

AN ANALYSIS OF ILLOCUTIONARY AND PERLOCUTIONARY SPEECH ACT IN DEFAMATION TEXTS

Endang Sholihatin

Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran, Surabaya, East Java

Email: Endang.sholihatin.ak@upnjatim.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The number of defamation in Indonesia keeps increasing. It is proven by many public complaints to the police department. The complaint is mostly about speaker speeches in electronic media. The purpose of this research is to analyze illocutionary and perlocutionary speech act about defamation texts in a family conversation through the social media group. Theoretically, this research has significance in linguistics, especially speech act. Practically it gives a concept and knowledge to society about what kind of speech acts that can insult or defile someone's good name. The method of this research is qualitative. The data of this research is public complaint texts at the police department in East Java. Based on the analysis, the illocutionary speech act in the family conversation through a social media group includes representative, declarative, and directive. Furthermore, the defamation text in perlocutionary speech act in family conversation through social media group shows that the speakers want their partner to be ashamed in the public.

Key Words: Illocution and Perlocution Speech Act, Defamation Texts

ABSTRAK

Pencemaran nama baik di Indonesia jumlahnya terus bertambah. Hal itu terbukti dari terus dari aduan masyarakat kepada pihak kepolisian. Aduan/laporan tersebut paling banyak berdasarkan tuturan penutur melalui medi elektronik. Di dalam penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis tindak tutur ilokusi teks pencemaran nama baik pada percakapan keluarga melalui grup media sosial. Selanjutnya, menganalisis tindak tutur perlokusi teks pencemaran nama baik pada percakapan keluarga melalui grup media sosial. Penelitian ini secara teoretis bermanfaat pada kajian kebahasaan khususnya tindak tutur. Sementara itu, secara praktis, penelitian ini bermanfaat memberikan wawasan dan pengetahuan kepada masyarakat mengenai tuturan-tuturan yang dapat menghina atau mencemarkan nama baik orang lain. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah metode kualitatif. Data penelitian berupa teks yang diadukan masyarakat kepada pihak kepolisian daerah Jawa Timur. Berdasarkan hasil analisis, diketahui bahwa tindak tutur ilokusi teks pencemaran nama baik pada percakapan keluarga melalui grup media sosial meliputi tindak tutur ilokusi representatif, deklaratif, dan direktif. Berikutnya, tindak tutur perokusi teks pencemaran nama baik pada percakapan keluarga melalui grup media sosial menunjukkan bahwa penutur menginginkan agar mitra tuturnya malu di muka umum.

Kata Kunci: tindak tutur ilokusi, tindak tutur perlokusi, dan pencemaran nama baik

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of technology gives impact to the life patterns changes especially in the way they communicate in society. Laswell (1960) states that communication is a process to send a message by a communicator to the communicant through media that gives special effect in five things, that are who

says, what, in which, channel to whom, and with what effect. Nowadays, the internet has become a trend in social media communication. The world is in our hands is a suitable expression to describe the advancement of internet technology today.

Defamation is increased by numbers in Indonesia. It is proven by many public complaints to the police department. The

complaint is mostly based on speaker speech through electronic media. The purpose of this research is to analyze illocutionary and perlocutionary speech act about defamation text in family conversation through social media group. Theoretically, this research has significance in linguistics, especially speech act. Practically it gives concept and knowledge to society about what kind of speech acts that can insult or defile someone's good name.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Locutionary Speech Act

Leech (1993) explains that locution speech act means that the speaker speaks to his/her partner with the spoken words that have meanings and certain references. From that limitation, it can be concluded that locution act is only an act that informs something without any effects on the partner. A locution speech act is a speech with words, phrases, and sentences which in accordance with the meaning of the words, phrases, and sentences (Rahardi, 2003:71). Wijana (1996) states that illocutionary speech act is a speech act to express something.

Illocutionary Speech Act

According to Austin (1962), the illocution speech act is a speech act that has meaning and function. Searle (1979) classifies the illocutionary speech act into representatives, directives, expressive, commissives, and declarations.

- a. Representatives; it is a speech act that ties the speaker to the truth for what he/she said. Some speeches are included in this speech act, i.e. stating, suing, admitting, showing, reporting, giving a testimony, mentioning, and speculating.
- b. Directives; it is a speech act that is intended so that the partner takes action as what the speaker said. Some speeches are included in this speech act, i.e.

asking, inviting, forcing, suggesting, insisting, ordering to do something, paying off, dictating, ruling, begging, challenging, giving a command.

- c. Expressive; it is a speech act that is intended so that the speech will be used as an evaluation based on what the speaker said, including saying thanks, complaining, congratulating, flattering, praising, blaming, and criticizing.
- d. Commissives; it is a speech act that ties the speaker to do all the things he said, e.g. swearing, promising, threatening, declaring ability.
- e. Declarative; it is a speech act that is intended to create something new (status, condition, etc).

Perlocutionary Speech Act

A perlocutionary speech act is an effect and the influence as the result from the speaker's speech (Austin, 1962:101). Based on the opinion, speech has the power to influence. It is related to the partner of speech interpretation ability to understand it.

Defamation

Insulting is humiliating someone, making someone's name worse, offending people (cursing, defamation, demeaning) (KBBI, 2008:499). Tiersma (1987:304) states defamation is language rules that prohibit someone to say some utterances in a specific condition. So, a speech which is libelous is forbidden to be told to others. If it is done it will cause a conflict.

Some articles which regulate defamation on electronic media in Indonesia are in law number 19 of 2016 about the changes of law number 11 of 2008. It is about information and electronic transactions, which is presented as follows.

Article 27

- (3) Everyone intentionally and without rights distributes and/or transmits and/or make

electronic information accessible and/or electronic documents which have insulting content and/or defamation.

- (4) Everyone intentionally and without rights distributes and/or transmits and/or make electronic information accessible and/or electronic documents which have extortion content and/or threatening.

In-laws of republic Indonesian number 19 of 2016 about the changes of the law number 11 of 2008 article 27 paragraph 1 explain several things as follows. What is meant by distributing is sending and/or spreading electronic information and/or electronic documents to various parties through an electronic system. What is meant by transmitting is sending electronic information and/or electronic documents addressed to one other party through an electronic system. What is meant by making it accessible is all other actions besides distributing and transmitting through an electronic system that causes electronic information and/or electronic documents can be known to other parties or the public.

Article 28

- (1) Everyone intentionally and without rights spreads a hoax and misleading news that causes consumer losses in electronic transactions.
- (2) Everyone intentionally and without rights spreads information that is intended to create hatred or individual and/or certain community group hostility based on tribes, religions, races, and between groups.

Article 36

Everyone intentionally and without rights or against the law by committing acts as referred to in article 27 to article 34 which causes harm to others.

Article 51

Everyone who fulfills the element as intended on article 36 convicted with a maximum imprisonment of 12 years and or a maximum fine of Rp 12,000,000,000 (twelve billion).

Next, criminal provisions are regulated in the law of republic Indonesia number 19 Of 201 about the changes of law number 11 of 2008 as follows.

Article 45

- (3) Everyone intentionally and without rights distribute and/or transmits and/or make electronic information accessible and/or electronic documents which have insulting content and/or defamation as stated in article 27 paragraph (3) convicted with a maximum imprisonment of 4 (four) years and/or maximum fine of Rp 750,000,000 (750 million).
- (4) Everyone intentionally and without rights distribute and/or transmits and/or make electronic information accessible and/or electronic documents which have extortion content and/or threatening as stated in article 27 paragraph (4) convicted with maximum imprisonment of 6 (six) years and/or maximum fine of Rp 1,000,000,000 (one billion).
- (5) The provisions referred to paragraph (3) are an offense complaint.

Article 45A

- (1) Everyone intentionally and without rights spreads a hoax and misleading news that causes consumer losses in electronic transactions as stated in article 28 paragraph (1) convicted with a maximum imprisonment of 6 (six) years and/or a maximum fine of Rp 1,000,000,000 (one billion).
- (2) Everyone intentionally and without rights spreads information that is intended to create hatred or individual

and/or certain community group hostility based on tribes, religions, races, and between groups as stated in article 28 paragraph (2) convicted with maximum imprisonment of 6 (six) years and/or maximum fine of Rp 1,000,000,000 (one billion).

Article 45B

Everyone intentionally and without rights sends electronic information and/or electronic documents which contains the threat of violence or scare intended personally as stated in article 29 convicted with maximum imprisonment 4 (four) years and/or maximum fine Rp 750,000,000 (750 million).

Based on article 27 paragraph (3) law of ITE, defamation criminal act can be seen from the text that has criteria as follows, distributing/transmitting information, through electronic, contains insulting/defamation.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research method is qualitative with case study approach. The technique of collecting data is used a literature review. The data are society complaint/report text to the police department in East Java (Polda Jatim). Next, the method analysis of this research is qualitative with the interactive model. The procedure of the data analysis is interactive model Miles and Huberman (1992) that covering three stages that is data reduction, data presentation, and verification/ inference.

DISCUSSION

The text below is a father (as 'A') speech to his children (as 'C') through a social media group. The 'A' talks about her ex-wife (the 'B') to the children.

"It's all just because there is someone who wants different penis anytime in

L so you can be the victims of savage passions..."

"Be careful of her sweet lips that are full of lie..."

"Girl, please ask your mother that is not human, don't send me any messages because I immediately delete it without reading it."

"Girl, please convey my message, if she still wants to make me embarrassed and makes me so difficult then you and your sister please don't contact me if you, dhian, and your sister still wants to stay with your mother that is not human. Thanks..."

"Your mother doesn't want it because she still wants to have different men anytime and be a whore."

"That's why I ask both of you to stay with me then become broken children just like her."

Defamation Text's Illocution in Family Dialogue Through Social Media Group happened. The Defamation Text's illocution in family dialogue through social media group analysis as shown on the data above can be explained as follows:

Representative Illocution

Representative Illocution is the illocution that says/ mention/ agreed/ shows. Furthermore, the data above has the representative illocution speech act as says/mentions/ agreed/ shows as follows:

the speech itself was made as to the basic complaint of defamation such as 1)...because someone wants to easily change their dick in L so that all of you has become the victim of his savage lust...2)Take caution of

her sweet lies 3) Please ask your mom who is not a human... (lb03) 4)...your mom who is not a human....5)Your mom does not want to do it because she wants to still change his man easily and become a bitch 6)... both of you should go with your dad so that you won't be like her...

The speech above has representative illocution speech act where B understand that A says/ mention/ agreed/ shows to C that B wants to easily change her dick, C is the victim of B's savage lust, B's mouth is full of lies, B is not a human, B wants to change her man and become a bitch, B is already ruined. Therefore, we can conclude that the speech of A has to defile a good name of B as explained before.

Declarative Illocution

Hereafter, the declarative illocution speech act is a speech that creates a status or negative condition that mean to cut, forbid, allow, and give a negative impression or to classify to the bad groups.

To impress or to classify

1. We know that the arguing language shown in the speech, 1) *...because someone wants to easily change their dick in L so that all of you have become the victim of his savage lust... 2) Take caution of her sweet lies. 3) Please ask your mom who is not a human...4) ...your mom who is not a human.....5) Your mom does not want to do it because she wants to still change his man easily and become a bitch 6) ... both of you should go with your dad so that you won't be like her...* A's speech impresses/classify B as a bad person that no longer called human, bitch, and has ruined her morality. Thus, A

- has defiling a good name of B and B has to report A to the police.
2. Forbid, from the aspects of illocution speech act which declare forbidden words shows in the text as follows: 1) *so that it is better than both of you do not have any contact with daddy if your sister Dhian and you still stay with your mom who is not human. Thank you and this is why daddy ask both of you to go with me so that both of you will not be spoiled like her.*

From the text above, we know that B understand A's speech means to forbid the C to contact A if they still live with B who is not a human anymore and A also forbid C to follow B so that C will not be ruined like B. Because of the speech of A, B has been defamed and made the speech of A as the proof of complaint.

Directive Illocution Speech Act

Directive illocution speech act has been classified into two classifications. They are subtle illocutionary directive and crude illocutionary directive.

Subtle Illocutionary Directive

Divided into a) Asking to do something, b) persuade, c) Giving sign, and d) recommending.

Asking to do something

The following are several data describe based on directive illocutionary which asking to do something. Previous text consists of speech that is disputed and subtle illocutionary directive aspects that ask to do something such as, *this is why daddy ask both of you to go with me so that both of you will not be spoiled like her.* Based on subtle directive illocutionary it is known that B understood that A is asked to do something to C and those C1 to follows A in order to not to be spoiled like B. According to these

speeches, B has been defamed which cause A to file a complaint to the police.

Persuade

Directive illocutionary that is persuading can be observed from the following description.

This is why daddy ask both of you to go with me so that both of you will not be spoiled like her is the speech which A disputed by B. it is shown from this speech that B understood that A is persuading C and C1 to follow A in order to not spoiled their moral like B. Based on this persuasion, B has been defamed and use this speech to file a complaint about A.

Giving sign

As explained above, the next subtle directive illocutionary is giving a sign. Which is described as followed: A produce a speech which causes language dispute with B that is 1) *Take caution of her sweet lies* and 2) *This is why daddy ask both of you to go with me so that both of you will not be spoiled like her*. That speech is based on the directive illocutionary aspects that B understood that A is giving a sign (warning) to C to be careful or aware of B since he thinks that B is a liar. Other than that, A also give a sign (warning) to C to follow A only in order to have a good personality. Based on A speech which seems to give warning, B file a complaint of defamation on A.

Recommending

The next subtle directive illocutionary is recommending. The explanation is as follow: based on the previous data language disputed from A speech to B *this is why daddy ask both of you to go with me so that both of you will not be spoiled like her*. It can be understood from directive illocutionary aspects A is giving a recommendation to C and C1 to follow A to not be a person with bad morality. Thus, the

speech by A, which is a recommendation can be categories as defamation to B.

Crude Directive Illocutionary

After a discussion about subtle directive illocutionary, this part of the paper will discuss crude directives illocutionary such as direction or order. Below is the explanation.

Direction or order

The directive illocutionary is directing or ordering if it as explained below. From the data above, directive illocutionary that is directing or ordering can be seen from the speech that said or stated, *C please tell your mom that is not human anymore, to stop send message to me because I always delete her messages and I never read them*. B understand that A is ordering C to tell B not to send A messages anymore since A is not feeling comfortable about the messages from B. Based on this explanation A speech which is ordering have defamed B in front of C and C1.

Perlocutionary Speech Act in online group family chat

Based on previous text, perlocution speech act A wants B to be ashamed and the children knows that B always change her men, so that C becomes the victim of her immorality lust, B is a liar, B is not human, B still change her men and become a bitch, and B has a spoiled morality. Thus, perlocutionary speech in this data (01) shows that the speech of A giving humiliation and defamation to B, so that B finally file a complaint about A to the police. It was shown in A speech 1) *...because someone wants to easily change their dick in L so that all of you has become the victim of his savage lust...* 2) *Take caution of her sweet lies*. 3) *.... Please ask your mom who is not a human...* 4) *...your mom who is not a human.....* 5) *Your mom does not want to do*

it because she wants to still change his man easily and become a bitch 6) ... both of you should go with your dad so that you won't be like her...

Based on the perlocutionary speech act analysis we can conclude that the speech of

A in the data above wants B to be humiliated in front of her children so that it will be defamed a good name of B. All of the explanation can be shortened in the following table.

Table 1
The analysis of Defamation Text's Illocution in Family Dialogue Through Social Media Group

Speech Act		Perlocutionary Speech Act
Illocutionary Speech Act		
Types of Speech Act	Description	The speaker wants their speaking partner to be humiliated in public.
Representative Expressive	1) says/ mention/ agreed/ shows	
Declarative	1) To impress/ to classify. 2) Prohibition	
Directive	1) Subtle directive a. Asking to do something. b. Persuade c. Giving sign d. Recommending 2) Crude Directive	

Source: Primer

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, knows that Defamation Text's Illocution in Family Dialogue Through Social Media Group includes the representative (says, mention, agreed, shows), declarative (to impress/to classify, prohibition), and directive (asking to do something, persuade, giving a sign, recommending). Moreover, Defamation Text's perlocutionary in Family Dialogue Through Social Media Group shows that the speaker wants their speaking partner to be humiliated in public.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Think with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press.
Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2008). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Pusat*

Bahasa Edisi Keempat. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Terj. Tjejep. Rohidi. Jakarta: UI Press.
Lasswell, H. (1960). *The Structure and Function of Communication in Society*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta : Penerbit Universitas Indonesia (UI-Press).
Rahardi, K. (2003). *Berkenalan dengan Ilmu Bahasa Pragmatik*. Malang: Dioma.
Searle. (1979). *Speech Acts An Essay in The Philosophy of Language*. Oxford: Basil Blacwell.
Tiersma. P. M. (1987). *The Language of Defamation*. Texas Law Review. vol 66. no. 2:303-350.

Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi Dan Transaksi Elektronik. 2016. Jakarta.

Wijana, I.D. P. (1996). *Dasar-dasar Pragmatik.* Yogyakarta: Andi.