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Abstract: This study examines the choice of personal pronouns made by pedophiles in interactions in e-mail. The main focus of this study is to determine who is downloaded by the two pedophiles, namely JON and ZEE when using personal pronouns and compare the use by the two pedophiles. The data of this research is in the form of conversations involving both pedophiles in interactions in electronic mail. Data collection is done through non-participating observation techniques which are suitable for observing activities that are not possible to be involved in. The data obtained from observations in the form of screenshots of the conversations of the two pedophiles in the telegram group were then stored in the data folder. The analysis of the use of personal pronouns in this study uses Fairclough's critical discourse analysis (CDA) dimension model in the form of description, interpretation, and explanation. The results showed that the use of personal pronouns in the interaction of the two pedophiles in electronic mail had a significant difference. The findings of this study indicate that the perpetrators of ZEE crimes use the words of the first and third person which are the most dominant compared to the perpetrators of JON crimes. The dominance of the use of first person pronouns by criminals as evidenced by the use of the words I, I, and we. For the use of the second person pronouns used in the form of you, while the use of the third person pronouns in the form of he and they. The conclusion of this study is that using personal pronouns in pedophile interactions in electronic mail has power in various forms.
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The subject of violence against children in Indonesia has become one of the most widely discussed topics in the Indonesian media. Violence against children is common in society and can occur anywhere. Sexual violence done by paedophiles dominates acts of child abuse. According to data from the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI), there were 419 incidents of minors facing the law (ABH) for sexual violence victims in 2020. Children who faced physical assault came in second, with 249 occurrences reported last year. As many as 119 youngsters were subjected to psychological abuse. Each year, 20 children are victims of sodomy/paedophilia and kidnapping. Meanwhile, 12 children were victims of homicide and had sharp weapons (KPAI, 2018).
The proliferation of social media applications makes it easier for paedophiles to carry out their actions. The Internet is a tool for paedophiles to interact with victims. This engagement takes the shape of paedophiles’ interactions on social media, one of which is email. E-mail conversations are considered illegal and are identical to acts of sexual aggression against kids. To conceal their genuine identity, the two paedophiles engaging in the encounter utilise anonymous names.

The study of digital communication in terms of various social practices within it necessitates the use of a discourse analysis framework that employs theories and methods created by professionals over the years. Discourse as a digital practice describes the practice of discourse analysis as well as the cost and limitations of the many analytical and theoretical instruments utilised in this practice. According to the researcher, the illegal practice of the paedophile subculture serves as a control for social practices that shape power practices. Ideology and power have a connection to digital practices. Criminals represent the practice of power through conversational communication by criminals on social media, which is employed as a technique for developing ideology and power.

Discourse about the paedophilia group is becoming increasingly prevalent. This is demonstrated by the numerous groups listed as sites for persons who like minors. One of the alleged culprits' Facebook pages is 'Kids' Shirt Fans in Elementary School Children's Singlets,' which has 256 members and frequently publishes photographs of young boys wearing only singlet shirts. There are additional paedophilia-related Twitter accounts. Bovid is a member of the Telegram group. Other offenders who want to watch the movie can join the paedophile community by clicking on the supplied telegram link. Online prostitution transactions occur in the paedophilia community on this telegram by purchasing movies and images depicting the sexual and psychological exploitation of child victims.

The use of personal pronouns in the paedophile group can be found in criminals' social media interactions. The discourse makes use of personal pronouns connected to self-presence, specifically how the perpetrator of the crime presents himself to the interlocutor as a speaker or producer of the text. This personal pronoun is used to refer to the relationship between power and solidarity. To demonstrate its power, the text's creator will employ certain words or word forms, particularly first-person pronouns, both singular and plural. On the other hand, choosing the proper term to address the interlocutor and using certain words is a very popular technique to demonstrate authority and togetherness. Criminals frequently utilise the pronouns 'saya' (I) and 'kita' (we) in the paedophile community on Indonesian social media, for example. Based on this description, this research is focused on the critical discourse analysis perspective because the language of paedophiles in the paedophile community studied has its peculiarities and to reveal the practice of power through discourse that cannot be separated from its context, both linguistically and in terms of socio-cultural practises.

Hala El Saj (2012) researched the usage of personal pronouns on Oprah Winfrey's show in a conversation with Jordan's Queen Rania. Oprah Winfrey uses personal pronouns as a crucial role in continuing conversational engagement to represent herself and others. Similarly, Hasan (2013) finds several strategies of political leaders, particularly the usage of first-person pronouns, used to persuade audiences to accept views and actions on crises, revolutions, and other controversial issues in his political discourse on Hosni Mubarak's speech given on February 10, 2011, Ali et al. (2011) investigated the role of pronouns, particularly personal pronouns, in representing socio-political ideology in connection to political speech in newspaper discourse. According to the findings, the usage of personal and possessive pronouns in newspaper articles indicates socio-political ideology. When alluding to their acts, the publications used verbatim quotations from statements made by American officials that featured plural personal and possessive pronouns. Political discourse on presidential speeches is one of the venues for analysing critical discourse using the Fairclough discourse scheme framework. Wahyuningsih (2018) examines Donald Trump's Inauguration Speech for the usage of personal pronouns. This study examines Donald Trump's use of personal pronouns in his inauguration speech, specifically the usage of first-person pronouns as a technique of keeping excellent engagement with the audience during speeches. The study of the use of personal
pronouns in political speeches is widely popular, while research on the use of personal pronouns in criminal cases is rare.

Hlioui (2020) analysed the use of personal pronouns as a means of exercising authority and power in legal discourse in case studies of life insurance contracts and court hearings, which is one of the studies that explore the use of personal pronouns in legal discourse in case studies of life insurance contracts and court hearings. The study looked into the choice of personal pronouns as well as the specific participant roles ascribed to them and discovered that the power dynamics that occur between different participants in a court hearing influence the participants’ choice of personal pronouns and roles.

The research equation above produces the same analysis as this research, namely the use of personal pronouns through the study of critical discourse. Furthermore, this study describes the same type of authority using personal pronouns. The type of data used in this study differs from that used in earlier studies. Previous studies collected data in the form of dialogue, political discourse, speeches, and legal discourse, but this study collected data in the form of e-mail dialogue. This study is significant because it is expected to reveal information about the use of personal pronouns that signify types of power, particularly paedophile encounters. As a result, this study is expected to expose the power of paedophiles through discourse, specifically personal pronouns.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), along with Critical Discourse Studies (CDS), is an interdisciplinary research movement that studies language and other semiotic systems and incorporates a variety of approaches and methods from different studies (Fairclough, Mulderrig, & Wodak, 2011). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) incorporates the critical tradition of social analysis into language studies and contributes to critical social analysis with a particular emphasis on discourse and the relationship between discourse and other social elements such as power relations, ideology, institutions, social identity, and so on (Van Dijk, 1993; Fairclough, 1989; Wodak, 1989). This approach is built on the concept of critical dialectic theory, which is more than just making and analysing basic claims about reality’s social laws. Furthermore, CDA’s emphasis is on scientific and theoretical results.

The foundation for critical discourse analysis is founded on a study of the systemic social and functional theory of linguistics, discourse practices (basically, communicative events and interpretations), and social practices generally (Rogers, 2011). In the field of sociolinguistics in England and Europe, critical discourse analysis is utilised to investigate power and social injustice (Slembrouck, 2001). As a theory, critical discourse analysis examines how language projects and interprets power and control. It also explains the inequities and discrimination that arise among individuals in interactions (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000).

CDA research in the digital era through social media necessitates the development of a semiotic framework to explain how the construction of social reality is built through linguistic and visual resources in crime, giving rise to a multimodal critical discourse analysis approach (Yilei & Dezheng, 2021).

Fairclough (1989) studies the ideological character of discourse using critical discourse analysis. Conversation as a type of power struggle, and discourse as a form of power struggle (Santoso, 2012). Thus, critical discourse analysis takes a nonconformist stance or opposes the dominant current in a broad framework to combat social injustice. The fundamental premise of critical discourse analysis is that discourse is not perceived only as a language study object. Of course, language is utilised to analyse the text. Language is not understood in the typical sense. Text in the context of language as a tool utilised for specific objectives and practises, as well as language in critical discourse analysis. Based on this description, this research takes a critical discourse analysis approach because text as discourse cannot be separated from its context, which includes linguistic aspects of the texts, the process of interpretation of text production and consumption, as well as socio-cultural and political practises.

Power is associated with the use of close personal pronouns that identify a person’s identity and ideology. Personal pronouns represent either collectivity or individualism (Fairclough, 2003). Furthermore, personal pronouns are frequently employed when referring to certain people or groups, and they
have been used to break up coalitions both within and outside of specific groups (Van Dijk, 2002). The hidden meaning in the usage of personal pronouns is heavily influenced by concerns that emerge in both social and political corridors where people or organisations have positioned themselves (Chilton & Schaffner, 1997). Formality and informality, status, access to authority, social rank, and race are all personal and social factors that influence interpretation and choice.

In terms of personal pronouns, Van Dijk (2002) contends that the pronouns kita (we) and kami (we) can be used either inclusively or exclusively. They are used to express solidarity in a broad sense. Meanwhile, they are primarily employed to share responsibility, so that no action or policy that is established and agreed upon is put solely on an individual (Dahnilsyah, 2017). Personal pronouns, on the other hand, are frequently employed as a method to win support and create trust. Personal pronouns are used to refer to the person or thing about whom the speaker is speaking, and they can also be used to refer to the speaker himself. According to Collins (1990), there are two sorts of personal pronouns: subjective and objective pronouns. Subjective pronouns, such as mereka (they), saya (I), kami (we), anda (you), dia (he/she), and mereka (they), are used to refer to subject complements or subject sentences. Objective personal pronouns refer to the same person or thing with an equivalent subject pronoun.

METHOD

The research method used was the qualitative approach. This type of research is descriptive which is oriented towards the study of critical discourse. The research data is in the form of conversations between paedophiles JON and ZEE from the telegram account @Bovid. The screenshot upload shows the two paedophiles' interactions between November 24, 25, and 27, 2019, and December 2 and 3, 2019. The data consists of ten data points acquired by researchers on the @Bovid telegram account on September 20, 2021. The ZED perpetrator's @Bovid telegram account reveals a screenshot of an interaction between JON and ZED that reportedly contains criminal elements. The data on paedophile interaction in e-mails was chosen as the subject of study because data in the context of forensic linguistics is geared towards uncovering the relationship between lingual evidence and crime.

This e-mail was utilised by the two paedophiles as a platform for engagement for JON and ZED to share their experiences. Data was collected using non-participatory observation techniques, which are appropriate for watching activities that do not allow researchers to participate in them. The data folder contains data acquired via observations in the form of screenshots of talks between the two paedophiles in the @Bovid telegram group. The data analysis technique used in this research uses Fairclough's (1989; 1995) critical discourse analysis model as follows.

![Figure 1. Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis Model (1989; 1995)](image-url)
Figure 1 shows the three steps of analysis in critical discourse analysis. In the description stage, the use of personal pronouns is analysed to provide an entry point to reveal the power used by the two paedophiles. At the interpretation stage, it is determined who the two paedophiles are referring to when using first, second and third person pronouns. In the explication stage, the differences in the use of personal pronouns by the two paedophiles are explained.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Findings**

The usage of personal pronouns in paedophile e-mail provides determines the proclivity to employ forms of power in exploiting criminal pronouns in pedophilic communications. Fairclough's critical discourse analysis framework for assessing power through the use of personal pronouns in paedophile relationships through e-mail is as follows.

The first step in analysing the usage of personal pronouns in paedophile communications via e-mail is to quantify the percentage of personal pronouns that appear in criminal talks. This quantitative count is not the analysis's final purpose. This estimate is merely the first step in determining the two paedophiles' proclivity to utilise personal pronouns. The second part of the analysis adheres to Fairclough's analytical techniques, notably the description, interpretation, and explanation stages. Analysis of the use of personal pronouns in the conversations produced by the two paedophiles obtained information that the use of first-person pronouns dominates the whole. This can be seen in the percentage diagram for the use of personal pronouns below. This can be seen in the percentage chart below for the use of personal pronouns.
The chart shows that the percentage of using the pronoun “saya” is 33%. Followed by the pronoun aku by 30%. Furthermore, the personal pronouns kamu and kita are 8% each. The personal pronoun "mereka" has a percentage of 3%. It can be concluded that the use of personal pronouns with a large percentage of "saya" reveals a more intimate relationship than other personal pronouns.

Based on the findings above, it can be concluded that the use of personal pronouns used to refer to the person or thing being discussed, or spoken about by the speaker can be used as a way for him to refer to himself. There are two types of personal pronouns, namely subjective pronouns and objective pronouns. Subjective pronouns are used to refer to subject complements or subject clauses, such as saya, kami, anda, dia, and mereka. The different things in objective personal pronouns refer to the same person or thing as the equivalent subject pronoun and the use of object pronouns is used as a subject complement object or a prepositional clause complement, such as aku, kita, anda, dia, and mereka.

Discussion

The Use of First Person Pronouns

The use of pronoun I is not used as a substitute for the speaker's name but rather to refer to himself. In the paedophile community, criminals use the word saya to convey their opinion so that it is more subjective. Here's an explanation.

Data (1).

ZEE : Di email ini cuma 1 atau 2 ada nya, coba saya cek dulu. Eh, om Joni ini bukan yang punya blog berbagi cerita onai/ngocok? Joni Parlente itu?
(There are only 1 or 2 in this email, let me check first. Uhm, Uncle Joni isn't the one who has a blog sharing masturbation stories? Joni Parlente?).

Context : ZEE responds to Jon's request to send photos or videos of sexual abuse of minors. This conversation took place on the offender's email on Sunday, 24 Nov 2019 at 15:52.

Data (1) shows how the use of saya conveys the personal opinion of the perpetrators of ZEE crimes about video files and photos that contain sexual violence against victims. Using the singular pronoun saya, the perpetrator clearly states that this is his opinion, without suggesting that anyone else agrees with him about complaints about files stored on Yahoo not necessarily still existing. ZEE did not mention JON in the statement. This is done to avoid mentioning the name of the interlocutor directly.

Data (2).

JON : Ok, aku tunggu ya … kkwkwkwkw, iya betul gak cari bocil buat mainan. hehehhe?
(Ok, I'll wait for you … kkwkwkwkw, yes, you don't look for kids to have fun. hehehhe?).

Context : JON asked ZEE if she was looking for minors to play with. This speech took place on Sunday, 24 November 2019 at 16:34.

Data (2). JON said unequivocally that he was waiting for the transmission of movies and images depicting the sexual exploitation of youngsters by referring to himself as “aku tunggu” ("I'm waiting") rather than “kita tunggu” (we waiting). This relates to the fact that he not only wants to watch the films and images but also orders Zee to look for them. In Indonesian, the pronoun aku refers to the person speaking. Criminals utilise the personal pronoun aku on their behalf. Thus, the use of the personal pronouns saya and aku in the preceding data as a declaration by the perpetrator of the crime against his interlocutor regarding requests for videos and images purportedly containing aspects of sexual violence. In e-mail interactions with paedophiles, the personal pronoun "kita" is also used, as used by ZEE. As evidence, consider quote (3) below.
Data (3).

ZEE : Susah sekarang cari bocil Om, dulu jaman masih sekolah, masih bareng ortu lumayan tuh, sama adik cewek sendiri, sama kawan kawannya adek juga sempet (masih anak tetangga), ada juga kawan dekat rumah yang suka gitu adiknya sendiri juga... kalau sekarang waah udah susah, serem kalau kita mau coba akrab akrab sama anak perempuan orang (It's hard now to find a kid, Uncle, back when I was still at school when I was still living with my parents it was quite easy, with my little sister, with her friends too (still a neighbour's child), there were friends close to home who like to treat their own younger siblings like that... Now, it's not easy trying to get along with someone's daughter).

Context : This utterance is in response to the question in data (4) which was answered by ZEE regarding finding a child (little boy) who is difficult due to parental supervision and ZEE actually shared his personal experience with the victim who is still family. This speech took place on Monday, 25 November 2019 at 09.11

Data (4).

JON : Sudah berapa anak kamu setubuhi? bosku loh uda nikah? kalau uda nikah bisa tu pakai anak loh sendiri, aman kan. Hahahahaha. (How many children have you had sex with? You are married now. If you are married, you can use your children. It's safe. Hahahaha).

Context : JON asks ZEE about the number of minors who have been victimised and also asks about personal identities related to marital status. The purpose of this question leads to the invitation and suggestion that JON is trying to make to ZEE to commit an act of sexual violence against his own biological child. This conversation took place on Monday, 25 November 2019 at 21.00.

The Use of Second-Person Pronouns

De Fina's analysis also shows how pronouns in an utterance must be considered in context, namely in the utterance as a whole, to find patterns of how the pronouns are used and what meaning is to be conveyed to the listener. The use of second person pronoun used by paedophiles in their interactions in e-mail is "kamu" which can be seen in data (4) and (5) below.

Data (4) the use of the personal pronoun "kamu" in the sentence "sudah berapa anak kamu setubuhi?". The use of the word "kamu" refers to the ZEE paedophile who explained in a previous conversation that he had committed an act of sexual violence. This makes the paedophile JON ask the number of children who have been victims. Apart from that, based on the data above, paedophile JON indirectly used his power to apply strategies to build a good image in approaching paedophiles ZEE by greeting bosku. The greeting shown by JON is the name given to the speech partner. The use of the pronoun "kamu" is also found in data (5) below.
Data (5).
JON : Iya pengalaman pribadi bos. Oh belum pernah sampai ngentot, oke2 .... ya kalau anak mu perempuan pasti uda kamu raba bahkan kamu oral tu. Hahahahaha. (Yes, personal experience boss. Oh, you've never had sex yet, okay... yes, if your kid is a girl, you will definitely touch her and you'll even oral. Hahahahaha).

Context : JON expressed his experience with a minor victim and asked ZEE if she had ever committed such an act of sexual abuse. This speech took place on Wednesday, 27 November 2019 at 00.47.

Data (5) the word "anakmu" is used by JON paedophiles as an illustration that the child of the ZEE paedophile will become a potential victim if he is female. The children of ZEE paedophiles are boys, not girls. This is what the paedophile JON tried to describe to ZEE if his daughter would surely be the victim. In another sentence, the paedophile JON uses the pronoun "kamu" referring to the paedophile ZEE. This is confirmed in the next statement.

With the pronoun "you" being repeated, it indicates JON's consistency in referring to potential victims. The use of the second-person pronoun "kamu" in the paedophile community is used more by criminals than by other second-person pronouns. If the perpetrator of the JON crime does not use the personal pronoun "kamu" and is replaced with an impersonal pronoun, such as this and that or omitted, it will affect the meaning of the speech.

The Use of Third-Person Pronouns

The use of third-person pronouns in paedophile interactions in e-mail determines the extent to which this use shows the power of the perpetrator over the victim. Orvig, et al (2009) explain that the use of third-person pronouns is the preferential use of "mereka" (as opposed to the use of other referential expressions) in (a) the context of shared concern and (b) the context of discursive continuity. Power through the use of personal pronouns in paedophile interactions in e-mail besides the first and second person pronouns, there is also a third person pronoun in the form of "dia" as shown in data (6) and (7) below.

Data (6).
JON : Enak lah bos masuk ke barang sempit apalagi mulus, nangis biarkan nanti dia akan ketagihan juga. iya juga seh bos kalau anak tetangga ngeri. cari anak gelandangan saja bos .... kasih uang suruh ikut bawa ke tempat yg sepi sikat deh.

Context : JON suggests to ZEE to commit an act of sexual violence and is accompanied by a request to look for potential victims from neighbouring children around ZEE's perpetrator's house and be rewarded with money. This speech took place on Monday, 2 December 2019 at 12.50pm.

Data (7).
ZEE : Masih nggak berani bos buat gelakuin gitu, ambil anak gelandangan trus ngentotin, bayanginya sih kayaknya asyik, tapi ngeri resikonya... Video itu dari temen, iya dia ngerekam sendiri waktu ngejilatin pepek keponakannya, katanya sering diajak jalan jalan, dijajanin, trus pas rumah sepi diajak nonton bokep, trus di praktekin sama dia, dan keponakannya mau jaga rahasia juga. (I still don't dare to do that, take a homeless child and fuck her, I imagine that it looks like it's fun, but it is also risky... The video is from a friend, he recorded himself licking his nephew's vagina, he said he often invited her to go for a walk and buy her snacks, then when there is nobody at home, he asked her to watch porn together, then practice it with him, and his nephew is also good at keeping secrets too).

Context : ZEE's statement signalled concern over JON's suggested action of taking a homeless child as an
object of sexuality. This speech took place on Tuesday, 3 December 2019 at 11.05am.

Data (6) shows how JON uses the word "dia" to show the minors discussed in the previous conversation as victims of EEZ perpetrators. The use of the word "dia" in the statement refers to the victim. The same thing can also be observed in data (7) which uses the personal pronoun "dia" as in the sentence “iya dia ngerekam sendiri waktu ngejilatin pepek keponakannya” It can be understood that the EEZ perpetrator explained that the perpetrator was not the perpetrator, but his friend who was also a pedophile. Based on the contents of JON’s conversation which stated that the perpetrator’s actions by sending video files containing exploitation of minors were an act of sexual crime. The use of the word "dia" in this statement refers to a friend of the perpetrator who committed an act of sexual violence accompanied by a video recording for personal documentation and distribution to fellow paedophiles. In addition to the use of the third person pronoun in the form of the word "dia", it was also found the use of the personal pronoun in the form of "mereka" which was used by EEZ perpetrators to refer to victims, as presented in data (8) below.

Data (8).

ZEE : Pernah ngintip mertua sama adik ipar waktu mereka main ketempatku di Jawa, heheh... kalau boss JON bisa tertarik sama pepek anak kecil gimana ceritanya?
(I have once peeked at my in-laws and sister-in-law when they were visiting at my place in Java, heheh... if boss JON could be interested in a child's vagina, how did it start?).

Context : ZEE shared her experience of peeping at her in-laws and sister in law. In addition, ZEE also asked why JON was interested in minors. This conversation took place on Monday, 2 December 2019 at 09.17.

Data (8) states that pernah ngintip mertua sama adik ipar waktu mereka main ketempatku di Jawa, it can be understood that the perpetrator shared his story with the victims. ZEE explained that he once peeked at his little sister-in-law when she was sleeping. What did ZEE do through the stigma attached to the victim with the name "anak kecil" related to the statement kalau boss joni bisa tertarik sama pepek anak kecil gimana ceritanya? is something that can be categorized as exchanging experiences with victims who are minors. Based on the contents of the ZEE conversation which is stated by the use of the pronoun "mereka" in the statement, referring to in-laws and sister-in-law.

Based on the analysis of the use of third-person pronouns, it is possible to conclude that the pronoun dia is a possessive pronoun for the perpetrator of the crime, referring to both the victim and the perpetrator of the crime, while the use of the personal pronoun mereka refers to the situation and conditions as well as the issues discussed and to separate the perpetrators of the crimes themselves and the communities they follow. Using various personal pronouns to exert influence over speech partners in paedophile exchanges in e-mails serves as a tactic to escape personal accountability when making statements in describing events and expressions that have been heard and carried out.

According to this explanation, the use of personal pronouns demonstrates the authority of the perpetrator (man) and the victim (female). This is consistent with Reynolds, et al. (2020) comment on how pronouns are employed to experimentally change the gender of the perpetrator but avoids gender pronouns when characterising the victim. Power is gained in this pedophilic relationship by the use of personal pronouns that represent relational values and experiences.

Critical discourse analysis has generated a lot of interest from linguists as an interdisciplinary study of the relationships between language, power, and ideology, and it may be used to analyse linguistic aspects in different social and cultural contexts. The usage of personal pronouns is one of the linguistic strategies used to analyse. Power in paedophile e-mail conversations cannot be divorced from the existence of modes of expressing desires and playing active or passive roles.
The linguistic trait of personal pronouns employed by paedophiles to refer to the person or object being discussed or uttered by the speaker can also be used to refer to himself. Personal pronouns are classified into two types: subjective pronouns and objective pronouns. Criminals employ subjective pronouns to refer to subject complements or subject phrases, such as saya, aku, dia, kamu, kota, and mereka. The difference is that paedophiles employ objective pronouns to refer to the same person or thing as the comparable subject pronoun, but objective pronouns are used as an object complement to a subject or as a complement to prepositional phrases like aku, kota, kamu, dia, and mereka. In pedophilic e-mail communications, the usage of Indonesian personal pronouns is split into three categories: first, second, and third-person pronouns.

The use of first-person pronouns, both singular and plural as in quotations (1), (2), and (3) as a strategy for self-presence concerning the relationship between power and solidarity. To show their power, paedophiles will use certain words or tenses, especially saya, aku, and kita. On the other hand, the two paedophiles use a very common way to show power and solidarity by choosing the right words to address the interlocutor and using certain words as well. Both paedophiles also use second-person pronouns, as in quotations (4) and (5), while the use third-person pronouns as in quotations (6), (7), and (8).

Based on the explanation provided above, this study discovered significant and new information in building power connections established by the two paedophiles through the use of personal pronouns. In pedophile contacts in e-mails, for example, the two paedophiles frequently employ the personal pronouns "saya" and "aku" as comments by perpetrators of crimes against their interlocutors regarding requests and as a kind of intimacy rather than other personal pronouns, as seen in data (1) and (2). As evidenced by data (3), both paedophiles not only speak for themselves and their victims but also as representatives of a paedophile community. In data (4) and (5), different things are found in the usage of the personal pronoun "kamu" to refer to the speech partner who committed a crime against the potential victim. As in data (6), (7), and (8), the pronoun "dia" will be used to allude to the success of an activity and vice versa.

There is, of course, a reason why the two paedophiles use different pronouns.

Thus, the findings of this study are consistent with the findings of (Chiu, et al., 2018), who found that identifying adolescent online chat with child sex offenders employs specific phrases (first person pronouns) as a kind of intimacy in indicating the use of self-disclosure treatment strategies. Argamon, et al. (2009) validated this by identifying paedophiles using linguistic traits useful for determining personal percentages and pronouns, such as the personal pronouns aku, kamu, and the reflexive pronouns diriku, dirimu (myself, yourself).

According to Ostermann (2003), pronoun change serves as a contextualization cue in face-to-face encounters. It demonstrates the various ways in which the pronoun state change is used to contextualize phenomena such as preference organisation and change in order and footing, as well as locally to exercise strength and unity. Pronoun substitution to refer to domestic violence, language, and gender. Häkansson (2012) investigates the usage of the pronoun saya when the speaker wishes to talk as an individual rather than as a group spokesperson.

The personal pronoun "kami" is used to evoke a sense of collectivity and to share responsibility. According to Lai & Reduzan (2013), the pronoun kami is in the exclusive form, referring only to the party speaking and not the person listening, whereas the pronoun mereka is used to separate oneself from others; whom speakers refer to when using them varies greatly between speakers. This study also demonstrates that the choice of pronominal and the person to whom the pronoun refers varies substantially depending on the context of the utterance.

This was corroborated by Dahnilsyah (2017), who noted that the use of pronouns in people is influenced by issues that arise in both social and political corridors, causing some individuals or groups to take positions. A variety of personal and social factors influence the usage of personal pronouns, including formality and informality, status, access to authority, social rank, and race. When it comes to personal pronouns, we and we can be used either inclusively or exclusively. They are widely used as a strategy to express solidarity. Meanwhile, their words are solely employed to share the blame, so that any action or policy that is
decided upon and agreed upon is not solely carried by individuals. Personal pronouns, on the other hand, are frequently employed by politicians as a method to attract support and establish trust.

According to the preceding ideas, language in critical discourse analysis is regarded as a social practice related to ideology and power relations. Furthermore, if a speaker or writer allows himself to be influenced by the communicant’s thinking, knowledge, behaviour, and ideology, he has complete control over his mind. Such mental control is an example of power abuse. A similar thing occurs in the conversations of paedophile criminals who utilise personal pronouns tied to identity and ideology. They stand for both collectivity and individuality. Furthermore, criminals' pronouns are frequently utilised when referring to specific people or have even been misused to acquire the trust of fellow criminals and the paedophile group.

This study has theoretical implications, specifically critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a method for investigating the phenomena of power. As a result, the role of CDA as an analytical tool is of critical importance. Ethically indicates that problem-solving is always based on cultural issues that describe the classification based on study findings. When referring to problem solutions, it is always dependent on what is in the paedophile's e-mail interactions. In this study, CDA was utilised to indicate authority via the usage of personal pronouns in paedophile e-mail communications. In addition, CDA can also be used to reveal power, ideology and hegemony in the study of literary texts such as novels, short stories, plays and oral traditions.

CONCLUSION

Three inferences can be drawn from the preceding explanation. First, power is expressed through the use of personal pronouns in paedophile exchanges through e-mail, with a preference for first-person pronouns. The findings of this study may shed light on power dynamics in paedophile e-mail interactions. "I and I are" are used as statements by perpetrators of crimes against their interlocutors regarding requests for videos and photos suspected of containing elements of acts of sexual violence, and as a way for both paedophiles to refer to themselves rather than as a substitute for the speaker's name.

Second, paedophile interactions in e-mail tend to use second-person pronouns, namely "kamu" which are used more by criminals than other second-person pronouns. The pronoun "kamu" is not difficult to analyze because it is obvious. The choice and use of second person pronouns as a form to focus attention that a speaker is directly addressing people who are present cognitively or physically. This is what distinguishes the first and third-person pronouns from not giving a focus signal to the speech partner. Therefore, speakers and listeners pay less attention to second-person pronouns.

Third, paedophile interactions in e-mail tend to use the personal pronouns "dia" and "mereka". The use of "dia" as a paedophile possessive pronoun indicates something is associated with someone's possession, whereas the use of "mereka" as an inclusive pronoun is adopted as a strategy for expressing solidarity. Meanwhile, the word "mereka" is exclusively used to share responsibility in the form of actions decided and carried out by paedophiles. Thus, the two paedophiles in e-mail interactions project and express power through discourse in the form of using personal pronouns.

Essentially, the process of analysing paedophiles’ language continues to evolve following the current era, leading to a variety of patterns of behaviour. As a result, a critical discourse analysis (CDA) researcher must be able to analyse the content and intentions contained in the text itself. Linguists must also be able to apply their knowledge to comprehend the ideas and actions of paedophiles on social media.
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