



## Hate Speech in the Comments Column of the @dpr\_ri Instagram Post Regarding the Post "Statement of Apology and Condolences from the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives"

Novi Imroatul Awaliyah<sup>1\*</sup>, Aida<sup>2</sup>, Hidhayahten Khasanah<sup>3</sup>, Mintowati<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1234</sup>Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

\*E-mail: [novi.22104@mhs.unesa.ac.id](mailto:novi.22104@mhs.unesa.ac.id)

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the form of hate speech in the comments column of the Instagram account @dpr\_ri on the post of the apology and condolences statement of the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Puan Maharani, and explain its legal implications based on Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (UU ITE). This study uses a descriptive qualitative method, and a pragmatic and forensic linguistic approach. The data collection technique uses digital documentation techniques. The data analysis technique uses content analysis techniques combined with pragmatic analysis to reveal the function of expressive speech acts and relate them to the articles of the ITE Law. The results of the study indicate that the hate speech found includes four categories, namely provocation, incitement, insults, and unpleasant actions. Linguistically, the speech contains expressive speech acts with connotations of hatred, while legally it has the potential to violate Article 27 Paragraph (3) concerning insults or defamation and Article 28 Paragraph (2) concerning the spread of hatred based on SARA. The social implications include the erosion of public communication ethics, the emergence of a culture of aggressive speech, and the risk of criminalization due to low digital legal literacy. These findings confirm that pragmatic analysis and forensic linguistics can be used as instruments for early identification of hate speech on social media, while simultaneously strengthening legal awareness and language ethics in Indonesia's digital space.

*Keywords: hate speech, comment column, instagram, statement of apology, condolences*

## Ujaran Kebencian pada Kolom Komentar Instagram @dpr\_ri terhadap Unggahan "Pernyataan Maaf dan Belasungkawa Ketua DPR RI"

### ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan bentuk ujaran kebencian dalam kolom komentar akun Instagram @dpr\_ri pada unggahan pernyataan maaf dan belasungkawa Ketua DPR RI Puan Maharani, serta menjelaskan implikasi hukumnya berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik (UU ITE). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif berjenis deskriptif, dan pendekatan pragmatik dan linguistik forensik. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan teknik dokumentasi digital. Teknik analisis data menggunakan teknik analisis isi yang dikombinasikan dengan analisis pragmatik untuk mengungkap fungsi tindak tutur ekspresif serta merelasikan dengan pasal-pasal UU ITE. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ujaran kebencian yang ditemukan mencakup empat kategori, yaitu provokasi, hasutan, hinaan, dan perbuatan tidak menyenangkan. Secara linguistik, ujaran tersebut mengandung tindak tutur ekspresif berkonotasi kebencian, sedangkan secara yuridis berpotensi melanggar Pasal 27 Ayat (3) tentang penghinaan atau pencemaran nama baik dan Pasal 28 Ayat (2) tentang penyebaran kebencian berbasis SARA. Implikasi sosialnya meliputi erosi etika komunikasi publik, munculnya budaya ujaran agresif, serta risiko kriminalisasi akibat rendahnya literasi hukum digital. Temuan ini menegaskan bahwa analisis pragmatik dan linguistik forensik dapat digunakan sebagai instrumen identifikasi dini terhadap ujaran kebencian di media sosial, sekaligus memperkuat kesadaran hukum dan etika berbahasa di ruang digital Indonesia.

*Kata kunci: ujaran kebencian, kolom komentar instagram, pernyataan maaf, belansungkawa*

Submitted  
21/11/2025

Accepted  
24/11/2025

Published  
26/11/2025

Citation	Awaliyah, N. I., Aida, A., Khasanah, H., & Mintowati, M. (2025). Hate Speech in the Comments Column of the @dpr_ri Instagram Post Regarding the Post "Statement of Apology and Condolences from the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives". <i>Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra</i> , Volume 4, Nomor 6, November 2025, 1737-1750. DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v4i6.995">https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v4i6.995</a>
----------	---

Publisher  
Raja Zulkarnain Education Foundation

Novi Imroatul Awaliyah, Aida, Hidhayahten Khasanah, & Mintowati, November 2025, 1737-1750

hate speech, comment column, instagram, statement of apology, condolences

1737

## INTRODUCTION

The development of information and communication technology in the digital era has transformed the way people interact and express their opinions. Social media has now become a new public space, enabling people to express ideas, criticism, and views on social, political, and state policy issues (Zempi et al., 2023). The most popular digital platform in Indonesia is Instagram, where people not only share personal activities but also actively participate, including in the comments section on the official accounts of government institutions and public figures. However, the freedom of expression present in this digital space is often accompanied by the emergence of aggressive, provocative communication, even containing hate speech.

Hate speech is a form of verbal violence that has the potential to cause social conflict and division in society (Wulandari & Hidayat, 2021). This means that hate speech is a form of violence that involves not only physical actions but also words that have social and psychological attack power against certain individuals or groups. According to the National Police Chief's Circular Letter No. SE/6/X/2015, hate speech includes acts of insulting, defaming, slandering, provoking, inciting, spreading false news, and engaging in unpleasant behavior (Mangantibe, 2016). Through this description, the National Police Chief's Circular Letter No. SE/6/X/2015 provides clear definitions that hate speech is not limited to the use of harsh words or insults, but encompasses a variety of linguistic actions that can incite hatred and hostility. In other words, hate speech is understood as a deliberate act of communication intended to attack, damage the reputation of, or provoke hatred against certain individuals or groups based on social identity, religion, ethnicity, race, or political views. In the digital context, hate speech emerges not only as a spontaneous expression of emotion but also as a communication strategy that reflects ideology, resistance, and power relations in the virtual public space.

Legally, hate speech is regulated in Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). Through Article 27 paragraph (3) and Article 28 paragraph (2), this law provides a legal basis for taking action against the dissemination of information that incites hatred, hostility, or defamation (Panji et al., 2023). However, the application of the ITE Law in the realm of hate speech often gives rise to debate due to the lack of clarity in distinguishing between legitimate social criticism and unlawful hate speech. This is where forensic linguistic analysis is important, namely a branch of linguistics that functions to bridge language and law through analysis of the form, function, and context of the speech in question.

In a linguistic context, a pragmatic approach can be used to understand how hate speech works at the level of meaning and speaker intent. Leech (1993) explains that expressive illocutionary speech acts are language acts that reveal the speaker's psychological attitude towards a situation (Assidik et al., 2023). This means that expressive illocutionary speech acts are used by speakers to express feelings or inner attitudes such as happiness, sadness, anger, gratitude, or regret towards an event or situation. In the context of hate speech, the function of hate (hating) is a crucial point for understanding how linguistic expressions can transform into forms of verbal attacks that violate norms of politeness. Dissected through Leech's pragmatic knife, hate speech can be seen as a form of violation of the principles of politeness in language. Meanwhile, in forensic linguistics, hate speech acts are understood not only from a psychological or social perspective, but also from a linguistic perspective with legal implications, which can generally be categorized into five types: (1) provocation, (2) incitement, (3) insults, (4) spreading fake news, and (5) unpleasant acts (Qotrunnada et al., 2024).

Previous research shows that numerous studies on hate speech have been conducted, but most



still focus solely on linguistic aspects. First, Batubara & Mulyadi (2023) examined hate speech in online news account comments using a forensic linguistic approach and found that the form of hate speech was dominated by expressive illocutionary speech acts with a blaming function. Second, Widyatnyana et al. (2023) studied hate speech against political figures on Twitter by highlighting the language forms and strategies without linking them to legal grounds. Third, Manurung et al. (2021) examined hate speech in online forums, focusing on identifying words with negative emotional content. These studies demonstrate that few studies have integrated Leech's pragmatic theory with the legal aspects of the ITE Law.

This research focuses on analyzing hate speech in the comments section of the official Instagram account @dpr\_ri, specifically the post "Statement of Apology and Condolences to the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Puan Maharani, August 29, 2025, and August 30, 2025." This post sparked a range of public reactions, ranging from support to hateful comments. This phenomenon is interesting to study because it demonstrates how society uses language to respond to symbols of state power and how expressions of hate can emerge in the context of digital political communication.

Based on the background that has been explained, the formulation of the problem in this study is divided into two, namely what is the form of hate speech in the comment column of the Instagram account @dpr\_ri regarding the apology and condolences statement of the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives?, and what are the legal implications of this form of hate speech if it is related to the provisions in Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions (UU ITE)? Based on the formulation of the problem, the purpose of this study is to describe the forms of hate speech based on pragmatic analysis of expressive illocutionary speech acts, and Leech's politeness theory and explain its legal implications in accordance with the

provisions of the ITE Law, so that a comprehensive understanding is obtained regarding the relationship between language, politeness, and law in digital communication.

This research provides both theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, the results enrich the study of pragmatics and forensic linguistics by demonstrating how Leech's politeness theory can be applied to analyzing forms of hate speech on social media, as well as broadening understanding of the relationship between language, emotion, and the legal context. Practically, this research is expected to raise public awareness of polite and responsible language in the digital space, while also serving as a reference for law enforcement officials and future researchers in identifying and assessing hate speech with legal implications on social media.

The novelty of this research lies in the integration of Leech's pragmatic analysis and a forensic linguistic approach, directly linked to the legal aspects of the ITE Law. Previous studies have generally focused solely on forensic linguistic aspects without systematically linking the analysis results to the legal dimension. Therefore, this article presents an interdisciplinary study that connects violations of politeness maxims, hate speech, and their legal consequences in a single analysis.

Overall, this article examines hate speech appearing in the comments section of the @dpr\_ri Instagram account on the post of the House of Representatives Speaker Puan Maharani's apology and condolences. It uses Leech's pragmatic theory as the primary analytical tool to examine the expressive illocutionary acts of hate speech. The results of this analysis are then examined through a forensic linguistics perspective to identify forms of hate speech that have the potential to violate the legal provisions of the ITE Law. Thus, this research emphasizes the importance of language analysis in understanding the boundaries between freedom of expression and violations of the law in Indonesia's digital space.

## METHOD

This research method is qualitative descriptive. Creswell (2014), Gerring (2017), and Razak (2017) state that qualitative descriptive methods are commonly used by researchers in the socio-cultural field. For theory, this study uses a pragmatic and forensic linguistic approach. This method was chosen because it allows for describing and analyzing forms of hate speech and their legal implications by examining aspects of linguistic meaning in netizens' comments. The pragmatic approach is used to examine the intent and function of expressive speech acts containing hate speech. Meanwhile, the forensic linguistic approach is used to link the results of the hate speech analysis to the applicable legal provisions of the 2016 Electronic Information and Transactions Law Number 19.

The data source for this study is the official Instagram account @dpr\_ri, focusing on the comments section of the post "Statement of Apology and Condolences of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, Puan Maharani, August 29, 2025, and August 30, 2025." The data used in this research comes from the official Instagram account "dpr\_ri" in the comments section of the post "Statement of Apology and Condolences of the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, Puan Maharani, August 29, 2025, and August 30, 2025." The research data consisted of netizen comments containing hate speech. The selected comments on public accounts were taken in their original form, without any editing, to maintain their original form.

The data collection process in this study utilized digital documentation techniques. The steps were as follows: a) Collecting data by taking screenshots of the comment section; b) Copying and storing it in a digital corpus archive. Data selection was then carried out based on the National Police Chief's Circular Letter Number SE/6/X/2015 concerning hate speech, which includes: provocation, incitement, insults, the spread of fake news, and unpleasant treatment.

Data analysis in this study was conducted using content analysis methods combined with pragmatic and forensic linguistic approaches. According to Sumarno (2020), content analysis is a research technique that allows researchers to systematically and objectively describe, understand, and interpret communication content (Sumarno, 2020).

The analysis process begins with: (a) reading and selecting comments, (b) classifying data into five categories of hate speech forms (provocation, incitement, insults, spreading fake news, and unpleasant actions), (c) analyzing and interpreting data based on Leech's (1993) pragmatic approach to see the function of hate speech acts that appear in speech, (d) the results of the content analysis are interpreted by linking them to Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning ITE, especially Article 27 paragraph (3) and Article 28 paragraph (2), (e) all analysis results are then presented descriptively to show the relationship between forms of hate speech and potential legal violations that may be contained therein. Thus, this study attempts to describe the relationship between language, language actions, and legal consequences in digital communication practices on Indonesian social media.

## RESULTS

### Analysis of Expressive Hate Speech Acts from a Forensic Linguistics Perspective

This section presents the results of an analysis of six hate speech items found in the comments section of the official Instagram account @dpr\_ri, specifically in the post "Statement of Apology and Condolences of the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Puan Maharani."

Ditemukan enam data ujaran kebencian pada kolom komentar Instagram @dpr\_ri yang terdiri atas kategori:

- 1) one type of provocation data
- 2) one type of incitement data
- 3) three type of hate speech data
- 4) one type unpleasant data action



### 1. Provocative Hate Speech

The comment "When will Puan Maharani's house be demolished?" falls into the provocative category. While the statement is rhetorical, it indirectly contains an urge to provoke the emotions and aggressive actions of the general public (public figures). The word "disatronj" (disatroned) suggests violence, while the rhetorical sentence masks its true directive intent. Therefore, the statement is classified as provocative hate speech because it can trigger emotions and potentially elicit negative actions from other readers.

### 2. Incitement-type Hate Speech

The comment "We will all evict her house together" is classified as incitement because it contains an invitation to the general public, symbolized by the word "we," to commit acts of violence. This statement not only expresses anger but also incites the audience to commit aggressive actions against specific individuals. Therefore, this statement is considered incitement.

### 3. Forms of Hate Speech in the Form of Insults

Three items fall into the insult category, characterized by the use of negative language and attacks on the image of individuals or institutions.

1. "WHEN WILL THE ASSET CONFISCATION LAW BE PRESENTED? @dpr\_ri. Prove you're not a bunch of idiots!"

This utterance combines interrogative and declarative sentences, serving as a sharp dig at the performance of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI). The use of the word "idiot" is a direct insult to the intellectual capacity of the council members.

2. "May Allah call you soon, Puan, amen." This utterance appears to be a prayer, but implicitly contains a death wish. This strategy is called a euphemistic prayer, which involves the use of religious lan-

guage to disguise the meaning of the insult.

3. "Hell is waiting for you."

This utterance has religious overtones with strong moral content. The declarative form emphasizes the condemnation that the person in question deserves punishment in the afterlife.

The three statements above illustrate forms of insult that attack both personal (moral and religious) and institutional aspects (the capacity of the Indonesian House of Representatives).

### 4. Forms of Hate Speech Involving Unpleasant Actions

One item falls into the category of unpleasant actions, namely the comment "I'M SORRY FOR BEING ONLINE." This statement is a form of satire against the actions of the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, which is considered insincere or inappropriate. The use of all capital letters indicates an expression of strong emotion and emphasizes displeasure. Although it does not contain offensive language, the statement has the psychological effect of causing embarrassment or discomfort to the intended recipient, thus still being classified as hate speech with demeaning intent.

### Implications of Hate Speech for the ITE Law

The analysis shows that hate speech in the comments section of the @dpr\_ri Instagram account regarding Puan Maharani's post has the strong potential to violate legal provisions as stipulated in Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). In this context, the two most relevant articles are Article 27 paragraph (3) and Article 28 paragraph (2), which regulate the dissemination of information containing insults or defamation and the spread of hatred or hostility based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA).

### 1. Relevance of Article 27 Paragraph (3) of the ITE Law

Forms of hate speech, namely direct insults, personal taunts, and unpleasant behavior, such as the data we found: "a bunch of idiots," "may Allah call you soon," "apologize for being online," and "hell is waiting for you" meet the elements of Article 27 Paragraph (3) for the following reasons: (1) They were conveyed intentionally and openly in a digital public space (Instagram). (2) They contained insults or defamation against an individual (Puan Maharani) or an institution (the Indonesian House of Representatives). (3) They had a detrimental social and psychological effect on the intended recipient.

The legal implication is that if the element of intent is proven, the perpetrator of the speech can be subject to criminal sanctions as stipulated in Article 45 Paragraph (3).

### 2. Relevance of Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law

Several comments containing elements of provocation and incitement, such as "Puan Maharani's house when will it be demolished" and "we will all evict her house," indicate an intention to incite hatred and collective action against certain individuals or groups. Such statements not only violate the Leech principle of politeness (tact and sympathy maxim), but also have the potential to incite public hostility, especially when disseminated on a wide-reaching platform like Instagram. Furthermore, statements with religious and moral overtones, such as "may Allah call you soon," can also be interpreted as a form of belief-based hatred, which falls under the category of violation of Article 28 Paragraph (2). Sanctions for this violation are regulated in Article 45A Paragraph (2).

### 3. Legal Implications and Digital Ethics

The analysis shows that hate speech on social media has the potential to result in criminal consequences if proven to be intentional and to have negative social impacts. From a digital ethics perspective, this finding reflects the low awareness

of social media users regarding responsible communication in the digital public space. Phenomena such as the use of capital letters, prayers with curses, and mockery of public figures indicate a digital empathy crisis, which indicates that expressions of freedom of speech exceed the limits of linguistic politeness and legal norms.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. Provocative Forms of Hate Speech

The utterance "When will Puan Maharani's house be destroyed" is a form of expressive illocutionary act with provocative nuances and an element of symbolic threat. Structurally, this utterance is a rhetorical question that implicitly conveys the hope or encouragement to carry out an attack or raid on someone's home, so that it actually occurs. In the context of digital communication, this type of question is not intended to elicit an answer, but rather to provoke public emotion and spread hatred toward the person mentioned.

According to Leech (1993), expressive illocutionary acts function to express the speaker's psychological attitude toward a situation, whether feelings of pleasure or hatred (Kirana et al., 2018). In this utterance, the speaker displays an extreme expression of hatred by alluding to physical threats against the person being discussed. The use of the word "when" indicates an encouragement to act, which carries a provocative implicature, namely the hope that something negative will actually be done by the other party.

In forensic linguistics, such speech falls into the category of provocation, as it contains an ulterior motive to encourage or encourage others to take actions that are detrimental or dangerous to someone. Madalena et al. (2025) explain that hate speech can be categorized as provocation if the speaker uses language intended to incite anger, hatred, or emotional reactions among the public toward a particular individual or group (Madalena et al., 2025). This means that provocative speech is a form of speech deliberately designed to provoke public emotions, leading them to hate or attack the target party.



Therefore, the utterance "Puan Maharani's house when will it be destroyed" can be understood as an expression of hatred that has the potential to elicit real action from others. From a pragmatic perspective, this utterance violates Leech's principle of politeness because it disregards respect for the interlocutor and demonstrates aggressive intent. Forensically, this utterance indicates provocation because it contains elements of encouragement to action and threats to the personal safety of public figures.

## 2. Forms of Hate Speech that are Incitement

This speech constitutes hate speech in the form of incitement. Pragmatically, this speech contains a directive illocutionary act intended to mobilize collective action from the reader. The speaker not only expresses personal emotions or opinions, but also encourages others to take action, namely attacking the house of an official deemed corrupt. The phrase "kita rame-rame evict his house" indicates a directive speech act aimed at influencing group behavior. According to Leech (1983), this type of speech act violates the principles of politeness, specifically the tact maxim, because it causes harm or threat to others (Claudia et al., 2018). This means that this type of speech does not adhere to norms of politeness in language because the speaker fails to consider the interests and safety of others. This speech, in fact, has the potential to cause harm, pressure, or threat to the target of the speech. In the context of hate speech, this maxim violation demonstrates that the speaker disregards social values and language ethics in order to assert anger and hatred toward the target. From a forensic linguistic perspective, this utterance contains indications of incitement, namely the use of language to encourage unlawful actions or incite hatred against a particular party. In line with the view of Rizky and Amantamora (2024), utterances containing explicit invitations and directed at the public have a high potential to be categorized as speech acts of instigation, because they contain the pragmatic intention of persuading oth-

ers to act (Rizky & Amantamora, 2024). This means that utterances that clearly invite others and are directed at the general public can be considered inciteful speech acts, because they contain the pragmatic purpose of influencing others to take an action according to the speaker's wishes. Furthermore, the use of the word "swear" functions as an emotional affirmation, reinforcing the expression of anger and the desire to influence the reader's emotions. Thus, this utterance not only conveys the message but also attempts to evoke emotional reactions and aggressive actions from the reader.

Based on this analysis, this data is categorized as hate speech of the incitement type, because the speaker consciously uses a direct invitation that is provocative and has the potential to cause social unrest.

## 3. Forms of Hate Speech in the Form of Insults

Three items fall into the insult category, characterized by the use of negative language and attacks on the image of individuals or institutions.

"WHEN WILL THE ASSET CONFISCATION LAW BE? @dpr\_ri. Prove you're not a bunch of idiots!"

This comment was posted by an Instagram user on the official post of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI) when Speaker Puan Maharani offered condolences for the death of Affan Kurniawan during a demonstration near the DPR/MPR RI Building. The comment consists of two sentences: a question demanding an explanation ("WHEN WILL THE ASSET CONFISCATION LAW BE?") and a declarative sentence containing an insult ("Prove you're not a bunch of idiots!"). Linguistically, the lexicon "a bunch of idiots" conveys a highly negative connotation because it implies that all DPR members are stupid and incapable of rational thought. The use of the word "a bunch" broadens the object of the insult to a collective, rather than a personal, context.

From a pragmatic perspective, this utterance contains two speech acts: a directive and an expressive one. As a directive, the speaker demands that the DPR immediately deliberate on the Asset Confiscation Bill; while as an expressive one, the speaker expresses anger and disappointment through insults. According to Leech's politeness theory (1983:132–133), this utterance violates three maxims: tact (because it fails to consider the other person's feelings), approbation (because it belittles the other party), and agreement (because it rejects the other party's wishes without any basis in politeness).

Forensically, this utterance falls into the category of institutional insult, because it attacks the image and honor of state institutions. Its social impact could undermine public trust in the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI), especially if widely disseminated in digital public spaces. From a legal perspective, this utterance potentially violates Article 27 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law, which prohibits the dissemination of electronic information containing insults or defamation. Therefore, this utterance carries legal consequences in the form of a maximum prison sentence of four years and/or a maximum fine of seven hundred and fifty million rupiah if proven intentional.

"May Allah call you soon, Puan, amen."

This comment appeared on a DPR Instagram post showing DPR Speaker Puan Maharani offering condolences for the death of Affan Kurniawan during a demonstration near the DPR/MPR RI Building. At first glance, the comment appears to be a prayer, but contextually, it carries a hidden meaning, a wish for the death of the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Puan Maharani. Linguistically, the verb "calling you," which is usually neutral (a casual address), is used here in a religious context referring to death, making its meaning euphemistic. The use of an emoticon at the end of the sentence reinforces the sarcastic tone and implies mockery.

From a pragmatic perspective, this utterance is classified as an indirect insult because it appears polite in form, but in meaning it contains a veiled insult and threat. The resulting implication is that the speaker wishes death for the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Puan Maharani, rather than praying for her well-being as is customary. According to Leech's (1983) theory, this utterance violates the sympathy maxim (because it lacks empathy for the addressee) and the approbation maxim (because it is actually demeaning).

Forensic analysis shows that this utterance constitutes a religiously charged personal insult. Its social impact is emotional and psychological because it touches on sensitive aspects of religion and human life. According to Wulandari and Hidayat (2021), expressive speech acts are utterances that express the speaker's psychological attitude towards a situation (Wulandari & Hidayat, 2021). In Data 8, the speaker uses an expression containing a death wish, which is a veiled insult that clearly falls into the expressive category. This type of utterance can incite hatred, especially if responded to by other users with a similar tone. Legally, this utterance can be categorized as personal and religious-based hate speech, according to Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law and the Chief of Police Circular Letter No. SE/06/X/2015, because it contains elements of hatred directed at individuals and has the potential to incite hostility in the public sphere.

"@dpr\_ri Hell waiting for you"

Comment on the DPR's Instagram post featuring Speaker of the House of Representatives Puan Maharani offering condolences for the death of Affan Kurniawan. The post contains a short English phrase meaning "hell is waiting for you." Linguistically, the phrase "hell is waiting for you" is a declarative sentence with an implicit subject that conveys moral condemnation. The symbol (fire emoticon) reinforces the association with hell, suffering, and moral punishment. This sentence is not only mocking but also conveys a negative moral



judgment against the person mentioned. In this case, it could be directed at the Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Puan Maharani, who in the post was expressing condolences for the death of Affan Kurniawan during a demonstration near the DPR/MPR building, or the sentence is directed at the problematic members of the Indonesian House of Representatives who sparked public anger, leading to demonstrations that claimed lives.

Pragmatically, the utterance "Hell is waiting for you" demonstrates an expressive element because the speaker expresses anger and hopes for condemnation toward the target. Furthermore, a directive element can be seen because the speaker is "directing" or "demanding" that the target face hell, an action the speaker desires. This utterance is clearly an expressive speech act with a condemning function. The speaker considers the target deserving of moral or spiritual punishment, thus violating the politeness maxims of tact, sympathy, and agreement. The resulting implicature is that the target is considered sinful or evil.

From a forensic linguistics perspective, this utterance falls into the category of moral and religious insults. Its social effects include the formation of a negative stigma against a particular individual and the reproduction of hatred based on religious values. From a legal perspective, this type of speech meets the requirements of Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law, which prohibits the dissemination of electronic information containing incitement to hatred based on religion or belief. Therefore, this speech has the legal potential to constitute religiously motivated hate speech.

#### **4. Hate Speech is a form of Unpleasant Behavior**

The utterance "I AM SORRY, YOU'RE ONLINE" is a type of expressive illocutionary act expressing hatred for an unpleasant act. The pragmatic analysis of the above utterance contains a satirical tone toward the Instagram post @dpr\_ri, referring to condolences and apologies. The speaker distrusts the sincerity of the condolences

and apologies conveyed through social media, which raises doubts and distrust among netizens toward the people's representatives.

According to Searle (in Leech, 1993:164), expressive speech acts express the speaker's psychological attitude toward the situation implied in the illocutionary act, for example, expressing gratitude, congratulations, forgiveness, criticism, praise, condolences, and so on. The above utterance demonstrates that criticizing is a form of apology and condolence. Leech (1993: 14) suggests that indirect speech acts are divided into three types based on the action behind the utterance: (1) locutionary acts, (2) illocutionary acts, and (3) perlocutionary acts. Furthermore, expressive illocutionary acts can be classified into seven functions: (1) thanking (thinking); (2) apologizing (pardoning); (3) congratulating; (4) blaming; (5) praising; (6) hating; and (7) condoling. These utterances can be classified as blaming, with a sarcastic tone, rather than simply asking questions.

According to Leech (1993), expressive speech acts are used by speakers to express psychological attitudes toward a situation, both positive and negative (Yasinta & Rohmadi, 2024). In this case, the utterance appears to be a negative expression of displeasure and blame toward the target. This utterance violates Leech's politeness theory, namely the sympathy maxim, to the point that the speaker minimizes disagreement with others, meaning refusing to show sympathy for a bereaved person and instead opposing them.

This form of unpleasant behavior is evident in the tone of sarcasm in the digital public space. It can cause embarrassment and discomfort for the target party. It is a form of character weakening that is insincere or disapproves of what the speaker says. It can trigger numerous similar negative comments.

## **Implications of Hate Speech for the ITE Law**

### **1. Relevance of Article 27 Paragraph (3) of the ITE Law**

Article 27 Paragraph (3) of the ITE Law states: "Any person who intentionally and without authority distributes and/or transmits and/or makes accessible Electronic Information and/or Electronic Documents containing insulting and/or defamatory content."

In the context of this research, forms of hate speech such as the utterances "a bunch of idiots", "may Allah call you soon", "apologize for being online", and "hell is waiting for you", linguistically indicate the existence of ill intent.

From a legal perspective, these four statements meet the requirements for violating Article 27 Paragraph (3) because: (1) They were intentionally and openly conveyed in a digital public space (Instagram), making them accessible to the wider public. (2) They contained insults or defamation, both against individuals (Puan Maharani) and institutions (the Indonesian House of Representatives). (3) They had social and psychological impacts in the form of degrading the dignity, image, and honor of the party attacked.

These statements no longer function as expressions of opinion, but have transformed into hate speech because they involve aggressive language and an offensive form. From a pragmatic perspective, this indicates the use of aggressive language and a disregard for public communication norms. The implication is that if intent can be proven, the perpetrator of the speech can be prosecuted under Article 45 Paragraph (3) of the ITE Law, which states:

"Any person who meets the elements referred to in Article 27 Paragraph (3) shall be punished with imprisonment of up to 4 (four) years and/or a maximum fine of Rp. 750,000,000.00."

Therefore, hate speech in the form of digital insults not only reflects a violation of communication norms but also has direct implications for violations of cybercrime law. These findings rein-

force the view that pragmatic linguistic analysis can help identify intent and the communication context that form the basis for legal considerations in hate speech cases on social media.

### **2. Relevance of Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law**

Article 28 Paragraph (2) of Law Number 19 of 2016 states:

"Any person who intentionally and without authority disseminates information intended to incite hatred or hostility against individuals and/or certain community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA)."

In the context of this research, several comments analyzed, such as "When will Puan Maharani's house be demolished?" and "We will all evict her house," contain elements of provocation and incitement aimed at inciting public hatred and encouraging collective action against specific individuals.

Pragmatically, this type of speech demonstrates a directive speech act that functions to motivate readers to take action or at least foster antipathy toward the public figure mentioned. Statements with an imperative structure or rhetorical questions like the ones above contain an element of intentionality because they are structured to provoke emotional reactions from other readers. In the context of a public and viral digital space, such speech can have perlocutionary effects in the form of widespread anger, condemnation, or calls for hatred.

Thus, such provocative and inciteful speech has the strong potential to violate Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law, because it incites hatred and hostility toward certain individuals or groups.

Furthermore, speech containing religious elements, such as "May Allah call you soon," even if it is in the form of a prayer, can be interpreted as a form of belief-based hatred. The use of religious elements to corner individuals indicates the exploitation of moral values ??and religious symbols to reinforce hate speech.



In a legal context, this form of speech can be categorized as religious-based hate speech, which constitutes a violation of Article 28 Paragraph (2). The sanctions for this violation are regulated in Article 45A Paragraph (2), which states:

"Any person who intentionally and without authority disseminates information that incites hatred or hostility against individuals and/or certain community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA) as referred to in Article 28 Paragraph (2) shall be punished with a maximum imprisonment of 6 (six) years and/or a maximum fine of Rp1,000,000,000.00."

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that hate speech containing provocation, incitement, or religious sentiment not only impacts the image and honor of individuals but also has the potential to cause social instability through the spread of hatred in digital public spaces.

These findings emphasize the importance of understanding pragmatics in a legal context, as language analysis can explain the elements of intent and social impact, which form the basis for legal assessments of violations of Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law.

### 3. Implications for Law and Digital Ethics

In general, the results of this study confirm that hate speech on social media not only violates communication norms but also has implications for violations of Indonesian positive law. In the context of forensic linguistics, netizens' use of language reflects elements of intent, forms of solicitation, and negative emotional expressions that can fulfill the elements of a criminal act as stipulated in Article 27 Paragraph (3) and Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law.

From a legal perspective, this phenomenon demonstrates that freedom of expression in the digital space is not absolute. This freedom is limited by social and legal responsibilities to prevent harm to others. Hate speech conveyed on social media has the potential to become digital evidence (electronic evidence) in legal proceedings, as it can

be used to assess the elements of intent, communication intent, and social impact of a speech.

Socially, these findings show three important implications, namely (1) The erosion of morals and ethics in public communication. Freedom of expression often turns into a tool for verbal attacks, where netizens express emotions without considering the psychological and social impacts on the recipient of the message. (2) The emergence of a culture of aggressive speech in the digital space. The phenomenon of hate speech that is left unchecked creates an unhealthy communication environment, strengthens polarization, and weakens social solidarity. (3) The potential for criminalization of social media users. The lack of digital legal literacy makes it difficult for the public to distinguish between constructive criticism and hate speech that is offensive, thus potentially being caught under the articles of the ITE Law.

In the context of digital ethics, this demonstrates that moral and polite language aspects must go hand in hand with an understanding of the law. Digital ethics is not only about communication etiquette, but also about the awareness that every utterance in cyberspace has real legal consequences. Therefore, efforts are needed to improve digital and legal literacy for the public so that virtual public spaces can become a means of critical yet civilized dialogue.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the results of an analysis of hate speech in the comments section of the Instagram account @dpr\_ri, which displayed a statement of apology and condolences from Puan Maharani, Speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, for the death of Affan Kurniawan during a demonstration near the DPR/MPR RI Building, various utterances contained expressions of hatred toward public figures. Based on Leech's pragmatic theory, these utterances are categorized as expressive speech acts that violate the principle of politeness because they express negative emotions such as anger, insults, and rejection without con-

sidering respect for others. The forms of hate speech found include (1) provocation, (2) incitement, (3) insults, and (4) unpleasant actions. Each of these forms exhibits a different pragmatic function, but they share a common communicative purpose: attacking the image and dignity of the target party. Therefore, hate speech in the context of social media represents a speech act that has the potential to spark social conflict and undermine language ethics in the digital public sphere. From a forensic linguistic perspective, the research findings indicate that the emerging forms of hate speech have legal implications under Law Number 19 of 2016 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law). Speech containing insults, provocation, and incitement has the potential to violate Article 27 paragraph (3) concerning insults or defamation and Article 28 paragraph (2) concerning the spread of hatred based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA). However, not all speech fully meets the criminal elements, as the context of the speech, the speaker's intention, and its social impact require further consideration. Overall, the results of this research confirm that pragmatic analysis and forensic linguistics can serve as a means of early identification of hate speech that has the potential to lead to legal violations, as well as serve as a basis for education to build a more polite and responsible communication culture on social media.

Based on the research findings, it is recommended that the public exercise greater caution when commenting on social media by understanding the boundaries between criticism and hate speech. Furthermore, forensic linguistic research is expected to continue to be developed as a scientific tool to support fair law enforcement and educate about polite language in the digital space.

## REFERENCES

- Assidik, G. K., Vinansih, S. T., & Kustanti, E. W. (2023). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif pada Penulisan Utas Mengenai Politik, Ekonomi dan Sosial. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, Dan Sastra*, 9(1), 29–37. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v9i1.2120>
- Adnan, A. & Naufal, N. (2025). Analisis Konten Dakwah Remaja dalam Akun TikTok@KADAM SIDIQ". *El-Hikmah: Jurnal Ilmu Dakwah dan Komunikasi* 20, no. 11, Januari (January 2, 2024): 22–33. Accessed November 26, 2025. <https://jurnal.alhikmah.ac.id/index.php/elhikmah/article/view/201>.
- Batubara, N. A., & Mulyadi. (2023). Ujaran Kebencian pada Berita-Berita Covid-19 di Instagram. *LINGUA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 20(1), 92–106. <https://doi.org/10.30957/lingua.v20i1.812>
- Claudia, V. S., Rakhmawati, A., & Waluyo, B. (2018). Kumpulan Naskah Drama Geng Toilet Karya Sosiawan Leak dan Relevansinya Sebagai Bahan Ajar Teks Drama di Sekolah Menengah Atas. *BASASTRA Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 6(2), 179–190. <http://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/5324>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Christianto, H. (2018). *Perbuatan Pidana Ujaran Kebencian Ragam dan Studi Kasus*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Farwati, R., Yuliyantim W., & Ningsih, W. P. R. (2023). Ujaran Kebencian dan Perundungan di Dunia Maya: Tantangan Etika dalam Ruang Digital



- Indonesia. *JISPENDIORA: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Pendidikan dan Humaniora* Vol. 2, No.3 Desember 2023, 213-225. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56910/diora.v2i3.1001>
- Gerring, J. (2017). *Qualitative Methods*. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20(1), 15–36. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-092415-024158>
- Kirana, C., Sumarlam, & Sulistyono, E. T. (2018). Tuturan Ekspresif dalam Humor Politik Republik Sentilan Sentilun di Metro TV (Tinjauan Pragmatik). *Kembara: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 4(1), 1–11. <http://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/article/view/5324>
- Madalena, S., Kirana, R., Puteri, S., Indonesia, S., Airlangga, U., Budaya, F. I., & Airlangga, U. (2025). Ujaran Kebencian Pada Ganjar Pranowo Menjelang Pemilu 2024 di Media Sosial Twitter: Linguistik Forensik *Unika Atma Jaya*, 1–3.
- Mangantibe, V. (2016). Ujaran Kebencian Dalam Surat Edaran Kapolri Nomor: Se/6/X/2015 Tentang Penanganan Ucapan Kebencian (Hate Speech). *Lex Crimen*, 1(1), 159–162.
- Panji, A. A. Agung N. A., Hartono, M. S., & Adnyani, N. K. S. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Pembuktian Secara Elektronik dalam Tindak Pidana Ujaran Kebencian. *Jurnal Gender Dan Hak ...*, 1(2), 156–166. <https://ejournal2.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JGHAM/article/view/2623%0Ahttps://ejournal2.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JGHAM/article/download/2623/1250>
- Qotrunnada, E. D., Hidayatullah, A., & Agustini, R. (2024). Ujaran Kebencian Netizen di Kolom Komentar Akun Instagram Rocky Gerung. *Diksatrasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 8(2), 533. <https://doi.org/10.25157/diksatrasi.v8i2.15102>
- Razak, A. (2017). *Metode Riset: Menggapai Mixed Methods Bidang Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Pekanbaru: Ababil Press.
- Rizky, S., & Amantamora, M. R. (2024). Pemahaman Pragmatik Dalam Menafsirkan makna Implisit Ujaran Sebagai Strategi Meningkatkan Efektivitas Dan Efisiensi Komunikasi. *KASAYA: Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Budaya*, 1(2), 53–64.
- Stefani Manurung, G., Kristin, D., Sukma Ayu, D., Sitorus, E., Simanjuntak, J., Fildawati, E., Siallagan, L., & dan konseling, B. (2021). *Analisis Ujaran Kebencian Netizen Di Media Sosial X Pada Postingan Akun "Habis Nonton Film" Analysis of Netizen Hate Speech on Social Media X on "Habis Nonton Film" Account Posts*. April, 7347–7354. <https://jicnusantara.com/index.php/jiic>
- Sumarno. (2020). Analisis Isi Dalam Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra. *Jurnal Elsa: Edukasi Lingua Sastra*, 18(2), 55. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47637/elsa.v18i2.299>
- Widyatnyana, K. N., Rasna, I. W., & Putrayasa, I. B. (2023). Ujaran Kebencian dalam Twitter #Sebelum2024JokowiLengser: Kajian Cyberpragmatics. *GHANCARAN: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 5(1), 151–170. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ghancaran.v5i1.8660>
- Wulandari, L., & Hidayat, S. (2021). Upaya Penanganan Hate Speech dengan Mediasi Penal. *Jatiswara*, 36(2), 140–148. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jtsw.v36i2.281>
- Yasinta, S. A., & Rohmadi, M. (2024). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Pada Novel Lima Sekawan: Menyamakan Teman Karya Enid Blyton. *LEKSIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 4(2), 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.60155/leksis.v4i2.426>



Zempi, C. N., Kuswanti, A., & Maryam, S. (2023). Analisis Peran Media Sosial Dalam Pembentukan Pengetahuan Politik Masyarakat. *Ekspresi Dan Persepsi/ : Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 6(1), 116–123. <https://doi.org/10.33822/jep.v6i1.5286>