

Conference Paper

Hate Speech on Social Media: A Pragmatic Approach

Hidayati, Aflina, and Arifuddin

Fakultas Bahasa dan Komunikasi, Universitas Harapan, Medan

ORCID:Hidayati: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3320-1859>**Abstract**

This research is based on people's behavior in communicating on social media, especially Facebook, which is currently developing without boundaries. In expressing their thoughts, a person often does not maintain ethics and provisions in communicating on social media. For personal gain, individuals or groups of people use language for the purpose of humiliating, insulting, degrading and defaming other individuals or groups of society they dislike. This phenomenon is widely known as hate speech. In line with the Pragmatic Approach, referring to the study of language use with its actual usage aspects, the utterances produced by language users have an effect that could influence the listener to grasp the meaning conveyed and take action as a result of the utterance. This study aims to reveal the types of hate speech on social media based on the criteria developed by Austin, and the meaning of hate speech spoken by individuals to other individuals on Facebook social media, using qualitative descriptive methods. The results show that hate speech on social media can be classified based on illocutionary acts developed by Austin, into verdictive, behabitives, and expositive.

Keywords: Pragmatics, social media, illocutionary acts, hate speech

Corresponding Author:

Hidayati

yatihida853@gmail.com

Published: 11 March 2021

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Hidayati, Aflina, and

Arifuddin. This article is

distributed under the terms of

the [Creative Commons](#)[Attribution License](#), which

permits unrestricted use and

redistribution provided that the

original author and source are

credited.

Selection and Peer-review under

the responsibility of the AICLL

Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

At the present time, communication is developing very fast to keep pace with the speed of voice supported by the freedom of individuals to voice thoughts and feelings that sometimes slide indefinitely through social media. We witness individuals or groups of people using language for the purpose of humiliating, insulting, degrading, and slandering other individuals or groups of society that they do not like. This phenomenon is widely known as hate speech. Social media such as *Twitter*, *Facebook*, *Youtube* and others play a very big role in spreading hate speech. This research is motivated by the increasing number of hate speech phenomena occurring in society through social media which, if not controlled, could lead to intolerant, aggressive and hateful behaviors towards others resulting in social conflicts in Indonesian multicultural society, further

OPEN ACCESS

resulting in the occurrence of disintegration in state life. Certain individuals or groups committing acts of hate speech come from various circles, from high-ranking people such as politicians, government officials, community leaders, to common people from various walks of life.

From the various relevant literature reviews there is not yet a single fully accepted definition of what hate speech actually means. An important aspect that needs to be considered in understanding hate speech is that it is not always in the same sense and in the same level of intensity but depends on the level of threatening of hate speech poses to individuals and society. The level of threat from hate speech can appear in loud, medium, and soft forms (Neshkovska & Trajkova, 2017).

The study of hate speech in recent years has attracted the attention of a number of researchers from various fields of science, including linguists, sociologists, philosophers, historians, anthropologists, lawyers and political scientists. The thing that makes these scholars focus on this issue is the fact that humans live in a world that continues to change dynamically then polarized into various different facets of life such as ethnicity, religion, culture, politics, etc., which ultimately makes them vulnerable against hatred which has a very detrimental effect on human life itself.

Hate speech is defined as any speech or utterance offending other parties. More broadly, words or utterances denigrating particular gender, religion, ethnicity, race, and sexual orientation (Neshkovska & Trajkova, 2017). According to the National Human Rights Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (2016), hate speech is any action and effort either directly or indirectly based on hatred against ethnicity, religion, religious sect, beliefs, race, classes, skin color, ethnicity, gender, disability, and sexual orientation inciting individuals and groups to discriminate, violence, loss of life and, or social conflict through various means.

Based on the data from the Indonesian National Police, there are 255 criminal cases of hate speech on social media throughout 2018, and in January-June 2019 period there are 101 cases of hate speech crimes on social media. To anticipate and overcome acts of hate speech so as not to continue to increase, the government of the Republic of Indonesia issued laws and circulars on hate speech through Article 27 paragraph (3) of the ITE Law, article 45 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law, and Circular (SE) Kapolri number SE / 6 / X / 2015.

Percentage of social media use and the average time spent accessing data by social media users all over the world:

From table 1 data, it can be seen that throughout 2018 *Facebook* was the most accessed social media after *Youtube* which was ranked first in terms of the percentage

TABLE 1: Data on the percentage of social media most actively accessed by Indonesian social media users in January 2018

Social Media Forums	Percentage of Users	Chat Application	Percentage of Users
Youtube	43%	Line	33%
Facebook	41%	Bbm	28%
Instagram	38%	Whatsapp	40%
Twitter	27%	Facebook Messenger	24%
Google+	25%	Skype	15%
Linkedin	16%	Wechat	14%

(Indonesian Digital Report, 2019)

level of users. Meanwhile, from table 2, it can be seen that the average time the Indonesians use social media is the highest in the world after Brazil. This opens up great openings for the increasing number of hate speech on social media.

According to Kaplan and Haenlein in Putri (2016), social media is a group of internet-based applications that are built on the basis of Web 2.0 ideology and technology, and enabling the creation and exchange of user-generated content. Meanwhile, social networking is a site where everyone can create a personal web page, then connect with other people to share information and communicate. If traditional media uses print media and broadcast media, then social media uses the internet. Social media invites anyone who is interested to participate by contributing and feedback openly, giving comments, and sharing information in a fast and unlimited time.

The study discusses the relationship between hate speech on social media with speech act theory in a linguistic perspective, especially pragmatics, developed by Austin (1962), and speech acts with hate speech obtained from the *Facebook* page become the source of data for this study parts of the incidents of speech acts related to forms of hate speech on social media pertaining to utterances can influence other people, provoke, become the public spotlight and even cause division simply caused by speeches from these social media users.

In his study of speech acts in Pragmatics, Austin (1962) then classifies illocutionary acts into 5 types, : verdict, exercitive, commissive, behabitive, and expositive.

2. Literature Review

The possession of language, perhaps more than any other attribute, distinguishes humans from animals. To understand our humanity, one must understand the nature of language that makes us human. According to the philosophy expressed in the myths and religions of many peoples, language is the source of human life and power (Fromklin

TABLE 2: Data on average social media users spending their time accessing social media

No	Negara	Durasi Penggunaan
21	Singapore	2 Hours 6 Minutes
22	Taiwan	2 Hours 3 Minutes
23	Hong Kong	2 Hours 1 Minute
24	United States	2 Hours 1 Minute
25	China	2 Hours
26	Sweden	1 Hour 56 Minutes
27	Great Britain	1 Hour 54 Minutes
28	New Zealand	1 Hour 53 Minutes
29	Italy	1 Hour 53 Minutes
30	Canada	1 Hour 48 Minutes
31	Ireland	1 Hour 47 Minutes
32	Poland	1 Hour 42 Minutes
33	Australia	1 Hour 39 Minutes
34	Spain	1 Hour 38 Minutes
35	Belgium	1 Hour 34 Minutes
36	France	1 Hour 22 Minutes
37	Holland	1 Hour 20 Minutes
38	German	1 Hour 13 Minutes
39	South Korea	1 Hour 12 Minutes
40	Japan	48 Minutes
41	Philippines	3 Hours 57 Minutes
42	Brazil	3 Hours 39 Minutes
43	Indonesia	3 Hours 23 Minutes
44	Thailand	3 Hours 10 Minutes
45	Argentina	3 Hours 9 Minutes
46	Egypt	3 Hours 9 Minutes
47	Mexico	3 Hours 7 Minutes
48	Nigeria	3 Hours 2 Minutes
49	Malaysia	3 Jam
50	United Arab Emirates	2 Hours 56 Minutes
51	Ghana	2 Hours 56 Minutes
52	Kenya	2 Hours 54 Minutes
53	Turkey	2 Hours 48 Minutes
54	South Africa	2 Hours 48 Minutes
55	Vietnam	2 Hours 37 Minutes
56	Saudi Arabia	2 Hours 34 Minutes
57	India	2 Hours 26 Minutes
58	Maroko	2 Hours 24 Minutes
59	Russia	2 Hours 19 Minutes
60	Portugal	2 Hours 10 Minutes

TABLE 3: Austin's Classification of Speech (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2014)

Types of Speech Acts	Direction of Fit	S = Speaker X = Situation
Verdictive: judging, diagnosing, calculating, predicting	Words fit the world	S trust X
Exercitives using power, right or influence (ordering, praying for, recommending)	World fit the words	S wishes X
Commissive: committing, promising, swearing	World fits the words	S means X
Behabitives social attitudes and behavior, apologies, thanks, congratulations	Words fit the world	S feels X
Expositive: postulating, defining, agreeing	Words change the world	S causes X

in Wijaya, et.al: 2018). By this it is clear that everyone should use polite language to maintain harmony in social relationship; any form of words or sentences tending to provoke hatred is to be avoided. This is related to the study of speech act.

In the field of Linguistics, one of the focuses of study in Pragmatics is the Speech Act theory, examining language with its actual use aspects. In a speech act developed by John Langshaw Austin in 1962 and also his student Searle in 1969, it is said that in every word situation, the utterances produced by language users have an effect that can influence the listener to perceive the meaning conveyed and take action as a result of the utterance. According to Austin, there are three types of speech acts: locutionary act, illocutionary act and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary act is the act of saying something with a word or sentence according to the conventional meaning and its syntactic rules. Illocutionary acts are speech acts that contain intent, relating to who is speaking, to whom, when and where the speech act is performed. Perlocutionary acts are speech acts whose utterance is intended to influence the speech partner. Perlocutionary acts occur when the interlocutor does something due to locutionary and illocutionary. Meanwhile, according to Searle, communication is not just a symbol, word, or sentence but it would be more appropriate to call it a product resulting from a symbol, word, or sentence in the form of speech act behavior (Levinson, 2004; Cumming, 2007). Of the three types of speech acts discussed in pragmatics, illocutionary acts are the most dominant part.

Austin distinguishes illocutionary actions into five categories: 1. Verdictive, an illocutionary act which is the delivery of the results of an assessment or decision based on certain reasons or facts. Examples of this action are assessing, diagnosing, calculating, predicting, and so on; 2. Exercitives, the speaker uses power, rights or influence, such as exclusion and resignation; 3. Commissive is the act of the speaker committed to a cause or action, for example promises and stakes; 4. Behabitives is the expression of a speaker's reaction to the attitudes and behavior of people, whether past, present

or future. Examples, are sorry, thank you, congratulations, and others; 5. Expositive is the act of exposition which involves the elaboration of views, executing arguments, and clarifying uses and references. Speakers explain how their utterances fit into the line of reasoning, for example, postulating and defining, agreeing, and so on (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2014).

Meanwhile, Searle in (Rohmadi, 2004; Rangkuti, 2019) classifies speech acts into five types: representative, commissive, directive, declarative, and expressive acts. 1. Representative is a speech act that binds the speaker to the truth of what he says. This type of speech act is also known as assertive speech act. Included in this type of speech act are speeches stating, demanding, confessing, showing, reporting, giving testimony, mentioning, speculating. It is the responsibility of the speaker that the utterances spoken are indeed facts and can be proven; 2. Commissive is a speech act that binds the speaker to carry out all the things stated in his utterance, for example swearing, promising, threatening, declaring commitment, making vows. Those utterances bind the speakers to carry out the mandate as well as possible; 3. A directive is a speech act intended by the speaker so that the speech partner takes action according to what is stated in the speech. A directive speech act is also called an impositive speech act. Included in this type of speech acts are asking, inviting, compelling, suggesting, urging, ordering, collecting, urging, pleading, challenging, giving cues; 4. Declarative is a speech act intended by the speaker to create new things (status, circumstances, etc.). Included in this type of speech is speech with the intention of impressing, deciding, canceling, prohibiting, granting, permitting, classifying, lifting, forgiving; 5. Expressive is a speech act which is meant by the speaker so that the speech is interpreted as an evaluation of the things mentioned in the speech, including utterances of gratitude, complaining, congratulations, flattering, praising, blaming, and criticizing.

In speech act theory, there is also a discussion about the direction of fit of a produced speech act. Saying or expressing an utterance, does not always attend to the direction of someone's speech when the person concerned gives a statement, prediction and an order. Every time someone expresses an utterance, his speech will adjust to the situation. When a person expresses an utterance in the form of a statement, it can be said that he has a word-to-world direction. In other words he adapts words to circumstances. Meanwhile, when a person expresses a speech in the form of a command, the direction of its suitability is world-to-word, that is, he adjusts the situation to his words. However, there are times when an utterance has no direction at all, for example when someone says, "Hooray..." (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2014).

3. Research Method

This research is conducted by means of a qualitative descriptive method that focusing on the library research proposed by Haughman (2009) using the Pragmatic approach.

The data source of this research is collected from utterances containing hate speech in the forms of words, phrases, or sentences spoken by *Facebook* social media users, taken randomly from *Facebook* pages with data collection techniques using note-taking and documentation. The data are then classified based on the types of illocutionary acts, such as verdictive, exersitive, commissive, behabitive, and expositive acts

The data collected are further classified based on the references submitted by Sudaryanto (2015). To explain the meaning of hate speech that is expressed by one individual towards another individual as opposed to another, the descriptive method is used to obtain a detailed explanation from the qualitative side. The words and sentences on the *Facebook* social media page are a form of spoken speech written in the comment column as well as personal account status using spoken language that does not need any grammatical elements. Finally, the data are presented in the research results.

4. Result and Discussion

In this section the data in the form of words, phrases, or sentences obtained from data sources, namely the personal accounts of *Facebook* social media users that contain illocutionary acts classified based on illocutionary acts developed by Austin (1962) are presented. These speech acts are utterances expressed by social media users containing hate speech.

In accordance with the explanation above, there are two things presented, 1) classifyng the types of hate speech on *Facebook* social media based on the criteria developed by Austin; 2) Analyzing the meanings of hate speech found in *Facebook* social media accounts.

Data (1) “**Anjirrrr.... Asli ngakak abis..... nemu nih foto sang legendaris kodok betina**” is an act of hate speech from a private account owner working as a housewife expressing illocutionary acts by judging someone with an insulting tone towards a female mayor by likening the mayor to one of the types of animals having no beauty value. The act of illocutionary utterance is **verdictive**: the user of the account delivers the results of an assessment based on facts, which she believes are true. Besides that, the utterance expressed clearly contains hate speech because she likens a human to a kind of animal causing other people to feel humiliated.

TABLE 4: List of hate speech found in Facebook social media accounts.

No	Hate Speech	Illocutionary speech acts
1	<i>"Anjirrrr... Asli ngakak abis..... nemu nih foto sang legendaris kodok betina". (Anjirr is slang word for dog. Totally laughing, finding the legendary photo of the female frog)</i>	Verdictive
2	<i>"Ingat bang @anies baswedan, kita ini keturunan Arab, tahu dirilah! Jangan pernah menghidupkan kembali politik busuk primordialisme kakekmu di bumi NKRI. Jangan pernah jadikan Kantor Gubernur DKI JKT sebagai markas politik intoleran HTI & PKS!" ("Remember @anies baswedan, we are of Arab descent, you know! Don't ever revive your grandfather's rotten primordial politics in the Homeland of the Republic of Indonesia. Don't ever make the DKI JKT Governor's Office the headquarters for the intolerant politics of HTI & PKS!")</i>	Behabitive
3	<i>"Mahfud percaya aja pengakuan 14 orang yang ditangkap ngapus berita.. ha ha, jadi ingat ketololan dia saat kalah polling menuduh polling twitter bisa divote oleh satu akun sekali pencet 20 x sampe ribuan kali. Loe beneran Prof kan pak @mohmahfudmd?" ("Mahfud simply believed the confessions of 14 people, erased the news... ha ha, so remember his stupidity when he lost the polling, accusing Twitter polling of being voted into by one account once pressed 20 times to thousands of times. You're really true, Prof, sir @mohmahfudmd?"</i>	Verdictive
4	<i>"Bahkan CINA CACAT MAU MATI DI KURSI RODA dan PAKAI PEMPERS pun ikut Nyoblos juga. Semua DEMI menguasai NKRI". ("Even a CHINESE, DYING AND DISABLED ON WHEEL CHAIRS and USING PEMPERS also joined the voting. All FOR possessing the Republic of Indonesia")</i>	Verdictive
5	<i>"D ajari dandan donk buuk... Biar cantik dlht. Sperti Aurel Hermansyah dlu kn jlek bngeet kek gak terurus. Tp krn bljr dandan jdi gk malu2 in dfto uuups" (Teach how to groom mam, to be pretty. Like Aurel Hermansyah formerly very ugly, like not taken care of. But owing to learning to groom, not making a shy in photo).</i>	Expositive

Data (2) *"Ingat bang @anies baswedan, kita ini keturunan Arab, tahu dirilah! Jangan pernah menghidupkan kembali politik busuk primordialisme kakekmu di bumi NKRI. Jangan pernah jadikan Kantor Gubernur DKI JKT sebagai markas politik intoleran HTI & PKS!"*, is an illocutionary act of the **behabitive** type conveyed by a person who comes from the common society by showing a reaction to one of the elected governors because he feels that the governor is not acting as he wants. The reaction of the owner of the personal account on social media expresses hate speech because his actions can provoke other people by giving arguments in an incendiary tone that is not necessarily true.

Data (3) *"Mahfud percaya aja pengakuan 14 orang yang ditangkap ngapus berita.. ha ha, jadi ingat ketololan dia sat kalah polling menuduh polling twitter bisa divote oleh satu akun sekali pencet 20 x sampe ribuan kali. Loe beneran Prof kan pak @mohmahfudmd?"*, is an act of **verdictive** illocutionary act containing hate speech by someone from the public against a government official. The owner of the account

expresses illocutionary act by giving a conviction-based judgment on the fact that a Professor cannot misrepresent anything.

Data (4) "**Bahkan CINA CACAT MAU MATI DI KURSI RODA dan PAKAI PEMPERS pun ikut Nyoblos juga. Semua DEMI menguasai NKRI**", this clearly expresses an act of illocutionary containing hate speech. The speaker in this case expresses hatred towards one of the ethnic groups through illocutionary act meaning he has predicted that the ethnic group he mentions will dominate the Republic of Indonesia in the future. The predictions that he convey in the resulting utterances are a type of **verdictive** illocutionary act because in his utterance the speaker has predicted something in the future. In addition, the illocutionary action could provoke others to do the same things, showing hatred towards one of the ethnic descendants.

Data (5) "**D ajari dandan donk buuk... Biar cantik dlht. Sprti Aurel Hermansyah dlu kn jlek bngeet kek gak terurus. Tp krn bljr dandan jdi gk malu2 in dfto uuups**". This utterance is expressed by a user of a private account from among the common society addressed to a public figure he does not like. The act of illocutionary speech expressed is an act of **expositive** type of illocutionary act because in her utterance the speaker describes her views and provides a reference to the personal account she is aiming for because she is sure what she is arguing is in accordance with the reasoning she conveys. The speech act he conveys also clearly contains hate speech because the target party feels offended by the speech.

5. Conclusion

Based on the explanation of the data analysis above, it can be concluded that the hate speech found on *Facebook* social media carried out by personal accounts against other personal accounts are classified into the forms of verdictive, behabitive, and expositive which are expressed by assessing, diagnosing, predicting and reacting to people's attitudes from the negative side. The expressions of illocutionary acts are insulting, inciting, degrading, and provoking based on a sense of antipathy and hatred towards others different circles of society. Hate speeches contained in the five data are classified linguistically into the Pragmatics field based on the classification of Austin illocutionary acts in the form of verdictive, behabitive and expositive.

References

- [1] Haughman, B. (2009). *Research Analysis*. London: Oxford Press.

- [2] Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia. (2015). *Surat Edaran Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor: SE/6/X/2015 tentang Penanganan Ujaran Kebencian (Hate Speech)*. Jakarta: Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia.
- [3] Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia. (2016). *Buku Saku Penanganan Ujaran Kebencian (Hate Speech)*. Jakarta: Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia.
- [4] Levinson, S. C. (2014). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: University Press
- [5] Neshkovska, S. and Trajkpva, Z. (2017). *Essentials of Hate Speech*. IJET Faculty of Education of Bitola. St. Kliment Ohridski University Press. Bulgaria.
- [6] Putri, W. S. R., Nurwati, R. N. and Budiarti, M. (2016). *Pengaruh Media Sosial Terhadap Perilaku Remaja*. Prosiding KS: Riset dan PKM.
- [7] Rangkuti, R., Pratama, A. and Zulfan Z. (2019). Hate Speech Acts: A Case in Batu Bara. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, vol. 3, issue 2. pp: 217-224, December 2019
- [8] Rohmadi, M. (2004). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta: Lingkar Media.
- [9] Sudaryanto, S (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yokyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- [10] Wijaya, L., et al. (2018, April). *Language as Art and Communication Tool*. Presented at 1st Annual International Conference on Language and Literature, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara. Indonesia, Medan: UISU Press.
- [11] Wijaya, L., et al. (2014). *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/speech-acts/#Aca>.
- [12] Data Reportal. (2019). *Frequency of Internet Use*. Indonesia Digital Report. Retrieved from <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2019-indonesia>.