

**PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH COMMENTS ON
INDONESIAN DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TAXATION INSTAGRAM**

A RESEARCH PAPER

Submitted to Fulfil One of Requirements
To Get Sarjana Sastra Degree (S1)



**IDHAM ABDUROHIM
NPM: C1.19200009**

ENGLISH LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

UNIVERSITY OF SEBELAS APRIL SUMEDANG

2023

APPROVAL SHEET

**PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH COMMENTS ON
INDONESIAN DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TAXATION INSTAGRAM**

by

IDHAM ABDUROHIM

NPM C1.19200009

approved by:

The 1st Supervisor,

The 2nd Supervisor,

Anit Pranita Devi, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIDN. 0415078703

Afni Apriliyanti D., S.S., M.Hum.

NIDN. 0401049701

known by

Head of English Literature Study Program,

UNSAP

Dr. Denny Kodrat, M. Pd.

NIDK. 8842810016

LEGALIZATION

**PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH COMMENTS ON
INDONESIAN DIRECTORATE GENERAL OF TAXATION INSTAGRAM**

by

IDHAM ABDUROHIM

NPM C1.19200009

legalized by:

Head of English Literature Study Program,

Dr. Denny Kodrat, M. Pd.

NIDK. 8842810016

The 1st Examiner,

The 2nd Examiner,

Nurhasanah, S.S., M.Hum.

NIDN. 0401058604

Suroto, S.S., M.Hum.

NIDN. 0414097803

The 1st Supervisor,

The 2nd Supervisor,

Anit Pranita Devi, S.Pd., M.Pd.

NIDN. 0415078703

Afni Apriliyanti D., S.S., M.Hum.

NIDN. 0401049701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Sheet	ii
Legalization.....	iii
Declaration.....	iv
Motto.....	v
Preface.....	vi
Acknowledgement	vii
Table of Contents.....	ix
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Appendices.....	xii
Abstract.....	xiii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background of the Research	1
B. Research Question	5
C. Aims of the Research	5
D. Scope of the Research	5
E. Significance of the Research	6
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
A. Literature Review	8
1. Pragmatics.....	8
2. Speech Acts	10
3. Illocutionary Acts	11
4. Hate Speech	14
B. Previous Research	17

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD	22
A. Research Design	22
B. Research Object.....	23
C. Data Collection Technique	23
D. Data Analysis	24
E. Data Validity	27
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	28
A. Findings	28
1. Hate Speech on Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram.....	29
2. Illocutionary Acts on Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram.....	31
B. Discussions	33
1. Types of Hate Speech on Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram.....	34
2. Types of Illocutionary Acts on Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram.....	42
3. Interpretation.....	47
CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
A. Conclusions	49
B. Recommendations	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
APPENDICES	

ABSTRACT

The title of this research is *Pragmatic Analysis of Hate Speech on Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation Instagram*. The purpose of this research is to find the type of hate speech and the type of illocutionary acts in the comment column Instagram Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation account. The object in this research is the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation Instagram account, and the data source in this research is people's comments in the comments column of the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram. The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative method. The grand theory used in this research is the pragmatic proposed by Yule (1996), illocutionary by Austin (1962), and Searle (1969). The result of this research there were 79 hate speeches which consist of 31 insulting, 10 defamation, 2 denigration, 17 unpleasant acts, 6 provoking, 12 inciting, and 1 spreading the hoax in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram account. Then the next result showed that from 106 hate Speech comments of netizens the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram account found there were 54 assertive, 21 directives, 1 commissive, and 3 declarative. Based on the results, the most dominant hate speech is inciting, then illocutionary acts which are most often assertive.

Keywords: *Pragmatics, Illocutionary acts, Hatespeech Instagram*

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the background of the study, the research questions, the objectives, the scope, and the benefits.

A. Background of the Research

The case of maltreatment involving Mario Dandy Satrio, a 20-year-old child of an official at the Directorate General of Taxation, and David, a 17-year-old child of the Jakarta GP Ansor (Gerakan Pemuda Ansor) Central Board, has sparked significant attention in Indonesia. Mario Dandy Satrio was found guilty of committing acts of torture and ill-treatment against David, who happened to be the ex-boyfriend of Mario's girlfriend. This incident gained widespread coverage on social media, television, and newspapers starting on February 20nd, 2023, and quickly became a trending topic in Indonesia.

After a thorough investigation, the police revealed that the suspect's vehicle was suspected of having unpaid vehicle tax. Additionally, there are allegations that the suspect's father, Rafael Alun Trisambodo, failed to report his assets in the wealth report. These developments have contributed to a decline in public trust regarding tax matters in Indonesia. In the latest update, it has been officially announced that Mario Dandy Satrio, the main suspect, was named a suspect by the Jakarta Metro Police on February 22nd, 2023, in connection with the case of maltreatment. The gravity of the situation is evident from the numerous hate

speeches and comments posted by Indonesian individuals on the official Instagram account of the Directorate General of Indonesian Taxation.

According to Mawarti (2018.), hate speech is an expression advocating incitement to harm based on targets identified with a particular social group or demographic. In a legal sense, Mawarti (2018) says hate speech is a prohibited word, behavior, writing, or performance because it can trigger acts of violence and prejudice, either on the part of the perpetrator of the statement or the victim of the action. According to circular letter from the state police of the Republic of Indonesia number: SE/6/X/2015 about handling hate speech, there are seven types of hate speech: insult, defamation, denigration, unpleasant acts, provoking, inciting, and spreading hoax. Hate speech touched many aspects ranging from race, color, ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation, nationality, religion, and others. Many people did hate speech on the pretext that it is a freedom of expression or freedom of speech.

Freedom of expression is the most fundamental human right. Freedom of expression can be exercised through oral or written means. It is protected by crucial legislations, such as Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 28 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. In the modern era, technology has experienced rapid development, offering new platforms for communication and self-expression. One of these platforms is social media.

Social media is media on the internet that allows users to present themselves and interact, work together, share, communicate with other users, and form social

bonds virtually (Nasrullah, 2016). Technology has expanded the space for individuals to express their opinions and engage in public discourse.

Based on the Digital 2023 Global Overview Report which was published on the website we are social (wearesocial.com), Instagram is the second favorite social media platform after WhatsApp. Instagram is a photo and video-sharing website that allows users to take photos and videos, apply digital filters, and share them with various social networking services. Instagram provides a comment feature, allowing users to engage in discussions and express their thoughts (Mattern, 2017).

It is important to recognize that the comment section on Instagram, like other online platforms, serves as a space for individuals to communicate and exercise their freedom of expression. With freedom comes the potential for both positive and negative impacts. The issue of communication ethics is becoming more prevalent as technology advances. One concerning phenomenon is the rise in cases of hate speech on online platforms.

To understand hate speech, illocutionary acts had an important role in understanding hate speech because it provides insight into the intent and effects of these speech acts. Analyzing the illocutionary in hate speech can uncover the speaker's motives and intentions, which can vary from making a statement, giving an order, expressing a feeling, or influencing someone's beliefs, and understanding whether hate speech aims to incite violence and demean a particular group. Gereda (2016) argues illocutionary acts are the intent and force generated by the utterances used. It means that speech can bring up an action that occurs during

communication, or speech that not only conveys information but also conveys the intention to do something based on the speech that has been conveyed from the speaker to the speech partner. In other words, illocutionary acts are speech acts that are used to express something and to give impact in the form of action from the utterances.

Several studies about the pragmatic approach on hate speech have been conducted by many researchers. Some of them are Alabi and Ayeloja (2019) who investigated hate speech on the utterances of Nnamdi Kanu, the self-acclaimed leader of the Independent People of Biafra (IPOB), a secessionist group based in the South- Eastern part of Nigeria; Afriawati and Guntari (2022) investigated the types of hate speech and illocutionary acts of netizens' comments on Joe Biden's Instagram account; Nasution et al. (2021) investigated the forms of hate speech including its illocutionary form found on Instagram and Twitter pages; and Putri et al. (2020) tried to explore the forms of illocutionary speech acts and types of hate speech in replies to Safarinaswifty's tweets. The novelty of this research lies in the object being examined. The previous research object is mostly personal, meanwhile this research object states institutions. Among those research, there has not been a research that explore hate speech on Instagram account of Directorate General of Taxation.

In response to the gap, the main focus of this study is to analyze illocutionary acts in hate speech, especially in the comments column of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's account on Instagram. By analyzing the illocutionary acts contained in hate speech, this study aims to reveal the motives

and intentions of these speech acts. Moreover, it seeks to make sure whether this hate speech serves the purpose of inciting violence or degrading specific groups. By shedding light on hate speech on social media platforms, specifically Instagram, this study will contribute to a better understanding of the phenomenon and provide insights on mitigating its prevalence.

B. Research Question

Based on the discussion in the background above, the questions are:

1. What types of hate speech were used in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account?
2. What types of illocutionary speech act occurs in the comment column Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account?

C. Aims of the Research

In line with the research question, the aims of the research are:

1. To find out the types of hate speech on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account.
2. To find out the types of illocutionary speech acts on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account.

D. Scope of the Research

This research will focus on analyzing and examining illocutionary speech acts in hate speech. In this study, the researcher applied the study pragmatics analysis

of speech acts and hate speech in the comment column on the Directorate General of Taxation Indonesia Instagram account. The theory used in this research is a pragmatic theory by George Yule and speech act by J.L Austin to analyze the hate speech on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account.

E. Significance of the Research

The benefits of this research are divided in two, theoretical benefits and practical benefits.

1. Theoretical Benefits

This research is a reference and basis for further research related to speech act pragmatics on social media and as material for further study. The findings of this study contribute to expand our understanding of the various types of hate speech and can significantly enrich the analysis of hate speech types in academic research.

2. Practical Benefits

Understanding the illocutionary acts in hate speech can bring about several practical benefits:

- a. For students, to expand their knowledge about hate speech, types of hate speech and Illocutionary speech act.
- b. For teachers, as the material input and consideration that may be useful and beneficial to improve knowledge about hate speech and types of hate speech and Illocutionary speech act.

- c. For readers, to understand hate speech and types of hate speech so that can be used as their references.



CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter presents the methodology in conducting the research. It consists of research design, research object, research site, data collection technique, data analysis, and data validity. Each of them is elaborated in the following sections.

A. Research Design

This research is focused on analyzing the illocutionary act in hate speech in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account. This research belongs to qualitative research because this research is focused on explaining social phenomena. According to Creswell (2013), qualitative research explores a problem and develops a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon. In line with Hancock (2002), qualitative research is concerned with developing explanations of social phenomena because it helps people to understand the society that occurs in this world.

Specifically, this research is categorized as descriptive qualitative research because it focuses on phenomena and analyzes the illocutionary act in hate speech in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation's Instagram account. According to Sugiyono (2009) "Descriptive is data collected in the form of words, pictures and not numbers, this is due to the

application of qualitative methods." Therefore, to describe these phenomena, descriptive qualitative research is suitable to conduct this research.

B. Research Object

The object of this research is the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation and the data is hate speech in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation. The data were taken from the object, namely the hate speech in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation, from February 2023 to May 2023.

C. Data Collection Technique

According to Sugiyono (2009), there are some techniques of data collecting such as observation, interview, and documentation. This research used a documentation technique as Sugiyono (2009) stated, "a document is a collection of written material in the media, meeting minutes, correspondence and reports to find the necessary information". The documented data is in the form of hate speech in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation. Here are the steps taken to collect the data:

1. Searching the Instagram account of the Directorate General of Indonesian Taxation namely @ditjenpajakri.

2. Choosing posts of account of the Directorate General of Indonesian Taxation.

3. Documenting the hate speech by taking screenshots of the hate speech using a smartphone.

4. The researcher read and selected or identifying and classifying the data the comments which indicate as hate speech.

E. Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study was done by using a content analysis. According to Miles and Huberman (2014), state that there are three activities in qualitative data analysis. They are data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Here are the steps to analyze the data in this research:

1. Data Reduction

According to Sugiyono (2013), reducing data means summarizing, choosing the main things, focusing on the important things, looking for themes and patterns. At this stage, researchers collect raw data from document sources. Then the data is organized and prepared so that it can be processed more efficiently and easily interpreted. Then the researcher selects the data that is considered the most significant and relevant to the research objectives.

Firstly, the researcher collected and identified the data from the Instagram account of the Directorate General of Indonesian Taxation namely @ditjenpajakri.

Second, the researcher analyzed and classified the hate speech into types of hate speech (insulting, defamation, denigration, unpleasant action, provoking, inciting, spreading hoaxes) and illocutionary act (assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, declarative). Here is the table for analyzing hate speech and

illocutionary acts in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation Instagram account:

Table 3.1 Categorizing Hate Speech and Illocutionary Acts

No	Data	Types Of Hate Speech						Types Of Illocutionary Act				
		Insulting	Defamation	Denigration	Unpleasant act	Provoking	Inciting	Spreading hoax	Assertive	Directive	Commissive	Expressive

2. Data Display

According to Sugiyono (2013), after the data has been reduced, the next step is to display the data. Sugiyono says Through the presentation of the data, the data is organized, and arranged in a relationship pattern, so that it will be easier to understand. After data reduction, the presentation stage involves presenting data that has been processed and compiled beforehand. The data presented is in the form of hate speech in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation.

Table 3.2 and table 3.3 shows the data display of the type of hate speech and types of illocutionary acts in the comment column on the Indonesian decorate general taxation Instagram account. Here is the table:

Table 3.2 Hate Speech Type Occurrence

No	Types of Hate Speech	Frequency
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		

Table 3.3 Illocutionary Acts Type Occurrence

No	Types of Illocutionary Act	Frequency
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

3. Conclusion Drawing/Verification

According to Miles and Huberman (in Sugiyono 2013) the third step in qualitative data analysis is drawing conclusions and verification. The conclusions that can be drawn are about the types of hate speech and the types of illocutionary speech acts in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian

Directorate General of Taxation. Meanwhile, verification in this research was done by asking experts in the relevant fields to review and evaluate the analysis and research findings as a form of verification. In this Research, the data was checked by two supervisors to confirm the research data.

F. Data Validity

Mason (2002) states that validity in qualitative research is a useful one because when the data is valid, it means that the observation and identification of the research are true. Creswell (2013) defines validity as the outcome of research which is based on trustworthiness and external reviews. According to Sugiyono (2013), data validity tests in qualitative research include tests, credibility (internal validity), transferability (external validity), dependability (reliability), and confirmability (objectivity). This research used the dependability test in this study. Sugiyono (2013) says dependability testing is carried out by auditing the entire research process, the method is carried out by an independent auditor, or a supervisor to audit all the activities of the researcher in conducting research. To validate the data in this study, the data was checked by two supervisors to confirm the research data.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the conclusion and recommendation will be presented in order in the following section.

A. Conclusions

This section presents the conclusions based on data analysis and discussion. The first focuses on hate speech and its types in the comment column of the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram account. The second focuses on illocutionary speech acts and their types of hate speech in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram account. After analyzing the data, the researcher concluded that:

First, the finding showed that there were 79 hate speeches which consist of 31 insulting, 10 defamation, 2 denigration, 17 unpleasant acts, 6 provoking, 12 inciting, and 1 spreading the hoaxes in the comment column on the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram account.

Second, the data showed that from 79 hate speech comments of netizens the Indonesian Directorate General Taxation Instagram account found there were 54 assertive, 21 directives, 1 commissive, and 3 declarative.

Based on the results above, the type of hate speech that is most often conveyed is hate speech insulting. Based on the explanation of the theory, insulting is an utterance that contains dirty words, harassing words, and words that

can make other people down. It shows that the Indonesian people are annoyed and no longer believe in taxation in Indonesia. Thus they express their emotions by throwing insulting hate speech, such as by saying dirty words and harassing words in the comments column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation.

Furthermore, the illocutionary speech act that is often used based on the conclusions above is the assertive illocutionary speech act, which according to the theory discussed, assertive is a type of speech act that states what the case speaker believes or not. Statement of a fact, asserting, concluding, stating and describing. It shows that the people who commented in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxes expressed their frustration by expressing their hatred and disappointment through hate speech. Besides, the illocutionary speech act that is second often used is the directive illocutionary speech act. In line with the theory, directive is a speech addressed by the speaker to the speech partner to carry out an action spoken by the speaker in the utterance. For example, ordering, begging, demanding, and giving advice. It shows that the Indonesian people are already disappointed with taxation in Indonesia so that many of them order and give advice for taxation in Indonesia to be abolished or closed. It is proven in the previous discussion that many people commented to dissolve or close taxation in Indonesia.

B. Recommendations

After all the research questions have been explained in the research result, the researcher realized that this research had so many limitations. The limitations of the research should be concerned to make better research. In addition, it can be a gap for future researchers in conducting research on a similar topic. Therefore, it is important to give several recommendations. The first limitation is that this research did not use semantic theory whereas the topic of this study can be studied with two branches of linguistics, namely pragmatics and semantics. Semantic theory whereas the topic of this study can be studied with two branches of linguistics, namely pragmatics and semantics. Semantic theory can explain in more detail the meaning contained in hate speech in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxes. The second limitation is about this research also not use semiotic theory. The use of semiotic theory in this study can help further in explaining the meaning contained in the utterances in the comment column on the Instagram account of the Indonesian Directorate General of Taxation because semiotics studies about signs or icons, and in the comment column itself there are signs or icons that known as emoticons. This research did not include or use semantics and semiotics because of the limitation of time. Thus, it is recommended for further researchers to use semantics and semiotics theory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alabi, T. O., & Ayeloja, A. K. (2019). Hate speech and security challenges: A pragmatic study of Nnamdi Kanu's speeches in the south-eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of English Research*, 5(4). Retrieved: at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333965613>
- Arfianti, I. (2020). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Analisis*. Semarang: CV Pilar Nusantara.
- Arfiawati, F., & Guntari, T. (2022). Hate Speech and Illocutionary Act on Joe Biden's Instagram: Pragmatics Approach. *Jurnal Sastra Studi Ilmiah Sastra*, 12(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.56413/studi_ilmiah_sastra.v12i2.335
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative, inquiry & research design* (3rd ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Fasold, R.W. (2006). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gereda, A. (2016). *Konsep-Konsep Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Lingkarantarnusa.
- Hancock, B. (2002). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Nottingham, UK: Trent Focus Group.
- Horn, L. R. & Ward, G. (2007). *The handbook of pragmatics*. Australia: Blackwell.
- Kridalaksana, H. (2008). *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Reseaching* (2nd ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Mattern, J. (2017). *Instagram. United State of America*: Abdo Consulting Group Inc.
- Mawarti, S. (2018). Fenomena Hate Speech Dampak Ujaran Kebencian. *Toleransi: Media Komunikasi umat Beragama*, 10(1), 85-86. doi: [10.24014/trs.v10i1.5722](https://doi.org/10.24014/trs.v10i1.5722)
- Mey, L. Jacob. (1993). *Pragmatics: an Intoduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis* (3rd ed.). USA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Nadar, F. X. (2009). *Pragmatik & Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Nasrullah, R. (2016). *Media Sosial: Perspektif Komunikasi, Budaya, dan Sioteknologi*. Bandung: Simbiosis Rekatama Media.
- Nasution, M. M., Izar, J., & Afifah, I. H. (2021). An Analysis of Hate Speech Against K-Pop Idols And Their Fans on Instagram and Twitter From The Perspective of Pragmatics. *JETLi: Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics*, 2(2). doi: <https://doi.org/10.55616/jetli.v2i2.143>
- Nuramalia. (2020). *Kajian Pragmatik Tindak Tutur Dalam Media Sosial*. Banten: Yayasan Pendidikan dan Sosial Indonesia Maju (YPSIM).
- Putri, A. D., Murtadlo, A., & Purwanti. (2020) Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Dalam Ujaran Kebencian Pada Balasan Tweet @Safarinaswifty. *Kajian Pragmatik. Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, 4(4). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v4i4.4408>
- Rahayu, I. (2020). *Hate Speech Analysis of Netizen's Comments on Donald Trump's Instagram Account*. Medan: Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara.
- Sari, M. K. (2021). *Tindak Tutur Permintaan Maaf Dalam Bahasa Inggris Oleh penutur Asli dan Penutur Bahasa Jawa*. Banyumas: CV. Pena Persada.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. (1975). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Act*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Surat Edaran Kapolri. (2015). SE/6/X/2015 Tentang Penanganan Ujaran Kebencian (Hate Speech). Jakarta.
- Stambo1, R., & Ramadhan, S. (2019). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Pendakwah Dalam Program Damai Indonesiaku Di TV One. *BASINDO: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia, dan Pembelajarannya*, 3(2), pp 251, doi: <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/basindo>
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R.&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge 2 Park Square.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). United Nations. Retrieved <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

Wearesocial.com. Retrieved from <https://wearesocial.com/id/blog/2023/01/the-changing-world-of-digital-in-2023-2/>

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics: An Introduction to Language Study*. New York: Oxford University Press.

