

# Politicians and Celebrities: Propagators of Hate Speech in Indonesia

*Ni Made Ras Amanda Gelgel<sup>a</sup>, Putri Limilia<sup>b</sup>, Lintang Ratri Rahmiaji<sup>c</sup>*

<sup>a</sup>Udayana University, Jl PB Sudirman Denpasar Bali, 80234, Indonesia, [rasamanda13@unud.ac.id](mailto:rasamanda13@unud.ac.id)

<sup>b</sup>Universitas Padjadjaran, Jl Raya Bandung Sumedang, Jatinangor, Jawa Barat, 45363, Indonesia

<sup>c</sup>Diponegoro University, Jl Prof Sudarto, Tembalang, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, 50275, Indonesia

## ABSTRACT

The advancement of technology provides the community with a new means of expression. One of them is social media, which is frequently used to express opinions on topics such as politics, health, and religion. However, the characteristics of social media that allow for equality without a "gatekeeper" result in the frequent misuse of this medium. For instance, a group uses social media to spread false information, propaganda, and other forms of hate speech. Intentionally or unintentionally, the general public frequently engages in hate speech through social media. In fact, these statements frequently result in legal proceedings. Different definitions of hate speech exist, but one definition identifies four characteristics: all forms of communication based on hatred of certain ethnic groups or groups intending to discriminate. Hate speech are one of negative activities happening in social media with or without purpose. This paper describes how hate speech in perspective of Indonesian netizens and to determine how the public views hate speech. The research is conducted by using survey with 846 sample in 13 provinces in Indonesia during September 2021. The result was netizens in Indonesia see that politicians, public figures, and celebrities are often found as propagators of hate speech. According to the study, people perceive humiliation, bullying, discrimination, and defamation as forms of hate speech. Most respondents indicated that hate speech contains harsh language and derogatory terms. In addition, respondents indicated that political and religious topics frequently appear in hate speech. On Instagram and Facebook, hate speech is the most prevalent. Respondents who encountered or experienced hate speech responded in various ways, including remaining silent, blocking accounts, reprimanding politely, notifying authorities, etc. Respondents believed that civil society performed better than the government in combating hate speech. They also agreed that hate speech perpetrators would be prosecuted under the Information and Electronic Transactions Act. With this finding, in political years ahead, Indonesia will heading a serious threat in democracy. [suggestion]

*Keywords: Hate Speech, Indonesia, Propagators, Social Media*

## 1. Introduction

Technology through social media has changed people's mind-set in where to express thoughts and perception. As the activity of social media users increases, the possibility of crimes of spreading hate speech can spread quickly and widely (Patihullah & Winarko, 2019). Hate speech issue in Indonesia, elevated in 2017, during the Jakarta Governor's election (Juditha, 2017). In the election, the hate speech activities aimed shown to pair lie and supporters cannot be avoided (Juditha, 2017). Many netizens also comments containing hateful speech against each candidate pair with words inappropriate, insulting, harassing and painful (Juditha, 2017). Religion often been the topic in hate speech.

It spread widely through social media. Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, and Twitter timelines containing Islamophobic hate speech that had gone viral on social media (Kastolani, 2020). Hate speech is intertwined with free speech, the human rights of individuals, groups, and minorities in particular (Glagiordone, 2014). Cohen-Almagor (as cited in Glagiordone, 2014) defines hate speech as a negative expression with the intent of discrimination, intimidation, rejection, or prejudice against individuals or groups deemed inferior due to differences in ethnicity, religion and belief, race, gender, skin color, or orientation sexual. Consistent with the previous definition, hate speech tends to cause conflict because its content includes incitements to violence, sowing the seeds of hostility between groups, provoking emotions, and psychologically harming victims (Andersson

and Hirsch, 2008). According to the National Human Rights Commission (2015), groups that are vulnerable to hate speech include people with disabilities and groups with different political orientations, with direct statements, campaigns, banners, and social media networks being used to spread hate speech, religious sermons, the media, and pamphlets.

Hate speech can be directed at individuals, typically public figures (Zain, 2022; Sari, 2022), certain social groups, such as women (Sitompul, 2022), online media (Nuraeni et al, 2022), and the government (Nuraeni et al, 2022). Hate speech is frequently associated with the occurrence of violent acts against religious minorities and being used to suppress political opposition. Thus, the demand for government to act decisively against hate speech is getting stronger (Iqbal and Suhadi, 2014). In addition, it was discovered that hate speech targets multiple identities inherent to the victim (Ukhty, 2018). For example, if the target of the hate speech has a series of minority cultural identities, women citizens with disabilities-public figures-religious-minority at the same time, then he or she can get multiple hate speeches.

Furthermore, according to Eriyanto (2011), hate speech is an attempt to marginalize the dominant group in favor of weaker groups. Forms of marginalization, among others, by using: a. Euphemism (refinement of the meaning), is generally used to soften "badness", so that in many ways it can deceive the recipient; b. Dysphemism (language cursing) is used to "badly" something; c. Labeling, that is, the use of words that are offensive to certain individuals, groups, or activities; and d. Stereotype, which is a practice of representation that describes (Eriyanto, 2011: 125-127). Article 28E, paragraph 3, of the Indonesian Constitution of 1945 protects the issue of freedom of expression: "Everyone has the right to freedom of association, assembly, and expression of opinion." However, there are restrictions, particularly if the expression disclosed violates the rights of others, as stated in Article 28 paragraph 2 of the Information and Electronic Transactions Law: "certain individuals and/or community groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroups."

### ***1.1. Hate Speech, New Media, and Public Sphere.***

The public sphere is a forum for the exchange of diverse economic, political, social, and cultural perspectives. Referring to the concept proposed by Habermas (2016), a space devoid of dominance from the government, political groups, corporations, or other interests (Curran, 2000). The public sphere is an important instrument for the realization of democracy, as it enables the public to engage in dialogue, form opinions, and criticize the performance of the government. In the current context, the public sphere is (supposed to be) more manifest due to social media, which gives all users an equal opportunity to speak. However, freedom of expression is interpreted as limitless freedom, so it does not reflect ethical communication practices. In essence, communicative actions bind humans, and social change is a process of ethical-practical learning through communication. Referring to Habermas' concept of

communicative action, communicative action is an action whose primary objective is to achieve comprehension and harmony among all communicating parties (Habermas, 2006). A communicative act is considered valid if it satisfies the four validity claims of truth, accuracy, honesty, and comprehensiveness.

In the discussion of hate speech, it can be concluded that according to Habermas, hate speech is not an act of communication in the public sphere. More so because hate speech does not satisfy the four claims of validity presented, namely accuracy, honesty, truthfulness, and exhaustiveness. This is evidenced by the findings of Putra's research (2021) on the hate speech produced by Nikita Mirzani and Habib Rizieq in the relevant social media space, where none of the claims are true, thereby failing to achieve what is necessary for achieving communicative rational actions and comprehension (consensus).

### ***1.2 Hate Speech and Hoax***

Hate speech can take the form of assertive, directive, expressive, and commiserating speech, according to a pragmatic viewpoint. These four have conceptual and contextual significance (Zain, 2022). Hate speech is also categorized as an illocutionary act, which is a speech act with a purpose from the speaker or message maker. This means that the speaker consciously produces speech in order to convey specific information, so it is not a spontaneous or unplanned utterance. This is supported by research on hate speech by Facebook users from January to February 2022 (Pratama, 2022), which uncovered illocutionary expressions of hate speech intended to incite, defame, spread fake news, and blaspheme.

In addition to propagating disinformation, hate speech cloaked in falsehoods also shows the seeds of conflict. Political hoaxes contain the most provocations related to ethnicity, religion, race, and group; they are responsible for the emergence of spin hate from political figures' statements (Nursahid, 2019). Hate spin is an attempt by instigators of hatred to create nonexistent hate messages. Cherian George (2017), a professor of media studies at the University of Hong Kong, introduced this concept. In the three largest democracies in the world, the United States, India, and Indonesia, inciting hatred was once a political strategy. Based on data from the Indonesian Anti-Defamation Society (Mafindo), the number of hoaxes spread in Indonesia in 2019 reached 1,221 hoaxes, in 2020 it rose to 2,298 hoaxes, and from January to June 2022, 985 cases were detected, with an average of 164 cases per month reported. The average number of reported cases is close to the total number of cases in 2021 despite the passage of less than a year. The political theme is the most prevalent, and it is anticipated that the number will increase as Indonesia enters the election year of 2024. Therefore, this paper's research questions are how hate speech in perspective of Indonesian netizens? and how the public determine hate speech? The problem will be discussed by using theory of public sphere, new media and two step flow communication.

2. **Methodology**

A survey was employed in this research in order to gain data from 13 provinces in Indonesia. Eight hundred forty-six respondents participated in this research. The respondents were chosen based on quota sampling, considering age proportionality. The survey conducted in September 2021.

This research descriptively examined hate speech by measuring hate speech’s definition, experience, forms, topic, perpetrators, and victim. Hate speech experience was measured by asking the respondents questions as response options, such as “whether they have ever found/seen/heard hate speech” and “where they frequently found hate speech.” Moreover, the variable of hate speech form was measured by asking respondents questions regarding modes of hate speech that are often seen or found on social media. However, open-ended questions were used for measuring hate speech topics. Some of the question being asked in the questionnaire are:

- a. do you ever see a hate speech in social media?
- b. where do you see/hear/find hate speech in social media?
- c. do you think, in hate speech it includes incitement, rant, nickname, stigma, and misinformation?
- d. in what form do you see/hear/find hate speech in social media?
- e. What kind of topics of hate speech do you find in hate speech in social media?
- f. Base on your experienced, who do you find the propagators of hate speech?

The research also examined public perception about who commits to hate speech. In order to discover public perception, this research inquires the respondent with multiple answers about what kind of profession is frequently found to disseminate hate speech. Furthermore, the respondents were questioned about the current programs for handling hate speeches. Data was collected by distributing online questionnaires, which have been tested using a reliability test. The questionnaire being asked through telephone to the selected respondents. The respondents were chosen based on quota sampling, considering age proportionality in 13 provinces selected. The data was analyzed by utilizing descriptive statistics.

3. **Results and Discussion**

3.1. **Respondents’ Profile**

About 33.8% of this study’s respondents were between the ages of 17 and 24. With a percentage of 28.5%, respondents between the ages of 25 and 40 (the millennial generation) occupy the second position. Next, respondents aged 41 to 56 (generation X) made up 23.4% of the sample. 13.5 percent of respondents are between the ages of 57 and 60 (the baby boomer generation), the age group with the least representation. In addition, the last level of education attained by respondents in this study was dominated by high

school graduates (SMA)/equivalent, with equal proportions of men and women.

This study describes how respondents perceive the content of hate speech, including whether it contains incitement, harsh language, slurs, stigmas/stereotypes, and misinformation. The following table depicts the distribution of respondents based on their perceptions of the content of hate speech.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents’ Perception Regarding Hate Speech Content

	Yes	No	Uncertain
Incitement	68.6%	8.3%	23.2%
Harsh Words	73.5%	6.7%	19.7%
Nickname	77.2%	6.4%	16.2%
Stigma/Stereotypes	54.6%	12.1%	33.3%
Wrong Information	50.4%	14.1%	35.6%

The graph shows that most respondents think that hate speech content contains derogatory nicknames or designations (77.2%), contains harsh words (73.5%), contains incitement (68.6%), contains stigma/stereotypes (54.6%), and contains information wrong (50.4%). Meanwhile, some respondents also seemed unsure whether hate speech contained false information (35.6%) or stigma/stereotypes (33.3%). This shows that most people perceive hate speech content to contain derogatory nicknames or designations, which is 77.2% and only 50.4% of people perceive hate speech content to contain false information.

3.2. **Hate Speech Experience**

In this study, the experience of hate speech is determined by whether or not respondents have ever found/seen/heard hate speech in the media, including social media, mass media (television and radio), online media (news portals), websites, and online games, and in which media did respondents find/seen/hear the hate speech.

According to the survey, respondents have encountered hate speech on Facebook (54.7%), Instagram (53.9%), YouTube (42.4%), and WhatsApp (40%) respectively. In the meantime, respondents reported rarely encountering hate speech on Telegram (0.4%) and in online games (0.3%). This indicates that the majority of respondents have encountered hate speech on Facebook (54.7%) and Instagram (53.3%). In contrast, only 0.3% of respondents reported encountering hate speech in online games.

Table 2. Where the Respondents Encountered Hate Speech

Where the respondents encountered hate speech	Yes	No
Facebook	54.7%	45.3%
Instagram	53.9%	46.1%
YouTube	42.4%	57.6%
WhatsApp	40.8%	59.2%
News Portal	30.3%	69.7%
TikTok	29.3%	70.7%
Twitter	28.4%	71.6%
Website	14.3%	85.7%
Television	4.6%	95.4%

Radio	3.8%	96.2%
Telegram	0.4%	99.6%
Game Online	0.3%	99.7%

**3.3. Hate Speech Forms**

In this study, the form of hate speech is represented by respondents who have found/seen/heard hate speech in the media, including social media, mass media (television and radio), online media (news portals), websites, and online games, in the following forms: text/narrative, videos, photos, memes, and images. In addition, the topics that respondents frequently encounter in hate speech in the media reveal the form of hate speech, as shown in the table 3 below.

Table 3. Form of Hate Speech

Form of hate speech	Yes	No
Teks/narrative	75.9%	24.1%
Videos	61.8%	38.2%
Photos	50.3%	49.7%
Memes	33.9%	66.1%
Images	30.2%	69.8%

Text/narrative is the most prevalent form of hate speech in the media, accounting for 75.9% according to Graph 4.7. In second place is a video containing 61.8% hate speech messages, which are frequently found in the media. Followed by photos at 50.3%, memes at 33.9%, and photos at 30.2%. This indicates that text/narrative (75.9%) and video (61.8%) are the media formats in which hate speech messages are most commonly found. Images (30.2%) and memes (33.9%) were the two rarest forms of hate speech. Furthermore, graph 4.8 explains the topics that respondents frequently find in hate speech in the media.

**3.4. The Topic for Hate Speech**

The topics most frequently found by respondents in hate speech in the media are politics at 65.6%, religion at 63.7%, ethnicity at 49.1%, and race at 46.0%. Then followed by LGBT topics at 28.7% and disability at 19.7%. Meanwhile, only 2.4% of respondents stated that they often find hate speech topics related to personal relationships, only 1.9% economic status, only 1.8% physical, only 1.5% career, only 1.4% artist, only 0.8% social status, lifestyle only 0.6%, and most recently only 0.5% of respondents stated that they often found the topic of hate speech related to education. This shows that the topic of hate speech that respondents often find in the media is dominated by the topic of politics and ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup.

Table 4. Topic for Hate Speech

Topic	Yes	No
Politic	65.6%	34.4%
Religion	63.7%	36.3%
Ethnicity	49.1%	50.9%

Race	46.0%	54.0%
LGBT	28.7%	71.3%
Disability	19.7%	80.3%
Private Issue	2.4%	97.6%
Economic	1.9%	98.1%
Physical issue	1.8%	98.2%
Career	1.5%	98.5%
Celebrities	1.4%	98.6%
Class	0.8%	99.2%
Life Style	0.6%	99.4%
Education	0.5%	99.5%

**3.5. Hate Speech Propagators**

In this study, the propagators of hate speech are depicted through the experiences of people/characters who frequently engage in hate speech in the media, including social media, mass media (television and radio), online media (news portals), websites, and online games, such as politicians, public officials, artists, religious leaders, public figures, communities, and educators/academics, as depicted in graph 4.9 below. In addition, it can be seen through the opinions of respondents regarding what can be done to those who engage in hate speech in the media, as shown in the table that follows.

Table 5. Hate Speech Propagators

Propagators	Yes	No
Politician	57.8%	42.2%
Celebrities	51.7%	48.3%
Public Figure	47.5%	52.5%
Public Official	33.6%	66.4%
Religious Leaders	30.7%	69.3%
Society	12.8%	87.8%
Academician	8.6%	91.4%

As shown in the table, 57.8% of respondents indicated that politicians are the group most frequently responsible for hate speech in the media. Moreover, 51.7% of respondents believe that artists frequently engage in hate speech. In contrast, the general public (12.8%) and educators/academics (8.6%) are less likely to encounter hate speech in the media. Furthermore, the graph below depicts the opinions of respondents regarding what can be done to those who engage in media-based hate speech.

**3.6 Actions When Dealing with Hate Speech**

In accordance with the graph, respondents believe that those who engage in hate speech in the media should be silenced by 30.8%, blocked by 26.5%, reported by 26.2%, commented on by 19.0%, clarified by 17.6%, and verified by 14.0%. In contrast, only 5.7% shared accounts and 1.3% responded to the actions of people/characters who engaged in media-based hate speech. The data indicates that most respondents do in response to those who engage in hate speech in the media remain silent, while the least they do is seek revenge for the actions of those who engage in hate speech. This section describes respondents who have been victims or perpetrators of hate speech in the media, as depicted in the graph that follows.

Table 6. Actions to Hate Speech

Actions to Hate Speech	Yes	No
Silence/ Do Nothing	30.8%	69.2%
Block the account	26.5%	73.5%
Report the account	26.2%	73.8%
Comment	19.0%	81.0%
Give Clarification	17.6%	82.4%
Verify	14.0%	86.0%
Spread the hate speech revenge	5.7%	94.3%
	1.3%	98.7%

### 3.7 Victims or Propagators of Hate Speech

Table 7. Victims or Propagators of Hate Speech

Have been victims of hate speech	(%)
Never	63.3%
Have been	36.7%

The majority of respondents (63,3%) stated that they had never encountered or been the target of hate speech in the media. Meanwhile, 36.7% of respondents claim to have experienced or been victims of media-based hate speech. Where respondents who have experienced or become victims of hate speech in the media choose to respond, 30.8% choose to keep the perpetrators silent, 20% choose to block accounts, and 15.5% choose to provide clarifications. The graph below depicts the respondents who claimed to have made hate speech in the media.

This finding, when Politician and celebrities as a main propagator of hate speech raise some concern. Politician and celebrities can be categorized as traditional influencer, as they are famous first in traditional media (Schmuck, et.al, 2022), but due to huge online audiences, they are now transformed as digital opinion leaders. As digital opinion leaders there are impacting user attitudes or behavior. Ironically, influencer or opinion leaders are considered to be credible, authentic, and trustworthy (Bause, 2021). Authenticity conceptualizes as an important aspect of their capital mostly by appearing “real” to their followers (Schach, 2018). In Indonesia, the source that demand authenticity are the ones that shared hate speech the most. So, it came the problem that should be faced, with an increasing usage of social media in Indonesia, and the opinion leaders and their role as intermediaries for information is gaining more significant and important. Related to the concept of two-step-flow of communication (Katz, 1957), influencer and followers both are important in the diffusion of information. The politician and celebrities decode and distribute the content, the netizen retrieve, respond and share the messages within their own networks (Sundermann and Raabe 2019). If this happened, the hate speeches are spreading widely and unstoppable.

### 4. Conclusion

According to the study, people perceive humiliation, bullying, discrimination, and defamation as forms of hate speech. Most respondents indicated that hate speech

contains harsh language and derogatory terms. In addition, respondents indicated that political and religious topics frequently appear in hate speech. On Instagram and Facebook, hate speech is the most prevalent. Respondents who encountered or experienced hate speech responded in various ways, including remaining silent, blocking accounts, reprimanding politely, notifying authorities, etc. Respondents believed that civil society performed better than the government in combating hate speech. They also agreed that hate speech perpetrators would be prosecuted under the Information and Electronic Transactions Act. With these findings, in political years ahead, Indonesia will heading a serious threat in democracy. The importance of the research and contribution to the academic literature are to discuss and give more attention the capacity and digital literacy of the traditional influencer such as the politicians and celebrities.

### Acknowledgments

The research team would like to give our sincerest gratitude to all parties involved in this research, especially RRI (Radio Republik Indonesia) who have helped and supported this research activity to run smoothly.

### References

Bause, H. (2021). Politische Social-Media-Influencer Als Meinungsführer? *Publizistik* 66, 295–316. doi:10.1007/s11616-021-00666-z

Curran, J. (2000). Mass Media and Democracy: A Reappraisal. Dalam James Curran and Michael Gurevitch(ed), *Mass Media and Society*, Third Edition. London: Arnold

Eriyanto. (2011). *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Metodologi untuk Penelitian Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Kencana.

George, C. (2017). *Pelintiran Kebencian*. PUSAD Paramadina, Jakarta.

Habermas, J. (2006). *Teori Tindakan Komunikatif 1: Rasio dan Rasionalisasi Masyarakat*, terj. Nurhadi. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.

Iqbal, Mohammad, Suhadi. (2014) Isu-isu Kunci Ujaran Kebencian (*Hate Speech*): Implikasinya terhadap Gerakan Sosial Membangun Toleransi. *Jurnal Multikultural & Multireligius* Vol 13 No. 3

Juditha, C. (2017). *Hatespeech in Online Media: Jakarta on Election 2017*. *Jurnal Penelitian Komunikasi dan Opini Publik* Vol 21. No. 2

Kastolani., (2020) Understanding the Delivery of Islamophobic Hate Speech via Social Media in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*. Vol 10, No. 2 (2020)

Katz, E. (1957). The Two-step Flow of Communication: An Up-To-Date Report on an Hypothesis Anniversary Issue Devoted to Twenty Years of *Public Opinion Research*. Public Opin. Q. 2161 (1), Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia, Buku Penanganan Ujaran Kebencian (*Hate Speech*), (Jakarta, 2015), hlm. 24-25.

Berita Hoaks di Indonesia Meningkat, Mayoritas soal

- Agama, Politik, dan Kesehatan  
<https://www.kompas.com/tren/read/2021/06/05/153205565/berita-hoaks-di-indonesia-meningkat-mayoritas-soal-agama-politik-dan?page=all>.
- Nuraeni, I., Harisanti, N. L. R., & Maksun, H. (2022). Tuturan Kebencian dalam Komentar Warganet Pada Akun Instagram@ obrolanpolitik: Kajian Pragmatik. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 11(1), 189-197.
- Nursahid, A., Kartika, D. Y., Rafsadie, I., Khairil, M., Astuti, S. I., & Mulyartono, S. (2019). Melawan Hasutan Kebencian. PUSAD Paramadina, Jakarta
- Pratama, Y. A. (2022). Ujaran Kebencian Pengguna Facebook Bulan Januari-Februari 2022 (Kajian Pragmatik Siber). *Jurnal Penelitian, Pendidikan, dan Pembelajaran*, 17(27).
- Patihullah, J., Winarko, E. (2019). *HateSpeech Detection for Indonesia Tweets Using Word Embedding and Gated Recurrent Unit*. Indonesian Journal of Computing and Cybernetics System. Vol 13, No 1 (2019)
- Putra, M. (2021). *Hate Speech: narasi ujaran kebencian Nikita Mirzani versus Habib Rizieq Shihab dalam perspektif tindakan komunikatif Jurgen Habermas* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya).
- SARI, I. R. (2022). *Analisis Ujaran Kebencian Dalam Kolom Komentar Instagram Aldi Taher: Kajian Pragmatik* (Undergraduated Thesis). Program Studi Bahasa Indonesia. Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara.
- Schach, A. (2018). “Von Two-Step-Flow bis Influencer Relations: Die Entwicklung der Kommunikation mit Meinungsführern Influencer Relations.”. Editors A. Schach and T. Lommatzsch (Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden), 33–2121. doi:10.1007/978-3-658-21188-2\_1
- Schmuck, D., Hirsch, M., Stevic, A., Matthes, J. (2022). Politics-Simply Explained How Influencers Affect Youth’s Perceived Simplification of Politics, Political Cynicism, and Political Interest. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, Vol 27(3) 738-762. Sage.
- Sitompul, L. U. (2022). Sexist Hate Speech Terhadap Perempuan Di Media: Perwujudan Patriarki Di Ruang Publik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi Undiksha*, 3(3), 152-161.
- Sundermann, G., and Raabe, T. (2019). Strategic Communication through Social Media Influencers: Current State of Research and Desiderata. *Int. J. Strateg. Commun.* 13 (4), 278–300. doi:10.1080/1553118X.2019.1618306
- Ukhty, B. F. R. (2018). Ujaran Kebencian (Hate Speech) Dalam Media Baru (Analisis Isi Kuantitatif Ujaran Kebencian dalam Kolom Komentar Berita Gerakan# 2019GantiPresiden pada Media Online Detik. com Periode 03-09 April 2018).
- Zain, V. D. A. (2022). Tindak Tutur Ilokusi Dalam Ujaran Kebencian Warganet Pada Kolom Komentar Akun Media Sosial Instagram Dody Soedrajat. *Jurnal Penelitian, Pendidikan, dan Pembelajaran*, 17(17).