

Speech Act of Indonesian Stand Up Comedian that Potentially Implicated to Racist Problem (Linguistic Forensic Analysis)

Tindak Tutur Komika Indonesia yang Berpotensi Memiliki Implikasi Masalah SARA (Analisis Linguistik Forensik)

Nini Ibrahim ¹, Ummul Qura ², & Fauzi Rahman ³

^{1,2} Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA

³ Universitas Indraprasta PGRI

Jakarta Timur, Indonesia

Email: nini.ibrahim@uhamka.ac.id

Submitted: 2020-08-27
Accepted: 2020-10-26

Published: 2020-10-31

DOI: 10.24036/humanus.v19i2.45274

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v19i2.45274>

Abstract

Indonesia has been made busy by the circulation of video footage showing the stand up comedian (komika) in a stand up comedy event that offend SARA (ethnicity, religion, ancestry, and group of people). The purpose of this study was to analyze the komika's materials using forensic linguistic analysis with functional pragmatic approaches. The method used in this research is descriptive qualitative with functional pragmatic analysis using data analysis techniques (1) speech illocution analysis, (2) speech implicature, and (3) level of speech validity. The results showed that the illocutionary power and implicature of the identified komika could fulfill the elements of leading opinion as an expression offending SARA. On the illocutionary power of speech, it is classified that an indicated declarative and expressive speech can potentially offend the speech partner. Moreover, if the diction is used in the speech, it raises the issue of SARA.

Keywords: Komika, SARA, Forensic linguistics, Pragmatics

Abstrak

Indonesia telah dibuat ramai oleh beredarnya beberapa cuplikan video yang menyanggah tentang komika dalam suatu acara stand up comedy yang dianggap telah menyinggung SARA (Suku, Agama, Ras, dan Antargolongan). Tujuan penelitian ini adalah menganalisis materi komika menggunakan analisis linguistik forensik dengan pendekatan pragmatik fungsional. Metode yang digunakan pada penelitian ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif dengan analisis pragmatik fungsional menggunakan teknik analisis data (1) analisis daya ilokusi tuturan, (2) implikatur tuturan, dan (3) tingkat validitas tuturan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa daya ilokusi dan implikatur dari komika teridentifikasi dapat memenuhi unsur-unsur penggiringan opini sebagai ungkapan yang menyinggung SARA. Pada daya ilokusi tuturan, terklasifikasi bahwa tuturan deklaratif

dan ekspresif terindikasi dapat berpotensi menyinggung mitra tutur. Terlebih lagi, jika diksi yang digunakan di dalam tuturan tersebut mempersoalkan masalah SARA.

Kata kunci: *Komika, SARA, Linguistik forensik, Pragmatik*

Introduction

A public figure's daily life with ordinary people has significant differences, starting from everyday life in society, privacy, and social status (Pattipeilohy, 2016). For example, an ordinary citizen walking in a shopping center will get a typical reaction from other people. It is different from a public figure; when they are in a crowd such as a shopping center, many eyes will undoubtedly look at them, and it is not uncommon for people to greet and invite them to take pictures together. Being a famous person will certainly get different treatment from the surrounding community (Tannaz & Utami, 2019).

The emergence of public figures' faces so that they are widely known in the community cannot be separated from the role of the media. Moreover, currently, the media is limited to print and electronic and added to the virtual world media or the internet. Usually, a public figure has a social media account on the internet with several followers or subscribers, reaching millions of people. It certainly makes the famous person even more recognized and, in the spotlight, because his daily life is published and can be seen by the broader community at all times (Pranaka et al., 2017).

Some time ago, the Indonesian people were animated by the circulation of comic videos in a stand-up comedy event whose content or material was slightly offensive about a group's beliefs. The content or material that he delivers raises not only appreciation but also presents many opinions in the community. This problem occurs because the content provided by Komika brings the idea of a group's beliefs. It has led to several interpretations, namely laughing at the comic through its content, material or laughing at the group's beliefs. It makes people busy because, for some people, bringing the context of faith in a joke is taboo (Nugroho, 2019; Siswanto & Febriana, 2018; Mulyani, 2017).

In responding to the above problems, forensic linguistic analysis is needed to answer whether speech acts can offend SARA. It is because this kind of forensic linguistic research has been carried out in previous studies. As has been done by Tri Jumartini Ilyas (2018) with the title "News Framing of Suspected Cases of Religious Blasphemy in Stand-Up Comedy in Online Media" with the analysis technique using the Framing approach with syntactic, script, thematic, and rhetorical tools. The results of this study are limited to the conclusion that online media can construct readers' thoughts and emotions to invite public sympathy

In addition to Ilyas' research (2018), Gahara (2019) also presented a paper entitled "The Controversy of Speech in a GP Single Comedy at the Film Launching Event 'Susah Tanda', at a seminar at PGRI University in Semarang. Gahara's research was compiled with forensic linguistic analysis techniques in GP speech. Gahara's research results (2019) show that GP's utterances contain SARA and create hostility towards certain groups.

An interesting point in Ilyas and Gahara's research is that the figures discussed (JS and GP) are famous and rising public figures on social media, especially Instagram. This figure is also known by many people, including very popular on social media, especially Instagram. JS shot up his career, starting with a child singer then taking root

into a famous comic. Then, GP shot up his career since auditioning for Stand-Up Comedy Indonesia until now he has successfully become a scriptwriter, director, and actress. On the other hand, the two comics both present content or material that raises many opinions in the community, which leads to offending the beliefs of a group (SARA).

If it is viewed based on Gahara's research, this research is relevant to this research, using forensic linguistic analysis. However, previous research was only limited to argumentation and public exposure without comprehensive language identification at the phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels. In addition, forensic linguistic analysis in this study tries to provide linguistic evidence through the stages of forensic linguistic analysis starting with the illocutionary power of speech, then continuing with the speaker's statement's implications until finally validating the meaning of the speaker's speech. The final result of the speech's validity in the form of writings from the komika utterances will be the supporting evidence of these utterances, which will lead to the presence or absence of potential implications for SARA problems.

When conducting forensic linguistic analysis, researchers or linguists' expertise in their field of knowledge may help solve language cases. It can occur because this forensic linguistic analysis uses linguistics and forensics, which are a combination of two different sciences to translate a language problem and a form of controlling one's use of language. For this reason, this research's contribution can be used as a reference for the comic in harmonizing the material so that it does not have the potential to contain irregularities that impact legal problems.

The study dimensions in forensic linguistics are quite broad and involve all linguistic levels, from phonology, morphology, syntax, to pragmatics (Santoso, 2016). According to Gibbons (2007: 12), it states that the development of language translation used in the context of providing forensic evidence must be based on a linguistic scope.

In forensic linguistic studies, one of the linguistic aspects that can be used is the pragmatic and sociopragmatic aspects (Subyantoro, 2019). In forensic linguistic studies, pragmatic analysis can be used both in written discourse and transcribed oral speech. These discourses are social texts derived from recordings, transcriptions, or conversations that can lead to acts against the law (Saifullah, 2009).

Forensic linguistic studies are considered appropriate in answering comic problems in cases that can offend SARA. The figures mentioned using Indonesian in the material they deliver, which raises linguistic phenomena that have become viral in society (Subyantoro, 2019). Forensic linguistics mainly deals with identifying speakers based on their dialect, speech style, or accent (Satria, 2016: 19).

Besides, forensic linguistics also tries to classify speech acts based on the speaker (Purba, 2011). It is following the objectives of this study, which tries to identify and classify speech acts of comics in the transcript of stand-up comedy material based on a forensic linguistic point of view - to answer the controversy that has arisen in society.

Method

The method used in this research is a qualitative descriptive method with forensic linguistic analysis. The forensic linguistic study in this study uses the functional pragmatic analysis aspect. The data analysis techniques used in this study refer to Bachari and Juansah's (2017) opinion, including (1) the illocutionary power of speech,

(2) the implicature of the speech, and (3) the level of validity of the speech. The illocutionary power of speech in the early stages of analysis is to identify and classify the character of speakers in the assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative aspects (Searle, 1979). Furthermore, in the utterance implicature, analysis refers to the illocutionary functions of speech that arise from the illocutionary being spoken. Finally, validity is used as a verification of illocutionary and implicative speeches that contain utterances that offend SARA.

There are also data sources used as material for analysis are (1) the material brought by Komika at the artist roasting event uploaded by Majelis Lucu Indonesia on Youtube (Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d2bPYJPUzG8>), (2) The material brought by Komika in the launching of the film "Susah Tanda" (Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-JaFpnn3KZk>). The data source taken is in the form of a video and then transcribed so that the analysis process can be carried out. The results of the transcription in the form of spoken sentences from speakers (komika) were analyzed with a forensic linguistic study to determine whether there were speech acts that indicated the potential to have implications that offend SARA.

Result and Discussion

The research data source produced two transcripts of conversations/utterances from speakers to speech partners in the context of the Stand-Up Comedy program. The conversational transcription data will then be analyzed using three analysis patterns, starting from the illocution of the speech, the implicature of the speech, and the validity of the speech.

Transcripts related to the things the speakers reveal can be seen in the table below.

Transcript 1

Speaker: *...dan yang gue bingung adalah Cherly ini, walaupun leader, dia gagal memanfaatkan kepemimpinannya untuk mendulang popularitas untuk dirinya sendiri. Terbukti, zaman dulu semua mata laki-laki tertujunya pada Annisa, Annisa, Annisa. Ya kan, semuanya Annisa. Padahal, skill nyanyi, ya... tipis-tipis, ya kan? Skill nge-dance, tipis-tipis. Cantik relatif, ya kan? Gue mikir, 'Kenapa Annisa selalu unggul dari Cherly?' Ah, sekarang gua ketemu jawabannya. Makanya Che, Islam! Huahahaha...!* (Disambut gelak tawa penonton dengan riuh).

(Speaker: ... and what I'm confused about is Cherly, even though she is a leader, she failed to take advantage of her leadership to gain popularity for herself. Evidently, in the past, all-male eyes were on Annisa, Annisa, Annisa. Yes, all of them are Annisa., singing skill, huh ... thin, right? Dancing skill, thin. Pretty relative, right? I thought, 'Why is Annisa always superior to Cherly?' Ah, now I have found the answer. That's why Che, Islam! Huahahaha...!) (Greeted by loud laughter from the audience)

Audience: *Allahuakbar... Allahuakbar! Takbir-Takbir!*

Speaker: *Karena di Indonesia ini, ada satu hal yang tidak bisa dikalahkan oleh bakat sebesar apa pun, Mayoritas! Mayoritas!* (Kembali disambut gelak tawa penonton.)

(Speaker: Because in Indonesia, there is one thing that cannot be beaten by any talent, the majority! The majority!) (Again, greeted by laughter from the audience.)

Transcript 2

Speaker: Nih, dulu nih Jakarta banjir, apa coba netizen netizen itu? Wih, Jakarta banjir. Ini gara-gara Ahok. Ini gara-gara Ahok ini. Ini gara-gara azab kita punya gubernur kafir. (Penonton tertawa riuh).

(Speaker: Here, in the past Jakarta was flooded, what do netizens try? Wow, Jakarta is flooded. It's because of Ahok. It's because of this Ahok. This is because of our punishment for infidel governors.) (Audience laughs boisterously)

Penutur: Nih, potong kuping gue. Nih sekarang udah Anies. Jakarta banjir, beda omongannya, 'Wah, ini adalah cobaan dari Allah SWT. (Penonton Kembali tertawa). 'Ini cobaan. Sesungguhnya Allah akan memberikan cobaan kepada orang yang Dia cintai. CinTAI apaan? Itu ada popok menggenang-genang! Cobaan? Stres banget gue.

(Speaker: Here, cut my ears. Here now, Anies. Jakarta was flooded, he said differently, 'Wow, this is a trial from Allah SWT. (Audience laughs again) 'This is a trial. Indeed, Allah will give trials to those He loves. What is CinTAI? There is a diaper float! Trial? I'm really stressed.)

Analysis of Speech Illocutionary Power

To identify the speaker's statements in the material at the stand-up comedy program, the first thing that needs to be studied is the illocutionary power of the speaker's speech. There are several statements or ideas from speakers that are highlighted in the first transcript, among others:

- (1) *"Makanya Che, Islam!"*
("So Che, Islam!"); and
- (2) *"Karena di Indonesia ini, ada satu hal yang tidak bisa dikalahkan oleh bakat sebesar apa pun, mayoritas! Mayoritas!"*
("Because in Indonesia, there is one thing that cannot be defeated by any talent, the majority! Majority!").

Tabel 1. Transcript Analysis 1

No	Statement	Illocutionary Power
1	<i>Gue mikir, 'Kenapa Annisa selalu unggul dari Cherly?' Ah, sekarang gua ketemu jawabannya. Makanya Che, Islam!</i> (I thought, 'Why is Annisa always superior to Cherly?' Ah, now I found the answer. So, Che, Islam!)	Directive
2	<i>Karena di Indonesia ini, ada satu hal yang tidak bisa dikalahkan oleh bakat sebesar apa pun, mayoritas! Mayoritas!</i> (Because in Indonesia, there is one thing that cannot be defeated by any talent, the majority! Majority!)	Declarative

In the first statement, the speaker's speech enters the illocutionary power of the directive's speech as an attempt to command, recommend, or ask the speech

partner. The speaker in this case recommended his speech partner (CJ) to enter into the majority belief/religion so that his popularity would increase. The power of directive illocution is expressed based on an example that occurs in speech partners (AR) who adhere to the majority belief and are very popular as public figures. In fact, the said partners are citizens who have other beliefs/minorities.

The problem raised in the first speech is closely tied to the second statement from the speaker who enters the power of declarative illocution as a claim in making justifications and making opinions. In the second statement, speakers expressed ideas that gave the impression of swaying the opinions of the speech partners who were present in front of him to accept that in Indonesia, any amount of talent would be inferior to followers of the majority belief.

Unfortunately, the directive and declarative illocutionary power expressed by the speakers do not have a strong argumentation basis, thus violating the maxims of quality. The violation occurred because the speakers conveyed information that was not yet known for its validity. The statements, *"Makanya, Che, Islam"* ("So, Che, Islam") and *"... satu hal yang tidak bisa dikalahkan oleh bakat sebesar apa pun, mayoritas! Mayoritas!"* ("...one thing that cannot be beaten by any talent, the majority! The majority!"), intending to insinuate that only followers of the majority belief can become popular and achieve, is a false statement. The case of a viral speaker statement on YouTube occurred because of a violation of the speaker's statement of the maximal quality.

Furthermore, in the second transcript, there are several statements identified that have received the spotlight from the public and are suspected of offending SARA. These statements include:

- (1) *"Nih, dulu nih Jakarta banjir, apa coba netizen-netizen itu? 'Wih, Jakarta banjir. Ini gara-gara Ahok. Ini gara-gara Ahok ini. Ini gara-gara azab kita punya gubernur kafir."*
 ("Here, Jakarta was flooded first, what do netizens try? 'Wow, Jakarta is flooded. It's because of Ahok. It's because of this Ahok. This is because of the punishment we have an infidel governor.");
- (2) *"Nih, potong kuping gue. Nih sekarang udah Anis. Jakarta banjir, beda omongannya, 'Wah, ini adalah cobaan dari Allah SWT'."*
 ("Here, cut off my ears. Here now Anis. Jakarta was flooded, he said differently, 'Wow, this is a trial from Allah SWT'."); and
- (3) *"'Ini cobaan. Sesungguhnya Allah akan memberikan cobaan kepada orang yang Dia cintai.' CinTAI apaan? Itu ada popok menggenang-genang! Cobaan!"*
 ("This is a trial. Indeed, Allah will give trials to those He loves. 'What Cintai (loves)? There is a diaper float! Trial!").

Table 2. Transcript Analysis 2

No	Statement	Illocutionary Power
1	<i>Nih, dulu nih Jakarta banjir, apa coba netizen-netizen itu? 'Wih, Jakarta banjir. Ini gara-gara Ahok. Ini gara-gara Ahok ini. Ini gara-gara azab kita punya gubernur kafir.'</i> (Here, Jakarta was flooded first, what do netizens try? 'Wow, Jakarta is flooded. It's because of Ahok. It's because of this Ahok.	Expressive

	This is because of the punishment we have an infidel governor.)	
2	<i>Nih, potong kuping gue. Nih sekarang udah Anis. Jakarta banjir, beda omongannya, 'Wah, ini adalah cobaan dari Allah SWT.'</i> (Here, cut off my ears. Here now Anis. Jakarta was flooded, he said differently, 'Wow, this is a trial from Allah SWT'.)	Assertive
3	<i>Ini cobaan. Sesungguhnya Allah akan memberikan cobaan kepada orang yang Dia cintai.' CinTAI apaan? Itu ada popok menggenang-genang! Cobaan!</i> (“This is a trial. Indeed, Allah will give trials to those He loves. 'What Cintai (loves)? There is a diaper float! Trial!).	Expressive

Speakers provide expressive illocutionary speech as a response as well as exemplify events that have occurred in the past. The exemplary statement is marked with the word “*dulu nih*” (“first”) followed by material about Jakarta floods in the past. After that, the speaker uses an example sentence that he claims is a statement by the people of Jakarta who say, “*Wih, Jakarta banjir. Ini gara-gara Ahok... Ini azab kita punya gubernur kafir.*” (“Wow, Jakarta is flooded. This is because of Ahok ... This is the punishment we have for infidel governors.”). In this statement, speakers exemplified the public using the expressions “*azab*” (“punishment”) and “*gubernur kafir*” (“Infidel Governor”) as a unitary idea that associates and forms an element of causality (cause-and-effect), because it has a “*kafir*” (in KBBI, *kafir* = non-Islamic, people those who do not believe in Allah and His Messenger in Islam), the community will receive “*azab*” (in KBBI, *azab* = punishment of God on humans who violate religious prohibitions).

In the next statement, speakers use the illocution of assertive speech as predictions, views, and claims that later people will say, “*Wah, ini adalah cobaan dari Allah Swt...*” (“Wow, this is a trial from Allah SWT ...”) if floods hit Jakarta again in the era of Governor Anies Baswedan. The statement is followed by expressive illocutionary power in the form of the speaker's response and complaint from his own predictions in the previous assertive speech. In this section, the speaker presents expressive illocutionary explosions to emphasize his complaints, especially in the section, “*Sesungguhnya Allah akan memberikan cobaan kepada orang yang Dia cintai! CinTAI APAAN?*” (“Surely Allah will give trials to those He loves! What is CinTAI? (loves)”).

The speaker's statement on the material has generated many opinions among the public. If viewed from the power of illocution and language violations, the speaker has violated the maxims of quality and the maxims of the method. In terms of quality, speakers have made examples of public statements during the leadership of Governor Ahok when the floods hit Jakarta. In fact, the voice of the community's response exemplified by speakers is not necessarily there and the truth is unclear. Violation of the maxim of quality also occurred when the speakers predicted the response of the Jakarta community to floods happened again during the reign of Governor Anies Baswedan. These two violations of the maxims of quality then caused unrest in the community when the video of the speakers went viral.

Lastly, speakers also violated the maxims of the method - in the statement, “*...CinTAI APAAN!*” (“What is CinTAI”) which was delivered with an explosive tone and

high emphasis. In fact, right in the previous statement, speakers carry the name of God, "Surely Allah will give trials to those whom He loves." In the clause "He loves (Dia Cintai)", the speaker continues with the sentence, "*CinTAI APAAN*" ("WHAT IS *CinTAI*"), which was brought up in a passionate manner which in turn created unrest in the community.

Implicature of Speech

From the results of the speech illocutionary power analysis above, the implicature function of each illocutionary statement can be found in the speaker's statement which can be seen in the table 3.

Table 3. Categorization of Speech Implications

No	Statement	The Illocutionary Power of Speech	The Implicature Function of Speech
1	<i>Gue mikir, 'Kenapa Annisa selalu unggul dari Cherly?' Ah, sekarang gua ketemu jawabannya. Makanya Che, Islam!</i> (I thought, 'Why is Annisa always superior to Cherly?' Ah, now I found the answer. So, Che, Islam!)	Directive	Advise, recommend, influence
2	<i>Karena di Indonesia ini, ada satu hal yang tidak bisa dikalahkan oleh bakat sebesar apa pun, mayoritas! Mayoritas!</i> (Because in Indonesia, there is one thing that cannot be defeated by any talent, the majority! Majority!)	Declarative	Justify
3	<i>Nih, dulu nih Jakarta banjir, apa coba netizen-netizen itu? 'Wih, Jakarta banjir. Ini gara-gara Ahok. Ini gara-gara Ahok ini. Ini gara-gara azab kita punya gubernur kafir.'</i> (Here, Jakarta was flooded first, what do netizens try? 'Wow, Jakarta is flooded. It's because of Ahok. It's because of this Ahok. This is because of the punishment we have an infidel governor.)	Expressive	Respond, mock exemplify, insinuate.
4	<i>Nih, potong kuping gue. Nih sekarang udah Anis. Jakarta banjir, beda omongannya, 'Wah, ini adalah cobaan dari Allah SWT.'</i> (Here, cut off my ears. Here now Anis. Jakarta was flooded, he said differently, 'Wow, this is a trial from Allah SWT'.)	Assertive	Claims, gives views/predictions
5	<i>Ini cobaan. Sesungguhnya Allah akan memberikan cobaan kepada orang yang Dia cintai.' CinTAI apaan? Itu ada popok menggenang-genang! Cobaan!</i>	Expressive	Responding, complaining, cursing

("This is a trial. Indeed, Allah will give trials to those He loves. 'What Cintai (loves)? There is a diaper float! Trial!").

- 1) *To advise*, in the first transcript, the speaker intends to give advice but in the sense of making fun of his speech partners who are considered less popular than his teammates so they advise him to convert. To advise in this case is to make a mockery. This implicature context is following Roasting's main goal, which is a comedy by mocking someone in front of him. There is no implicature to advise on the second transcript.
- 2) *Justifying*, in the first transcript, in this case, the speaker justifies that citizens who hold minority beliefs will not be able to excel compared to people who have majority beliefs. Speakers in this case give an insinuation to the public that if you want to be popular you have to be part of the majority belief somewhere. If not the majority, then his fate will be the same as CJ, the partner said, which the carrier not very popular. No justifying implicature was found on the second transcript. In this justifying context, the meaning of influencing appears in the first transcript, the speaker indirectly tries to influence his speech partners, both speech partners, and other audiences, to agree with his opinion that no amount of talent can develop, will not progress, will not be popular, and will not be supported. Speakers assume that followers of the majority belief will only support their fellow majority. No implicature was found in the second transcript.
- 3) *Satire*, In the second transcript, the speaker wants to insinuate and at the same time respond to some of the Jakarta people whom he exemplifies to make a statement that the Jakarta floods occurred because they had a Governor with a different belief from the majority of the population - in the previous era. Speakers also use the terms "kafir" and "azab" as complementary diction to clarify their target, namely the people who adhere to a certain belief. In fact, in Indonesia recently, the term 'kafir' as a religious terminology is sensitive when pronounced, especially in the context of a pluralistic society.
- 4) *Scoffing*, in the second transcript, the speaker mocked some of the people of Jakarta whom he predicted would respond differently when he had a new governor in the same flood situation. The speaker intended to mock the people who had previously considered the Jakarta floods to be a punishment, then changed that opinion as a disaster when they were led by a governor who had the same belief as to the majority of the population. In other words, speakers assume there is a double standard in the view of society.
- 5) *Predicting*, in the second transcript, the speaker will make a simulation when the floods occur again in Jakarta when the governor's leadership has changed from the Ahok era to the Anies Baswedan era. There was no predictive implicature on the first transcript.
- 6) *Swearing*, on the second transcript, the speaker made a curse on the phrase "CINTAI WHAT!" with a strong emphasis on the "Cin-TAI" fragment so that it has a very negative connotation when heard by audiences. In fact, the word "Cintai (loves)" is continued and quoted from the previous speaker's statement in a sentence that people consider holy, "Allah will give trials to His servants whom He loves." The speaker intends to give curses and emphasis to society which he

considers to be of the double standard. There was no swearing implicature on the first transcript.

Level of Speech Validity

In the first transcript, in the speaker's speech, the implicature of advising or influencing his speech partners is intended to joke and joke as the main purpose of the material and events he is participating in. As long as the speech partner does not object to the influence/incitement of the speaker, the status of "joking" cannot be included in the category of unpleasant actions (Sentosa, 2020). Furthermore, on the implication of complaining, speakers only show their uneasiness as citizens with minority beliefs who have difficulty becoming public figures and have difficulty increasing their popularity in Indonesia.

Speakers' utterances that have implications for SARA problems are those that justify speech partners. At the end of the material, a statement by the speaker who said, "There is one thing that cannot be beaten by any talent, the majority! Majority!" as a form of expression of dislike for people majority in Indonesia. Speakers have stated a form of information that is an opinion that contains judgment against the people or the majority group. In this case, speakers try to give an inaccurate analogy to the point of view of the people/majority group who are always dominant in supporting their fellow adherents regardless of the achievement, creativity, and talent of a person/group in general.

In fact, as we all know that in Indonesia, no matter someone has a religious background, he can still achieve. Even though Indonesia is a country with the largest Muslim population in the world (more than 80%), for matters of achievement, it still returns to the individual and the hard work of each (Kusnandar, 2019). Many artists, artists, singers, professional athletes, businessmen, who have been making achievements to make the nation proud, come from various religious backgrounds. Until now, the spirit of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* is still upheld and is the basis for Indonesian citizens to unite and achieve regardless of ethnicity, religion, race, and between groups (Jaelani, 2015).

Moreover, the second transcript shows that basically, the narrative presented by the speakers is in the context of stand-up comedy. However, content that offends ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup still needs to be considered so as not to offend the community.

The implicature teases the community by exemplifying a response that reads, "Wow, Jakarta Flood. This is because of Ahok... This is because of the punishment we have infidel governors." Some parts are considered to be mocking or degrading certain beliefs. The parts that are considered mocking are the diction of 'doom' and 'governor of kafir' which are delivered with a tone of ridicule and fiery pressure. In fact, those who feel offended by the speakers believe that they must elect a leader (in this context the governor) from the same group according to the references they believe and they can be accounted for.

Furthermore, in the implication of predicting as well as mocking by drawing a picture of the flood events that will occur in the era of Anies' leadership as a governor who shares the same faith with the majority of the community, no part is considered to cause hatred, hostility, ridicule, or tarnish certain groups. This section is only a criticism

of speakers who consider some of the people of Jakarta to apply double standards in dealing with floods in two different eras of leadership.

The part of the statement that the most attention of speakers is on the implicature of swearing. The speaker quotes the holy sentence, "Allah will give a trial to His servant whom He loves (Cintai)...What love (Cintai)!", As well as quoting one diction from the sentence, namely "CinTAI (love)" with repetition, giving the impression that the syllable is cut off more clearly as the word "Tai" (in KBBI, 'Tai'-nonformal; tahi-formal = feces/excrement). The speaker's statement implies offending SARA.

Discussion

Based on the identification and classification of the two transcripts in the research results, in the first transcript, two statements are in the spotlight, and on the second transcript, three statements are in the spotlight. The two statements in the first transcript give rise to two illocutionary forces consisting of (1) directive illocution and (2) declarative illocution. The directive illocution in a speaker's utterance results in a form of recommendation and a form of shortcuts to the speech partner to follow his directions (Kuncara, 2013; Hernandez 2011; de Morraes & Rilliard, 2014). In this case, speakers recommend speech partners to become popular by embracing other beliefs context joking). Meanwhile, declarative illocution spoken by speakers produces a form of justification and assessment (Harrington, 2010). In this case, the assessment or justification comes out of the speaker's personality to lead the opinion of the speech partners to accept that any talent will lose to the majority belief in Indonesia. In fact, speakers perform repetitions at the time of saying the word, 'majority! The majority! 'Twice. Repetition is used to emphasize that diction is taken seriously and must be accepted by speech partners (Parwati, 2013; Vickers, 1994; Blankinship, 2019; Norrick, 1987; Jackson, 2016).

The utterances of speakers show essential features that have the potential to offend SARA. From the results of the material presented in the first transcript, there is a message that adherents of other faiths have no place to excel in Indonesia. In fact, in reality, many non-majority believers in Indonesia have achieved achievements without being influenced by any religious background (Pratama, 2016; Salim, 2016). The allegation of speech that has the potential to offend SARA is clearly evident in the illocutionary power of the speakers' speech which shows that there is an act of categorizing and concluding matters of certain community beliefs. Speakers carry a certain element of belief in their material by comparing the popularity of AR with CJ due to differences in beliefs. What becomes the focus of speech acts, in this case, is that the speakers are different from the majority in Indonesia, so that offense in the community begins to develop (Musyarofah, 2016). This caused several groups of people to be offended by the material presented by the speakers (Winarno, 2018; Fitri et al., 2019; Yahya, 2019; Wahyudin et al., 2019). In this case, the result of the speaker's speech has implications for offending SARA based on forensic linguistic analysis.

Furthermore, regarding the three statements in the second transcript, the speaker as a comic gives the illocution of speech in an expressive and assertive form on his material which is considered offensive to SARA. The three statements, if classified, bring back expressive, assertive, and expressive illocutionary power. Expressive illocution is used to (1) respond, (2) criticize, and (3) give examples, while assertiveness

is used to (1) claim, (2) believe, and (3) provide predictions (Sari, 2012; Sloane, 2013); Somers, 2017).

Based on the above classification, on the expressive illocutionary power, the speakers gave responses as well as exemplifying the opinions of Jakarta residents during the era of Ahok's leadership when the floods hit. The speaker clearly mentions the terminologies in one of the religious teachings, namely 'doom' and 'kafir', to mock the people of Jakarta who have the view that they must elect a governor who has the same belief as to the majority of the people. The mocking implications made by speakers clearly have the potential to offend the beliefs of people who uphold the principle that their leaders must be a group (Sari, 2016; Khalik, 2014; Muttaqin, 2017). In this speech, the speaker has entered the realm of SARA.

Regarding the assertive illocutionary power of speakers who criticized the people of Jakarta during the floods of Anies Baswedan's leadership, there were no expressions that caused hatred, enmity, or desecration towards SARA. The implication of this assertive illocution is only in the form of criticism of the dual standard attitude of Jakarta's. Therefore, there is no motive to insult or offend a particular belief in this section. Speakers in their assertive speech only try to provide lessons for society to be fair to anyone and whatever their beliefs. This speaker's statement proves that it is undeniable that the double standards in Indonesia are still quite strong (Hendro, 2013; Dahlan, 2012; Ghazali, 2013).

Finally, the part of speech that is considered to be the highlight of the speech act is when the speaker gives the last expressive speech. The speaker clearly quotes a verse from the holy book with repetition (repetition) of a certain word as an emphasis as well as ridicule to the speech partner that this part must be heard and accepted. In fact, holy sentences are very taboo when used as the material in a joke, especially when used as material for ridicule. This expressive speech has the potential to have implications for racial problems.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the forensic linguistic analysis carried out, there are essential comic utterances that have the potential to implicate SARA problems because the speech act categorizes, responds, predicts, and conclude affairs the trust of society. This happens because of the speaker's illocutionary power (komika) which contains expressive and declarative illocutionary power with diction which refers to content containing SARA. This means that if speakers are not careful in conveying expressions and declarations, especially those related to racial issues, then the potential to offend the speech partners will arise. What's more, now the legal instruments have become more comprehensive in ensnaring a speaker who utters a speech to insult, mock, leading opinions, or other things that are considered unpleasant acts.

Although in this study there is no potential to offend SARA in directive, assertive, and commissive speech, it does not mean that the illocutionary power of the speech can be freely explored by speakers regardless of the diction chosen. A speaker still has to be careful in issuing his speech so that between the speaker and the speech partner there is no offense between one another.

Reference

Bachari dan Juansah (2017). *Pragmatik: Analisis Penggunaan Bahasa*. Bandung: Penerbit Prodi Linguistik Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

- Blankinship, K. Y. (2019). Repetition for Emphasis. In *The Inimitable Qur'ān* (pp. 83-93). Brill.
- Dahlan, M. (2012). Paradigma Ijtihad Fiqh Minoritas di Indonesia. *Analisis: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, 12(1), 49-70.
- De Moraes, J. A., & Rilliard, A. (2014). Illocution, attitudes and prosody. *Spoken Corpora and Linguistic Studies*, 61, 233.
- Fitri, F., Mahyuni, M., & Sudirman, S. (2019). Skemata Wacana Humor Stand Up Comedy Indonesia. *LINGUA: Journal of Language, Literature and Teaching*, 16(1), 65-76.
- Gahara, N. R. (2019). Kontroversi Ujaran Dalam Komedi Tunggal GP Pada Acara Launching Film "Susah Sinyal". In *Seminar Nasional Literasi IV* (Vol. 4, No. 1).
- Ghazali, A. M. (2013). Teologi Kerukunan Beragama dalam Islam (Studi Kasus Kerukunan Beragama di Indonesia). *ANALISIS: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, 13(2), 271-292.
- Gibbons, J. (2007). *Forensic Linguistics, An Introduction To Forensic Linguistic Language In Evidence*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Harrington, D. (2010). Remembering the body: Eighteenth-century elocution and the oral tradition. *Rhetorica*, 28(1), 67-95.
- Hendro, E. P. (2013). MULTIKULTURALISME Sebagai Model Integrasi Etnis Tionghoa Di Indonesia. *Sabda: Jurnal Kajian Kebudayaan*, 8(1), 34-42
- Hernández, L. P., & de Mendoza Ibáñez, F. J. R. (2011). A Lexical-Constructional Model account of illocution. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, (8), 98-137.
- Ilyas, T. J. (2019). *Framing Berita Dugaan Kasus Penodaan Agama Dalam Stand Up Comedy Di Media Online Republika. Co. Id Dan Sindonews. Com (Periode Januari 2018)*. UIN Raden Fatah Palembang.
- Jackson, R. C. (2016). *The pragmatics of repetition, emphasis and intensification* (Doctoral dissertation, Salford).
- Jaelani, J. (2015). Kontroversi Khilafah: Islam, Negara, Dan Pancasila. *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, 14(2).
- Khalik, A. T. (2014). Pemimpin Non-Muslim dalam Perspektif Ibnu Taimiyah. *Analisis: Jurnal Studi Keislaman*, 14(1), 59-90.
- Kuncara, S. D. (2013). Analisis terjemahan tindak tutur direktif pada novel *The Godfather* dan terjemahannya dalam bahasa Indonesia. *TransLing*, 1(1).
- Kusnandar, V.B. (2019). *Indonesia: Negara dengan Penduduk Muslim Terbesar Dunia*. Diakses dari: <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2019/09/25/indonesia-negara-dengan-penduduk-muslim-terbesar-dunia>
- Leonard, R.A. (2005). *The International Journal of the Humanities*. Melbourne: Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd.
- Mulyani, L. T. (2017). Indonesian Portrayed In English Genre Texts: A Student's Worksheet Analysis. In *4th UAD TEFL International Conference* (pp. 322-329).
- Musyarofah, I. (2016) Hubungan kristen dan Islam di Indonesia dalam pandangan HM Rasyidi. SKRIPSI. Jakarta: UIN Jakarta.
- Muttaqin, A. (2017). Pemimpin Non Muslim dalam Pandangan Hamka (Kajian Tafsir Al-azhar). *Al-Dzikra: Jurnal Studi Ilmu al-Qur'an dan al-Hadits*, 11(1).
- Norricks, N. R. (1987). Functions of repetition in conversation. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 7(3), 245-264.
- Nugroho, G. A. Resepsi Khalayak Dalam Video Stand Up Comedy. UIN Yogyakarta
- Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic Linguistics: Second Edition*. London: Continuum International Publishing Company.
- Parwati, E. (2013). Kohesi Leksikal Repetisi pada Wacana "Wayang Durangpo" dalam Surat Kabar Harian Jawa Pos Edisi Februari-April 2010. *Jurnal Artikulasi*, 12(2).
- Pattipeilohy, E. M. (2016). Citra diri dan popularitas artis. *Jurnal Dakwah dan Komunikasi*, 1(2).
- Pranaka, A. S., Ghina, A., & Putri, M. K. (2017). Pengaruh Media Sosial Instagram Terhadap Keunggulan Bersaing (studi Kasus Pada Usaha Menengah Guten Inc Bandung). *eProceedings of Management*, 4(3).

- Pratama, A. (2016). *Perbedaan Motivasi Berprestasi Antara Karyawan Etnis Tionghoa Dengan Jawa di SPD (Sinar permata Deli) Communication Medan*: Universitas Medan Area.
- Purba, A. (2011). Tindak Tutur dan Peristiwa Tutur. *Pena: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 1(1).
- Saifullah, A. R. (2009). "Analisis Linguistik Forensik terhadap Tindak Tutur yang Berdampak Hukum (Studi Kasus Delik Penghinaan dan Pencemaran Nama Baik di Polres Bandung Tengah dan Bandung Timur)". Laporan Penelitian Dasar. Program Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
- Salim, I. (2016). Motivasi Berprestasi dan Motivasi Berafiliasi Siswa Etnis Tionghoa Yang Bersekolah di SMA Negeri 1 Tebas. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 3(10).
- Santoso, I. (2016). *Mengenal Linguistik Forensik: Linguis Sebagai Saksi Ahli*.
- Sari, E. (2016). Kebangkitan Politik Identitas Islam Pada Arena Pemilihan Gubernur Jakarta. *KRITIS: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Hasanuddin*, 1(1), 145-156.
- Sari, F. D. P. (2012). Tindak tutur dan fungsi tuturan ekspresif dalam acara galau finite di Metro TV: suatu kajian pragmatik. *Jurnal Skriptorium*, 1(2), 1-14.
- Satria, R. (2016). Analisis Kasus Pembunuhan Dan Pemerasan Menggunakan Teori Linguistik Non-Kepengarangan: Sebuah Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *Prosiding 1th Celscitech-UMRI*, 1, 20.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Essay Collection* (Vol. 49). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2184707>
- Sentosa, W. (2020). *Implementasi Penjatuhan Pidana Terhadap Tindakan Body Shaming Di Media Sosial*: Universitas Muhammadiyah Magelang.
- Siswanto, A., & Febriana, P. (2018). Representasi Indonesia dalam Stand Up Comedy (Analisis Wacana Kritis Norman Fairclough dalam Pertunjukan Spesial Pandji Pragiwaksano "Mesakke Bangsaku"). *KANAL: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 5(2), 121-130.
- Sloane, T. O. (2013). From elocution to New Criticism: An episode in the history of rhetoric. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 31(3), 297-330.
- Somers, M. (2017). Modernism at the University: New Elocution, New Criticism, and New Poetry. *Orbis Litterarum*, 72(2), 93-115.
- Subyantoro (2019). Linguistik Forensik: Sumbangsih Kajian Bahasa dalam Penegakan Hukum. *Adil Indonesia Jurnal*. 1(1). 36-50.
- Subyantoro, S. (2019). Linguistik Forensik: Sumbangsih Kajian Bahasa dalam Penegakan Hukum. *ADIL Indonesia Journal*, 1(1), 36-50.
- Tannaz, D., & Utami, L. S. S. (2019). Strategi Rebranding Citra pada Figur Publik (Studi pada Aktor Tio Pakusadewo). *Prologia*, 3(2), 498-504.
- Vickers, B. (1994). Repetition and emphasis in rhetoric: Theory and practice. *Swiss Papers in English Language and Literature*, 7, 85-114.
- Wahyudin, W., Maimun, A., & Jalil, M. (2019). Islamic Humanism In Indonesia's Context: Discourse Analysis of Nationality Problems in Indonesia. *Ulul Albab*, 20(2), 302.
- Winarno, S. (2018). Ketika Agama Jadi Lelucon. *Arsip Publikasi Ilmiah Biro Administrasi Akademik*.
- Yahya, Y. K. (2019). Phenomenological approach in interfaith communication: a Solution to allegation of religious blasphemy in Indonesia. *Al-Tahrir: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam*, 18(2), 305-322.