

Intertextuality in Cybercrime Texts as Social Reality in Indonesia

Mimas Ardhianti¹,
(Corresponding author)
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Bambang Yulianto²,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Suhartono³
Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Abstract:- This study aims to examine the intertextuality of cybercrime texts as a social reality in Indonesia. Intertextuality is the meaning formation of a text by another text. This is due to the interconnections between similar or related cybercrime texts that reflect and influence the audience's interpretation of the texts. This is descriptive qualitative research with the data source comes from the Cybercrime Investigation Reports from the Regional Police Office (*Polda*) of East Java, Yogyakarta, Metro Jaya, and Bandung. The data analyzed in this study are in the form of words, phrases, and sentences that exist in the cybercrime text. The results show that the structure of cybercrime texts reflects intertextuality among the analyzed texts, which is obtained from the analysis of evidence and patterns of relationships in a holistic, heuristic, deductive, and inductive way. This refers to hypo-texts and hypertexts which become the main capital in studying the relationship among cybercrime texts.

Keywords:- *Intertextuality, Cybercrime Text, Social Reality*

I. INTRODUCTION

Data on hate speech cases and the spread of hoaxes were revealed by the chief of Metro Jaya Police that Polda Metro Jaya has handled 443 cases, while 14 cases will be investigated to completion in 2020. At the end of 2020, Polda Metro Jaya had handled 1,042 cases. Of the total number of cases, Polda Metro Jaya completed 711 cases in 2020, 710 cases in 2019.

The accused commonly produced texts on social media based on their previous knowledge, so that there was a link between the texts produced and the texts previously obtained, which is called intertextuality. Intertextuality is the formation of the meaning of a text by another text. This is due to the interconnection between similar or related cybercrime texts which may influence the audience's interpretation of the text. Hypo-texts are the previous texts that serve as the source of the next texts, hypertext (Bronwen 2006). To relate anything that unites the new texts

(hypertexts) with the previous texts (hypotexts) is called hypertextuality.

Hypertextuality is part of intertextuality in general, in Gerard Genette's terms, it is called transtextuality. To examine the relationship between the texts in the data and the comparative data, it is necessary to examine the structure of the cybercrime texts as an open structure. To examine the text of cybercrime in Indonesia an intertextuality approach is applied, but to determine the relationship between texts, hypertextuality is used. These parts are events in the text. Changes (transpositions) of events from the hipotext to the hypertext can be in the forms of reduction and reinforcement. The reduction includes removal of inappropriate parts (self-expurgation), cutting or removal (excision), and reduction (Allen, 2000, p.109). Amplification includes the process of elongation, contamination, and expansion (Allen, 2000b, p.110). Reinforcement in hypertext can be in the form of telling things that are missed or do not exist in the hypotexts.

In general, intertextuality can be divided into two major parts, namely intertextuality manifest and inter-discourse interrelationships (Fairclough, 1992b, pp. 107–130). The intertextuality manifest is used to determine the defendant's strategy in writing cybercrime texts. Intertextuality manifest is a form of intertextuality from other texts or other voices that appear explicitly in the text, such as in the form of quotations. A text may combine other texts without directly quoting the other texts. Manifest intertextuality is divided into (1) writing style. In writing style, someone chooses to write using a certain way rather than using other methods. For example, the author chooses to use a different type of text in accordance with the function of the text being produced. The selection is adjusted to the cultural context of each writer; (2) presuppositions. Presuppositions are propositions accepted by the author which are seen as true and placed in the organization of the text as a whole. In other words, when someone writes a text with a presupposition in it, there is a proposition that precedes it and it is assumed that the readers have understood the meaning; (3) negation. Negation or denial is a form of text that usually contains a refutation of

other texts preceding it. The sentences or negative comments are usually used to create a polemic; (4) metadiscourse. The author of the text gives different levels to the texts that he produces. Metadiscourse is characterized by the use of hedging which serves to disguise its true intentions. Metadiscourse presents the speaker in a dominant situation and positions the object in a non-dominant group or becomes a defined object (Eriyanto, 2001, p.313); (5) irony. Irony is a term to express something with the intention of something else which is meant to be satirical or not for humor.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach. In this qualitative research, the data are in the form of words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs in the cybercrime texts that contain elements of criminal acts under the ITE Law. The data came from the Regional Police Offices in Java Island. The data were collected by using the documentation technique. To get data on the construction of signs, codes, myths, and ideologies in cybercrime texts, documentation is done through reading, marking, and recording the data. To optimize the implementation of the documentation, a data collection table was used.

The data analysis technique applied the content analysis. Through the content analysis, a taxonomy of cybercrime text genres could be identified. The data analysis in this study followed the model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana. In this study, triangulation techniques were carried out using the method triangulation, source triangulation, and expert triangulation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results

The first intertext concerns the texts that contain insulting elements in the forms of disrespectful and ridiculing expressions or statements. The insulting texts consist of six data used as the hypo-texts and hypertexts. For example, data (1) and (2) below contain elements of contempt for the city and the people of Yogyakarta. Data (1) below is the hypotext, used as a background for other texts.

(1) *Yogyakarta miskin, tolol dan tak berbudaya. [1] teman-teman Jakarta-bandung, jangan mau tinggal di Yogyakarta. [2]*

(Yogyakarta is poor, stupid and uncultured. [1] Jakarta-Bandung friends! Don't live in Yogyakarta. [2])
(T100/BPDYg/2014)

Data (2) below is used as the hypertext, because it has similarities in terms of the insulting event.

(2) *Itulah kerjaan orang jawa pasti, kapok gw ke Yogyakarta [1] menurut gw miris literally warganya semua miskin dan kampungan, [2] kalo wisatawan dateng apa apa di mahalini [3]*

(That's the work of the Javanese for sure, I've given up on going to Yogyakarta [1] in my opinion, it's sad that literally all of the citizens are poor and lout, [2] if tourists come, everything becomes expensive [3])
(T8/DPDYg/2019)

Based on the convention of insulting text, data (1) has similarities with data (2) in the form of background events and forms of insults. The form of insult in data (1) contains the words poor and lout which are the same as in data (2). The setting of events in data (3) is Yogyakarta, which is indicated by the sentence [1], *itulah kerjaan orang jawa pasti, kapok gw ke Yogyakarta* (that's the work of the Javanese for sure, I've given up on going to Yogyakarta). The same background is also found in data (1) which is shown in the sentence [1] *Yogyakarta miskin, tolol dan tak berbudaya* (Yogyakarta is poor, stupid, and uncultured). Certainly, data (1) has similarities with the data (2). However, there is a little bit different structure. In data (2), the targets of insult are two: the Javanese and the people of Yogyakarta.

Data (1) exists before data (2). It starts from the events experienced by the defendant. In data (1), the defendant wrote the text when he was riding a motorcycle and grabbed the queue at the gas station. The defendant was warned by the officer to queue in order, but he refused and canceled to buy fuel. He then wrote an insulting tweet on social media using someone else's Twitter account that was no longer used. The insulting tweet was based on @Khaira Nissa's tweet telling her experience asking the taxi fare from Adisutjipto Airport to a hotel. The taxi driver responded that the fare was one hundred thousand rupiahs. She then checked the online taxi application and it turned out to be only eleven thousand rupiahs. The @Khaira Nissa's tweet was then responded to by the defendant with an insult as in data (2). It turned out that the defendant used someone else's Twitter account, thereby not only defaming the name of the original Twitter account owner but also causing unrest among the people of Yogyakarta.

The hypertextuality begins with a satirical statement from the defendant directed at the Javanese. This is different from the hypotext which directly mentions the background of the events (Yogyakarta) which is followed by other forms of insults. Although it has a different opening, the hypotext also mentions another setting, namely the city of Yogyakarta. The setting is still used by the defendant in his hypertext and is followed by an insult (i.e., the word 'poor'). In addition, the defendant also openly referred to the Javanese as the people of Yogyakarta. In the hypertext, there is a statement that can be provocative (i.e., the sentence [3] *kalo wisatawan dateng apa apa di mahalini* (if tourists come, everything becomes expensive). The statement is in line with the hypotext that also has a provocative element (i.e., the sentence [2] *teman-teman Jakarta-bandung, jangan mau tinggal di Yogyakarta*. (My) friends from Jakarta-Bandung! Don't go to Yogyakarta).

The defendant’s hate speech is persistence of attitude over his experience of social interaction. The defendant subjectively viewed the people of Yogyakarta as bad and uncultured. The expression is part of face-to-face social interaction; so that in such a situation, other people are fully real and massive (convincing). The defendant's bad experience of an unwanted incident in a face-to-face encounter gave rise to his negative perception of other individuals. The formation of negative perceptual attitudes tends to persist, partly because they are considered mutually supportive. The act of insulting certain ethnic groups manifested through hatred is a form of racial or ethnic discrimination. This negative impression aims to improve the defendant's image to produce a prejudice that he or his race is better than the Javanese race. His negative belief validated his negative feeling, making it seemed true. The defendant tended to use the emotional feeling that encouraged him to use primordial racial sentiments.

Negative prejudice can appear quickly because it avoids complex thought processes. Therefore, prejudice

forms uniformity of information in human reasoning, giving rise to stereotypes. If the stereotype has existed for a long time in the individual, it will make him not go through a long process of thinking because the knowledge already exists. The defendant’s discriminatory statement was the result of stereotypes because there was a social relationship between the defendant and the people around him. He built his own knowledge of reality based on the structure of knowledge he has, resulting in a discourse considered discriminatory.

The expansion of the text can be observed in the hypertext referring to the hypotext. Even though there are several events in data (2) that expand, the expansion certainly comes from data (1) which is used as the hypotext. Some events are not repeated in the hypertext, i.e., stupid and uncultured which is changed to loud. The two texts have similarities in terms of the pattern of the story in data (1) and data (2). However, some changes occur in the events in the hypotext and hypertextual contexts, making the contents of data (1) different from the contents of the data (2).

No	Hypotexts	Hypertexts
1	The defendant rode a motorcycle and grabbed the queue at the gas station	Taxi fare from Adisutjipto Airport to a hotel
2	The defendant were irritated and canceled to buy fuel in the gas station	The taxi fare costed one hundred thousand rupiahs while an online taxi costed only eleven thousand rupiahs
3	A tweet containing an insult on social media Path	A tweet containing an insult on Twitter
4	Privately his owned social media	Other people's Twitter account that was no longer used
5	The incident experienced by the defendant	The incident was not experienced by the defendant, but the experience of others
6	The target was people of Yogyakarta	The target was the people of Java and Yogyakarta
7	Yogyakarta was poor	The people were all poor

Table 1:- Change of events in the insulting texts

Based on the table above, it can be seen that they do not have intertextuality with each other even though they both discuss an insult on Yogyakarta. On the other hand, the intertextual relationship that appears in the hypotext and hypertext is the type of quotation. That is, the defendant quoted the idea of another defendant. The intertextuality is intended to determine the defendant's strategy in writing cybercrime texts. In the analysis above, a strategy of intertextuality is found, namely metadiscourse characterized by hiding the defendant's true intention.

Other texts that are categorized as insulting texts are also found in data (3) and (4) that have elements of similarities and differences in the insulting events. Data (3) and (4) below are data containing an insult to a government official, namely the Mayor of Surabaya. Data (4) is used as a hypotext, so it is used as a background for another text.

Maaf ... kagak usah melotot gitu keles... [1]
Tuh kota lo banjir kagak usah sok sibuk [2]
Ngurusin kota orang bu ... [3]
lo keder kan bu kota lo kena juga ma banjir ... [4]
makan tuh cebong2 yang baru netes [5]
(T50/BPJTm/2017)

Sorry... no need to glare like that ... [1]
 Look, your city is flooded, you don't have to look busy [2]
 Taking care of other people's city... [3]
 you're afraid ma'am, your city has also been hit by a flood... [4]
 eat the newly hatched tadpoles [5]
 (T50/BPJTm/2017)

Data (4) below is used as the hypertext, because it has similarities and differences in the insulting events.
(4) Anjir asli ngakak abis...nemu nih foto sang legendaris kodok betina [1]
 Anjir... it is really funny...(I) found this photo of the legendary female toad [1]
 (T95/DPJTm/2017)

First, based on text convention, data (3) has similarities with data (4) in terms of the object, event, and form of insult. The insult in data (3) is directed to the same object as in data (4) which is the Mayor of Surabaya, Risma Harini. Although the name of Risma is not explicitly mentioned in the two texts, there exists Risma’s photo edited in such a way to support the contents of the text. The background of events in data (3) is Surabaya, which is the same as in data (4). However, there is a little bit of structural

difference between the two texts. The targets of insult in data (3) are the City of Surabaya and Mrs. Risma Harini, while in data (4) the target of insult is only Mrs. Risma Harini.

Data (3) existed before data (4) which started from the incident experienced by the defendant (initial name: ZKR), a resident of Bogor. In data (3) and (4) the defendant wrote the text because he was frustrated that Anies (the governor of Jakarta) was often bullied. In his confession, ZKR said that it was the social media that triggered his insult against the City of Surabaya and Risma Harini.

Second, the hypertext starts with a mockery implicitly aimed at Risma Harini. It is different from the hypotext that directly mentions the photo of the legendary female toad as Risma Harini. Although having a different opening, the hypotext also mentions another background event, namely flood. In the hypertext, there is a statement that contains an insulting element (data (4) sentence [1]) *nemu nih foto sang legendaris kodok betina* (find this photo of the legendary female toad), which is the same as in data 3. The hypotext also has an insulting element (data (3) sentence [4]) *makan tuh cebong2 yang baru netes* (eat the new tadpoles that just have been hatched). Judging from the relationship of sentences that contain insults in the form of animal names.

The expansion of the text can be observed in the hypertext which refers to the hypotext. Though data (4) undergoes expansion, the expansion still comes from data (3), the hypotext. However, some things are not repeated in the hypertext, such as ‘tadpoles’ is changed to ‘frogs’. Though the two texts have similarities in the form of text story patterns, there are some changes in the hypotext and hypertext, making the contents of data (3) different from the contents of the data (4).

No	Hypotext	Hypertext
1	Risma Harini is looking at Anies Baswedan	Risma Harini is picking up trash
2	Events in the form of dialogue	Events in the form of floods
3	Floods in Jakarta and Surabaya	Floods in Surabaya
4	The insulting form of "tadpole"	The insulting form of "female toad"

Table 2:- Changes of text events of humiliation

Based on the table above, it can be seen that they have intertextuality with each other even though they both discuss the insults of Risma Harini and the City of Surabaya. The relationship between the two texts lies between paragraphs in the text. This relationship is because the defendant in the two texts is the same person, ZKR. The type of intertextuality is used to determine the defendant's strategy in writing cybercrime texts. In the analysis, an

intertextuality strategy was found that is metadiscourse in the form of hedging carried out to disguise the real intent.

Other texts that are categorized as insulting texts are found in data (5) and (6) which have elements of similarities and differences in the insulting events. Data (5) and (6) below are insults to the TNI (Indonesian national army) and Police. Data (6) is used as a hypotext so that it is used as a background for the other text.

(5) *Oknum TNI banci ngrusak aset Negara. [1] Dibayar Negara buat ngrusak aset Negara? [2] Tololnya udah hebat sekali [3]*

(A sissy TNI officer destroys the state's assets. [1] Paid by the state to destroy the state assets? [2] His stupidity has been amazing. [3] (T27/BPJTm/2018)

The data (6) below is used as hypertext, because it has similarities and differences in the insulting event.

(6) *Assalamualaikum? Bangok SUKRA ngancam sama temen gue duel sama gua mati'an, DASAR POLISI MONTAT DAN TENTARA MONYET TIDAK BERGUNA [1]* (Assalamualaikum? Bangok SUKRA threatened my friend with a duel with me to death, MONTAT POLICE AND USELESS MONKEY ARMY [1])

(T1/DPJBn/2020)

First, based on the text convention, data (5) has similarities with data (6) in terms of the insulted object, namely the state institutions. It is clear in the two texts insult state institutions, namely the Police and the Army.

Data (5) existed before data (6). Data (5) was written when the defendant read news from online media. The defendant (GKR) gave an emotional tone of a comment. The sentence is considered an insult to TNI. The post used the defendant's account which was uploaded on Tuesday, December 12, 2018. A difference occurs in data (6), the defendant (KI) uploaded a sentence with a negative comment to the TNI-Polri on his personal Facebook account on December 30, 2019.

Second, the hypertext begins with an indirect insult. The defendant greeted the readers, then insulted the police with MONTAT (monkey ass) and TNI with USELESS MONKEY. It is different from the hypotext which directly insults TNI as a sissy. Although it has a different opening, the hypotext also mentions an accusation of damaging state assets and stupid. In the hypertext, there is a sentence that indicates a challenge to the TNI ('a duel to death').

The expansion can be observed in the hypertext which refers to the hypotext which comes from data (5), the hypotext. Some events are not repeated in the hypertext, such as a sissy which is changed to a monkey.

No	Hypotext	Hypertext
1	Uploaded on facebook	Uploaded on facebook
2	The insulting incident was based on the defendant's comments in response to the Ciracas Case: The Improper Soul of Korsa.	The humiliation incident was based on distaste for police agencies, both the police and the army.
3	Insults directed at TNI	Insults directed at TNI and Police
4	An insult of "sissy"	Animal insults, "like monkeys"
5	Allegations of damaging state assets	The accusation that the army is useless

Table 3:- Event changes in the insult texts

Based on the table above, it can be seen that they do not have intertextuality with each other though they both discuss the events of insulting the Police and the Army. On the other hand, the intertextual relationship that appears in the hypotextual and hypertextual contexts is a type of quote, that is, the defendant cites the other defendant's idea in insulting the targets.

In terms of the strategy, it is found that the defendant used irony in writing the text. In this case, the defendant quoted from what he read in the mass media regarding the Ciracas case. The sentence "Paid by the state for destroying the state assets?" is written by the defendant as a response to a text in online news titled, The Ciracas Case: The Improper Soul of Korsa.

Eight data can be included as defamatory texts, including the hypotexts and hypertexts. Data (7) below is the hypotext and was used as a background for writing other texts.

(7) Hanya butuh TIGA logika sederhana untuk mengetahui KESESATAN Islam Nusantara [1] (Ini adalah posting ulang dari status sebelumnya, saya buat gambar yang lebih pas, dengan harapan untuk di-SHARE oleh teman-teman sekalian. [2] Semoga bermanfaat bagi syiar dakwah, dalam rangka memerangi aliran sesat yang bisa merusak aqidah dan iman Islam kita). [3]

(It only takes THREE simple logic to find out the error of Islam Nusantara [1] (This is a repost from the previous status, I made a more fitting picture, in the hope that it will be shared by you all. [2] Hopefully, it will be useful for da'wah, to combat heretical sects that can damage our aqidah and Islamic faith). [3])
(T84/BPMJk/2017)

The data (8) below is used as hypertext, because it contains elements of similarities and differences in terms of defamation events.

*(8) Jika NU adalah ... [1]
ISLAM NUSANTARA ... [2]
Saya Bukan bagian dari ini [3]
Harus Jadi PENDUKUNG JOKOWI [4]
apalagi ini, Saya pasti bukan bagian dari ini [5]
MEREKA YANG MENGANGGAP [6]
KELOMPOK NYA YANG PALING BENAR [7]
Obviously Not My Kinda Group [8]
MEREKA YANG TIDAK BELAJAR [9]
DARI SEJARAH MASA LALU [10]
apalagi ini, Jelas bukan Golongan saya [11]*

*MAKA SAYA BUKAN "NU" JENIS INI [12]
Saya NU Pengikut HADRATUSSYEKH HASYIM ASY'ARI [13]
Saya NU GUSDURIAN [14]
100% ISLAM SAYA ISLAMNYA GUSDUR [15]
Dari dulu Hingga Sekarang ... [16]
AhmadDhani Pondok Pesantren MEDAENG [17]
(If NU is ... [1]
ISLAM NUSANTARA ... [2]
I'm Not a part of this [3]
Must Be a JOKOWI SUPPORT [4]
moreover this, I'm definitely not a part of this[5]
THOSE WHO ASSUME [6]
THAT THEIR GROUP IS THE TRUEST [7]
Obviously Not My Kinda Group [8]
THOSE WHO DO NOT LEARN [9]
FROM THE PAST HISTORY [10]
moreover this, Definitely not my group[11]
THEN I AM NOT THIS KIND OF "NU"[12]
I am a NU follower of HADRATUSSYEKH HASYIM ASY'ARI [13]
I'm NU GUSDURIAN [14]
100% MY ISLAM IS GUSDUR'S ISLAM [15]
From then Until Now ... [16]
AhmadDhani Islamic Boarding School MEDAENG [17])*
(T9/DPJm2019)

In terms of text convention, data (7) came before data (8). In data (7) the defendant (JR) wrote a controversial statement and conveyed it to the public through social media. In data (8), the defendant (AD) wrote a letter at the Medaeng prison, Surabaya, containing a statement about an Islamic sect that adheres to NU which was once led by Abdurrachmad Wahid or Gus Dur. The defendant also alleged that Islam Nusantara was part of NU and Jokowi's group.

Second, the hypertext begins with a statement alleging that NU is part of Islam Nusantara. This is different from the hypotext that directly states that Islam Nusantara is heretical. Even though it has a different opening of the text, the hypotext also mentions the object of the event, namely Islam Nusantara. Judging from the relationship between the texts, they both have elements of defamation, accusing that Islam Nusantara is heretical.

The expansion of defamation event can be observed in the hypertext which refers to the hypotext. Data (8) experiences some expansions which come from data (7) as the hypotext. Several events are not repeated in the hypertext. The following are some changes of defamation events in the hypertext.

No	Hypotext	Hypertext
1	Written on facebook	Written in prison
2	The accusation of heresy by Islam Nusantara that could damage the Islamic aqidah and faith	The accusation against Islam Nusantara, NU, Jokowi supporters
3	Religious issues	Political issues
4	The defendant only cornered those who supported Nusantara Islam	The defendant cornered various parties

Table 4:- The changes of the defamation events

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the two texts do not have intertextuality even though they both discuss the events of defamation of ISLAM NUSANTARA and NU. On the other hand, the intertextual relationship that appears in the hypotext and hypertexts is in the form of citation, that is, the defendant cited other defendants' ideas in making a text. In terms of the strategy of intertextuality, the writer of the hypertext used the "negation" strategy such as "I am not part of this" which is a rebuttal to the statement that NU is Islam Nusantara.

B. Discussion

Studying intertextuality requires hypertextuality to examine the text in depth. The text is studied in detail, starting from the convention of the text, the content of the text (text expansion), text changes, and the relationship between the earlier texts (hypotext) and the new text (hypertext). The problems in the text are studied using the hypertextuality of the new texts with the previous texts as the hypotexts or the background texts. Thus, to examine the text of cybercrime in Indonesia the intertextuality approach is used, while to determine the relationship between texts, hypertextuality is used.

The cybercrime text in Indonesia is mostly in the form of hate speech. Besides finding the cybercrime text as a social reality through intertextuality, through intertextuality analysis, the defendant's strategy in writing the texts is also revealed. The construction of social reality in the texts is a form of attitude persistence as a result of social interaction. The defendant's bad experience of an unwanted incident in a face-to-face encounter gave rise to a negative perception of other individuals. The formation of negative perceptual attitudes tends to persist, partly because they are considered mutually supportive. The act of insulting certain ethnic groups is a form of racial or ethnic discrimination. The negative impression aims to improve the defendant's image so as to produce a prejudice that he or his race is better than the Javanese race. The defendant's negative belief validates

his negative feeling, making the negative belief seems true. The defendant tended to use emotional feelings that encouraged him to use primordial racial or ethnic sentiments.

Negative prejudice can appear quickly because it avoids complex thought processes. Therefore, prejudice forms uniformity of information in human reasoning, giving rise to stereotypes. If the stereotype has existed for a long time in the individual, it will make him/her not go through a long process of thinking because such knowledge has existed before. The defendant, in this case, built his own knowledge based on the knowledge structure he already had, resulting in a discourse that is considered discriminatory.

IV. CONCLUSION

The intertextual relationship that appears in the hypotexts and hypertexts is the similarity of ideas in writing cybercrime texts. The discussion on the types of intertextuality is intended to determine the defendant's strategy in writing cybercrime texts. In the analysis above, it was found that negation is a strategy used by the defendants in writing a text that quotes and paraphrases the opinion of others in the previous texts. Thus, intertextuality in the cybercrime texts in Indonesia is obtained through the analysis of evidence and patterns of relationships of the texts conducted in a holistic, heuristic, deductive, and inductive way. This refers to the hypotexts and hypertexts which are the main capital in studying the relationship between the cybercrime texts.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London dan New York: Routledge.
- [2]. Barthes, R. (1993). *Mitosologies*. Paris: Editions de Suil.
- [3]. Bronwen, M. (2006). *Key Terms In Semiotics*. Continuum.
- [4]. Endraswara, S. (2004). *Metodologi Penelitian Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Widyatama.
- [5]. Eriyanto. (2001). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: PT LkiS.
- [6]. Fairclough, Norman. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity. Press.
- [7]. <https://news.detik.com>, 2020.
- [8]. Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva Reader, Toril Moi (ed.)*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- [9]. Riffaterre, M. (1978). *Semiotic Of Poetry*. London: Indiana Of University Perss.
- [10]. Sawirman, Novra, H., & M. Y. (2014). *Linguistik Forensik Padang: Andalas University Press. 1*.