

## Theme-Rheme Analysis in Probing Google's Coercion Trespassing User's Privacy: A Forensic Linguistic Research

Sabtra Lesmana<sup>1</sup>, Sawirman<sup>2</sup>, Fajri Usman<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1-2-3</sup>Andalas University

Padang, Indonesia

E-mail: <sup>1</sup>[saptralesmana@gmail.com](mailto:saptralesmana@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup>[sawirman@unand.ac.id](mailto:sawirman@unand.ac.id) & <sup>3</sup>[fajri.usman@unand.ac.id](mailto:fajri.usman@unand.ac.id)

### Abstract

This research constitutes a mixture of multidisciplinary between linguistics with forensic. It represents the clause analysis through the use of theme-rheme in probing the user's privacy violations in Google's user privacy policy agreement: a forensic linguistics research. It is aimed to reveal and explain the violations conducted by Google to its user privacy which is implied through its text agreement by analyzing it with Theme and Rheme focus. This qualitative research is done by applying the documentation recording method in collecting data and the Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics theory specifically theme-rheme. The result of the data is presented in the table analysis and in the form of descriptive interpretation. The result showed that Google build its clauses with the 4 types of theme construction. From 73 analyzed clauses, the dominantly built clause is the single constituent with marked theme where "We" is the mostly occurred subject with 31 occurrences. Yet, Google applied unmarked theme mostly in their 38 clauses. With this dominant occurrences of "We", Google construe its existence as the authority holders of the whole agreement. The researchers found that similar finite predicator appeared repeatedly such "collect" and "use" in building its clauses. These constitute Google's strategy in order to force the user's permission to let Google freely access their privacy. In addition, the operation of the conjunction "And", extention, expansion and exemplificatory constituents represent the plentiful request of Google related to its user's information. Those summarized the violation conducted by Google to its user's privacy.

**Keywords:** clause, constituent; forensic-linguistics; misleading-statement; privacy

### 1. Introduction

Through the advancement in technology, communication can be quickly developed. However, it is impossible to deny that technological advancements have both positive and negative consequences. Not all technology consumers comprehend and evolve in their use of current conveniences. These detrimental impacts have far-

reaching implications that impact not only people but also society as a whole. Since the internet shortens the distance between people, it allows people to reach out to others more quickly via a variety of contact channels. Arbitrarily using language becomes the underlying foundation for anybody, whether knowingly or unintentionally, to create effects of language that cannot be handled and are often irresponsible.

As stated by Auer and Schmidt that language is formed through a relative form, cooperative and mostly does not reflect many actions. Relative uniformity is a prerequisite for language to be able to serve its basic purpose (communication); the existing variability serves a number of other functions (Auer & Schmidt, 2010). This concept will serve as the basis for the analysis of the broad spectrum of human behavior. This action, like a stimulus and response mechanism, relates to the current state of human activity. Text is created when people talk or compose. Any instance of language, in any form, is referred to as a text (Halliday and Hasan in Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004). A substantial base is employed to mention or activate the reality and fact; one of which is its lingual form trace. Language is not only a neutral medium for generating subject knowledge, but is a form of social practice that acts to reflect social reality (Silverman, 2000). Language is used by humans to interact with other humans and remain linked. Humans use words to establish their activities and identities. If a crisis arises, humans may use language to track any event, even those that exist in between. Forensic linguistics is one of the fields of linguistics that can be used to uncover linguistic difficulties that have occurred or may occur within people. Forensic linguistics is a multidisciplinary discipline that is used to answer legal questions about language (Leonard, 2017). It enhances legal analysis by strictly applying scientifically accepted principles of language analysis to legal evidence such as e-mails, text messages, contracts, letters, confessions, and recorded speeches (Shuy, 2006). Forensic linguistics itself is one of the fields of science in linguistic studies that has recently become popular to be developed since its presence is capable of being an expert solution in solving deadlocks or being a guide in determining facts.

There are various types of verbal assaults committed by one person against others. Words with derogatory connotations, curses, words that contribute to injustice (SARA), provocative calls, and others are examples (McMenamin, 2002). Any created text is a reflection of the text maker's propensity, and it is, of course, a way for him to manipulate the interlocutor or the object of the text (Asya, 2013, p. 79). Forensic linguistics is concerned with analyzing a document that is used in a civil or criminal context. According to McMenamin (2002), forensic linguistics is "the scientific study of language as applied to forensic purposes and contexts" (p. 22). Therefore, linguistic implementation research may assist judicial or criminal inquiries. On the same pad, Olson (2008) states forensic linguistics as "the application of linguistic expertise to a specific social environment, especially the legal field" (p. 3). Depending in the legal sense, any spoken or written document, such as a suicide note, law, deposition, handwriting, video, or email scam, can be identified as forensic text.

As Halliday (1957) said that "language is what it is because of what it has to do" (p. 19), functional language theory emerges, providing a viewpoint on meaning-making focused on social experience and in a wide range of diverse and nuanced contexts. This is consistent with forensic linguistics studies in which Coulthard and Johnson (2010) sought to clarify that language analysis for legal meaning answers the question of how language has and is being used, who is using it, how they are writing, where they are speaking, why they are communicating in that way, and what is achieved by that interaction (p. 1).

In order to define and expand the field of forensic linguistics in a legal setting, this research employs linguistics and forensics in the examination of contract texts. From linguistics aspect, the researchers apply the Systemic Functional Linguistics specifically the Theme-Rheme theory by Halliday. This theory provides the systematic way to uncover the language mechanism through its sequential position in a clause. As mostly people do reading the text like focusing on the verb to assume the clause's information, this theme-rheme concept offer the ultimate way in revealing the text meaning especially from the text maker or speaker's intention. We recognize that this is essential to explore the creation of lingual units in the language of the contract text and to interpret the messages found in the contract text more thoroughly. This study analyzes the contract text of Google's user privacy policy agreement with its users. When agreeing to the policies contained in the agreement, it is suspected that Google service users are not thoroughly understood. Not a few users who are ignorant or even do not read at all the contents of the message contained in the terms of the agreement.

## 2. Research Method

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach. In language analysis, a qualitative approach is used because it is more receptive and adaptable to a lot of sharpening the effect together and to the newest trends value (Moleong, 1989). As stated by Neuman, "data are in the form of phrases, sentences, and paragraphs rather than numbers, and it corresponds to qualitative study" (Neuman, 2013, p. 327). This approach explicitly presents the linguistic data collected in the field based on its use. As a result, qualitative researchers are compelled to reliably capture their study subjects' viewpoints and pay particular attention to the details their informants offer, thus researchers will have the right "meaning" of all encountered phenomena (Zaim, 2014). Since the type of study to be conducted has been decided to be a qualitative research design, all aspects of procedures, from methodology to analysis outcome presentation are presented in the form of descriptive analysis. Both analyzed data are transformed into a concise description focusing on the phenomena and its meaning in depth and detail.

Various kinds of data can be collected during observation: field notes made by the researcher, qualitative checklist of different behaviors, video and audio recordings and artifacts like maps, photographs, and organizational charts (Cowie in Heigham and Croker, 2009:169). The researcher starts the data collection stage by deciding the

data that was used as the focus of analysis in accordance with the theory to be applied. Since the researcher's study was a linguistic analysis, the data and the origins of research data will be in the form of language text. Linguistics, as it is called, is the science of language; in a sense, it is one of the concepts that deal with language by using language as its target object (Sudaryanto, 1992, p. 24). Therefore, the writer bases the text analysis on the Theme and Rheme, which are the primary subjects of this analysis. Thus, the text of the Google Privacy Policy agreement serves as the foundation for data to be evaluated in relation to the target object in the form of language. After choosing the text, the writer begins the data collection process. The data in the form of clauses found in the body of the agreement text is then collected. Since the object of the analysis is the actual text of the agreement; this must be emphasized since the aim of this analysis is to analyze the whole structure of the text agreement, so each clause in the contract is the data to be analyzed.

### 3. Results/Findings

To identify how the user's privacy being violated as indicated in the text, the clauses must contain the violation indicator constituent occurred in the system of the text's clause through Systemic Function Linguistics by Halliday. A text can be said to have violated-constituents if they fulfill the characteristics of violation, which according to Green (2001) language is deemed violating if it contains representation such as lying, misleading, and falsely denying. He argued that "Lying involves asserting what one believes is literally false. When A lies to B, A gets B to place his faith in him, and then breaches that faith. Merely misleading, by contrast, involves a quite different dynamic. When A merely misleads B, A invites B to believe something that is false by saying something that is either true or has no truth value. Any mistaken belief that B may draw from A's misleading statement is, at least in part, B's responsibility, and (other things being equal) A should be regarded as less fully culpable than if she had lied" (Green, 2001, p.159-160).

"Mobile apps collect, manage, and transmit some of the most sensitive information that exists about users—including private communications, fine-grained location, and even health measurements" (Andow & Mahmud, 2019, p. 1). This quotation is a conclusion based on Andow et al's study on internet-based services, particularly application-based devices. Based on these facts, additional study into how to determine whether a service is doing this may be traced back to the early phases of the service being utilized; one of which is analyzing the text of the privacy policy text agreement.

According to the staging of the analysis sequences, it previously concentrated on giving an explanation to the identifying the process of developing the construction of Theme and Rheme on the clauses of Google's Privacy Policy Text. Then a qualitative description is made to reveal and explain the violations committed by Google to its users' privacy as suggested by its text agreement by examining it with a Theme and Rheme perspective. By applying the Theme-Rheme theory in Systemic Functional Linguistics, the analysis of clauses containing violation can be traced

through the linguistic elements in the text body of Google's User Privacy Policy, including an analysis of the builder's structure with obligatory and non-obligatory constituents. In the process of analyzing the constituents of this texts privacy policy's clause, the chosen clauses with violation indicated constituent are examined selectively. Further stages in the analysis may be taken based on the results acquired in table of clause analysis, where each constituent label of each clause data is tagged. The suspected clauses of indicating violations are then evaluated at the SFL theorem based on the semantic content of their linguistic constituent units.

### 3.1. The Operation of Obligatory and Non-Obligatory Constituent

There is a study in linguistics that focuses on clause building units, and a clause is considered to be full if it includes complete building elements. The building components in question are linguistic units in the form of words that occupy positions in syntax based its categories. Baurer (2007) stated that "Syntax is concerned with the ways in which words can be organized into sentences and the ways in which sentences are understood". One of the fields of study of syntax is analyzing clauses and sentences. A clause refers to a unit of grammatical organization smaller than the sentence, but larger than phrases, words or morphemes (Crystal, 2008). A clause is considered to be full if it has at least two obligatory constituents, namely the subject and predicate, and a sentence is said to be complete if its structure consists of obligatory constituents such as subject, predicate and object.

The data in the Google Privacy Policy text below meets the criteria for the linguistic unit in issue based on the basic definitions of syntax and its relationship to clauses. The text's terms of agreement are words that Google service consumers must agree with before using it. According to the SFL Theme-Rheme perspective, the contents of the agreement are then its builder constituents which will be sorted based on their function in the sentence. However, there are certain basic issues that users should be aware of before signing to the agreement, such as the security of their personal data and information, which may be easily accessible by the service owner, as mentioned in the agreement. The terms of the agreement contain indications of a request to access and control users' personal data and information which can be traced in its text.

Datum 1-2.

"When you use our services, you're trusting us with your information."

<b>Datum C.1</b>	When you use our services, you are trusting us with your information					
When	you	use	our services	you are	trusting	us with your information
WH/Adj	Sub ject	Finite	Comple ment	Subject +Finite	Predicator	Complement
T1	T2	Rheme				
Theme						

“We understand this is a big responsibility and work hard to protect your information and put you in control.”

<b>Datum C.2</b>		We understand this is a big responsibility and work hard to protect your information and put you in control					
We	understand	This	is	a big responsibility and work hard	to protect your information	And (*ellipsis of we)	put you in control.
Subject	Finite	Deictic: Det.	Predicator: Exist	Det: Nominal phrase: Existent	Complement: Circ.	Conjunction: additive	Complement: Circ.
The me	Rheme						

In truth, this is a rather simple stage. The simple thing to perform at the stage of analyzing the violation included in Google's privacy policy's text clause is to interpret every word in the text in order to construct a unified overall meaning in the clause. According to the SFL, the acquired meaning takes the form of tagging-meaning, which is linked to the language unit depending on its location in the clause, for example a verb if in a stand-alone linguistic unit the meaning is about stating or doing something or an action. A verb "use" and "understand" which are quoted from datums 1 and 2 above have their meanings translated in the dictionary where use means 'to do something with a machine, a method, an object, etc. for a particular purpose' and "understand" means 'to know or realize the meaning of words, a language, what somebody says, etc.' (Oxford Learner's Dictionary). The two meanings possessed by the two verbs only represent what is represented by the two words. The two meanings of the two verbs simply describe what the two words indicate. If a verb is operated into a clause, say by occupying one of the clause structure's obligatory slots, one of which works as a finite, then the meaning of "use" and "understand" will grow in tandem with the existence of additional constituents that take positions before and after the verb. As previously stated finite serves as a barrier between what the subject performs and the object or simply offers an explanation of the scope of activities carried out by the subject in the clause.

The Theme-Rheme theorem had been applied to analyze the meaning of the structure of the first clause; the constituent labels in the grammatical function system were previously known in the previous chapter data 1-2. Whereas the datum 1 element consists of the Theme "When you," which in the grammatical category bears the place of the subject. The fact that the subject of the clause datum 1 is begun with a WH/Adj indicates that the current topic suggests specific circumstances, which are underlined by the word "When," implying that the verbs in the sentence would behave in accordance with the explanation provided by the Theme. As a result of the datum 1's clause, the subject "you" will be able to perform something connected to

"our services," namely product services provided by Google. However, in addition to the usage of services by "you," Google states in the text contained in the embedded clause a reciprocal action, namely "you are trusting us with your information". "Complex sentences often involve embedded clauses that separate the important parts of a sentence and require mental reconstruction by the listener" (Blackwell, 2016, p. 62). In the clause of datum 1 structure, this embedded clause is in a complement position. The embedded clause at this complement place verifies Google's request to monitor user information represented by "you." Because of the word "When" occurred in the Theme clause structure, the form of monitoring of that information begins to take effect "when", since or when "you" agrees and starts using all services owned and related to Google.

Furthermore, the clause of datum 2 has a Theme that is realized by the word "We," which in this case is a textual representation of Google. "We" is a meaningful Theme that is the major emphasis of the intent that is centered on this clause. The other builder constituents, both obligatory and non-obligatory, will then describe the entire meaning of what "We" aim to achieve in greater detail. The constituents that follow the subject are the obligatory finite "understand" and the obligatory complement, which are completely expressed in the clause level by "this is a big responsibility and work hard to protect your information and put you in control." It can be interpreted that datum 2 implies that Google "we" wants to emphasize to its users that he understands his duties and responsibilities as a "undergoer" of the actions referred to in the complement of datum 1 "trusting", and states that he wants to give confidence to users that Google remains as a second party who does not have full control over the collected and managed information. This is implied by the non-obligatory constituent in the clause labeled with Circ. "to protect your information," Conjunction:additive "and," and complement: Circ. "put you in control." Google claims in this statement that it ensures the security of its users' information and provides them the authority to control it.

The two clauses in datum 1-2 constitute the first section of the agreement that will tie the user to Google. At first glance, it appears that Google affirms the security of a coalition with it, but the scope and details connected to binding matters are concealed in the subsequent statements, which are becoming increasingly diverse. This variance will be visible in the next analyses. The following datums are taken selectively based on the implication in the clause that has complete meaning which indicates a violation committed by Google. As previously explained in the analysis of datum 1-2, Google implies two things in its statement about Google's intentions. The first is Google states that it has the right to obtain user information, and the second is that Google wishes to provide the best service as possible by managing the information provided by the user to Google.

From an independent survey conducted, it is known that statistical data contains various responses related to user activity in reading Google's privacy policy. One of the results obtained from the survey stated that of the 88 respondents surveyed there were about 12 people or about 13% of the respondents who stated that they only

read the title or a small part of the agreement. One of the questions in the survey also looked at the parameters of users who only read the title. This means that the possibility of the user will only touch 1-2 statements contained in the agreement. This corroborates the findings that users will assume what Google means is comprehensively summed up by the title to the second clause.

While the fact is that in the text of the agreement there are further statement items that are not related to Google's goal stated in the opening clause, as well as things that say what scope will be taken and managed by Google, which is just managing and maintaining at the beginning. The opening becomes contradictory with the stated points in the next section of the text. The issue referred to (contradictory facts and informations) is further detailed in numerous clauses chosen as an analysis of clause data indicating a violation.

Datum 11-12

“We want you to understand the types of information we collect as you use our services”

<b>Datum C.11</b>		We want you to understand the types of information we collect as you use our services	
We	want	you	to understand the types of information we collect as you use our services
Subject	Finite	Complement	Complement: Circ
Theme	Rheme		

“We collect information to provide better services to all our users from figuring out basic stuff like which language you speak, to more complex things like which ads you’ll find most useful, the people who matter most to you online, or which YouTube videos you might like”

<b>Datum C.12</b>		We collect information to provide better services to all our users from figuring out basic stuff like which language you speak, to more complex things like which ads you’ll find most useful, the people who matter most to you online, or which YouTube videos you might like		
We	collect	information	to provide better services to all our users from figuring out basic stuff like which language you speak, to more complex things like which ads you’ll find most useful, the people who matter most to you online,	or which YouTube videos you might like

Subject	Finite	Complement	Complement: Circ.	Alternative
Theme	Rheme			

In the perspective of the law, a violation is an act that enters the context of a crime. This viewpoint is consistent with Sawirman, Hadi, & Yusdi (2014) that expressed in his book "Linguistik Forensik" p. 86, which states that "aspects of losses incurred are main variables that can be developed and directed to various forms of action, plus with the indicator of awareness, then this has met the requirements of the crime regardless of the medium." The action stated in the clause of datum C.11 "We want you to understand the types of information we collect as you use our services" bears an element of intended violation, assumed from the quotation. The statement in the datum 11 sends a signal to users to guide them to Google's "goodness," to introduce its wishes, which are indicated by the obligatory finite "want" after the obligatory subject "We," in order to help the user to "understand" what Google is collecting. This conclusion can be construed in context of circumstance datum 11's non-obligatory constituent, which is realized in "the types of information we collect as you use our services". We can see that there is an element of ambiguity in the information provided by Google in this constituent. The word "types" is used with an indefinite plural, implying that the types Google refers to have no bounds (as for the extent to which only Google can decide the reason, as Google underlines with the word "as you use our services"). If there are variables in the agreement statement that are unclear or whose scope is undefined, this can be classified as a violation since this inevitably must be accepted by the user.

As explained by Sawirman, Hadi, and Yusdi, in terms of the scale of the occurrence of a violation, the obfuscation of information in the agreement items has met the conditions for the crime in question. In actuality, Google emphasizes that when users use their services, they explicitly "request" the authority to access. This is indicated in clause of datum 12 by the obligatory constituent subject "We" with the obligatory finite realized in a verb "collect" and the obligatory complement realized in noun "information." The word "collect" in this clause means "to bring things together from different people or places" referred to the English dictionary. In this example, Google did not describe the constraints that Google anticipated in requesting the access space in any specificity or certainty. This can be interpreted through the meaning represented by the exemplificatory constituents in the form of "like" in clause of datum C.12 "We collect information to provide better services to all our users from figuring out basic stuff like which language you speak, to more complex things like which ads you'll find most useful, the people who matter most to you online, or which YouTube videos you might like". This exemplificatory operation emphasizes the range of information that Google intends to collect in relation with clause's actions. The non-obligatory exemplificatory constituent, on the other hand, provide an expansion of the explanation by supplying examples, with the connotation that there are other things intended beyond the examples presented. This means that Google gives users an example of what information is gathered, but it also

indicates that Google collects information beyond the instances set forth in the agreement.

Datum 16

“When you’re signed in, we also collect information that we store with your Google Account, which we treat as personal information.”

<b>Datum C.16</b>	When you’re signed in, we also collect information that we store with your Google Account, which we treat as personal information.				
When you are signed in	we	Also	Collect	information that we store with your google account,	which we treat as personal information
WH/Adj.	Subject	Expansion	Predicator	Complement: Circ.	Complement: Expository
T1	T2	Rheme			
Theme					

The other clause representing the violation conducted by Google to its user’s privacy reflected on datum 16. The clause builder's constituent variables contain information about the clause's violations. Datum 16 is made up of both obligatory and non-obligatory constituents. Datum 16 is a Marked Theme with multiple-Themed clause. If a clause includes a multiple Theme of Marked Theme, it signifies that the clause's major emphasis of meaning begins with the clause's earliest constituents before the subject. The Theme is in charge of the flow of information in the clause. Furthermore, Rheme is concerned with the growth of the breadth of action information suggested by the Theme. The constituents created the two portions of the clause's Theme, including the obligatory subject, which was realized by "When you are signed in, we." These constituents indicate that Google, as represented by "We", will conduct actions that are realized by the obligatory finite verb "collect," but that expansion will occupy the position immediately realized by "also" before finite operates. The presence of the word "also" denotes a broadening of Google's intended activity. When the "you" user is "signed in," it can be deduced that Google will "collect" even more information. The non-obligatory constituent at the end of the clause "that we store with your Google Account, which we treat as personal information" gives additional meaning about the information referred to by "also". The more private information has become easily accessible and infinitely shareable and transferable, the more monitoring may extent to private spaces, activities, and time (Gritzalis, Kandias, Stavrou, & Mitrou, 2014, p. 18). The information gathered by the Google system will subsequently be saved on the user's account's media.

Google will then have ownership over this information as well. This includes an invasion of confidentiality in which Google will record and collect all of the activity that users conduct on their accounts.

Datum 17

“When you create a Google Account, you provide us with personal information that includes your name and a password.”

<b>Datum C.17</b>	When you create a Google Account, you provide us with personal information that includes your name and a password.			
When	you	Create	a Google Account	you provide us with personal information that includes your name and a password
WH/Adj.	Subject	Finite	Complement	Complement: Circ.
T1	T2	Rheme		
Theme				

The information given in the non-obligatory constituents of datum 16 is then described in further depth by Google in the next clause, which is represented by datum 17. Google outlines the criteria associated with "signed in"; that "signing in" may only be done once the user has registered and created an account in order to use the services provided by Google. This statement indicates that when a user registers a Google account, the user will supply Google with personal information including a name and password. The information is realized by means of finite's obligatory constituents, which are realized by the "provide." The Oxford Learner's Dictionary defines provide as "to give something to somebody or make it available for them to use". Google explains what information may be gathered from users once more. Google has underlined the "collect" and "use" actions carried out numerous times in the sequence of the clauses from the beginning to datum 17. This suggests that Google has a lot of requests to users in terms of how they use existing services. If Google follows through on its promise at the outset of the agreement that it would not compromise the confidentiality of user data, then this agreement will only be fulfilled until datum 3.

When the Theme in datum 17 with datum 18 is examined more closely, there is a coherence deviation, which means that the focus of the flow of information conveyed should be the same, but here it is indicated that Google wants to concurrently provide personal information referred to in datum 17 with datum 18, including the phone number and payment information.

Datum 18

“You can also choose to add a phone number or payment information to your account.”

<b>Datum C.18</b>		You can also choose to add a phone number or payment information to your account.		
You	Can	also	choose	to add a phone number or payment information to your account.
Subject	Modal Finite	Expansion	Predicator	Complement: Circ.
Theme	Rheme			

Data such as the Theme of the clause is realized by the obligatory "You" where after the subject is immediately followed by a modality that is realized by "can" as an outcome of the constituent composition breakdown that creates the clause structure in datum 18. The "can" modality serves as a probability signal in his sentence. Google allows users to add more information about their personal identification. Specifically, "phone number or payment information to your account." In this clause, Google utilizes a sort of persuasion strategy to get users to attach additional personal information. Google intentionally includes a clause with the subject "You" so that users know they are the first to act. However, Google adds a non-obligatory expansion component "also" between capital and the predicator "choose" in the agreement's text. The use of expansion is not meaningless; in this way, Google appears to provide users with a plethora of options for determining their attitude toward Google services. However, this is where Google's deception tactic against its users comes into play, because the expansion in the clause makes no direct reference to datum 17 or the prior datum.

Datum 20-21

"We also collect the content you create, upload, or receive from others when using our services."

<b>Datum C.20</b>		We also collect the content you create, upload, or receive from others when using our services.		
We	also	collect	the content you create, upload, or receive	from others when using our services.
Subject	Expansion	Predicator	Complement	Circumstance
Theme				

"This includes things like email you write and receive, photos and videos you save, docs and spreadsheets you create, and comments you make on YouTube videos"

<b>Datum C.21</b>	This includes things like email you write and receive, photos and videos you save, docs and spreadsheets you create, and comments you make on YouTube videos			
This	includes	things	like email you write and receive, photos and videos you save, docs and spreadsheets you create, and comments you make on YouTube videos.	
Deictic: Det. Subject	Finite	Complement	Complement: exemplificatory	
Theme	Rheme			

Related to the occurrences of Theme-Rheme table in Chapter IV, "We" is the most often appearing element in the Theme part of Google's privacy agreement's single-Themed clause. It is reasonable to assume that Google is the top priority in this agreement. This indicates that Google will become the most powerful player in carrying out the actions outlined in the text. Datum 20-21 also has a Theme with obligatory constituents realized by "We." In this datum, "We" is joined by many other constituents, including the non-obligatory constituent in the form of expansion "also," the predicator "collect," and the obligatory constituent "the content you create We may assume from this obligatory structure that Google is once again attempting to signal that they want to "collect" content created, uploaded, and accepted by users. Google states in the complement position that it will collect not only content created by users, but also content uploaded by users and content received by users from other users. By placing many verbs in a non-obligatory position, Google's wide scope of power over user data is plainly highlighted.

Datum 22-23

"We collect information about the apps, browsers, and devices you use to access Google services, which helps us provide features like automatic product updates and dimming your screen if your battery runs low"

<b>Datum C.22</b>	We collect information about the apps, browsers, and devices you use to access Google services, which helps us provide features like automatic product updates and dimming your screen if your battery runs low			
We	collect	information	about the apps, browsers, and devices you use to access Google services,	which helps us provide features like automatic product updates and dimming your screen if your battery runs low.
Subject	Finite	Complement	Complement:	Expository

			Circ.	
Theme	Rheme			

“The information we collect includes unique identifiers, browser type and settings, device type and settings, operating system, mobile network information including carrier name and phone number, and application version number”

<b>Datum</b> <b>C.23</b>	The information we collect includes unique identifiers, browser type and settings, device type and settings, operating system, mobile network information including carrier name and phone number, and application version number			
The information	we	collect	includes	unique identifiers, browser type and settings, device type and settings, operating system, mobile network information including carrier name and phone number, and application version number.
Adj.	Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
T1	T2	Rheme		
Theme				

Google is increasing the emphasis in the text of the agreement on the widening of access rights to the security of users' personal data. In the preceding analysis, Google has explicitly stated in this agreement that they will collect information owned by users when activating this Google service; the information gathered also includes personal identification information such as phone numbers, user names, passwords and information to payment transactions used by user.

Continuing on from datum 22-23, the scope of the access permissions sought by Google covers the user's actions, including the applications used by the user. More completely, it may be understood in clause 22, where this sentence is formed by several constituents, including the Theme realized by "We," implying that Google is the actor in this clause. Following the subject is the obligatory finite constituent, which is re-realized by the "collect," and the constituent that builds the Rheme of this clause is an obligatory constituent "information." Then the conclusion that can be taken from these three elements is the same as the previous analysis of where Google conducts information collecting operations.

Furthermore, Google acknowledges in its statement that the information gathered at this time differs from that indicated in the preceding sections. The intentional distinction is abided in the non-obligatory constituents that follow complement. This constituent is realized by circumstance in the form “about the apps, browsers, and devices you use to access Google services,” and the additional expository constituent, which “helps us provide features like automatic product

updates and dimming your screen if your battery runs low.” Google specifies what extra information it plans to gather in the first non-obligatory constituent. Meanwhile, Google provided the reasons for collecting such information in the following non-obligatory constituents. Google gathers data related to the apps, browsers, and devices that users use while using Google services so that Google may synchronize service updates and assist users in using services efficiently by synchronizing information about the devices used, such as minimizing data collection, and reducing battery power consumption. Furthermore, at datum 23, Google released another statement signaling a further expansion of user data gathering. Datum 23 takes the form of a clause that states "The information we collect includes unique identifiers, browser type and settings, device type and settings, operating system, mobile network information including carrier name and phone number, and application version number."

This datum 23's clause is an explanatory and affirmative clause for the information in datum 22. The Theme for datum 23 is made up of several marked Themes. The noun phrase "the information we" is its component constituent. We can easily understand what the focus is about to be conveyed from this type of Theme. The "information" is the information that Google want to emphasize in this clause. This Theme is a follow-up reference to the constituents of complement datum 22. The breadth of information to be carried out by Google can be evaluated by the obligatory finite constituents realized by "includes". As referred to the Oxford Learner's Dictionary, the word "includes" means "to make somebody/something a part of something." Due to the large amount of information requested by Google for its access rights, it exposes more and more user information to Google. Not to mention, Google indicated at the start of the agreement that, in addition to "gathering" user information, Google has the right to manage and distribute the information it gets to related parties that Google believes are necessary to disseminate it. This is mentioned by Google in the agreement item represented by clause datum 4 where Google services are also integrated with third parties as shown in the bold phrase "We create a range of services that enable millions of people every day discover and connect with the world in innovative ways." Google applications, sites, and gadgets such as Search, YouTube, and Google Home Platforms such as the Chrome e browser and Android operating system Products that are integrated into third-party apps and sites, like ads and embedded Google Maps."

Some of the data used as a guide for analyzing violations committed by Google against its users via statements contained in its Privacy Policy text can be concluded that Google clearly states that every user who will use Google services will comply with the instructions, orders, and requirements set by Google. As with most agreements, at least two parties will be involved. In terms of legal administration, this Google privacy policy agreement is a bit distinctive. When both parties cannot be confronted at the moment of signing the agreement, this is well termed as the one-sided approval agreement. One of the disadvantages of this sort of agreement is that it places one of the parties in the most vulnerable position. One of

the weaknesses that one of the parties may encounter is that if the components of the agreement are changed, the party who agreed is obligated to accept the change without having the ability to argue or disagree.

The second flaw that most users have is a lack of thoroughness and a sense of laziness in reading and comprehending the contents of each item in the agreement statement. The ordinary reader, faced with an unknown or confusing term, does not go immediately to a dictionary, but tries to find out the meaning from the context. Given that 'impairment' was not specifically defined and that the examples helpfully provided in later parts of the question suggest a meaning of 'major physical problem', the examples are at best unhelpful, if not downright misleading, when one is made aware of the meaning the insurance company according to the word was intended to have. (Coulthard, Johnson, & Wright, 2017, p. 117). A survey from an online study of Google service customers, over 60% of respondents (who simply read the title, read a brief section, and read randomly) did not completely read and comprehend the contents of the established agreement. This is extremely risky, given that the terms of each item of the agreement suggest "coercion" on management and access rights, as well as the right to disclose information provided to Google. Not only does it give a long text that, psychologically, will cause every user to "surrender" to the contents of the agreement because they are too sluggish to read, yet clause structures with odd terminology or deceptive claims are also included.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Overall, based on the results of the clause analysis of the Google Privacy Policy text in the framework of Halliday's Theme-Rheme SFL theory and its application in forensic linguistic investigations, it is possible to conclude that Google's strategy in developing the privacy policy text contains elements of coercion that lead to violations of the majority of users' privacy domains. The modifications in the clause construction related to this are (1) Google applies the majority of unmarked Theme forms with a single constituent as the clause builder constituent with "We" as the realization (2) In Rheme construction, Google uses the verbs "collect" and "use" as the majority of the clause's finite/predicator. When a user agrees to the agreement, these two verbs offer explicit instructions on the activities Google will take regarding the privacy of its users. (3) In the non-obligatory construction section, the dominant constituents that occur in the agreement's text are exemplificatory and circumstance. This forensic linguistic research is conducted by referring to Halliday's theory of the Theme-Rheme system and is only limited to Google Privacy Policy text. There are some suggestions that the researcher proposed to the other future researchers who are interested to conduct forensic linguistic research as well.

1. Forensic linguistic research can be conducted by using Systemic Functional Linguistic theory, especially the clause's Theme-Rheme analysis.

2. Other researchers are suggested to decide the other Systemic Functional Linguistic theory that is suitable to analyze other policy or agreement text other than

as already applied in this Thesis.

3. Forensic specialists and law enforcement are suggested to collect comprehensive information regarding the data.

## REFERENCES

- Andow, B., & Mahmud, S. Y. (2019). PolicyLint: Investigating Internal Privacy Policy Contradictions on Google Play. *Proceedings of the 28th USENIX Security Symposium*, 585-602.
- Asya, A. (2013). Linguistic Manipulation: Definition and Types. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, 78-82.
- Auer, P., & Schmidt, J. E. (2010). *Language and Space. An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation. Theories and Method*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- Blackwell, W. (2016). *Communication in Investigative and Legal Context Integrated Approaches from Forensic Psychology, Linguistics and Law Enforcement*. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2017). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence*. New York: Routledge.
- Cowie, N. J. (2009). Observation. In J. Heigham, & R. Croker, *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 165-181). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Dictionary, O. O. (n.d.). *Oxford Learner's Dictionary*. Retrieved July 25, 2021, from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/understand?q=understand>
- Green, S. P. (2001). Lying, Misleading and Falsely Denying. *Hasting Law Journal*, 158-210.
- Gritzalis, D., Kandias, M., Stavrou, V., & Mitrou, L. (2014). *History of Information: The case of Privacy and Security in Social Media*. INFOHIST Legal Publications, 1-25.
- Halliday, M. A. (1957). *Some Aspects of Systematic Description and Comparison in Grammatical Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Hodder Headline Group.
- Leonard, R. A. (2017). Forensic Linguistics Applying The Scientific Principles of Language Analysis to Issues of The Law. *Hostra Law Review*, 881-897.
- McMenamin, G. R. (2002). *Forensic Linguistics*. New York: CRC Press.
- Moleong, L. J. (1989). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Neuman, W. L. (2013). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Olsson, J. (2008). *Forensic Linguistics*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Lesmana, Sabtra; Sawirman & Usman, Fajri. (2022). Theme-Rheme Analysis in Probing Google's Coercion Trespassing User's Privacy: A Forensic Linguistics Research. *IJOTL-TL* (2022, January), 7(1): 25-42. DOI 10.30957/ijotl.v7i1.691.

---

- Sawirman, Hadi, N., & Yusdi, M. (2014). *Linguistik Forensik Vol 1*. Padang: Pusat Studi Ketahanan Nasional Universitas Andalas.
- Shuy, R. W. (2006). *Linguistics in the Courtroom: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shuy, R. W. (2016). *The Language of Fraud Cases*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silverman, D. (2000). Analyzing talk and text', in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd edn). London: Sage.
- Sudaryanto. (1992). *Metode Linguistik Bagian Pertama ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Zaim, M. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Pendekatan Struktural*. Padang: Sukabina Press.