

DIGITAL ANTIPATICITY AND THE PROBLEM OF COLORITY: A FORENSIC LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF INSTAGRAM COMMENTS ON THE ISSUE OF JOKO WIDODO'S ALLEGED FAKE DIPLOMA

Hernita Syafri¹⁾, Yarno²⁾, R. Panji Hermoyo³⁾

^{1,2,3}Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya

Jalan Sutorejo 59 , Kec. Mulyorejo, Kota Surabaya, Prov.Jawa Timur

Email: h3rnitasyafri@gmail.com

Email: yarno@um-surabaya.ac.id

Email: panjihermoyo@um-surabaya.ac.id

Abstrak

Ruang publik digital telah berkembang menjadi arena utama pertukaran opini politik sekaligus ekspresi emosi kolektif masyarakat. Salah satu fenomena yang menonjol ialah maraknya komentar bernada antipati di media sosial Instagram terkait isu dugaan ijazah palsu Presiden Joko Widodo. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis bentuk-bentuk ujaran antipati dalam komentar pengguna Instagram dengan pendekatan linguistik forensik serta menelaah pelanggaran prinsip kesantunan berbahasa yang menyertainya. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif dengan data berupa komentar pengguna Instagram yang dikumpulkan dari unggahan akun tokoh publik dan media berita daring selama periode Mei–Juni 2025. Analisis data dilakukan melalui tahapan reduksi, klasifikasi, dan interpretasi linguistik dengan merujuk pada teori linguistik forensik serta prinsip kesantunan Brown dan Levinson. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ujaran antipati dominan diwujudkan dalam bentuk ujaran kebencian, sarkasme, cacian atau makian, tuduhan tanpa bukti, sindiran keras, dan pelabelan negatif. Secara linguistik forensik, ujaran tersebut ditandai oleh penggunaan leksikon evaluatif negatif, praanggapan yang membingkai asumsi sebagai fakta, serta strategi delegitimasi terhadap subjek. Dari sisi kesantunan berbahasa, mayoritas komentar melanggar muka positif dan muka negatif, sehingga berpotensi menimbulkan implikasi etis dan hukum. Penelitian ini menegaskan urgensi edukasi kesantunan berbahasa sebagai bagian integral dari literasi digital.

Kata kunci: linguistik forensik, ujaran antipati, kesantunan berbahasa, Instagram, ruang publik digital

Abstract

Digital public spaces have evolved into primary arenas for political discourse as well as for the expression of collective emotions. One prominent phenomenon is the proliferation of antipathy-laden comments on Instagram related to the alleged fake diploma issue of President Joko Widodo. This study aims to analyze forms of antipathy expressed in Instagram users' comments from a forensic linguistics perspective and to examine associated violations of language politeness principles. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, the data consist of 58 Instagram comments collected from posts by public figures and online news media during May–June 2025. Data were analyzed through stages of reduction, classification, and linguistic interpretation based on forensic linguistics frameworks and Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. The findings reveal that antipathy is predominantly expressed through hate speech, sarcasm, insults, unsubstantiated accusations, harsh satire, and negative labeling. From a forensic linguistics perspective, these expressions are characterized by negative evaluative lexis, presuppositions that frame assumptions as facts, and delegitimizing linguistic strategies targeting the subject. In terms of politeness, most comments violate both positive and negative face, indicating potential ethical and legal implications. This study underscores the urgency of language politeness education as an integral component of digital literacy in fostering responsible online public discourse.

Keywords: forensic linguistics, antipathy expressions, language politeness, Instagram, digital public space

1. INTRODUCTION

The development of digital technology has significantly changed the communication patterns of contemporary society. Social media no longer functions solely as a means of personal interaction, but has transformed into a digital public space that allows people to express opinions, criticisms, and emotions openly and widely. Instagram, as a visual-based social media platform with a high level of user participation, plays a crucial role in shaping public discourse, particularly regarding controversial political issues (Lestari et al., 2023).

In the context of Indonesian politics, the issue of President Joko Widodo's alleged fake diploma has become one of the events that has triggered polarization of public opinion on social media. The issue not only generated critical discourse but also spawned a wave of antipathetic comments filled with hate speech, sarcasm, and personal attacks. This phenomenon demonstrates that digital space is often used as a medium for venting negative emotions without considering communication ethics and polite language (Ramadhani, 2021).

Antipathy in online communication is a form of negative affective attitude expressed through language. In practice, antipathy often manifests itself in speech that is offensive, demeaning, or delegitimizing of certain parties. On social media, expressions of antipathy become more intense due to the platforms' relatively anonymous, fast-paced nature, and minimal social control. (Putri et al., 2025) This situation has the potential to worsen the quality of public discourse and increase the risk of social conflict and legal violations.

From a linguistic perspective, the phenomenon of antipathetic speech on social media cannot be understood in isolation. An analytical approach is needed that can uncover the linguistic structure, communicative intent, and social and legal implications of these

utterances. Forensic linguistics, as a branch of applied linguistics that focuses on language use in legal contexts, offers a relevant analytical framework for examining this phenomenon (Coulthard et al., 2010; Olsson, 2004) Through a forensic linguistic approach, utterances on social media can be analyzed not only in terms of form and meaning, but also for their potential violations of legal norms and communication ethics.

Furthermore, the study of antipathy in Instagram comments is also closely related to the concept of politeness. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory emphasizes the importance of maintaining both positive and negative face in social interactions. Violations of these politeness principles can threaten an individual's self-image and damage social relationships (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In the context of social media, politeness violations often occur because users tend to ignore the impact of their speech on others.

Several previous studies have shown that hate speech and antipathy on social media are a growing phenomenon, particularly in the context of political issues. (Syahid et al., 2025) found that politically motivated hate speech on Indonesian social media exhibits specific linguistic patterns that can be forensically analyzed. Similar findings were also presented by (Lestari et al., 2023). who emphasized that netizen comments on Instagram often violate the principles of politeness and have the potential to lead to legal implications. However, most of these studies still focus on classifying hate speech without comprehensively integrating the educational dimension of politeness.

Building on this gap, this study offers a novelty by integrating a forensic linguistic analysis of antipathetic speech with an educational perspective on politeness in the digital space. The study focuses on Instagram user comments related to the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo, which are

analyzed to uncover forms of antipathy, dominant linguistic characteristics, and violations of politeness principles. Furthermore, this study aims to formulate educational implications that can serve as a basis for strengthening digital literacy and language ethics in social media..

Thus, this research has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it enriches the study of forensic linguistics and social media pragmatics by presenting an empirical analysis of antipathetic speech in the context of Indonesian politics. Practically, the research findings are expected to serve as a reference for educators, policymakers, and the wider public in their efforts to build a more civil, critical, and responsible digital public space.

Forensic linguistics is a branch of applied linguistics that focuses on the analysis of language in legal and judicial contexts. This discipline has developed with the increasing need for linguistic expertise to uncover, interpret, and evaluate linguistic evidence arising in various legal cases, including defamation, hate speech, threats, and slander (Coulthard et al., 2010). As it has developed, forensic linguistics has expanded beyond oral texts or conventional written documents to include language used in digital and social media.

The shift in communication from physical to digital spaces has led to language becoming an increasingly dominant form of evidence in social and legal conflicts. Social media provides linguistic traces that can be scientifically analyzed, including in terms of lexical structure, syntax, pragmatics, and discourse. (Olsson, 2004) asserts that forensic linguistics is tasked with uncovering how language is used to construct meaning, influence perception, and express certain attitudes in specific social contexts. Therefore, speech on social media cannot be understood simply as spontaneous expression, but rather as linguistic acts with potential legal and social consequences.

In the context of digital communication, forensic linguistics plays a crucial role in identifying linguistic characteristics that indicate an intent to attack, demean, or discredit a particular party. Recent research shows that hate speech and antipathy on social media exhibit distinctive linguistic patterns, such as the use of negative evaluative diction, derogatory metaphors, repeated moral judgments, and presuppositions that position assumptions as facts (Putri et al., 2025). These patterns can serve as the basis for forensic analysis to assess the speaker's communicative intentions.

Furthermore, forensic linguistics does not function to determine the guilt or truth of a party, but rather provides a scientific analysis of how language is used and how meaning is constructed within a context (Coulthard et al., 2010). In this study, forensic linguistics was used as the primary analytical framework to uncover the linguistic structure of antipathetic speech in Instagram comments and to assess the potential for ethical and legal violations contained therein.

Antipathy is a negative affective attitude characterized by feelings of dislike, rejection, or hatred toward a particular individual or group. In social psychology, antipathy is understood as an emotional response that can influence how individuals behave and communicate (Baron & Byrne, 2005). In linguistics, antipathy is expressed through language laden with negative evaluations, both explicitly and implicitly.

Language is a primary medium for conveying antipathy, particularly on social media. The characteristics of social media, which allow for rapid and anonymous interactions, tend to amplify the expression of negative emotions. (Afal, 2022) states that expressions of antipathy on social media often manifest in the form of hate speech, sarcasm, harsh criticism, and negative labeling. These forms serve not only as a means of emotional expression but also as a tool to delegitimize and demean the targeted party.

In a political context, antipathy has a more complex dimension because it is related to ideology, group identity, and power relations. Antipathetic expressions toward political figures are often framed as criticism, but linguistically, they exhibit characteristics of personal attacks and moral delegitimization (Syahid et al., 2025). Therefore, analyzing antipathy requires an approach that can distinguish between constructive criticism and speech that has the potential to damage the social order.

Linguistic forms of antipathy can be classified into several categories, including: (1) hate speech, which is expressions containing incitement or insults toward individuals or groups; (2) sarcasm, which is the use of irony with the intention of demeaning; (3) insults or curses, which involve the use of harsh words; (4) accusations without evidence, which position opinions as facts; (5) harsh satire; and (6) negative labeling that creates derogatory stereotypes (Kusumasari & Arifianto, 2020). This classification serves as the basis for data analysis in this study.

Hate speech is a form of communication that aims or has the potential to incite hatred, hostility, or discrimination against a particular individual or group. In forensic linguistics, hate speech is understood as a linguistic act with legal implications because it may violate applicable legal norms (Coulthard et al., 2010). In Indonesia, hate speech is regulated by the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (UU ITE), specifically Article 28 paragraph (2), which prohibits the dissemination of information that incites hatred or hostility based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA) (Dirga, 2021).

From a linguistic perspective, hate speech is characterized by the use of negative evaluative vocabulary, dehumanizing metaphors, and syntactic structures that emphasize moral judgment. Research by (Ramadhani, 2021) shows that hate speech on Instagram is often

delivered in declarative sentences that make accusations, even though they are not supported by empirical evidence. This demonstrates how language is used to unilaterally construct public perceptions.

In the context of President Joko Widodo's alleged fake diploma, hate speech emerged in the form of delegitimizing the subject's academic and moral identity. These comments not only questioned the validity of the document but also attacked personal integrity and political credibility. From a forensic linguistic perspective, such speech requires careful analysis to uncover its intent and potential impact on social order.

2. METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical design to gain an in-depth understanding of linguistic phenomena found in Instagram users' comments concerning the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo. The approach was selected because the study is not aimed at quantitative measurement but at interpreting language phenomena within a specific social context. The analysis focuses on linguistic forms, socio-political contexts, and the ethical dimensions of language use underlying expressions of antipathy in digital spaces.

Forensic linguistics serves as the primary analytical framework because it is highly relevant for examining language use in contexts of social and legal conflict, including hate speech, defamation, and symbolic delegitimization commonly found on social media platforms. From this perspective, language is viewed as a social action that carries ethical implications and may also entail legal consequences.

The research data consist of written comments posted by Instagram users expressing antipathy toward the issue of President Joko Widodo's alleged fake diploma. These data are considered natural because they emerged spontaneously through online interactions. The comments are characterized by the use of informal to semi-formal Indonesian, the presence

of negative evaluative elements such as sarcasm, accusations, and labeling, their occurrence within sensitive political discourse, and their potential violation of politeness principles and ethical norms of digital communication. The data were collected from the comment sections of President Joko Widodo’s official Instagram account and several national media accounts during May–June 2025, when the issue attracted significant public attention. To uphold research ethics, all user identities were anonymized without affecting the linguistic analysis.

Data were collected through documentation and non-participant observation techniques. The researcher acted as a passive observer by identifying Instagram posts relevant to the issue, reviewing the comment sections, and selecting comments that contained expressions of antipathy based on specific linguistic indicators, such as negative vocabulary, sarcastic structures, and unsubstantiated accusations. The selected comments were then documented through screenshots and textual transcriptions for analytical purposes.

Data analysis followed the interactive model of Miles and Huberman, which consists of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification (Yusuf, 2014). During the reduction stage, comments were selected and categorized according to their linguistic forms, including hate speech, sarcasm, insults, accusations, harsh criticism, and negative labeling. Data validity was ensured through theoretical triangulation by integrating perspectives from forensic linguistics, antipathy theory, and politeness theory. Furthermore, the study adhered to ethical principles by protecting user anonymity and avoiding the disclosure of personal information, thereby contributing to scholarly research while respecting the privacy rights of social media users.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of an analysis of antipathetic utterances found in Instagram user comments related to the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo. The presentation of the results focuses on the classification of the forms of antipathetic utterances, dominant linguistic characteristics, and tendencies to violate the principles of politeness. All data were analyzed qualitatively using a forensic linguistic approach to uncover emerging linguistic patterns in the digital public sphere.

The research data consisted of Instagram user comments collected from the comment sections of posts by official public figures and online news media accounts during the period May–June 2025. These comments were selected based on linguistic criteria, namely containing expressions of antipathy characterized by negative evaluations of the subject, the use of sarcastic language, unsubstantiated accusations, or derogatory labels. The data analysis shows that antipathetic comments are not homogeneous but rather vary in form and linguistic strategies. A total of 58 utterances were analyzed, which were then classified into six types of antipathies.

Table 1. Research Data on Forms of Antipathy

Types of Antipathy	Number of Findings
Hate Speech	37 data points
Sarcasm	15 data points
Insults/Insults	15 data points
Unsubstantiated	41 data points
Accusations	24 data points
Harsh Innuendo	29 data points
Negative Labeling	

Table 2. Data on Impoliteness

Forms of Impoliteness	Number of Findings
<i>Positive face</i>	50 data points
<i>Negatif Face</i>	7 data points

The results of the data analysis are classified into six main forms of antipathy speech in Instagram user comments, namely: (1) hate speech, (2) sarcasm, (3) insults or curses, (4) accusations without evidence, (5) harsh sarcasm, and (6) negative labeling. These six forms often overlap in one speech, thus strengthening the intensity of the antipathy conveyed, as can be seen in the table below. Hate speech is the most explicit and confrontational form of antipathy. This speech is characterized by the use of lexicon that is insulting, demeaning, or stigmatizing the subject directly. In research data, hate speech often contains negative moral judgments and symbolic calls that have nuances of threats, both religiously and socially.

"Wi kowi... the most complicated person in the world... you'll be miserable in the afterlife" (data47)

This statement represents a form of antipathy, a form of hate speech, that emerged in Instagram user comments related to the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo. This antipathy is evident through the misuse of the name "Wi kowi," which functions as a mockery and negative labeling of the subject's identity. In forensic linguistics, misuse of names is understood as a strategy of "mocking name alteration," namely the use of language to demean and lower an individual's social authority in the public sphere (Coulthard et al., 2010).

"I just found out, sir, that there's wood technology at UGM." (data01)

This statement demonstrates a form of antipathy in the form of sarcasm that emerged in Instagram user comments regarding the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo. The sarcasm serves as an expression of distrust and disdain for the subject's academic background, particularly the study program associated with

him. Although it doesn't contain explicit insults or accusations, this statement still represents antipathy because it implies a negative judgment through its implied meaning.

—When you go to court, bring your original diploma. Oh my, you're so stupid. It's pointless to hire as many lawyers as you if you don't have your original diploma. Lawyers look as stupid as you." (data18)

This statement is categorized as an antipathetic statement in the form of an accusation without evidence accompanied by insults/curses and negative labeling. This form of antipathy arises because the speaker accuses the subject of not having an original diploma, doubts their legal abilities, and simultaneously demeans their lawyer with words like "stupid," which are explicit insults.

Statements that include accusations without evidence are also found in the following quotation.

—I can only pray: O Allah, protect Jokowi, if his diploma is genuine, make things easier for him. O Allah, if Jokowi's diploma is fake, curse it, humiliate him as insultingly as possible. So do the people who protect it" (data10)

This speech is categorized as antipathetic speech in the form of accusations without evidence accompanied by implicit hate speech. Even though on the surface it is packaged in the form of a prayer, the content of the speech contains assumptions about the possibility of the subject's diploma being fake as well as requests for extreme moral and social punishment, such as curses and insults, which are directed at the subject and the parties who are thought to be protecting him.

"Insulted but not defeated, praised inappropriately" (data02)

The phrase "Insulted but not defeated, praised inappropriately" demonstrates a form of antipathy, a harsh, sarcastic sarcasm that emerged in Instagram user comments regarding President Joko Widodo's alleged fake diploma. Antipathy is expressed through evaluative statements that belittle the subject's position by placing them in any situation that remains negative.

Statements that fall under negative labeling are also found in the following quote.

—This is what you do, sir. The country is being destroyed because Indonesia's natural resources are being sold by a narrow-minded Chinese. After retiring, he's playing president, FAKE DEGREE + FAKE diploma from UGM (data15)

This statement is categorized as antipathetic speech in the form of hate speech and unsubstantiated accusations, accompanied by negative labeling. This form of antipathy arises because the speaker accuses the subject of committing acts detrimental to the country and falsifying academic degrees, despite the lack of independently verifiable evidence. Furthermore, the use of pejorative terms like "Squinty Chinese" adds an element of racial slur, further strengthening the antipathy.

From a forensic linguistics perspective, hate speech demonstrates the use of negative evaluative words that function as a tool of delegitimization. The speaker not only conveys disapproval but also constructs an image of the subject as unworthy of trust or respect. This strategy demonstrates how language is used to influence public perception and reinforce social stigma.

Sarcasm is the most quantitatively dominant form of antipathy in the research data. Sarcasm is manifested through the use of irony,

puns, or symbolic expressions that implicitly convey negative meanings. In Instagram comments, sarcasm is often used to mock the subject's academic background, integrity, or consistency of statements.

Linguistically, sarcasm exploits the discrepancy between literal and implicit meanings. The speaker makes a statement that appears grammatically neutral or positive, but pragmatically carries a negative evaluation. This strategy allows the speaker to convey antipathy without resorting to direct harsh words, while still producing a demeaning effect.

Insults or swearing are forms of antipathy that use harsh and offensive language. These utterances usually take the form of a single word or phrase directed directly at the subject. In research data, insults often emerge as spontaneous emotional responses to issues deemed sensitive.

From a forensic linguistics perspective, insults function as powerful affective expressions and demonstrate the speaker's emotional intensity. Although linguistically simple, insults are highly offensive because they directly threaten the subject's positive face. The presence of insults in Instagram comments indicates a lack of self-control and awareness of language ethics in the digital space.

Accusations without evidence are a form of antipathy that presents assumptions or opinions as facts. These utterances often take the form of declarative or rhetorical interrogative sentences that imply the subject's guilt without providing any empirical basis. In the context of this research, accusations without evidence relate to the validity of the subject's diploma and academic integrity.

Linguistically, accusations without evidence are characterized by the use of presuppositions that position assumptions as truth. The speaker does not open up space for dialogue or clarification, but instead immediately concludes that the subject is wrong. This strategy

has the potential to mislead other readers and reinforce negative opinions in the digital public sphere.

Harsh satire is a form of antipathy that uses comparison, metaphor, or analogy to convey sharp criticism. This satire often involves references to other events or figures as comparisons, with the aim of indirectly denigrating the subject.

In forensic linguistic analysis, harsh satire demonstrates the complexity of linguistic strategies because it requires a broader understanding of context. The speaker relies on shared knowledge between the speaker and the reader to interpret the satire's meaning. This demonstrates how language is creatively used to convey antipathy without having to explicitly state it. Negative labeling is a form of antipathy that assigns a specific label or identity to the subject, such as "liar," "fraudster," or other derogatory labels. This labeling serves to simplify the subject's identity into a single negative attribute that is easily remembered and disseminated.

From a forensic linguistics perspective, negative labeling is an effective discourse strategy for constructing stigma. By assigning a particular label, the speaker limits the public's perception of the subject and directs the interpretation of all of the subject's actions in a negative framework. This type of labeling has the potential to have long-term impacts on the individual's reputation.

Data analysis reveals several dominant linguistic characteristics in antipathetic speech. First, the use of negative evaluative lexicon, which serves as a marker of the speaker's attitude. Second, the presence of presuppositions and implicatures that frame assumptions as facts. Third, the use of imperative or interrogative sentence structures rhetorically pressures the subject. Furthermore, antipathetic speech is also characterized by the use of repetition and intensification, both through word repetition and

excessive use of capital letters and punctuation. These strategies are used to emphasize emotion and strengthen the speech's offensive power. These findings suggest that graphological aspects also play a role in constructing antipathetic meanings on social media.

Violation of Principles of Linguistic Politeness

Based on analysis using Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, most antipathetic comments violate the principles of positive and negative face. Positive face violations occur when speech undermines the subject's self-image, credibility, or integrity. Negative face violations occur when speech coerces, pressures, or interferes with the subject's freedom.

The findings indicate that positive face violations are more prevalent than negative face violations. This indicates that netizens tend to attack the subject's identity and reputation rather than simply demanding specific action. These violations of politeness demonstrate the degradation of language ethics in digital public discourse, particularly in the context of sensitive political issues.

DISCUSSION

Overall, the research results indicate that Instagram user comments regarding the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo are rife with expressions of antipathy, expressed through various linguistic strategies. These utterances not only reflect netizens' emotional attitudes but also exhibit linguistic patterns that have the potential to raise ethical and legal implications. These findings form the basis for further discussion on the meaning and implications of antipathy utterances from the perspective of forensic linguistics and politeness education. A similar view is also expressed by (Aryono et al., 2016), who stated that positive and negative face expressions have different functions and timing.

This discussion section interprets the research findings by linking them to the theoretical framework of forensic linguistics,

antipathy theory, and the principles of politeness. The discussion aims to explain the meaning behind the linguistic patterns found and their implications for communication practices in the digital public sphere. Thus, the discussion does not simply repeat the research findings but rather places the empirical findings within a broader theoretical and social context.

Antipathy as a Delegitimization Strategy in Digital Discourse

Research findings indicate that antipathy in Instagram comments is not sporadic, but rather forms a systematic linguistic pattern. This pattern indicates that antipathy functions as a delegitimization strategy for the subject. From a forensic linguistic perspective, delegitimization is understood as a linguistic attempt to undermine a person's credibility, authority, or social image through language (Coulthard et al., 2010).

The hate speech, negative labeling, and unsubstantiated accusations found in the research data serve to frame the subject as morally and socially illegitimate. This strategy aligns with the findings of (Syahid et al., 2025), who stated that politically motivated hate speech on social media often aims to create collective negative perceptions. In the context of the alleged fake diploma issue, delegitimization is directed not only at academic aspects but also at the subject's personal integrity and political legitimacy.

This linguistic delegitimization is reinforced through the use of presuppositions and implicatures. The speaker does not explicitly state evidence but structures the utterance in such a way that certain assumptions are perceived as truth. From a forensic perspective, this strategy is dangerous because it can mislead other readers and shape public opinion that is not based on facts. Thus, antipathy in Instagram comments serves as a tool for producing discourse that has broad social impact.

Instagram user comments regarding the alleged fake diploma of President Joko Widodo

are rife with expressions of antipathy, expressed through various linguistic strategies. These utterances not only reflect netizens' emotional attitudes but also exhibit linguistic patterns that have the potential to raise ethical and legal implications. These findings form the basis for further discussion on the meaning and implications of antipathy utterances from the perspective of forensic linguistics and politeness education. A similar view is also expressed by (Aryono et al., 2016) who stated that positive and negative face expressions have different functions and timing.

This discussion section interprets the research findings by linking them to the theoretical framework of forensic linguistics, antipathy theory, and the principles of politeness. The discussion aims to explain the meaning behind the linguistic patterns found and their implications for communication practices in the digital public sphere. Thus, the discussion does not simply repeat the research findings but rather places the empirical findings within a broader theoretical and social context.

Research findings indicate that antipathy in Instagram comments is not sporadic, but rather forms a systematic linguistic pattern. This pattern indicates that antipathy functions as a delegitimization strategy for the subject. From a forensic linguistic perspective, delegitimization is understood as a linguistic attempt to undermine a person's credibility, authority, or social image through language (Coulthard et al., 2010).

The hate speech, negative labeling, and unsubstantiated accusations found in the research data serve to frame the subject as morally and socially illegitimate. This strategy aligns with the findings of (Syahid et al., 2025), who stated that politically motivated hate speech on social media often aims to create collective negative perceptions. In the context of the alleged fake diploma issue, delegitimization is directed not only at academic aspects but also at the subject's personal integrity and political legitimacy.

This linguistic delegitimization is reinforced through the use of presuppositions and implicatures. The speaker does not explicitly state evidence but structures the utterance in such a way that certain assumptions are perceived as truth. From a forensic perspective, this strategy is dangerous because it can mislead other readers and shape public opinion that is not based on facts. Thus, antipathy in Instagram comments serves as a tool for producing discourse that has broad social impact.

The dominance of positive face violations indicates that netizens are more focused on attacking the subject's identity and dignity than delivering substantive criticism. (Culpeper, 2008) view of impoliteness as a linguistic strategy aimed at creating conflict or symbolic domination. In the context of political issues, this impoliteness has the potential to deepen polarization and worsen the quality of public discourse.

Furthermore, violations of politeness in Instagram comments reflect a low awareness of digital communication ethics. Anonymity and social distance allow users to feel free to express speech that would be considered inappropriate in a face-to-face context. This situation highlights the need for educational interventions to reinstill the value of politeness in online communication.

Implications of Forensic Linguistics for Ethics and Law

From a forensic linguistics perspective, the findings of this study have important implications for understanding the relationship between language, ethics, and law in the digital space. The antipathetic speech analyzed not only violates norms of politeness but also potentially violates legal provisions regarding hate speech and defamation. Forensic linguistic analysis allows for the identification of relevant linguistic elements to assess potential violations.

It is important to emphasize that forensic linguistics does not aim to determine legal guilt,

but rather to provide a scientific analysis of how language is used in specific contexts. Therefore, the findings of this study can serve as a reference for law enforcement officials and policymakers in understanding the characteristics of antipathetic speech on social media. This aligns with (Olsson, 2004) view that forensic linguistics serves as a bridge between linguistics and the legal system.

One of the main contributions of this research is its emphasis on the educational dimension of politeness. The findings indicate that antipathy and incivility on social media cannot be addressed solely through repressive or legal approaches. A preventative approach is needed through digital literacy education that emphasizes language ethics and user social responsibility.

Digital literacy is an individual's ability to access, understand, evaluate, and produce information through digital media in a critical and responsible manner. Gilster, (1998) emphasizes that digital literacy is not only related to technical skills but also to a critical understanding of the social context and ethics of media use. In subsequent developments, digital literacy has come to include awareness of legal and ethical considerations regarding language use in the digital space (Buckingham, 2007).

Comprehensive digital literacy not only teaches technical skills but also fosters critical awareness of the impact of language. (Putri et al., 2025) emphasized that politeness education can reduce the intensity of hate speech and improve the quality of public discourse. In the context of this research, the results of the forensic linguistic analysis can be used as teaching materials or educational modules based on real data.

Politeness education needs to involve various stakeholders, including educational institutions, the government, and social media platform providers. In this way, the digital public space can be directed into an arena for critical, yet polite, and responsible discussion. This research

provides an empirical basis for formulating such educational strategies.

Theoretically, this research contributes to the development of forensic linguistics and social media pragmatics by presenting an empirical analysis of antipathetic speech in the Indonesian political context. The integration of forensic analysis and language politeness education is a novelty that distinguishes this research from previous studies. Practically, this research offers perspectives that can be used to improve the quality of communication in the digital public sphere. This section elaborates on the findings, differences, and new discoveries resulting from the research.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examines expressions of antipathy in Instagram user comments regarding President Joko Widodo's alleged fake diploma using a forensic linguistics approach and principles of politeness. Based on a qualitative analysis of 58 comments collected from posts by public figures and online news media, the study found that the digital public sphere tends to be an arena for intense expressions of negative emotions and minimal control over language ethics.

The results indicate that antipathy in Instagram comments manifests itself in six main forms: hate speech, sarcasm, insults or curses, unsubstantiated accusations, harsh criticism, and negative labeling. These six forms do not appear in isolation but often overlap and reinforce each other within a single utterance. From a forensic linguistics perspective, these utterances exhibit dominant linguistic characteristics such as the use of negative evaluative lexicon, presuppositions that frame assumptions as facts, and strategies to delegitimize the targeted subject.

The analysis of politeness based on the theory of Brown and Levinson indicates that most antipathy comments violate the principles of positive and negative face. Positive face

violations are evident in attacks on the subject's self-image, reputation, and integrity, while negative face violations manifest in the form of pressure, demands, and symbolic interventions against the subject's autonomy. The dominance of positive face violations indicates that netizens are more inclined to attack personal identity and dignity than to deliver substantive, argument-based criticism.

Overall, the findings of this study confirm that antipathetic speech on social media is not simply a spontaneous expression, but rather a linguistic act with ethical, social, and potentially legal implications. Thus, this study demonstrates the relevance of forensic linguistics as an analytical approach to understanding language practices in the digital space, particularly in the context of sensitive political issues that have the potential to trigger societal polarization.

5. REFERENCE

- Afal, M. (2022). *Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial: Perspektif Linguistik dan Hukum*. Prenadamedia Group.
- Aryono, W. R. D., Drs. Yarno, M. P., & R. Panji Hermoyo, S. S. (2016). *Kesantunan berbahasa pada mata najwa di metro tv*'' [Other, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya]. <https://repository.um-surabaya.ac.id/id/eprint/1376/>
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (2005). *Social Psychology* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Buckingham, D. (2007). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Polity Press.
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2010). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. Routledge.
- Culpeper, J. (2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on Its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, 4(2), 17–44. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344.1.17>

- Dirga, R. (2021). *Ujaran Kebencian dan Hukum ITE di Indonesia*. Sinar Grafika.
- Gilster, P. (1998). *Digital Literacy*. Wiley.
- Kusumasari, B., & Arifianto, S. (2020). Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa di Media Sosial. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 15(2), 101–112.
- Lestari, D., Firmansyah, D., & Solihat, I. (2023). Ujaran kebencian netizen pada kolom komentar di instagram bem kbm untirta tahun 2022 (kajian linguistik forensik). *Nusra : Jurnal Penelitian Dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 4(3), 766–773.
<https://doi.org/10.55681/nusra.v4i3.1449>
- Olsson, J. (2004). An Introduction to Language, Crime and the Law. In *Forensic Linguistics*. Continuum.
- Putri, A. N., Hidayat, R., & Sari, M. (2025). Ujaran kebencian terhadap tokoh politik di media sosial: Perspektif linguistik forensik. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan*, 15(1), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.32460/jlt.15012025>
- Ramadhani, F. R. (2021). Ujaran kebencian netizen Indonesia dalam kolom komentar Instagram selebgram Indonesia: Sebuah kajian linguistik forensik. *Aksara: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 22(1), 1–19.
- Syahid, A., Muhlisin, M., & Fauzan, M. (2025). Tindak Tutur Ujaran Kebencian Bermuatan Antargolongan di Media Sosial Indonesia: Kajian Linguistik Forensik. *Mabasan*, 19(1), 1–18.
<https://doi.org/10.62107/mab.v19i1.1037>
- Yusuf, M. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif & Penelitian Gabungan*, (Jakarta: Prenadamedia. Jakarta: Prenadamedia.