

FORENSIC STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH ON
ROYAL FAMILY INSTAGRAM ACCOUNT

Romlah¹, Alexander Batara Manalu², Marlaba Agustina Manalu³, Rendy Ilham Azhari⁴,
Rahmadsyah Rangkuti⁵

¹Universitas Sumatera Utara. E-mail: romsadhkn@gmail.com

²Universitas Sumatera Utara. E-mail: alexandermanalu15@students.usu.ac.id

³Universitas Sumatera Utara. E-mail: manalu.marlabaagustina@gmail.com

⁴Universitas Sumatera Utara. E-mail: rendyilham10@gmail.com

⁵Universitas Sumatera Utara. E-mail: rangkuti@usu.ac.id

INFORMASI ARTIKEL

Submitted : 2024-06-30
Review : 2024-06-10
Accepted : 2024-06-25
Published : 2024-06-30

KEYWORDS

Forensic Linguistics, Hate speech, Royal family, Pragmatic.

A B S T R A C T

This research aims to use forensic linguistic and pragmatic approaches to examine the stylistic components of hate speech on the Royal Family's Instagram account. The research project seeks to clarify the communicative goals underlying hate speech, assess its influence on social media conversation, and investigate the consequences of legal and legislative responses. It uses linguistic forensics and pragmatics to examine hate speech-language, identifying the multiple motivations behind such communications, which are classified by Kreidler's theory as ridiculing, accusing, blaming, insulting, and insinuating. By researching the vocabulary used in hate speech comments, the study hopes to help develop ways for preventing and minimizing hate speech, as well as creating a constructive and courteous online communication culture. The findings add to the larger discussion about regulating hate speech in the digital age and the role of forensic linguistics in recognizing and minimizing its impact.

INTRODUCTION

According to McMenamin (2002:4), linguistic forensics is the academic study of language and its application in forensic and legal contexts. In between according to Oslon (2008:3), linguistic forensic refers to the interaction between language, criminal acts, and law, which includes law enforcement, legislation, conflicts, and legal processes. Forensic linguistics takes an interest in understanding many different aspects of how language and law collide however, this is not restricted to the courtroom. Forensic linguists analyze and produce legal language, and they are interested in understanding its complexity and origin.

Yule (2017:362) defines pragmatics as the study of unnoticed words spoken or written by speakers. Effective communication is essential for ensuring the audience understands what is being said. Hate speech is an often-seen aspect of pragmatic speech

acts. The dislike expression can be directed against someone with a negative attitude or to hurt someone's feelings. El Sherief et al. (2018:42) define hate speech as defamatory remarks towards others. Hate speech is now expressed both directly and indirectly. Hate speech can be based on several factors such as race, behaviour, physical characteristics, class, gender, ethnicity, religion, or handicap. Hate speech is shared on social media by people.

Recognizing and studying hate speech in many contexts and languages is one of the more difficult aspects of dealing with it. Hate speech has increased in frequency and diversity as people can readily communicate their opinions and sentiments to a vast and diverse audience. However, not all online utterances constitute hate speech, and the degree and type of hate speech may differ based on the speaker's or author's purpose, tone, style, and impact. Furthermore, hate speech can vary among cultures and languages, as words, phrases, metaphors, and symbols can have distinct meanings and connotations in different linguistic and social situations.

According to Lim's (2020) research into the growing dimension of hate speech on social media platforms, the audience response to hate speech posted online has been rising as technology becomes more mainstream and people's communication skills improve. His study's findings force mass media researchers to conduct additional research into this phenomenon and ensure that societal issues and media digitization are debated in public discourse. Malmasi and Zampieri (2017) recognized hate speech on social media using the classification text approach. The study's primary purpose was to distinguish between hate speech, profanity, and other forms of social media content. The research study's findings revealed that there is little contrast between hate speech and profanity, and it is difficult to tell the two apart.

The following past studies have a strong connection to this one: Virginia and Olarewaju (2017), who studied hate speech in magazines and newspapers; Alabi and Aleyoja (2019), who studied hate speech in Nnamdi Kanu's speech; Iswatiningsih et al. (2019), who studied hate speech on Facebook, Instagram, and news portals; Subyantoro and Apriyanto (2020), who studied Facebook, and Wiana (2019), who studied Facebook. Previous studies focused on hate comments on personal social media accounts. The present study complements the previous one as it focuses on visual tabloids. This research uses the speech act theory by Kreidler (2002).

METHOD

This is a qualitative study that uses descriptive approaches. Arikunto (in Putra, 2015: 73) argues that descriptive research does not test hypotheses, but rather provides information about a variable. This research uses words and sentences from netizens to analyze hate speech.

The data analyzed are hate speech comments on pictures of Queen Camilla and Prince William. The researcher collected the primary data for this study from the Instagram accounts @theroyalfamily and @PrinceandPrincessofWales. The research began with the identification of a case involving forensic linguistics. When the data was collected, the researcher examined it using forensic linguistic theory and pragmatic method.

FINDING & DISCUSSION

This section presents statistics in the form of sentences sourced from Instagram users' profiles, which contain hate speech. The researcher applies Kreidler's (2002) theory to identify five types of hate speech intentions: mocking, accusing, blaming, insulting, and insinuating data.

Table 1. Hate Speech Intention

No	Hate Speech Intention	Example
1.	Mocking	Not a queen, never will be, just a mistress
2.	Accusing	Post a photo of your late mother on Mother's Day to honor her memory, no one posts it, but to post a photo with the woman who destroyed your own mother's life, you'll always understand
3.	Blaming	Camilla is not a queen, I don't know how William looks at Camilla like that, she was his parents' triangle
4.	Insulting	Camilla is NOT THE QUEEN, maybe a queen for Charles but not for us! NEVER!!!
5.	Insinuating	Disappointment... William smiling at the one who destroyed his mother, like nothing was horrible! I understand Harry so much that he no longer wants pretend

The information collected from Instagram users' profiles demonstrates the many intents behind hate speech, as defined by Kreidler's theory. Each category, mocking, accusing, blaming, insulting, and insinuating—serves a distinct communicative function yet all contribute to the spreading of negative perspectives.

Mocking is used to humiliate and criticize someone, frequently downgrading their rank or role to something less significant or deserving of respect. This type of hate speech is distinguished by mockery and sarcasm. Exaggeration or satire is sometimes used to denigrate the target. The goal is to lower the target's status or value by making them the object of scorn. Mocking can spread swiftly on social media as people share and copy the disparaging remark, thus increasing its reach and impact. The example given, referring to someone as "not a queen, never will be, just a mistress," attempts to undermine the person's dignity and status.

Accusing a person refers to pointing an accusing finger at them for a perceived fault. It frequently conveys a sense of superior morality and judgment. Accusatory hate speech entails directly accusing someone of a mistake or violation. It's a confrontational style that not only calls out the individual but also invites others to criticize and potentially exclude them. On platforms like Instagram, where personal narratives and photographs are shared, charges can be more harmful since they may be seen as

trustworthy by others. The example offered implies an absence of regard for someone's manner of commemorating memories, implying a betrayal of family ties.

Blaming allocates the fault of a bad occurrence or situation to an individual while often neglecting the situation's complexities. Blaming hate speech sets blame for a negative condition or incident to a specific person or group. It simplifies complex matters by pointing fingers, frequently overlooking the larger context. This can lead to victimization, in which the blamed party is held responsible for events beyond their control, promoting feelings of injustice and animosity. The example "Camilla is not a queen, I don't know how William looks at Camilla like that, she was his parents' triangle," is blaming someone for problematic personal connections.

Insults are direct attacks on someone's character or identity. It's frequently explicit, with little opportunity for ambiguity. Insults are clear and blatant attacks on someone's personality, looks, beliefs, or abilities. They are intended to harm and degrade the target. In the digital era, insults can spread virally, causing severe emotional suffering to the targeted individual and occasionally leading to real-world consequences.

The statement "Camilla is NOT THE QUEEN, maybe a queen for Charles but not for us! NEVER!!!" is a clear example of an insult aimed at delegitimizing someone's role or position.

Insinuating is more subtle, implying something unpleasant without stating it explicitly. It uses shared information or values to convey a cruel message. The insinuation is a more subtle type of hate speech. It indicates something bad or insulting without explicitly stating it, relying on the audience's capacity to discern the hostile purpose. This subtlety can make insinuations more dangerous, as they can be dismissed as misunderstandings or jokes, even when they include a distinct undertone of hatred. The example "Disappointment... William smiling at the one who destroyed his mother, like nothing was horrible!" insinuates a lack of loyalty or respect.

To sum up, the topic of hate speech as defined by Kreidler's theory and its expression on Instagram accounts, is clear that hate speech takes many forms, each with a specific communicative goal that contributes to the spread of negative attitudes. Mocking damages human dignity by ridiculing their status, accusing them of unjustified blame, reducing complex issues to target victims, insulting them outright, undermining their identity, and discreetly spreading negativity through implication. These types of hate speech, when combined, can create an environment that develops hate and conflict.

The fast spread of such speech on social media sites such as Instagram emphasizes the need for effective moderation and instructional initiatives to fight hate speech. It also emphasizes the significance of gaining a better understanding of the motivations behind hate speech to drive policy and legal responses that safeguard individuals and communities from its negative consequences. Finally, countering hate speech involves a holistic approach that takes into account the linguistic, social, and technological dimensions of how hatred can be expressed.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study researched the interaction of forensic linguistics and pragmatics, specifically in the context of hate speech on social media, with Instagram serving as the primary data source. The study revealed the several motivations underlying hate speech, as defined by Kreidler's theory: mocking, accusing, blaming, insulting, and implying. Each sort of hate speech serves a specific communicative role,

contributing to an increase of unfavorable viewpoints and potentially inciting violence. The findings highlight the critical need of efficient regulation and educational efforts to reduce hate speech on social media. Furthermore, understanding the factors behind hate speech is critical for developing constitutional and legal solutions to protect individuals and communities from its harmful impact.

Preventing hate speech involves a multifaceted approach that takes into account linguistic, social, and technological factors, with a focus on creating a more positive and respectful online environment. This study offers new insights into the changing nature of hate speech in the digital era, emphasizing the complexity and effect of linguistic expressions on social media platforms. As technology evolves and influences communication patterns, continuing study and awareness campaigns are critical for addressing and minimizing the detrimental impacts of hate speech.

REFERENCE

- Festl, R., & Quandt, T. (2013). Social relations and cyberbullying: The influence of individual and structural attributes on victimization and perpetration via the internet. *Human communication research*, 39(1), 101-126.
- James Banks (2010) Regulating hate speech online, *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 24:3, 233-239
- Kridalaksana, Hari Murti. 2001. *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Lim, S. S. (2020). Manufacturing Hate 4.0: Can Media Studies Rise to the Challenge?. *Television & New Media*, 21(6), 602-607
- McMenamin, G. R. (2012). Theory and practice of forensic stylistics. In M. Coulthard & A. Johnson (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Forensic Linguistics* (pp. 487-507). New York: Routledge.
- Malmasi, S., & Zampieri, M. (2017). Detecting hate speech in social media. arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06427
- Rao, M. F. (2020). Hate Speech and Media Information Literacy in the Digital Age: A Case Study of 2018 Elections in Pakistan. *Global Media Journal*, 18(34), 1-10.
- Syarif, E. (2020). Pengaruh Media Sosial Terhadap Sikap Dan Pendapat Pemuda Mengenai Ujaran Kebencian. *Jurnal Common*, 3(2), 120-141. <https://doi.org/10.34010/common.v3i2.26>
- Saletovic, Lucia M., & Kisicek, Gabriejela. (2012). Contribution to The Analysis of Witness Statements in The Croatian Language. *Dalam Suvremena Lingvistika*, Vol. 38.
- Saifullah, A. R. (2009). Analisis linguistik terhadap tindak tutur yang berdampak hukum. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Suryani, Y., & Istianingrum, R., & Hanik, S. U. (2021) Linguistik Forensik Ujaran Kebencian terhadap Artis Aurel Hermansyah di Media Sosial Instagram. *Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa & Sastra Indonesia*. Vol. 6, No. 1, hal: 107-11
- Verdonk, P. (2002). *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University
- Meknas, N. (2015). A case of forensic linguistics. *Psu-sa*. https://www.academia.edu/15357262/A_Case_of_Forensic_Linguistics.