Pejorative Words Indicating Indonesian Hate Speech

Citra Suryanovika[1] and Laily Nur Affni[2]

Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Pontianak, INDONESIA[1]

Universitas PGRI Semarang, INDONESIA[2]

Corresponding Author:

Citra Suryanovika

Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing

Pontianak, INDONESIA

Email: csuryanovika@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The study aims to identify the pejorative words in *@detiknews'* comments and hate speech targets. This study was qualitative research, specifically descriptive content analysis. The researchers took the data from Indonesian comments in eighteen news of *@detiknews'* Instagram account. The researchers used MAXQDA to show the results of the coding process. The study has found seven categories of Thurlow: social personality, uncategorized, top-5, racist, homophobic, phallocentric, and physicality. In this study, pejorative words were in the standard and non-standard Indonesian, local languages (Javanese, Betawi), vulgar slang, and animal metaphors. The study has classified pejorative words (Thurlow, 2001) as directed or generalized hate speech (Elsherief et al., 2018). The findings show that directed speech was a personal matter. To sum up, pejorative words indicating hate speech in Indonesia are not randomly used; it intends to show the users' disagreement toward the publisher or another user's comment: it is addressed explicitly to either directed or generalized targets.

INTRODUCTION

The news on Instagram has users of various ages with diverse news demands, and language use expressions. This fact encourages the researchers to analyze hate speech expression on this social media. NapoleonCat (2020) recorded that *Instagram comprises* users aged 18-24. Indonesia, in January 2020, had 62.230.000 Instagram users, including 49% men and 51% women. It explains why the responses to Instagram's posts are conveyed in slang and non-standard language. Besides, most Indonesian online newspapers post on Instagram daily. Until April 12, 2020, *@detikcom* had 2,3 million followers with 12,153 posts; it has the most followers compared to other online mass media like *@kompascom*, *@cnnindonesia*, *@tempodotco*, *@mediaindonesia,* and *@republikaonline*. Unlike other news on Instagram, *@detikcom*'s posts are presentable and well-organized; thus, it has more followers than others. The Instagram and Facebook accounts of *@detikcom* show different news content. The former presented the interactive pictures completed with the short version on news or link to the website, and it usually publishes at least twenty-five posts in a day. In the meantime, the latter presents some stories published on the website. Different publications on two social media consequently influence the number of responses to the news. In addition, *@detikcom* shares trending topics triggering hateful comments. The Corona Virus (Covid-19) in February 2020 became a controversial issue in Indonesia when the government officially signed the regulation for large-scale social restriction in Jakarta on April 6, 2020. on April 6, 2020.

Some comments contain hate speech because commenters tend to express what they have in their mind without filtering the language expression. Hate speech is defined as a language variety to degrade and stigmatize (Vedeler, Olsen, & Eriksen, 2019). It also can be the possible acts of cyberhate (Ghaffari, 2020), as shown in the report of Gelber & McNamara (2016). "Hate speech, in particular, hurts the individuals and groups targeted, as well as society as a whole" (Carlson, 2020, p.1). Hate speech on Twitter, in particular, targeted women using certain pejorative words degrading women (Lingiardi et al., 2020). Furthermore, Reichelmann et al. (2020) surveyed online hate speech in Finland, France, Poland, Spain, the United Kingdom, and the United States. They found that the targets of hate speech mostly are race/ethnicity. Some experts have studied hate speech using different theories.

Đorđević (2020) analyzed the Serbian News Website *Politika* comment sections using Van Dijk's sociocognitive dimension. She stated that the comments were responses to the news content, and she has proven that hate speech reflects the fault of news content. Likewise, other researchers around the world have studied hate speech: Mossie & Wang (2019), Lu (2019), Sigurbergsson & Derczynski (2019). Mossie & Wang (2019) designed and applied automatic hate speech detection, and they found that the main target of hate speech was the ethnic group identity.

In the meantime, Lu (2019) argued that tweets in African-American English categorized as offensive speech by Artificial Intelligence, but the vernacular language was still undetected. Sigurbergsson & Derczynski (2019) claimed that the Danish dataset has yet to be set; therefore, they developed hate speech detection from *Twitter, Facebook,* and *Reddit* data to identify English and Danish offensive language. Examining Indonesian hate speech is challenging for a particular field because Indonesia has a diverse culture and varied local languages. Moreover, most internet users use local languages in social media, and Indonesian hate speech labels have yet to be precisely defined.

In Indonesia, hate speech has been discussed in the law, philosophy, computer, and linguistics. However, a study examining pejorative items indicating hate speech has still to be done. They checked propositional content, preparatory, sincerity and essential of the utterance to determine types of speech acts (Rangkuti et al., 2019). Alfina et al. (2018) employed a machine-learning approach to detect hate speech in texts of Twitter data. Winiasih (2010) and Rangkuti et al. (2019) studied hate speech using a linguistic approach. The former identified the use and function of Surabaya's swearing words using sociolinguistic theory; she has listed the swearing form and meaning (Winiasih, 2010). The latter, in the meantime, analyzed utterances from Facebook groups using Searle's speech acts. They checked propositional content, preparatory, sincerity, and essential of the utterance to determine the types of speech acts (Rangkuti et al., 2019). Ningrum et al. (2018) previously studied hate speech in a Facebook comment section using Searle's taxonomy and found expressive speech acts using swearing words.

It is known that detecting hate speech largely depends on the linguistic corpus; however, the available Indonesian corpora do not show potential hate speech. The Indonesian dictionary only contains standard language, while most negative expressions comprise daily vocabulary. It is insufficient to depend on the dictionary, which still requires improvement (Sirulhaq, 2018).

Considering a non-linguistic context when examining the lexical items on comments is important. As Allan (2016, p.3) discussed, the word *nigger* is a slur or a sign of solidarity according to the context (situation of utterance). Identifying and categorizing pejorative words by adopting Thurlow's nine categories (2001) may support the study of Indonesian hate speech. In addition, some former researchers have not used Thurlow (2001) to detect Indonesian pejorative words. To understand derogatory terms, Hom (2012) and Corredor

(2014) grouped pejoratives, including slurs and swearing to discredit the hearers. Hom (2012) suggested semantic externalism in identifying pejorative, while Corredor (2014) suggested semantic-pragmatic analysis. Likewise, Thurlow (2001) stated that pejorative naming is the hate words for the groups.

The researchers use Thurlow's types to classify and list the pejorative words. Thurlow (2001) stated that pejorative naming is the hate words addressed to the groups. Thurlow's categories are necessary for this research. Thurlow (2001) involved high school pupils in identifying naming for bisexual, gay, and lesbian, which he classified into nine categories of pejorative naming. He exemplified the categories with some noun phrases and ranked them in order of priority. The following types are Thurlow's research priority: 1) Homophobic (e.g., *queer, poof, ginger, lesbian*); 2) Racist (e.g., *nigger, Paki, Somalian*); 3) Top-5 (e.g., *cunt, wanker, motherfucker, bastard,* and all *fuck* derivatives), Sexist (e.g., *slag, slut, whore, cow, bitch, slapper*), Phallocentric (e.g., *dickhead, prick, sheepshagger*), Scatalogical (e.g., *shit, arse-wipe, turd, scatty*), Others— Social-Personality (e.g., *loner, sad, pompous, stupid)*, Others—Physicality (e.g., *fat, ugly, smelly*), and Uncategorized items (e.g., *jackass, dustbin man/woman, pedophile,* and other unknown, local items not found in the dictionaries).

In his research, Thurlow (2001) disregarded imperative and expletive items and only counted a single word or a compound item once. Thurlow (2001) employs a formalist approach by criticizing language without contextual information and then classifies the findings by priority rank. The current research identifies nine pejorative categories and targets to justify the opinion that disparaging expression reflects hate speech online. The researchers preliminarily observed how these possible words aim at a particular individual or the news in the comments. It means that the dictions do not target randomly as they denote disagreement and hatred.

The researchers believe that the pejorative naming or item, as defined further by context, strongly represents hate speech, depending on how the speaker/writer appoints others with the derogatory items. On that account, the study examined the targets after classifying pejorative items. ElSherief et al. (2018) stated that hate speech could be directed or generalized. Based on their theories, the target of hate speech determines the form or even level of hate speech (ElSherief et al., 2018). They argued that directed hate speech is personal; and characterized by words indicating deliberate action, statements, and explicit remarks to inhibit the target's actions (e.g., "calling the target a *retard*). Meanwhile, generalized hate speech targets religions and races, which indicators are quantity words (for example, million, all, many), religious words (Muslims, Jews, Christians), and lethal words: murder, beheaded, killed, exterminate (ElSherief et al., 2018).

METHOD

The study employed a qualitative approach to collect, analyze and present the findings regarding pejorative items in the comment section of @*detikcom* on Instagram. The quantitative data were submitted to complement this qualitative study, as Maxwell (2010) stated that numerical data aims to justify thorough analysis. The research used purposive sampling to determine samples; thus, the researchers only took samples that fit the purposes: 1) the post is informative or provocative news, not an advertisement; 2) it has comments which do not spam; 3) the comments are downloadable. The researchers took the news @*detikcom* published on April 6, 2020. The researchers chose the date when the Ministry of Health officially signed the regulation for large-scale social restriction in Jakarta because the date created controversial decision-making about Covid-19 in Indonesia. The government's decision usually triggers hate speech expression in some news. The data contained varied news topics with the expectation that the researchers could collect various pejorative words. There were 28 posts on @*detikcom* on April 6, 2020; however, ten files did not fit the criteria (6 posts were product sales/marketing, while the rest were videos with non-downloadable comments). Thus, the researchers

only analyzed 18 posts. In collecting the data, the researchers exported the comments using *Export Comments* (https://exportcomments.com), which can download over 100 comments. The website provides a tool to extract data from *Instagram* comments, especially posted photos; however, it cannot extract data from posted videos.

The research used descriptive content analysis. "Content analysis or document analysis is a method for systematically investigating texts" (Leavy, 2017, p.146). In implementing the procedure, the researcher follows Neuendorf (2002). The process of descriptive content analysis was theory and rationale, conceptualizations (variables), operationalizations (measures), coding schemes, sampling, computer coding, tabulation, and reporting (Neuendorf, 2002). As the research aimed at examining Thurlow (2001) and ElSherief et al. (2018), the researchers chose the comments on a post of @*detikcom* as the variables.

The study used MAXQDA qualitative analysis tool. After data collection, the researchers listed the coding schemes according to Thurlow (2001) and ElSherief et al. (2018). The study used eleven codes: uncategorized, physical, social personality, scatological, phallocentric, sexist, Top-5, racist, homophobic items, generalized, and directed targets.

The researchers applied KBBI online (the Great Indonesian Dictionary available online at https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id). They examined the non-linguistic context to determine if it was necessary for the sample text to define and compare the meaning and to generate per unit before tabulating. The researchers set aside spam in the comments to identify Thurlow's categories. They interpreted the potential pejorative words from standard and non-standard Indonesian and Javanese or Betawi languages. After that, the researchers grouped the words into Thurlow's categories and the hate speech of ElSherief et al. (2018). After coding, the tabulation on MAXQDA was done by dragging the sample text to the codes. The researcher used a comparative analysis of MAXQDA to present and conclude the findings. For presenting the comments, they wrote the number of documents sequentially; for instance, data 6:131 indicates that it is from document 6, comment number 131. The number on each datum was according to data recorded in MAXQDA. The researchers anonymized the Instagram username in presenting comments which mention the username.

DISCUSSION

Pejorative Words indicating Indonesian hate speech

The study had 3,050 data downloaded from eighteen posts. It grouped 133 pejorative items into Thurlow's nine categories and then defined Elsherief's hate speech targets. The pejorative words in Table 1 showed that the target of hate speech varied in seven of Thurlow's categories. MAXQDA illustrated the distribution of coded segments (Thurlow's categories) in 18 documents. It is found that 4 of 18 @*detikcom* news do not have pejorative words, and three news have more words. In addition, the most pejorative items on three news are uncategorized, social personality, top-5, homophobic and racist.

To sum up, the news determines the usage of pejorative items because the news talks about controversial issues. Talking about news topics, the informative news did not have pejorative items (mask recycled factory, Corona's patient increases, and Corona's suspect increases). At the same time, three topics (Corona's impact on the Kaaba of Mecca, gold price increases, and a female murder victim) generated many pejorative items.

Table 1. Pejorative Categories

Thurlow's Pejorative Categories	Number of Pejorative Words
Uncategorized	29
Physicality	2
Social Personality	66
Scatological	0
Phallocentric	7
Sexist	0
Top-5	10
Racist	10
Homophobic	9

The analysis showed that the most frequently used pejorative is social personality, while sexist and scatological are not found in the data. In this discussion, the researchers describe the findings by rank. Regarding the most frequently used pejorative categories, the researchers found a word indicating a social personality category similar to Thurlow (2001) is the adjective *stupid*. It was found in twelve different data, representing in English (*stupid, too dumb*), common Indonesian words (*bodoh, bebal, tolol*), Indonesian slang (*bego*, *dongo*, *otak pendek, peak*), and Javanese language (*goblok, gemblung*). Of all twelve words, twenty-two data used the word *goblok* (Javanese language for stupid). In other words, it becomes the most frequently used pejorative word in the social personality category. Referring to the meaning, it contains hate to attack someone else on the comment verbally. It covers what Alfina et al. (2018) missed as the detection automatically labeled the word *bloon* (stupid in English) as non-hate speech.

Besides, the study found some words representing the social personality category that Thurlow (2001) did not list. The words reflect the category as they were publicly well-known for their connotative meaning in Indonesia. It relates to group/community, social level, and social characteristics. Some words targeting particular groups are related to communism, the unemployed community, and people with low incomes. In addition, some words indicating social traits are hypocrite, sycophant, coward, attention seeker, deaf, and childish. These findings show that the Indonesian context enables the creation of other social personality words. These words are categorized into social personalities because they are nouns representing human characters. Cervone et al. (2021) states that these words are pejorative labels that may trigger adverse effects.

In the second place of the research findings, the researchers found 29 uncategorized items. Thurlow listed *jackass, dustbin man/woman, and pedophile* as uncategorized items because these words do not belong to other categories. The study only found one word similar to Thurlow's list: *sampah* (rubbish). Meanwhile, the other 28 words belong to uncategorized categories: *yajuj majuj* (gog and magog), *anjing* (dog and it was also written *anying*), *bacot* (dysphemism of "too much talking"), *iblis* (demon), *monyong* (mouth), *setan* (satan), *cecunguk-cecunguk* (dysphemism of spy), *kuntilanak* (a female ghost), *kafir* (infidel), *petrus* (the abbreviation of *penembak misterius* or mysterious shooter which was well known in New Order Regime), *cocot* (a Javanese word refers to mouth or talk), *preman* (thug), and *babi* (pig). According to these labels, the researchers conclude that the uncategorized type in Indonesian is related to the demon, human organ, animal, religion, occupation, or things. In addition, the study found that animal emoji grouping to uncategorized items because it represents and even intensifies the contemptuous purpose. It is a pejorative item because the commenter compared people with animals. Although Thurlow (2001) did not find this, the use of animal metaphors to indicate hate speech has been noted by Cervone et al. (2020).

Another interesting finding is in the third rank of the research findings, Top-5 items. One of the top-5 items in Thurlow (2001) includes vulgar slang. The commenters intentionally misspelled English vulgar slang (*fuck* becomes *fucek*) and vulgar Javanese slang. In the study, the word *fucek* was found six times in the comments

of different *Instagram* users. It contains hate as it targets unknown readers and has the exact meaning of vulgar English slang but is written differently to adjust to the local dialect emphasis. This finding differs from Nicolau & Sukamto (2014), who found the swear word *fuck* of male students for solidarity purposes. In addition, the Javanese words *dancok* and *cuk* (the abbreviation of *jancuk,* usually used as an address term) are originally from the local language of Surabaya, East Java which Winiasih (2010) classified as swearing. Besides, *kentod* (derogatory slang for *fuck*) was also found and categorized into the top-5 items. It can be inferred that Indonesian diverse culture influences varied Indonesian words for vulgar English slang, and it highly depends on the setting. The manner, situation, and addressee of the offensive label strongly indicate that it is contrary to Nicolau & Sukamto's (2014) solidarity marker.

In the fourth and fifth place, the researchers found eight racist items in three news and nine homophobic items in two news. In Thurlow (2001), the words *nigger, Paki,* and *Somalian* are examples of the racist category. The researchers found some words targeting certain races (mainly *Chinese* and *Arabian*): *cino, chino, china, bule kambing, onta kadrun,* and *kadrun.* The racist words found explicitly in the news about or closely related to Covid-19. It indicates that the hatred toward China, where the virus spread for the first time, triggers the use of the racist words *Cino/Chino* (the Javanese language refers to Chinese) *or China.* The racist items also refer to Arabian and Muslim found in the words *bule kambing, onta kadrun,* and *kadrun.* The Great Indonesian Dictionary does not list these three words; the researchers consider the situational context to interpret the meaning. The phrase *bule kambing* contains two Indonesian nouns: *bule* refers to a foreigner, especially Western people, while *kambing* means *goat* is an allegory referring to Arabian food. The phrase *onta kadrun* also has a similar proposition: *onta* (a *camel)*, and *kadrun* is an abbreviation of *kadal gurun* (*dabb lizard*). Heriyanto (2019) wrote that Joko Widodo's hardcore supporters labeled his critics and Anies Baswedan's supporters *Kadrun*; the label specifically refers to Anies (a politician of Arab descent) and some Muslim critics wearing robes. The word *kadrun* allegedly refers to Muslims in general, as it emerged after the general election in 2019. Animal metaphors in the phrase dehumanize people, as Cervone et al. (2021) suggested. It also explains that the label has a relation with political discourse.

In the sixth place, the study found that homophobic items occur in specific news. It strengthens the idea that the news topic determines the offensive dictions, as in two news: 1) an allegedly Indonesian transgender singer in jail, 2) a fake groom (a woman who pretended to be a man) married an innocent woman. The lexical items differed slightly from Thurlow's (2001), including *queer, poof, ginger, and lesbian.* The study only found three homophobic words: *LGBT, lesbian* (also using the abbreviated version *lesbi*), and *banci* (Indonesian pejorative item for she-male).

The study obtained different nouns yet similar meanings as Thurlow's (2001) phallocentric items appearing seven times. In Thurlow (2001), phallocentric items refer to words indicating male genital organs: *dickhead, prick, sheepshagger.* In this study, Indonesian phallocentric labels are *kontol* (written *kontol, qntol, kontollll)* and *terong* (eggplant), usually associated with the male genital organ, as reported by Silalahi (2016). In the last rank, the study identified the physicality category in the comments containing words offending physical condition. According to Thurlow (2001), the adjectives *fat, ugly, and smelly* are offensive. Interestingly, the response in @*detikcom* has the Javanese noun *picek* (a derogatory word for the blind); using twice in the comments, it defined not only the physical disability but also illiteracy.

Pejorative Words Intensify Hate Speech

The study surprisingly found more than one pejorative word in a comment, particularly in two unanticipated conditions: 1) two pejorative words of one category used in a comment; 2) two pejorative words of more than

one category in a comment. There were 19 utterances with at least two pejorative words; 18 addressed to a directed target, while the rest targeted a generalized audience.

The finding was inconsistent with Thurlow (2001), which did not report the occurrence of double pejorative words. Thurlow (2001) reported 6,000 pejorative items, which were calculated only once. The current study should consider these unexpected findings that intensify hate speech. It was found that some comments have two words grouped into one item, respectively consisting of uncategorized, social personality, and racist categories. In one comment (2:344), two disparaging words are uncategorized categories.

The commenter (2:344) confronted a user and brought the name of a religious leader (*Ustadz Abdul* Somad) into the discussion. According to the Great Indonesian Dictionary, The comment had *monyong* (protruding mouth, like a dog) and *cocot* (Javanese swear word for the mouth, according to Nastiti et al. (2019) in one utterance to intensify the hate.

> *(2,344) @oeb lah loe kan si monyong tomad bilang corona tentara allah...loe kok beda tentara allah mu wah loe ga se cocot ini sama junjungan mu beda.aliran berarti....wkwkwkw malu ya loe sama si tomad*
> *(You said Tomad/Ustadz Abdul Somad said Corona is Allah's army… why is the army different, wow you, it means your talk is not similar to your leader… wkwkwkw are you ashamed of Tomad)*

Differently, the racist category has two comments, and the social personality has eight comments with two words belonging to the category. In the racist category, the comment (28:142) and (28:153) used the words *chino* (Chinese), *bule kambing* (goat foreigner), and *onta asli* (the authentic camel)—the word *chino* derived from the Javanese language tending to have a derogatory purpose.

> (28:142) *@fhnx gak chino tok,* **bule kambing** *ne yo akeh pol*
> *(not only Chinese but also many goat foreigners)*

> (28:153) *@bugxs onta asli di INDON minoritas jarang gawe problem. chino dah tak terhingga atau jgn2 lu jongos ne kah iso ngomong ngene ki.. yo pantes*
> *(the authentic camel is a minority INDON rarely raises an issue, Chinese are already infinite, or perhaps you are their maid until you can say that..)*

The words *bule kambing* (goat foreigner) and *onta asli* (the authentic camel) refer to Arab descents. Three words are racist categories because they prefer using those words to euphemistic words like *Chinese* or *Arab*. This finding confirmed how animal metaphors intensify hate speech.

> (2:274) YANG KOMEN RATA² OTAKNYA **DANGKAL** !!! **GUOBLOK**.. podo bacot rok ae (the commenters have shallow brains, STUPID, only talk)

The comment (2:274) used two words of the social personality category to show anger. It also emphasized the expression of hate speech using capital letters in the first sentence. The comment (2:312) also showed how two different pejorative words of the same category are used in a comment.

> *(2:312) @brxc heyyyy* **stup1d***.. emang ka'bah punya umat muslim. Bahkan nonmuslim ga boleh masuk mekkah n madinah. So di kota itu isinya muslim semua.. ini kan dilakukan tujuan biar semua orang tenang biar virus ga makin nyebar, wajar dong pemerintah arab melakukan ini, mendukung keamanan dunia juga.. gw lempar juga lu ke wuhan.. sumpah* **bebal** *bgt makhluk kek gini.. udh diserbu masih aja ngeyel*

(hey, stupid, you think Moslems own Kaaba. Even non-Muslims cannot enter Mecca or Madinah. So, the city only has all Muslims. This is to calm all people so the virus is not spreading; it makes sense that the Arab government does this; it supports global security; I will throw you to Wuhan. You are foolish, many people here have told you so, but you still insist)

The commenter in (2:312) used two different words (*stupid* and *bebal)*, meaning low intellectual capacity (stupid*)*. The first adjective (*stupid*) is considered softer than the second (*bebal*) to reinforce the intention. The comment in (3:127) has two words (*pengecut/coward* and *dungu/dumb*); the first pejorative word relates to attitude, while the second indicates lacking intellectual acuity.

(3:127) Percaya deh, pasti ujung ujungnya demo lengeserkan jokowi.. 😂 *heran, yg bermasalahkan di India, kenapa kedutaannya yg di demo?, dasar pengecut semua lu. Kalo berani sono jihad ke india langsung. Dasar dungu dungu..* 😂
(Believe me, in the end, they will depose Jokowi.. 😂 *I wonder why the demonstration in the embassy, the issue is in India? Loser, all of you. If you dare, go to India yourself. Dumb, dumb).*

The comment (3:161) has the words *munafik* (hypocrite) and *penjilat* (sycophant), which are under social personality. It is also found that the labels *tergoblog/the most stupid* and *tolol/stupid)* in the comment (16:111) represent ignorance, and the same words were found in a separate comment. In the comment (21:247) *@detikcom, you guys are the real virus!* **Too dumb** *to educate people by posting this news.* **Loser!** 👎. The words *too dumb* and *loser* belong to social personality indicating the writer's disagreement toward the news content. The emoji thumb down after the comment emphasized disappointment and hate. Although in one category, two pejorative words and emoji show intense hate speech.

The second unanticipated condition presents how two pejorative words of more than one category were used in a comment; the categories which always lead or follow another category are social personality and uncategorized. The former is almost found in a comment which has either uncategorized, homophobic, racist, or phallocentric. There are two comments which consist of social personality and uncategorized. The comment (2:5) showed that the word (*bego/stupid)* of the social personality category leads to the word (*anying/dog)* of uncategorized. Likewise, the word for social personality (*tolol/stupid*) was also expressed before the uncategorized one (*babi/pig)* in the comment (7:126).

(2:5) @brxc **Bego anying**. *(You are stupid, dog)*
 (7:126) @c88 iya termasuk lo juga tolol, dasar babi bisanya pake akun klonengan wkwkwk (yes, it includes you stupid, you pig only can use fake account wkwkwkw)

The uncategorized words after the social personality were more degrading in the comments because the commenters compared the users with the animal. In the meantime, social personality with phallocentric was found only in one following comment:

(28:125) @rhx lu jg tolol 😂😂 *udah tau dia balas org goblok* 😂😂 *lu ikutan balas jg....kontol...sama2 tolol lu sama yg update status* 😂😂
(you are also stupid; you know that he replied to people, stupid; you also replied. Dick. You are as stupid as the one who updates the status).

The comment had two words of social personality indicating ignorance (*tolol* and *goblok,* which are adjectives for stupid); the word *tolol* even comes twice. The phallocentric word *kontol* in the above comment indicates that the commenter knew the targeted user's gender.

The pejorative words representing the commenters' hate intention indicate the hate speech; they mainly serve as a reference for directed targets. The comment (12:469) "Kalau **lgbt** *cri yg sejenis* **lesbi tolol**" *(if LGBT, look for the same lesbian, stupid)* did not mention another user and addressed to generalized target consisting of two homophobic words and one social personality word. One pejorative phrase was produced by the social personality word *tolol* (stupid) and modified the homophobic word *lesbi* (lesbian). It means that hate speech can be originated from a pejorative noun phrase.

Besides the social personality category, some comments include uncategorized, physicality, and racist categories. Using more than one pejorative word means that the commenters accentuate the hate speech expression. A comment which has uncategorized, physicality and racist categories, for example, shows the words *cecunguk-cecunguk* (spies)*, picek* (Javanese word for blind), and *cadruna* (another version of *kadrun* or dabb lizard), which were used in sequence. On the contrary, the usage of uncategorized and racist categories in the two comments differs in position. There is a comment which has uncategorized and racist category included the word *onta sesat* (misguided camel, which refers to Arab) and *bacot* (the Betawi language for talk), while another comment which has the racist word *chino* (Chinese) and the uncategorized word *yajuj majuj (Gog and Magog)*. Although the position is different, all words of uncategorized physicality and racist categories have the same function, to intensify the hate speech expression as they address the directed targets.

Targets of Hate Speech

ElSherief et al. (2018) defined directed hate as exclusively pointing to a specific individual, while generalized hate speech targets widespread groups or individuals with common characteristics, such as ethnicity or religion.

Table 2. Targets of Hate Speech

Thurlow's Pejorative Categories	Directed Hate Speech	Generalized Hate Speech
Uncategorized	20	9
Physicality	2	0
Social Personality	47	19
Scatological	0	0
Phallocentric	4	3
Sexist	0	0
Top-5	3	7
Racist	2	8
Homophobic	8	1

The table indicates that directed hate speech contains more pejorative categories than generalized hate speech. The findings are consistent with ElSherief et al. (2018), stating that hate speech is a personal matter showing deliberate action, statements, and exact words, as the study determined the directed hate speech from using the symbol @ in a comment. For further explanation, the researchers presented directed and generalized hate speech sequentially in the following paragraphs.

The comment (6:39) @*dwx almarhum itu buat laki.. dongokk... (The word 'Almarhum' used for the deceased man., stupid)* showed that the commenter attacked another commenter with a different opinion. Some directed hate speeches did not use the symbol @ because it refers to the news, as in (21:80). The address term *lo (you)* without the symbol @ criticizes the news in (21:80) *Lo bikin judul yang bener lah, dogol lo detikcom bikin panik masyarakat! (You should make a correct title; you are stupid; detikcom is causing public panic).* To be specific, it mentioned the news directly after using the pronoun. Similarly, the pronoun *lu* (you) is found in (3:127), referring to the actors discussed in the news.

3:127) Percaya deh, pasti ujung ujungnya demo lengeserkan jokowi.. 😩 heran, yg bermasalahkan di India, kenapa kedutaannya yg di demo?, dasar pengecut semua lu. Kalo berani sono jihad ke india langsung. Dasar dungu dungu.. 😆

(Believe me, in the end, they will depose Jokowi.. 😆 I wonder why the demonstration in the embassy, the issue is in India? Loser, all of you. If you dare, go to India yourself. Dumb, dumb).

The pronoun *lu* (you) has emerged frequently, referring to the actors in the story, meaning that the derogatory naming was addressed to actors, not the news.

The indicators of generalized hate speech differ from directed ones, as Elsherief et al. (2018) suggested. It becomes generalized hate speech if it aims at people in general; the following utterance shows how a commenter attacked the Yogyakarta people because of a perpetrator in Yogyakarta.

 (6:322) Yogyakarta kenapa jadi masyarakat bar barian ya? (Why do Yogyakarta people become barbarian?).

English and Indonesian generalized hate speech is different in some manners. According to ElSherief et al. (2018), quantity words become a generalized hate speech indicator that uses standard English determiners (*many, million, all*). Indonesian quantity words in this study differed from the standard English Elsherief et al. (2018) exemplified. It is known that plural noun phrases in standard Indonesian should only consist of a plural indicator and a word. Contrarily, the pejorative phrases violated the standard grammar by having both a plural indicator and repeated words.

(25:136) *MayOritas msh primitif* 😅🤚 *kumpuLan **banci-banci** (majority is still primitive, they are a group of transsexuals)*

(3:57) @xxxx *biarin aj para **pengangguran2** gembel itu demo (just let the poor unemployment hold the demonstration).*

The phrases *kumpulan banci-banci* and *para pengangguran2* (the sign two after the word is an informal symbol to indicate that the word *pengangguran* should be written twice) are grammatically incorrect because they have used the quantity words (*kumpulan* and *para*) before the nouns. Moeliono et al. (2017) concluded that Indonesian use repetition to regular nouns (for instance, *rumah-rumah, orang-orang*), and affixes (*-an, para, kaum, umat*) to indicate plural concepts.

Instead of finding generalized hate speech that attacks religion using religious words (Elsherief et al., 2018), the study found that Indonesian comments used the religious community or topic to attack Muslims. For example, the word 212 as in (3:69) ***212 fucekkkk fucek*** (*fuck 212*) refers to a mass action on December 2, 2016, where Muslim people demanded legal action for alleged blasphemy of the Jakarta's governor at that time, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama.

In short, directed hate speech is a personal matter that includes the commenters' preconceived knowledge or experience, which they insist to others. Instead of sharing their knowledge with others who made mistakes in a kind and informative way, some users used pejorative words to accentuate their disapproval or correction. On the contrary, the generalized hate speech primarily found in the news about controversial topics (the fake groom), religious group activity (FPI), and all information related to Covid-19 (the story of Vietnam dealing with Covid-19, the emptied Kaaba during Covid-19, and Indonesian press conference talking about Covid-19). The commenters expressed the generalized hate speech by giving a general statement or targeting public groups/individuals.

CONCLUSION

This present study has identified pejorative words and the target of hate speech. Indonesian pejorative words are slightly different from Thurlow (2001), mainly because the comments in @*detikcom* use standard and non-standard Indonesian. However, those words were categorized into Thurlow's seven categories (2001) because the meaning of the words was closely related. It was found that the pejorative words in Indonesian were delivered literally and using allegory and animal metaphors. The commenters also intensified the hate speech by using emojis and more than one pejorative word in a comment. Indonesian pejorative words in the comments were not for solidarity reasons but for derogatory purposes leading to hate speech. Thus, classifying Indonesian pejorative words from the comments requires a high understanding of the cultural and situational contexts. The dictionary still had no official list of most Indonesian pejorative words in the comments.

The study also confirmed that directed hate speech targets individuals simply because of different opinions or thoughts. Meanwhile, generalized hate speech attacked religious communities as the controversial issue triggered it, and they struck. It differs from Elsherief et al. (2018), which used English determiners; Indonesian hate speech employed non-standard plural nouns (at the same time using the plural indicator and repetitive words).

After completing the identification, the researchers conclude that the news content determines pejorative words and hate speech for Indonesian social media users. It means that pejorative words indicating hate speech in Indonesia, according to the findings, are not randomly used; it intends to show the users' disagreement toward the publisher or another user's comment: it is addressed explicitly to either directed or generalized targets. As initial research identifies pejorative words that indicate Indonesian hate speech, the study may develop the theory of Thurlow (2001) and Elsherief et al. (2018) in practice. The research concerning Indonesian hate speech still requires a linguistic concern to raise public awareness of potential hate speech in social media. The study has presented how racist labels have a historical point of view; thus, a further examination to reveal the correlation between pejorative items and political discourse is deemed necessary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Alfina, I., Mulia, R., Fanany, M. I., & Ekanata, Y. (2017). Hate speech detection in the Indonesian language: A dataset and preliminary study. In *2017 International Conference on Advanced Computer Science and Information Systems, ICACSIS 2017* (pp. 233–237). https://doi.org/10.1109/ICACSIS.2017.8355039

Allan, K. (2016). Pragmatics in language change and lexical creativity. *SpringerPlus*, *5*(342), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomphys.2007.08.010

Carlson, C. R. (2020). Hate speech as a structural phenomenon. *First Amendment Studies*, *54*(2), 217–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/21689725.2020.1837649

Cervone, C., Augoustinos, M., & Maass, A. (2021). The language of derogation and hate: Functions, consequences, and reappropriation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *40*(1), 80–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X20967394

Corredor, C. (2014). Pejoratives and social interaction. In Stalmaszczyk, P. (ed), *Issues in philosophy of language and linguistics* (pp. 39–55). Lodz University Press.

Đorđević, J. P. (2020). The sociocognitive dimension of hate speech in readers' comments on Serbian news websites. *Discourse, Context and Media*, *33*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2019.100366

ElSherief, M., Kulkarni, V., Nguyen, D., Wang, W. Y., & Belding, E. (2018). Hate lingo: A target-based linguistic analysis of hate speech in social media. In *12th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media, ICWSM 2018* (pp. 42–51). AAAI Press.

Gelber, K., & McNamara, L. (2015). Evidencing the harms of hate speech. *Social Identities, 22*(3), 324–341. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2015.1128810

Ghaffari, S. (2022). Discourses of celebrities on Instagram: digital femininity, self-representation and hate speech. *Critical Discourse Studies, 19*(2), 161–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2020.1839923

Heriyanto, D. (2019, November 20). The rise of "kadrun" and "togog": Why political polarization in Indonesia is far from over. *The Jakarta Post*. https://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2019/11/19/the-rise-of-kadrun-and-togog-why-political-polarization-in-indonesia-is-far-from-over.html

Hom, C. (2012). A puzzle about pejoratives. *Philosophical Studies, 159*, 383–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-011-9749-7

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative,mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Lingiardi, V., Carone, N., Semeraro, G., Musto, C., D'Amico, M., & Brena, S. (2020). Mapping Twitter hate speech towards social and sexual minorities: A lexicon-based approach to semantic content analysis. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, *39*(7), 711–721. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1607903

Lu, D. (2019, August 17). Google's hate speech AI may be racially biased. *New Scientist, 243*(3243), 7. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0262-4079(19)31505-2

Maxwell, J. A. (2010). Using numbers in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(6), 475–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364740

Moeliono, A. M., Lapoliwa, H., & Alwi, H. (2017). *Tata bahasa baku Bahasa Indonesia* [Standard Indonesian Grammar] (4th ed.). Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Mossie, Z., & Wang, J. H. (2019). Vulnerable community identification using hate speech detection on social media. *Information Processing and Management*, *57*(3), 102087. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2019.102087

NapoleonCat. (2020, January). Instagram Users in Indonesia. Retrieved from https://napoleoncat.com/stats/instagram-users-in-indonesia/2020/01

Nastiti, F. F., Sariono, A., & Asrumi, A. (2019). Forms of swear word expression in *basa Suroboyoan* (Surabayan Javanese) based on its lingual units and references. *The International Journal of Scientific Development and Research*, *4*(2), 105–111.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. London: Sage Publication.

Nicolau, M. F. S., & Sukamto, K. E. (2014). Male and female attitudes towards swear words: A case study at binus international school. *K@Ta*, *16*(2), 71–76. https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.16.2.71-76

Ningrum, D. J., Suryadi, S., & Wardhana, D. E. C. (2018). Kajian ujaran kebencian di media sosial [Hate speech study on social media] . *Jurnal Ilmiah KORPUS*, *2*(3), 241–252. https://doi.org/10.33369/jik.v2i3.6779

Rangkuti, R., Pratama, A., & Zulfan, Z. (2019). Hate speech acts: A case in Batu Bara. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, *3*(2), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v3i1.1998

Reichelmann, A., Hawdon, J., Costello, M., Ryan, J., Blaya, C., Llorent, V., … Zych, I. (2021). Hate knows no boundaries: online hate in six nations. *Deviant Behavior*, *42*(9), 1100–1111. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2020.1722337

Sigurbergsson, G. I., & Derczynski, L. (2020). Offensive language and hate speech detection for Danish. *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2020),* France, 3498–3508. http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2020/LREC-2020.pdf

Sirulhaq, A. (2018). Questioning " The Great Indonesian Dictionary " (KBBI). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, *228*, 162–165.

Thurlow, C. (2001). Naming the "outsider within": Homophobic pejoratives and the verbal abuse of lesbian, gay and bisexual high-school pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, *24*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2000.0371

Vedeler, J. S., Olsen, T., & Eriksen, J. (2019). Hate speech harms: a social justice discussion of disabled Norwegians' experiences. *Disability and Society*, *34*(3), 368–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1515723

Winiasih, T. (2010). *Pisuhan dalam "Basa Suroboyoan": Kajian sosiolinguistik* [*Swearing in Surabaya Variety of Javanese: A sociolinguistic study*] [Master's Thesis, Universitas Sebelas Maret]. Repositori Institusi Kemen-dikbudristek. https://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/436/