Allah'. Apart from that, the repetition of the pronunciation 'Allah' in the last sentence contains the impression of mocking and insulting the nature of God. In fact, this is an act that violates the religious principles of every religion. The case was tried by the Medan District Court and stipulated a sentence of 1 (one) year and 6 (six) months in prison.

### III. CONCLUSIONS

This study identifies key linguistic characteristics of hate speech in cyberspace, emphasizing how forensic linguistic methods aid in its analysis. The findings reveal that most hate speech cases originate from posts or statuses uploaded directly by the perpetrators, rather than mere comments on others' content. Through forensic linguistic analysis of three cases, specific linguistic markers were identified, such as provocative language intended to incite reactions and discourse strategies targeting sensitive issues, including SARA-related offenses. The study highlights that these speech patterns contribute to legal consequences, as perpetrators are held accountable based on linguistic evidence and witness testimony.

### REFERENCES

---

Allan, K. (1986). *Linguistic Meaning*. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.

Aziz, E. Aminuddin. (2021). Forensic Linguistics: A Linguistic Contribution for Law and Justice Enforcement. *Jurnal Forensik Kebahasaan*; Vol 1(1), 1-22.

Bach, K. & R.M. Harnish. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Coulthard, Malcolm. & Johnson, Alison. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

<https://aji.or.id/informasi/kampanye-pemilu-2024-ujaran-kebencian-terhadap-kelompok-minoritas-meningkat>. Diakses pada tanggal 17 Juni 2024.

<https://www.kominfo.go.id/content/detail/34136/siaran-pers-no-1-143hmkominfo042021-tentang-sejak-2018-kominfo-tangani-3640-ujaran-kebencian-berbasis-sara-di-ruang-digital/0/siaran-pers>. Diakses pada tanggal 17 Juni 2024.

Imamah, FM, Arimi, S., Susilowat, NE, & Surahmat. (2023). Ancaman dan Pelecehan Verbal terhadap Feminis: Analisis Forensik Linguistik pada Komentar Instagram. *IJFL (Jurnal Internasional Linguistik Forensik)*, Vol.4(1). Doi: <https://doi.org/10.55637/ijfl.4.1.6670.136-146>.

Moleong, Lexy J. (2013). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif* (Edisi Revisi). Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Triyanto. (2023). Telaah Linguistik Forensik terhadap Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial. <https://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id>. Diakses pada tanggal 18 Juni 2024, pukul 11.35 WIB.