

ABSTRACT

Carina Fernanditha:

Graduate Thesis

Agents of Post-Truth: A Study of Truth Manipulation by Indra Kenz and His Supporters

Indra Kenz is an influencer famous for his involvement in *Binomo*'s viral fraud case. Indra claims that *Binomo* is a safe trading application, while in reality, the Indonesian Trade Regulatory Body (Bappebti) declares that it is an illegal gambling application. Fairclough's three-dimensional CDA reveals how Indra's clarification arguments show symptoms of a post-truth phenomenon where objective truth loses its significance compared to emotional judgment and personal beliefs. His misinformation via social media was so effective, that it motivated people to voice their support on Instagram, even after he was declared guilty of causing 144 victims to lose a total of 83 billion rupiahs. Among thousands of comments on his self-defense post, three people earned thousands of likes and support from fellow netizens after creating three comments that benefit Indra. These people took some elements from Indra's self-defense and elaborated them into a victim-blaming discourse, a perpetrator-excusing discourse, and an institutional distrust discourse. By further performing CDA on the three comments, it was found that these netizens also show symptoms of truth manipulation, qualifying Indra's case and the aftermath of it as post-truth phenomena.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, post-truth, social media

ABSTRAK

Carina Fernanditha:

Tesis

Agen Pasca Kebenaran: Studi Manipulasi Kebenaran oleh Indra Kenz dan Para Pendukungnya

Indra Kenz adalah seorang *influencer* yang terkenal karena keterlibatannya dalam kasus penipuan *viral Binomo*. Indra mengklaim bahwa *Binomo* adalah aplikasi trading yang aman, sementara kenyataannya, Badan Pengawas Perdagangan Berjangka Komoditi (Bappebti) menyatakan bahwa aplikasi tersebut adalah aplikasi judi ilegal. Analisis Wacana Kritis (AWK) Fairclough mengungkap bagaimana argumen klarifikasi Indra menunjukkan gejala fenomena pasca-kebenaran di mana kebenaran objektif kehilangan signifikansinya dibandingkan dengan penilaian emosional dan keyakinan pribadi. Informasi salah yang disebar Indra melalui media sosial sangat efektif dalam memotivasi orang untuk mendukungnya, bahkan setelah ia dinyatakan bersalah atas 144 korban dengan total kerugian 83 miliar rupiah. Di antara ribuan komentar pada posting pembelaan diri Indra, tiga orang memperoleh ribuan suka dan dukungan dari sesama netizen setelah membuat komentar yang menguntungkan Indra. Orang-orang ini mengambil beberapa elemen dari argumen Indra dan mengelaborasikannya menjadi wacana yang menyalahkan korban, wacana yang membela pelaku, dan wacana ketidakpercayaan terhadap institusi. Dengan melakukan AWK lebih lanjut pada ketiga komentar tersebut, ditemukan bahwa para netizen ini juga menunjukkan gejala manipulasi kebenaran, mengindikasikan kasus Indra sebagai fenomena pasca-kebenaran.

Kata kunci: analisis wacana kritis, media sosial, pasca-kebenaran

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER.....	i
ACCEPTANCE SHEET.....	ii
LEMBAR PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	6
1.3. Purpose of the Study.....	6
1.4. Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5. Theoretical Framework.....	7
1.5.1 Post-truth.....	8
1.5.2 Critical Discourse Analysis.....	14
1.5.3 Forms of Capitals.....	17
1.5.4 Review of Related Studies.....	18
1.6. Methodology.....	20
1.7. Organization of the Study.....	26
2. DISSECTING INDRA’S MISINFORMATION AND NETIZENS’ PARTICIPATION.....	27
2.1. Trivializing the Opposition: <i>Binomo’s</i> Case in the Words of Indra Kenz’.....	27
2.1.1 Description of Language Properties in Indra Kenz’s Clarification Video.....	27
2.1.2 Interpretation of Discursive Process in Indra Kenz’s Clarification Video.....	30
2.1.3 Explanation of Post-truth Phenomenon in Indra Kenz’s Clarification Video.....	36
2.2. Blaming the Victims: <i>Binomo’s</i> Case in the Words of @_nerseus.....	43
2.2.1 Description of Language Properties in The First Comment.....	43
2.2.2 Interpretation of Discursive Process in The First Comment.....	47
2.2.3 Explanation of Post-truth Phenomenon in The First Comment.....	55
2.3. Excusing the Perpetrator: <i>Binomo’s</i> Case in the Words of @rickkoo52.....	61
2.3.1 Description of Language Properties in The Second Comment.....	61
2.3.2 Interpretation of Discursive Process in The Second Comment.....	65

2.3.3 Explanation of Post-truth Phenomenon in The Second Comment.....	71
2.4. Distrusting the Institution: <i>Binomo's</i> Case in the Words of @alfiranizma_96.....	75
2.4.1 Description of Language Properties in The Third Comment.....	76
2.4.2 Interpretation of Discursive Process in The Third Comment.....	78
2.4.3 Explanation of Post-truth Phenomenon in The Third Comment.....	84
3. CONCLUSION.....	91
3.1. Conclusion.....	91
3.2. Suggestion.....	93
REFERENCES.....	95

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	Example of Indra Kenz's Flexing Content.....	3
1.2	Indra Kenz's Most Controversial Statement.....	3
1.3	Example of Indra Kenz's Promotion.....	4
1.4	Video Containing Indra Kenz's Truth Manipulation.....	21
1.5	Indra Kenz's Attorney's Reasons for Indra's Innocence.....	23
1.6	Indra Kenz's Attorney's Reasons for Indra's Innocence.....	23
1.7	Research Samples.....	24
2.1	A Zoomed-in Caption from SEC's Notice That Indra Showed in His Video.....	34
2.2	Snippet That Indra Uses to Defend the Legality of Binary Options.....	35
2.3	Visual That Reestablishes Indra's Identity as Trading Mentor.....	38
2.4	Visual That Reestablishes Indra's Identity as Trader.....	38
2.5	The First Sample.....	44
2.6	Examples of Comments That Support @_nerseus.....	49
2.7	Interaction between @aldireksiy and @_nerseus.....	51
2.8	Interaction between @__3yanto_d1432 and @_nerseus.....	52
2.9	Captions on Videos About <i>Binomo's</i> Status.....	53
2.10	Captions on Videos About <i>Binomo's</i> Risks.....	53
2.11	Interaction between @ramatriputra and @_nerseus.....	54
2.12	The Second Sample.....	61
2.13	Examples of Comments That Support @Rickkoo52.....	66
2.14	The Attorney's Argument Concerning Disclaimer and User Consent.....	67
2.15	Additional Comment by @rickkoo52.....	68
2.16	Interaction between @rickkoo52 and @apipsiraja.....	69
2.17	Interaction between @rickkoo52 and @hapotansimbolon016.....	70
2.18	The Third Sample.....	76
2.19	Examples of Comments That Support @alfiranizma_96.....	80
2.20	The Caption of the Self-Defense Post.....	81
2.21	Interaction between @alfiranizma_96 and @xaivoel_anwar.....	81
2.22	Interaction between @alfiranizma_96 and @lavender.sari.....	82
2.23	Interaction between @alfiranizma_96 and @gopandaaa.....	83