

Analysis of Hate Speech in Comment Sections Aceh TikTokers Accounts (Pragmatic Study)

Mulyani Mulyani✉, Syahriandi Syahriandi, Juni Ahyar

Universitas Malikussaleh, Indonesia

Article Info

History Articles

Received:

5 May 2025

Accepted:

10 Juny 2025

Published:

30 August 2025

Keywords:

hate speech,
pragmatic, TikTok

Abstract

This study aims to describe the forms of hate speech in the comment sections of TikTok accounts HK, AA, FH, and SS, as well as the (pragmatic) meaning contained in each instance of hate speech found. This is a qualitative study using a descriptive approach. The research data consists of speech containing elements of hate in the form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. The data sources in this study are the TikTok application, focusing on the HK account (@herlin****02) on January 3, 2025, the AA account (@arif*****) on January 10, 2025, the FH account (@fatieh**** 24) on January 14, 2025, and the SS account (@She* Sau***) on January 17, 2025. In the data collection process, the author used three techniques: documentation, reading, and note-taking. The results of the study revealed a total of 57 instances of hate speech. The forms of hate speech obtained were divided into 5 parts as follows: 1) 28 instances of insults; 2) 12 instances of defamation; 3) 3 instances of blasphemy; 4) 10 instances of provocation/incitement; and 5) 4 instances of spreading false news. Furthermore, the pragmatic meaning found generally consists of phrases used to insult and mock Acehnese TikTokers for actions deemed highly inappropriate.

✉ Correspondence address:

Kampus Sekaran FBS UNNES

E-mail: wahyumutiana1998@students.unnes.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between language and its context of use. Pragmatics does not only discuss the literal meaning of utterances, but also the hidden meaning (beyond meaning) which is interpreted based on the context of language use by speakers and listeners. Every utterance has a certain purpose aimed at a certain social context in order to achieve the communicative goals of the speaker. Speech can be delivered directly (oral) or indirectly (written), and social media is now the dominant platform for delivering written speech that can be accessed by the public at large. Social media as an internet-based communication tool has grown rapidly and become the main choice for people to interact and express themselves. Social media is a platform or container that focuses on the existence of users, because of the user generated content facility. In addition, social media is a collection of software that allows individuals and communities to share, gather, communicate, and in certain cases collaborate or play with each other. So, it can be concluded that social media is the most practical means of communication and is very popular with many people because it allows users to communicate, share information, and interact virtually. However, the openness of information and freedom of speech on social media also raises new challenges, namely the increasing use of inappropriate language, including hate speech, even though this freedom has been regulated in Article 27 paragraph 3 of the ITE Law. One of the most popular social media platforms today is TikTok. This platform allows users to create and share short videos with various creative features. Through TikTok a person is free to communicate with others, both in the form of status updates, commenting, criticizing, and even blaspheming others. A person can easily participate, share, and fill in forums on their respective social media, and social media as a public space that acts as a medium for discussing, exchanging ideas, and communicating freely so that hate speech often appears.

Through TikTok, hate speech often appears in the comments section, especially against content that is considered controversial or disliked by netizens. This phenomenon shows how social media users easily convey criticism, insults, and even slander to other users openly and massively. Common forms of hate speech include insults, defamation, blasphemy, unpleasant actions, provoking/inciting, and spreading false news. All of these forms are not only negatively charged, but also loaded with context-dependent meanings, so pragmatic analysis is a relevant approach to examine them more deeply into the occurrence of freedom of communication with others, whether in the form of status updates, commenting, criticizing, or even blaspheming others. A person can easily participate, share, and fill in forums on their respective social media, and social media as a public space that acts as a medium to discuss, exchange ideas, and communicate freely and democratically. Social media provides internet users or better known as netizens, a tool for online communication. For example, in TikTok citizens can communicate through comments sent to the TikTok application. These comments can be positive and some are negative. Negative comments are a problem because they often contain hate speech. This research is important because the phenomenon of hate speech on social media, especially TikTok, is increasingly widespread and endangers social relations. Social media has become an interactive and open public space, so hatred can be easily disseminated. In addition, hate speech also has a serious impact on the psychological condition of the victim, such as decreased self-confidence and even extreme actions such as suicide. Therefore, understanding the form and meaning of hate speech through a pragmatic approach is an important step in educating and preventing negative communication culture on social media.

Several previous studies have examined hate speech on social media from various perspectives. First, Widyatnyana et al. (2023) in their research on Twitter social media found various types of hate speech such as insults, defamation, and incitement, as well as six

pragmatic meanings that accompany them. This research is relevant because it links the types of utterances with their contextual meanings, but the object studied is limited to the Twitter platform. Therefore, it needs to be developed on other platforms such as TikTok that have different forms of interaction, such as video comments that are more direct and spontaneous. Second, Irawan et al. (2024) highlighted the internal and external factors that influence the emergence of hate speech and its impact on society. While this study is important in understanding the social and psychological background of hate speech, it does not focus on the form of language or the meaning of the speech itself. This research could be complemented with a linguistic approach, particularly pragmatics, to examine how these utterances are shaped and understood in a particular context. Third, research by Musriana et al. (2024) focuses on the phenomenon of hate speech on Instagram by highlighting forms of speech such as mockery and insults. However, this study has not analyzed the meaning of speech in a particular context in depth. Therefore, there is still room to develop this study through a pragmatic approach that not only identifies the form of utterances, but also interprets their meaning based on the context of interaction. Therefore, the pragmatic approach still needs to be developed in analyzing hate speech that appears in the context of everyday digital communication, such as in TikTok.

This research focuses on the comments column of Aceh tiktokers accounts including; HK (@herlin****02) on January 3, 2025, AA account (@arif****) on January 10, 2025, FH account (@fatieh*****24) on January 14, 2025, and SS account (@she*Sau***) on January 17, 2025. This account was chosen because the account owner was involved in a problem and caught a lot of public attention. The purpose of this study is to describe the forms of hate speech and describe the pragmatic meaning of netizen comments on the TikTokers Aceh account comment section. Thus, this research is expected to provide a deeper understanding of hate speech in terms of pragmatic studies. As well as the benefits obtained with this research, namely; first, this

research is expected to add insight to readers about hate speech that often appears on social media as well as its form and meaning. Second, this research is expected to be a reference reading source and a reminder for the community not to easily give negative comments on social media.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative approach to describe the form and meaning of hate speech in the comment sections of Aceh TikTokers' accounts. Sugiyono, (2022:9) explains that qualitative research is research used to study or examine natural objects. The researcher acts as the key instrument, data analysis is inductive, and the research results focus more on meaning than generalization. This type of research is descriptive research. Kurniasih, (2019:51) explains that descriptive research is research that describes the actual state of the object being studied. The data consists of utterances in the form of words, phrases, clauses, and sentences containing elements of hatred sourced from four TikTok accounts, namely @herlinken02, @arifafanda, @fatiehton24, and @She* Sau***, with posts selected based on the high level of negative interaction from netizens. The indicators of hate speech focused on in this study refer to the Chief of Police Circular Letter Number SE/06/X/2015 as follows.

- a) Insult, characterized by the use of words or phrases that demean a person's dignity.
- b) Defamation, in the form of comments that accuse without basis and have the potential to damage reputation.
- c) Defamation, indicated by speech that offends someone's identity or beliefs.
- d) Provoking/inciting, which is speech that encourages others to hate or attack.
- e) Spreading fake news, in the form of conveying information that does not correspond to the actual facts.

Data collection is done through documentation techniques by storing data by utilizing relevant documents such as written text, photos, videos, or other forms. Documents in this

study are in the form of videos, followed by reading techniques to select hate speech, and note taking techniques to record data systematically. Maghfiroh et al (2021: 4) states that the note technique is a technique by recording parts that are considered important, recording can be done after the previous technique has been completed and with certain tools. The data found in this study amounted to 57 speech data containing elements of hatred. However, in this article, the researcher only analyzes 14 data of hate speech insulting 4 data, defaming 3 data, blasphemy 2 data, provoking/inciting 3 data, and spreading false news 2 data. Furthermore, the data is analyzed based on Miles and Huberman's theory through the stages of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing, so as to obtain an in-depth understanding of the form and meaning of hate speech analyzed contextually in pragmatics studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study were obtained through an in-depth analysis of hate speech found in the comment sections of TikTok accounts belonging to Acehnese users. A total of 57 data points were identified. The data was selected based on elements such as offensive, intimidating, and prejudicial statements from various parties. This data was found in the comment sections of posts by Herlin Kenza (HK) on January 3, 2025, Arif Afanda (AA) on January 10, 2025, Fatiehaton (FH) on January 14, 2025, and Shella Saukia (SS) on January 17, 2025. The data was then classified based on its form and described pragmatically. After analyzing 57 data points, the forms of hate speech found in the comment columns of Acehnese TikTokers' accounts are presented in the following table.

Table 3. Research Results on Forms of Hate Speech

No.	Forms of Hate Speech	Amount of data
1.	Insult	28
2.	Defamation	12
3.	Blasphemy	3
4.	Provoking/inciting	10
5.	Spreading Fake News	4

The data in this study is presented in its original form as found in the comment sections of Aceh TikTokers' accounts, even though it does not conform to the rules of proper and correct language, in order to preserve the authenticity of the meaning and context of the statements. Therefore, presenting the data in its original form provides a comprehensive picture of the reality of language use in the context of communication on social media, particularly in TikTok comment sections.

The forms of hate speech in this study are classified based on the Criminal Code (KUHP) and other provisions outside the KUHP; namely 1) insult, 2) defamation, 3) blasphemy, 4) unpleasant acts, 5) provocation/incitement, and 6) spreading false news (Mauludi, 2018: 278). Furthermore, the meaning presented in this study is viewed from a pragmatic perspective. The

following is a discussion of the forms of hate speech found in the comment sections of Aceh TikTokers' accounts.

A. FORMS OF HATE SPEECH ON TIKTOK

1. Insults

Mauludi (2018:278) states that insult in the Criminal Code is attacking someone's honor, the person being attacked usually feels ashamed. The object of insult is a sense of self-esteem or dignity regarding honor and the good name of a person, whether individual or communal (group). KBBI VI Online (2023) states that insult is the process, method, and act of insulting someone that is truly excessive. According to Widyatnyana et al (2023:71) insult is offending and degrading

someone's dignity. This form of hate speech was found on the Acehese TikTok account.

(1) *ikan pesut yang pake helm bogo*

Data (1) account users commented that HK was like an animal called a “pesut fish.” According to KBBI VI Online (2023) pesut is a freshwater dolphin commonly found in the Mahakam River in Kalimantan. The pesut has a slender body, a short snout, a rounded forehead, a grayish-blue color on the upper body, and a lighter color on the lower body (orcaella brevirostris). The phrase “helm bogo” is used to mock physical appearance excessively, implying that HK's head appears large and abnormal. Therefore, the account user has no right to compare HK to an animal with a large head because HK is a human being. According to the KBBI VI Online (2023), a human being is a rational creature. The statement in question is a phrase. This comment constitutes an insult because it degrades HK's dignity. This sentence is used as a form of hyperbole humor that combines something unusual, a pesut fish with human attributes in the form of a helmet, thus creating a funny effect and attracting attention on TikTok. For TikTok users, this sentence functions as entertainment because its strangeness easily triggers laughter and curiosity. However, if addressed to someone the utterance can have implications as a form of ridicule or satire of appearance or behavior that is considered unusual.

(27) *Panèe lumoe nyoe (sapi dari mana ini)*

Data (27) account users commented that FH is a “cow.” Calling someone a ‘cow’ in Indonesian culture generally has a derogatory meaning, so when directed at a human being, it can be considered treating that person as if they have no dignity or are considered stupid, slow, or just “following” without thinking. This form of speech is a phrase. According to the KBBI VI Online (2023) a cow is a ruminant animal with horns, even-toed hooves, four legs, a large body, and is raised for its meat and milk. The addition of the phrase “where did this come from” reinforces the mocking impression, as if questioning someone's existence or origin in a dismissive tone or considering that person

“unworthy” of being there. Thus, this comment can be categorized as hate speech because it contains elements that demean FH. Comments like this, contain a derogatory meaning of mockery because the word cow is used as a derogatory metaphor to equate the account owner with an animal that is considered stupid or worthless, while the phrase from where reinforces a sarcastic impression as if his existence is strange and inappropriate. Pragmatically, the comment serves to dehumanize the account owner, cause embarrassment or offense, and has negative implications for other audiences because it can normalize hate speech and encourage the creation of mocking comments on social media.

(44) *Sedeng (kurang waras)*

Data (44) account users commented that SS was insane. The form of speech was a word. According to KBBI VI Online (2023) Sedeng means crazy or insane. The term “crazy” has negative social and cultural connotations. When used to refer to or mock someone, especially in a public context, it can be considered a form of degradation or harassment of personal dignity. Calling someone “crazy” openly can tarnish that person's reputation and make them appear insane or untrustworthy, especially if said without basis. This form of speech is a phrase. According to KBBI VI Online (2023), “crazy” has several meanings, including: mentally ill or mentally unstable, insane, excessively fond of something, losing one's mind due to strong emotions, and as an informal expression of surprise or admiration. However, when the word “crazy” is used to directly refer to or mock someone, its use in such a context can be considered an insult because it degrades a person's dignity, attacks their personality, especially if uttered in public spaces like social media. This comment is used as a form of insult that attacks a person's psychological state by equating the account owner as mentally unhealthy or not thinking normally. Pragmatically, it serves to undermine the account owner's dignity and credibility by questioning his or her sanity, which may cause offense, embarrassment, or anger. For other audiences, such comments have negative implications because they normalize the use of the term mental

illness as a pejorative, reinforce mental health stigma, and create a climate of abusive and hateful communication in digital spaces.

(19) *Doktif vs Satwa Liar*

Data (19) account users commented that AA was referred to as “wild animals.” According to the KBBI VI Online (2023), wild animals are all animals that live on land and in water that still have wild characteristics, whether they live freely or are kept by humans. This statement is a phrase. This comment has a derogatory meaning, equating AA with wild animals that are often associated with brutal behavior, lack of education, and no social norms. In our culture, humans are valued for their intellect, ethics, and ability to behave well in society. When someone is called a “wild animal,” it means they are considered to lack these qualities, thereby degrading their dignity and personal honor. Such insults not only attack a person's character but also humiliate them in front of others, which under the law or social norms can be considered a violation of personal dignity. Therefore, this comment can be categorized as hate speech because it contains elements that demean others. This comment appears to be derogatory because it compares the account owner to a “wild animal,” which is an animal that is considered untamed, uncivilized, or difficult to control. Pragmatically, this comment is used to ridicule by associating the account owner's behavior or appearance with something wild, strange, and not in line with social norms. The implication is that the account holder may feel humiliated or negatively labeled, while other audiences may also consider themselves worthy of ridicule or belittlement. This can reinforce a bad image of the account holder while normalizing the use of animal names as a form of insult in social media comment spaces.

2. Defamation

Defamation is a series of acts that cause damage to a person's self-esteem, tarnish their reputation or good name, and are carried out contrary to ethics (KBBI VI Online, 2023). Mauludi (2018:72) states in the Criminal Code that defamation is also known as (defamation) is

the act of defaming someone's reputation or honor by stating something either verbally or in writing. Defamation is the act of tarnishing someone's reputation with something that is not true, thereby making individuals or groups feel uncomfortable (Widyatnyana et al., 2023:71). The impact of this is that it influences public opinion and can change the views of others towards the person or group being targeted. Simply put, defamation can result in the loss of public trust in the party mentioned. The following is a discussion of defamation data.

(11) *Ti boti*

Data (11) The account user commented that AA is a boti. The word boti in slang has negative connotations related to sexuality. In addition, the word “boti” is derived from the word “bottom,” which refers to a person's position in a same-sex sexual relationship, particularly in gay couples. This form of expression is a word. The use of this term is often intended to belittle someone. It is evident from the comment that the account user belittled AA's self-esteem by calling him a “boti,” even though AA was clearly dressed like a man in the video. This comment is a form of ridicule intended to belittle the account owner, with associations to the terms bot or robot, which in the context of social media are often used to refer to someone who is considered inauthentic, strange, or does not think like a normal human being. Pragmatically, it serves to demean the account owner by labeling them as if they were not an individual worthy of respect, but rather something artificial or worthless. As a result, the account owner may feel humiliated, while for other audiences, the comment can create a negative perception as a form of insult in the digital space.

(52) *yang tertutup belum tentu baik*

Data (52) account users commented, “Being covered up does not necessarily mean you are good,” meaning that SS women who wear Muslim clothing do not have good character. This statement is in the form of a sentence. The sentence can be interpreted as a negative insinuation or innuendo against SS women who dress modestly. This means that even though

someone appears “covered up” (often associated with piety or goodness), it does not necessarily mean they are good. The form of this statement is a phrase. Such a phrase can be interpreted as indirectly accusing hypocrisy, which can be seen as demeaning to SS. This comment contains subtle insinuations that question a person's character based on their outward appearance, especially if the account owner wears modest clothing or has a religious appearance. Pragmatically, it serves to question the account owner's morals by implying that outward appearance does not always reflect inner goodness. As a result, the account holder may feel offended for being cornered or perceived as hypocritical, while other audiences may be influenced by negative stereotypes toward those who dress modestly, thereby reinforcing stereotypes and worsening the account holder's image in the digital public sphere.

(31) *Tanda-tanda melèe tan lé* (tanda-tanda malu tidak ada lagi)

Data (31) account users commented that “there are no more signs of shame.” This means that FH is a woman who has no sense of shame. This statement is in the form of a phrase. The phrase “there are no more signs of shame” indicates that FH does not feel ashamed of her actions or behavior, which could be considered a negative assessment of FH's character. Such comments have the potential to damage FH's reputation, especially if read by others who may not be aware of the context or reasons behind the commenter's actions. This could lead others to view FH negatively, even without clear reasons or valid evidence, thereby tarnishing SS's reputation on social media. This comment is a disparaging criticism that implies that the account owner has no sense of shame or knows no bounds in their behavior in public spaces. Pragmatically, this statement is used to judge the account owner's actions or appearance based on certain moral standards. The implication is that the account owner may feel humiliated, as if their behavior is deemed inappropriate, while other audience members may be influenced to reinforce this stigma, ultimately strengthening bullying practices and hate speech in the comment section.

3. Blasphemy

Blasphemy is a process, method, and act of insulting that makes an individual or group feel humiliated (KBBI VI Online, 2023). Mauludi (2018:279) states that in the Criminal Code, blasphemy is an act carried out by accusing an individual or group of having committed a certain act with the intention of making the accusation public (carried out by many people). Widyatnyana et al (2023:72) argues that blasphemy is an act that demeans by accusing someone of doing something related to religion, race, and culture. The following is an explanation of the form of hate speech found on Acehnese TikTok accounts that are considered to contain blasphemy.

(36) *Bijéh Israel nyan (keturunan Israel itu)*

Data (36) account users commented “descendant of Israel” to FH. This means that FH is a woman who comes from the Jewish people or ancient Israeli tribes. FH is a Muslim and used these words with the intention of degrading or insulting FH in relation to Israel or Jews, which is considered blasphemy against that group. Even in the context of Islam, which teaches respect for all human beings, such statements can contradict religious teachings. This comment could give rise to negative news about FH's life and the origins of her descendants. Thus, this comment can be categorized as hate speech in the form of blasphemy. The form of speech is a phrase. his comment has negative connotations because it uses a specific ethnic or national identity as a form of ridicule. Pragmatically, this sentence is used to stigmatize the account owner by associating them with a group that is often linked to sensitive political and religious issues, thereby demeaning or disparaging them. As a result, the account owner may feel humiliated because their identity is equated with something perceived as negative, while other audiences may be influenced and contribute to normalizing the use of ethnic or national stereotypes as tools of insult. This has the potential to reinforce discrimination, intolerance, and hate speech based on ethnicity, religion, or race in the digital space.

(26) *Astagfirullah gadéh marwah (Astagfirullah, Hilang Marwah Aceh)*

Data (26) account users commented, “Astagfirullah, Aceh's honor is lost,” meaning that FH, a woman, has damaged the honor of the community, especially in Aceh. Account users commented that FH has damaged Aceh's honor simply because she became a model. This means: she is considered shameful to the people of Aceh because she does not live according to “Islamic law” as perceived by some people. This is seen as insulting to the people of Aceh who live differently, especially if it is stated openly on social media. The form of this statement is a sentence. This comment could lead to negative news about FH's life. Therefore, this comment can be categorized as hate speech in the form of defamation. This comment has religious undertones because it contains religious expressions (*astagfirullah*) followed by an assessment that the account owner's actions are considered damaging or demeaning to the honor (*marwah*) of the Acehnese community. Pragmatically, this sentence is used to blame and humiliate the account owner by linking his behavior to the collective image of a region or cultural identity. The implication is that the account owner is not only viewed negatively on a personal level but also seems to be the cause of the community's honor being tarnished. For other audiences, this comment can reinforce moral and customary-based social control while normalizing the practice of social punishment in the digital space.

4. Provoking/Incitement

The word provoke comes from the word provocation. Provocation is an act of arousing anger, incitement, instigation, or provocation that leads to bloodshed, while incitement is arousing people's emotions so that they become angry, rebellious, and so on (KBBI VI Daring, 2023). Widyatnyana et al (2023:73) state that provoking/inciting is arousing someone's emotions to make them angry and act in accordance with the speaker's expectations. Mauludi (2018:280) states that in the Criminal Code, provoking/inciting means an act

committed to provoke anger, irritation, and cause people to have negative thoughts and emotions. The following are forms of hate speech that provoke/incite.

(14) *Yok kawal yok pokoknya harus sampe pake baju orange*

Data (14) shows that the account user commented, “Let's keep an eye on it, we have to make sure he wears orange.” The user is encouraging other social media users to monitor SS until he is sent to prison. This statement is in the form of a sentence. The word ‘yok’ is an informal version of “yuk,” but it has the same meaning. In the KBBI VI Online (2023), “yuk” is an exclamation indicating an invitation. In this sentence, it means inviting other social media users to join in monitoring or pressuring the case so that SS is punished. The expression “we must make sure he ends up wearing an orange jumpsuit” indicates the account user's desire for SS to definitely end up as a suspect and be detained, as “orange jumpsuit” typically refers to prison attire. According to KBBI VI Daring (2023), “harus” means ‘must’ or “obligatory.” The word “harus” expresses necessity or coercion, meaning that SS must end up as a prisoner. This shows a judgmental attitude before the legal process is complete. This comment is deemed as hate speech that provokes/incites because it takes the form of a command to influence other account users to ensure SS is imprisoned without waiting for evidence or the legal process.

This comment contains provocative undertones because the phrase “orange shirt” is usually associated with the uniforms worn by criminal prisoners in Indonesia. Pragmatically, this comment is used to corner the account owner with veiled accusations that he deserves to be prosecuted and sent to prison. As a result, the account owner may feel humiliated and defamed, as if they are already guilty, while other audience members may be influenced to reinforce negative stigma and pressure the account owner through mob mentality (trial by netizens). This has the potential to lead to cyberbullying while also reinforcing a culture of social punishment without a legitimate legal process.

(23) *Kawal SS pke baju oren dayang-dayang kmb ke lampu merah*

Data (23) The account user commented, "Escort SS wearing orange jumpsuits to the red light district." This statement is a sentence. The intention is for the account user to encourage other social media users to escort SS to prison, resulting in SS workers becoming unemployed and resorting to begging on the streets. "Monitor SS wearing orange uniforms" means the account user is urging others to monitor (supervise/pressure) SS until they are imprisoned, as "orange uniforms" are often worn by detainees (especially at the KPK), thereby rendering SS workers unable to secure decent employment and forcing them to become street beggars at the traffic light. This comment is deemed hate speech that provokes/incites because it issues a command to influence other account users to escort SS to prison without waiting for evidence or legal proceedings.

This comment is full of mockery and social condemnation. The phrase "orange jumpsuit" refers to prison uniforms, so pragmatically this comment implies a hope or encouragement that the account owner will be arrested and imprisoned. Meanwhile, the phrase "the maids return to the red light district" adds sarcasm by associating the account owner's circle or followers with the world of prostitution (red light district), thereby shaming not only the individual but also the group around them. The implication is that the account owner may feel humiliated, slandered, and labeled as criminal or immoral, while other audiences may reinforce this stigma. This is dangerous because it can normalize hate speech, strengthen digital bullying, and build public opinion that is judgmental without a clear legal basis.

(39) *BOYCOTT YUK*

Data (39) account users commented "boycott yuk," meaning that account users invited other social media users to join them. This statement is in the form of a phrase. In KBBI VI Daring (2023), yuk is an interjection that expresses an invitation to boycott SS because of its alleged sale of overclaimed products. In the KBBI VI Online (2023), "yuk" is an exclamation

indicating an invitation. In the KBBI V Online (2019), the word "boycott" means to refuse to cooperate. A call to boycott without explanation or strong grounds can be confusing, lead to speculation, or provoke anger without direction. This can stir up mass emotions without proper understanding. If this comment is directed at a product, brand, figure, or group without reason or evidence, it can be categorized as speech that has the potential to incite hatred or damage reputation. This comment is deemed as hate speech that provokes/incites because it takes the form of a command to influence other account users to boycott SS. This comment is a collective call to reject or withdraw support for the account owner, whether in the form of viewing, following, or interacting on social media. Pragmatically, this comment is used as a form of social pressure with the aim of undermining the popularity and image of the account owner through collective action. As a result, the account owner may feel isolated and lose public support, while other audiences may be provoked to join the boycott movement. This has the potential to create a domino effect of digital shaming and reinforce cancel culture in the social media space.

5. Spreading False News

Spreading false news is the act of conveying or disseminating information that is not in accordance with the facts in order to deceive or negatively influence others (KBBI VI Daring, 2023). Mauludi (2018:281) states in the Criminal Code that spreading false news is the act of deliberately conveying false information that can cause harm, unrest, or anxiety in society. Indicators of the spread of false news/hoaxes include false or fabricated information disseminated to create panic in society (Widyatnyana et al., 2023:73). Therefore, it can be concluded that spreading false news is the act of disseminating information that does not align with reality to others. The following are forms of hate speech that spread fake news.

(6) *Suaminya kurir rupanya*

Data (6) account users commented, "Her husband is apparently a courier," meaning that HK's husband works as a courier, which is false

or fake news. This can be seen from the facts in the following statement from a reliable media source:

WarnaNusa.com: Deriel Realdy is a handsome man from Jakarta born on June 5, 2004. Deriel is known as a professional model. He won second place in the Mister Glam International 2022 competition, a prestigious talent search event under the auspices of Miss Grand Tourism Indonesia. As is known, Deriel Realdy owns a clothing business named DHER.ID.

From the quote above, we can see that HK's husband is not a kuru. The statement is a phrase. The comment made by the account user was proven to spread false news. Mauludi (2018:281) states in the Criminal Code that spreading false news is the act of deliberately conveying false information that can cause harm, unrest, or anxiety in society.

This comment is derogatory because the profession of courier is used as a subject of ridicule, as if the job is of little value or inappropriate. Pragmatically, this comment is used to belittle the social status of the account owner by insulting their spouse, thereby not only demeaning the individual but also their family. The implication is that the account owner may feel offended or humiliated because her husband's profession is viewed negatively, while other audience members may be influenced to reinforce the negative stigma associated with the courier profession. This is dangerous because it normalizes class-based harassment and reinforces discrimination against a profession that deserves respect.

(41) *BPOM bisa dibeli coy*

Data (41) account users commented, "BPOM can be bought, dude." The comment implies doubt about the integrity and credibility of the permits issued by the Indonesian Food and Drug Administration (BPOM), suggesting that the BPOM permits obtained by SS were obtained through unlawful or improper means, such as bribery, rather than through an objective evaluation process in accordance with applicable regulations. This is false information or a hoax. The form of the statement is a phrase. This can be

seen from the facts in the following statement from a reliable media source:

Jakarta, VIVA News: Ikrar also emphasized that BPOM cannot be paid or bribed with money. "It cannot be done (paid to issue a distribution license), and that is our commitment as a state institution that cannot be paid or bribed."

From the above quote, we can see that the Head of the Food and Drug Supervisory Agency (BPOM), Taruna Ikrar, clearly stated that the BPOM cannot be bought or bribed with money. Mauludi (2018:281) states in the Criminal Code that spreading false news is an act of intentionally conveying false information that can cause harm, unrest, or anxiety in society.

This comment is a form of satire that accuses the account owner (or the promoted product) of obtaining distribution permission from BPOM not through official procedures, but through bribery or manipulation. Pragmatically, this sentence serves to cast doubt on the authenticity, safety, and legality of the product, while damaging the credibility of the account owner in the eyes of the public. The implications are that the account owner could be labeled as dishonest or untrustworthy, while other audiences may be swayed to also distrust, reject, or even label the product and account owner as fraudsters. This has the potential to reinforce negative stigma, damage reputation, and normalize unfounded accusations in the digital space.

B. The Pragmatic Meaning of Hate Speech by Aceh TikTokers

Yule (in Wulandari et al., 2023:26) explains that pragmatics is the study of the meaning conveyed by the speaker (writer) and interpreted by the listener (reader). Pragmatics is a very important concept and cannot be separated from speech and the speaker, because without context, the meaning of speech cannot be analyzed. Akbar et al (2023:264) state that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between language and context as well as other external factors, so that the meaning of a statement can be understood. Understanding

the meaning of utterances using this theory means analyzing what people mean by their utterances (Susiani, 2023:56). Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the relationship between the context outside language and the meaning of utterances (Eliastuti et al., 2023). Simply put, it is about studying the meaning of utterances, i.e., the purpose for which the utterances are made. Pragmatics is needed so that the process of interpreting hate speech can be linked to contexts as in pragmatic theory.

(1) *ikan pesut yang pakek helm bogo*

The above statement was made by @Fak**ran on January 4, 2025, on HK's account with the intention of insulting HK's physical appearance and the way he wore a large konde that resembled a helmet. This insult occurred while HK was broadcasting live. During the broadcast, HK challenged NM, which enraged NM, prompting NM to retaliate during their own live stream by using the terms "minion, doll, dolphin, and wearing a headdress larger than their head." Additionally, this occurred because HK defended his sister (SS), who was involved in a case related to the pilgrimage of transgender individual Isa Zega and the sale of products allegedly making exaggerated claims. As a result, netizens have continuously insulted HK with the term "dolphin."

(27) *Panèe lumoe nyoe (sapi dari mana ini)*

The context of the above statement was posted by the account @Matku***m on January 1, 2025, on FH's account, intended as an insult comparing FH to an animal, as a form of harsh sarcasm and rejection of her appearance, which was considered inappropriate. This comment arose because, after officially becoming a widow, FH frequently posted videos without wearing a hijab. Now, FH is known as an adult magazine model and often shares videos with appearances that are considered inappropriate according to Islamic law. In fact, we know that Aceh is very strict in its application of Islamic law. In one of the videos uploaded, FH is seen wearing a hijab that does not completely cover her head and wearing sexy clothes that reveal her thighs.

(44) *Sedeng (kurang waras)*

The context of the above statement was made by @Xuang***93 on January 19, 2025, on the SS account, intended as a satirical remark implying that SS's behavior in confronting Doktif was considered irrational or unreasonable according to social norms. This comment emerged when SS confronted Doktif in mid-January 2025, specifically on January 17, 2025, while Doktif was conducting a live stream on TikTok to review SS's skincare products. Feeling defamed because his products were labeled as dangerous, SS and his team visited the live stream location to seek clarification. However, the meeting escalated into tension and mutual reports to the police.

(19) *Doktif vs satwa liar*

The context of the above statement was made by @Raa*** on January 19, 2025, on the AF account, with the intention of mocking AF for describing behavior that was considered uncontrollable when confronting Doktif. This statement emerged when AA and SS confronted Doktif on Friday night, January 17, 2025, around 9:00 PM WIB, at a restaurant in Jakarta. The incident occurred while Doktif was doing a live broadcast on his TikTok account, discussing SS's skincare products, which he had previously reviewed critically. SS arrived with his entourage and immediately confronted Doktif, accusing him of spreading information that was detrimental to his business. The incident was recorded in a video that went viral on social media, triggering various reactions from netizens.

(11) *Ti boti*

The above statement was made by @Nady**da on January 18, 2025, on AA's account, intended as a derogatory taunt to imply that AA is feminine. This mockery arose when AA defended SS, who was in a dispute with NM, Doktif regarding SS's overclaimed product, and Dr.R, who reported NM as a suspect in extortion. During AA's live broadcast, AA mocked NK's personal assistant Mail by calling her a "babu" (maid) for conducting an investigation into DR. NM did not accept his personal assistant being insulted and responded to AA through a live broadcast on his TikTok account, calling AA a "boti international convict, babu Rahma uler"

(boti international convict, Rahma uler maid). That is why netizens continue to refer to AA as boti.

(36) *Bijéh Israel nyan (keturunan Israel itu)*

The context of the above statement was made by @Petern***k on January 16, 2025, on FH's account with the intention of insulting and mocking FH for dressing immodestly, comparing her to an enemy of Islam, because in Aceh, "Israel" is often considered a symbol of evil or religious disobedience. This comment arose because, after officially becoming a widow, FH frequently posted videos without wearing a hijab. Now, FH is known as an adult magazine model and often shares videos with appearances that are considered not in accordance with Islamic law. In fact, we know that Aceh is very strict in its application of Islamic law. In one of the videos uploaded, FH is seen wearing a hijab that does not fully cover her head and wearing sexy clothes that reveal her thighs.

(26) *Astagfirullah gadoh marwah aceh (astagfirullah hilang marwah aceh)*

The context of the above statement was made by the account @Puti***73 on February 22, 2025, on FH's account, intending to express moral condemnation implying that FH's actions were deemed to tarnish the honor and cultural values of the Acehnese community, which is known for upholding religious values and cultural dignity. This comment arose because, after officially becoming a widow, FH frequently posted videos without wearing a hijab. Now, FH is known as an adult magazine model and often shares videos with appearances that are considered not in accordance with Islamic law. In fact, we know that Aceh is very strict in its application of Islamic law. In one of the videos uploaded, FH is seen wearing a hijab that does not completely cover her head and wearing sexy clothes that reveal her thighs.

(14) *yok kawal yok pokoknya harus sampek pakek baju orange*

The context of the above statement was made by @Borom**t on January 19, 2025, on the AA account, with the intention of encouraging continued monitoring or pressure to ensure that the legal process proceeds until AA is formally

charged and detained. This statement arose because Doktif reported AA to the authorities regarding the assault and coercion with violence that Doktif experienced in Kelapa Gading, Jakarta, on Friday, January 17, 2025. From this, netizens reminded AA to be imprisoned for what he had done to NM and Doktif.

(23) *kawal SS pake baju oren dayang-dayang kmb ke lampu merah*

The context of the above utterance made by @Miqb**1 on January 19, 2025 on AA's account means an invitation to continue to supervise or pressure so that the legal process runs until AA is actually made a suspect and detained. This speech arose because Doktif reported AA to the mandatory parties about the beating and violent coercion experienced by Doktif in Kelapa Gading Jakarta on Friday, January 17, 2025. From that netizens reminded AA to be thrown into prison for what he had done to NM, and Doktif.

(39) *Boycott yuk*

The context of the above utterance made by @Bunaa***m on January 18, 2025 on SS's account intends to eliminate SS's existence because it has never shown guilt for its actions. This comment arose because SS summarized Isa Zega, allegedly sold overclaimed products, and feuded with NK and Doktif. Shella and Nikita were initially close friends, having even performed Umrah together in October 2024. However, their relationship soured after Shella facilitated the Umrah trip of Isa Zega, a transgender, without telling Nikita first. Nikita felt betrayed and considered SS's actions a form of support for blasphemy. In addition, Nikita accused SS of having debts of Rp100 billion and called him a "debtor". Nikita also criticized SS's skincare business, accusing him of overclaiming in the marketing of his products and saying the products came from China at low prices. The conflict between SS and Doktif began when Doktif reviewed Shella's alleged skincare products through a live broadcast on TikTok. Doktif found the product without a complete label and planned to test it in a laboratory. Feeling defamed, SS and her team went to Doktif at a restaurant to ask for clarification. The

meeting led to tension, and Doktif reported SS to Polda Metro Jaya for alleged coercion and threatening. SS denied the allegations and stated that his visit was only to confirm the origin of the product Doktif was reviewing. Until NM intervened in the feud between SS and Doktif by defending Doktif. She criticized SS's actions in coming to Doktif with her entourage and called SS by the nickname "Rahma Ular". NM also accused SS of overclaiming in her skincare business.

(6) *suaminya kurir rupanya*

The context of the above utterance was made by @y.b***e on January 5, 2025 on HK's account intending to insinuate that HK's husband is only a driver whose only job is to pick up HK wherever HK goes. The speech appeared when NK live broadcast said "instead of you saying Mail bencong you find out your man who you are now married to is a normal or normal guy" so that netizens were affected by NK's words and asked about HK's husband's life. Not only that, when HK was broadcasting live on TikTok, one of the netizens commented on what HK's husband did, HK also replied "there is no need to take care of my husband's kitchen, I don't need to explain what his job is, you don't need to know just take care of your own kitchen". Not only that, because HK's husband, whose daily life is seen on social media, only follows wherever HK goes, causing netizens to assume that HK's husband does not have a special or permanent job, in fact HK's husband is a model and owner of a clothing business called DHER.ID.

(41) *Bpom bisa dibeli coy*

The context of the above utterance made by @Chocola**e on January 19, 2025 on SS's account intends to imply a cynical criticism of BPOM's credibility and the legitimacy of Skinker SS products, which shows users' distrust of official authorities and endorsements on social media. This comment came at a time when NM criticized BPOM in late December 2024 to early January 2025. In her Instagram Story post on December 31, 2024, she voiced concern about the circulation of dangerous skincare products containing ingredients such as hydroquinone and mercury, and questioned how these products

could pass BPOM's license. NK also responded to BPOM's plan to call influencers who review skincare, including Dokter Detektif (Doktif), stating that BPOM should focus more on monitoring dangerous products rather than calling independent reviewers. In addition, on January 3, 2025, NM alleged that there were people at BPOM who received bribes related to the circulation of dangerous skincare products on the market. He expressed his readiness to be summoned by BPOM to provide information and submit questions directly to the agency.

(31) *Tanda-tanda melée tan lé (tanda-tanda malu tidak ada lagi)*

The context of the above statement was posted by the account @Agusfir***a on January 19, 2025, on FH's account, implying that FH has no shame in wearing revealing clothing and behaving in a manner inconsistent with the norms of decency in Acehese culture. This comment arose because, after officially becoming a widow, FH frequently posted videos without wearing a hijab. Now, FH is known as a model for adult magazines and frequently shares videos with appearances deemed inconsistent with Islamic law. Despite this, we know that Aceh is strongly rooted in the implementation of Islamic law. In one of the videos uploaded, FH is seen wearing a hijab that does not fully cover her head and wearing sexy clothing that exposes her thighs.

(52) *yang tertutup belum tentu baik*

The context of the above statement was made by @Virgo*o on January 19, 2025, on SS's account, with the intention of mocking SS for appearing religious but behaving badly. This comment arose because SS performed the umrah for IZ, an Indonesian transgender who performed the umrah dressed as a woman, and SS was suspected of selling overpriced products, leading to a dispute with NK and Doktif.

CONCLUSION

This study found that hate speech in the comment sections of Aceh TikTokers' accounts appeared in various forms, namely insults, defamation, blasphemy, provocation/incitement, and spreading false news, with insults being the

most dominant form and blasphemy being the least common. Furthermore, the pragmatic meanings found generally consist of phrases used to insult and mock Aceh TikTokers for actions deemed highly inappropriate. This study has addressed the research question and achieved its objectives by detailing the forms and meanings of hate speech using a pragmatic approach. The contribution of this research to knowledge lies in expanding pragmatic studies into the realm of digital communication, particularly social media, emphasizing the importance of contextual analysis in understanding the meaning of implicit speech. These findings can also serve as a foundation for the development of digital literacy, language ethics, and policies to address hate speech in online public spaces.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express gratitude to all contributors who are not listed as authors but have played a significant role in the writing of this journal, particularly to Syahriandi, S.Pd., M.Pd., as the first supervisor, and Juni Ahyar, S.Pd., M.Pd., as the second supervisor, who patiently provided guidance and direction from the beginning to the end of the writing process, as well as the author's family, especially his father Abdul Sami, mother Nur Hayati, and siblings Muhammad Mujizan and Salsabila, who provided motivation, prayers, and full moral and material support throughout the research process. All these contributions were instrumental in the completion of this journal. All funding for this research came from the author's personal funds, and there was no support from external parties or institutions. Therefore, there is no grant number to be listed.

REFERENCES

- Hj. Iswan Adriana, s. Ag, M. P. (2018). *Pragmatics* (A. Aziz (ed.)). Pena Salsabila, surabaya.
- Irawan, A. P., Irawatie, A., & Mulyana, P. D. (2024). Hate Speech in Deviation from the

- 2nd Precept of Pancasila. *Ikraith Humaniora*,
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37817/ikraith-humaniora.v8i1Ujran>
- KBBI. (2023). *Big Indonesian Dictionary VI Online*.
- Kurniasih, D. (2019). Hate Speech in Public Spaces: Pragmatic Analysis of Data from the Center for the Study of Religion and Peace (PSAP) Solo Raya. *Study of Religion and Society*, 15(01), 49–57. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jsam.v15i1.1153>
- Magfiroh, L., Patrisia, C., & Yuliati, A. E. (2021). Analysis of Imagery in a Collection of Poems Kuajak Kau ke Hutan dan Tersesat Berdua Karya Boy Candra. *Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, and Culture*, 1, 36–44.
- Mauludi, S. (2018). *Smart Law Series Awas Hoaks*. PT. Elex Media Komputindo Gramedia Group, member of IKAPI< Jakarta.
- Musrina, Firdaus, Istiqamah, & F, H. (2024). The Phenomenon of Warganet Hate Speech in the Instagram Social Media Comments column Riaricis1795 Account. *Journal of Indonesian Language Education and Learning*, 13(2), 187–198.
- Nabila, S., Kharisma, S. Z. A., Nathania, A. T., Vira, A. A., Alfina, U. Z., & Eni, N. (2023). Analysis of Hate Speech in Comment Columns on Social Media X, Tik Tok, and Instagram. *Social Science and Humanities*, 2(4), 45–51. <https://doi.org/2997>
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2022). *Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods*. ALFEBETA, CV Bandung.
- Widyatnyana, K. N., Rasna, I. W., & Putrayasa, I. B. (2023). Analysis of types and Pragmatic Meanings of Hate Speech in social media Twitter. *Indonesian Language Education and Learning*, 12(1), 68–78.