

## Analysis of Hate Speech Against Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan Related to the Mystical Prediction of the Sumatra Flood on Instagram @Gtlo.karlota

Putri Salsabilah Murad<sup>1</sup>, Israhayu Djafar<sup>2</sup>, Juriyati Rajak<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author:* [israhayudjafar1305@gmail.com](mailto:israhayudjafar1305@gmail.com)

**Submission:** 23 December 2025

**Revision:** 27 December 2025

**Accepted:** 03 January 2026

### Abstract

This study aims to identify the forms of hate speech directed at the figure of “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan” found in the comment section of the Instagram account @gtlo.karlota concerning her mystical prediction of floods in Sumatra. The data consist of user comments containing elements of insult, profanity, sarcasm, and threat. The data were analyzed using a forensic linguistic approach, focusing on speech act identification, violations of politeness principles, and their legal relevance to Indonesia’s Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) and the Criminal Code (KUHP). The findings reveal that hate speech is dominated by expressive and directive speech acts carrying insulting and threatening intentions. The use of aggressive language reflects low levels of legal awareness and digital ethics among social media users. These results emphasize the importance of digital literacy and responsible communication to foster a safe, polite, and civilized online environment.

**Keywords:** Netizen Comments; Politeness; Pragmatic Analysis; Speech Acts

### Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengungkap bentuk ujaran kebencian terhadap figur “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan” yang muncul dalam kolom komentar akun Instagram @gtlo.karlota terkait ramalan mistis banjir di Sumatera. Sumber data penelitian berupa komentar warganet yang mengandung unsur penghinaan, makian, sindiran, dan ancaman. Data dianalisis menggunakan pendekatan linguistik forensik dengan mengidentifikasi tindak tutur, pelanggaran prinsip kesantunan, serta keterkaitannya dengan pasal-pasal dalam Undang-Undang ITE dan KUHP. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ujaran kebencian didominasi oleh tindak tutur ekspresif dan direktif yang bermuatan penghinaan dan ancaman. Penggunaan bahasa yang agresif memperlihatkan rendahnya kesadaran hukum dan etika berbahasa di media sosial. Temuan ini menegaskan pentingnya literasi digital dan tanggung jawab komunikasi publik agar ruang digital menjadi tempat yang aman, santun, dan beradab.

**Kata Kunci:** Komentar Netizen; Kesopanan; Analisis Pragmatis; Tindakan Ucapan

## INTRODUCTION

Hate speech has become increasingly prevalent in social media comment sections. It represents a form of linguistic crime committed by spreading opinions to gain followers or support in order to foster hatred toward a person or a particular group.<sup>1</sup> The use of language on social media, which is often considered a form of humor or casual expression, can in fact lead to legal consequences when examined through a juridical lens. It is therefore unsurprising that language use in digital spaces frequently borders on criminal acts such as minor insults, defamation, slander, false information, indecency, gambling, death threats, or other forms of intimidation directed at others.

The field of study most often associated with examining such issues is forensic linguistics. Forensic linguistics is the scientific study of language as applied to legal and forensic contexts.<sup>2</sup> It is often employed to analyze linguistic expressions or utterances that carry potential legal or ethical implications—many of which occur on social media. People frequently make statements without realizing that their words may contain negative or harmful elements. Through forensic linguistic analysis, language is not only seen as a medium of communication but also as evidence that reflects intent, power, and potential criminality.

One case that attracted significant public attention for allegedly containing hate speech involved Fenny Rama, also known as “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan”. She is a sacred dancer with a deep interest in spiritual and mystical matters.<sup>3</sup> One of her mystical predictions concerned the occurrence of flooding, in which she claimed that floods would strike parts of Sumatra. This statement sparked heated reactions in the comment section of the Instagram account @gtlo.karlota, which reposted her remarks from a podcast interview with Robby Purba on YouTube. Many users responded with provocative and demeaning comments toward her figure, generating public debate about the limits of free expression and the violation of ethical and legal norms.

Studies on hate speech in social media have been widely conducted, yet few have examined it within the context of mystical narratives and local culture in Indonesia. Mjelva et al. highlights how online rumors can trigger social tension without explicit hate speech, but does not discuss the role of mystical symbolism in constructing such discourse.<sup>4</sup> Priyatna et al. analyzes network dynamics and types of hate speech on Twitter, but has not explored cultural contexts or local beliefs such as the myth of the Queen of the Southern Sea.<sup>5</sup> Joshi et al. develops a natural language-

---

1 Naganna Chetty and Sreejith Alathur, “Hate Speech Review in the Context of Online Social Networks,” *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 40 (May 2018): 108–18, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.003>.

2 Ahmed Alduais et al., “Forensic Linguistics: A Scientometric Review,” *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 10, no. 1 (December 31, 2023), <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2214387>.

3 Aji Susanto Anom Purnomo, “Mitos Peziarahan Pantai Selatan Melalui Perspektif Pseudo-Etnofotografi,” *Jurnal Bahasa Rupa* 7, no. 3 (August 31, 2024): 139–49, <https://doi.org/10.31598/bahasarupa.v7i3.1530>.

4 Mathilde B. Mjelva et al., “Beyond Hate Speech: Online Rumors and Out-Group Resentment in Divided Societies,” *Comparative Political Studies*, September 29, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00104140251381753>.

5 Centurion Chandratama Priyatna et al., “Analyzing Network Dynamics and Dominant Hate Speech Types in Twitter Conversations during Professional Football Matches,” *Retos* 73 (December 15, 2025): 78–96, <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v73.116541>.

based hate speech classification model but does not address spiritually nuanced speech.<sup>6</sup> Rahmat and Komariah discuss Instagram content management but do not connect it to hate speech issues.<sup>7</sup> Setya et al. focuses on user behavior rather than discourse of hatred toward mystical figures.<sup>8</sup>

This case is particularly relevant to be examined through a forensic linguistic approach because it involves the use of language that can be analyzed in terms of speech acts, speaker intent, situational context, and potential legal consequences for the individual being targeted. Based on this background, the present study seeks to address several questions: What forms of hate speech appear in the comments on the Instagram account @gtlo.karlota regarding the figure of “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan”? What types of speech acts are evident from a forensic linguistic perspective? And how do these utterances manifest legal implications, particularly in relation to Indonesia’s Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) and the Criminal Code (KUHP).

## Method

This study employs a qualitative descriptive approach aimed at understanding the forms and meanings of hate speech found in the comment section of the Instagram account @gtlo.karlota. This approach was chosen because it allows for an in-depth interpretation of linguistic data within its social, cultural, and communicative contexts.<sup>9</sup> The primary focus is on how language is used to express hostility and exercise symbolic power in digital spaces. The qualitative method provides the flexibility to interpret utterances that cannot be measured numerically, allowing each expression to be analyzed based on its function, intent, and communicative impact within online interactions. Through this perspective, linguistic behavior is treated not only as a reflection of emotion but also as an indicator of social dynamics in digital discourse.

The data for this research consist of comments posted by Instagram users on @gtlo.karlota, particularly those responding to “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan” and her prediction about flooding in Sumatra. Data were collected through observation and documentation techniques by monitoring the post and recording comments that met two main indicators: (1) comments containing elements of insult, profanity, or threat, and (2) comments referring to religion or personal identity. The collected data were then analyzed using a forensic linguistic approach, which involved identifying types of speech acts, examining violations of politeness principles, and linking the linguistic findings to relevant legal articles under Indonesia’s Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) and the Criminal Code (KUHP) to determine potential legal implications of the utterances.<sup>10</sup>

---

6 Avnesh Kumar Joshi, Hitesh Kumar Patel, and Pratik Kumar Mewada, “Multiclass Classification of Hate Speech Based on Large Language Models,” in *AI and Sustainable Transformations* (London: CRC Press, 2025), 40–47, <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003642886-6>.

7 Khansa Thifal Rahmat and Kokom Komariah, “Proses Pengelolaan Media Sosial Instagram Trans Studio Mall Bandung Sebagai Media Penyebaran Informasi,” *CONVERSE Journal Communication Science* 2, no. 2 (September 28, 2025): 10, <https://doi.org/10.47134/converse.v2i2.4967>.

8 Yanto Azie Setya et al., “Impulsive Buying Behavior on Instagram among Generations Y and Z in Indonesia,” *Retos* 15, no. 30 (September 26, 2025): 341–161, <https://doi.org/10.17163/ret.n30.2025.09>.

9 Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan RD*, Cet. ke 23 (Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta, 2016).

10 Georgina Heydon, *Researching Forensic Linguistics: Approaches and Applications* (Routledge, 2019).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Representation of Hate Speech in the Instagram Comment Section

Social media has become a space where discussions about spirituality, culture, and entertainment often intersect.<sup>11</sup> The Instagram account @gtlo.karlota, known for sharing mystical and cultural content from Gorontalo, uploaded a video excerpt from a podcast featuring Fenny Rama, or “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan.” In the clip, she made a mystical prediction about a potential flood that would strike the island of Sumatra. Her statement—expressed with spiritual confidence—quickly drew public attention. The post went viral and triggered thousands of reactions from users who were divided between curiosity and skepticism toward her claim. What began as a seemingly harmless mystical declaration soon evolved into a controversial digital discourse.

The responses in the comment section reflected a wide spectrum of emotions. Some users viewed her prediction as a personal belief unworthy of ridicule, while many others considered it excessive, irrational, or even misleading. The discussion, initially informative, gradually transformed into a site of verbal hostility.<sup>12</sup> The comment section no longer functioned as a forum for public dialogue but became a battleground for mockery and anger. Words, instead of fostering understanding, were now used as tools to express contempt and aggression toward a person rather than her ideas.

The post served as a magnet for collective emotional outbursts in the digital sphere. To some, “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan” was a controversial figure challenging common sense; to others, she was a victim of public scorn. What stood out most, however, was how easily the discussion shifted from reasoned disagreement to personal attacks. The comments were not aimed at examining the content of her prediction but at discrediting her as an individual. This illustrates how issues related to spirituality in digital culture often dissolve into emotionally charged disputes that neglect civility and empathy.<sup>13</sup>

To capture the linguistic patterns of hostility in the comment section, the researcher collected data using documentation techniques by transcribing and classifying comments containing verbal assaults, insults, profanity, or threats. These comments were then categorized according to their linguistic form and the type of attack directed toward the figure of “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan.” The table below summarizes representative examples of hate speech identified in the comment section of the @gtlo.karlota account.

---

11 Talib Hussain and Dake Wang, “Social Media and the Spiritual Journey: The Place of Digital Technology in Enriching the Experience,” *Religions* 15, no. 5 (May 16, 2024): 616, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15050616>.

12 Ljiljana Progovac and Antonio Benítez-Burraco, “From Physical Aggression to Verbal Behavior: Language Evolution and Self-Domestication Feedback Loop,” *Frontiers in Psychology* 10 (December 18, 2019), <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02807>.

13 Jodi Hunt, “Righteousness and Truth: Framing Dignity of Persons and Digital Discipleship as Religious Educational Forms of Response to Cyberbullying,” *Religions* 12, no. 4 (March 24, 2021): 227, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12040227>.

**Table 1.** Classification of Hate Speech Comments on @gtlo.karlota

Original Comment	English Translation	Type of Utterance	Nature of Attack
“Japodata huangango tanta”	“Don’t talk too much, auntie”	Direct insult	Verbal humiliation
“Busu mulu ibu”	“Your mouth stinks, ma’am”	Body shaming	Physical attack
“Tanya kasana dia mo mati di keadaan seperti apa”	“Ask her in what condition she wants to die”	Threat	Verbal intimidation
“Macam asli-asli ngana ini pukima”	“You act so righteous, you <i>pukima</i> (vulgar curse)”	Vulgar profanity	Extreme insult
“Halahhh, hari bgni msh prcaya? Apakah dia Tuhan?”	“Seriously? In this day and age you still believe that? Is she God?”	Religious sarcasm	Symbolic degradation
“so lawan-lawan nabi ey, so bole minta akan aer ini?”	“Defying the prophets, huh? Can she even give us water?”	Religious mockery	Spiritual degradation
“S macam Tuhan Nn ini b tau-tau bencana yang m terjadi”	“You act like God, pretending to know what disasters will happen”	Derisive remark	Demeaning comparison
“Depe mata saja tilutilupo sabla stel mo lia masa depan”	“She claims to see the future, but her eyes are cross-eyed”	Body shaming	Physical humiliation
“Ambungu tahede”	“Whatever, the leader of demons”	Moral insult	Religious stigma
“Ahh td percaya yg bgini kt, sma dng mnduakan Tuhan”	“I don’t believe such nonsense—it’s like betraying God”	Moral judgment	Religious denigration

*Source: by Author*

The table above reveals a variety of hate speech forms expressed in response to the post. Most comments did not address the substance of the mystical prediction but rather targeted the speaker’s identity and beliefs. The choice of words demonstrates an intention to humiliate, ridicule, or delegitimize. The dominance of vulgar and religiously loaded expressions highlights how digital discussions often escalate from rational criticism to emotional aggression.<sup>14</sup> Hate speech here functions not only as spontaneous expression but also as a form of collective moral judgment aimed at silencing someone deemed “different.”

Expressions like “Busu mulu ibu” and “pukima” represent an absence of empathy in digital communication. The deliberate use of offensive language reflects how users employ social media to channel collective frustration. In online culture, profanity often becomes normalized and even celebrated as a sign of authenticity or bravery. The harsher the language, the greater the attention

14 Lavinia Marin and Sabine Roeser, “Emotions and Digital Well-Being: The Rationalistic Bias of Social Media Design in Online Deliberations,” in *Religion and Philosophy Philosophy and Religion (RO)*, 2020, 139–50, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50585-1\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50585-1_7).

received. This pattern suggests that hate speech can serve as a social performance—an act of self-display that gains validation through linguistic aggression rather than respectful dialogue.<sup>15</sup>

Religious remarks such as “Apakah dia Tuhan?” and “so lawan-lawan nabi ey” reveal how users interpret mystical figures through moral and theological lenses. These utterances are not mere disagreement but moral condemnation. In Indonesian digital spaces, religious references are potent rhetorical devices for undermining someone’s legitimacy. By labeling a person as “challenging God” or “defying prophets,” commenters create a collective perception of wrongdoing.<sup>16</sup> Thus, religion becomes a discursive weapon that reinforces social exclusion in the guise of defending faith.

More severe examples, like “Tanya kasana dia mo mati di keadaan seperti apa,” cross the boundary between insult and threat. Mentioning death implies psychological intimidation and escalates verbal aggression into symbolic violence. In forensic linguistics, such utterances are categorized as severe hate speech because they evoke fear and humiliation. The anonymity of the internet emboldens users to express hostility they would never voice in person. As a result, digital spaces allow the circulation of threats that, while symbolic, can still cause real psychological harm.<sup>17</sup>

Comments such as “Depe mata saja tilutilupo sabla stel mo lia masa depan” exemplify physical humiliation or body shaming. Here, the user attacks bodily appearance—“cross-eyed”—to undermine credibility and dignity. In online discourse, physical mockery functions as a social tool for exclusion, signaling that those who deviate from normative beauty or behavior deserve ridicule.<sup>18</sup> Such language reproduces inequality in digital hierarchies, turning physical imperfection into moral deficiency. It transforms the body into a target of public entertainment and symbolic punishment.

Several users employ sarcasm to disguise hostility behind humor. For instance, “asik, dia melawan Tuhan” (“Cool, she’s fighting God”) may appear playful, yet it carries a sharp undertone of mockery. Sarcasm in digital communication often operates as a moral shield—users justify their insults as jokes. However, linguistically, this form remains deeply offensive, combining ridicule with humiliation. The overlap between humor and hatred makes detection difficult and normalizes cruelty as part of online entertainment.

Other comments rely on indirect forms of humiliation. The statement “Aku lebih percaya sama Mantri Oro ketimbang ibu itu” (“I’d rather believe Mantri Oro than that woman”) seems like a simple comparison but subtly discredits the target by aligning her with a figure perceived as nonsensical. This *indirect insult* masks aggression with politeness. In discourse analysis, such

---

15 Svenja Schäfer, Michael Sülflow, and Liane Reiners, “Hate Speech as an Indicator for the State of the Society,” *Journal of Media Psychology* 34, no. 1 (January 2022): 3–15, <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000294>.

16 Marc Ziegele, Teresa K Naab, and Pablo Jost, “Lonely Together? Identifying the Determinants of Collective Corrective Action against Uncivil Comments,” *New Media & Society* 22, no. 5 (May 17, 2020): 731–51, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819870130>.

17 Rob Cover, “Digital Hostility, Subjectivity and Ethics: Theorising the Disruption of Identity in Instances of Mass Online Abuse and Hate Speech,” *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 29, no. 2 (April 14, 2023): 308–21, <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565221122908>.

18 Mar Forment and Cristina Illamola, “May the Force Be with You... Gesturality of the Barcelonians Associated with Mockery, Insult and Protection,” *Languages* 9, no. 6 (May 23, 2024): 191, <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9060191>.

expressions are particularly insidious because they appear rational while delivering moral degradation. They contribute to a toxic communication culture that rewards clever ridicule over honest dialogue.

Almost all comments fall under expressive speech acts, revealing emotional states rather than reasoned arguments.<sup>19</sup> Users express anger, disbelief, or mockery without offering factual rebuttals. This linguistic behavior reflects how social media prioritizes affect over logic—language becomes an outlet for emotional release rather than mutual understanding. The immediacy of digital interaction amplifies this tendency, turning comment sections into arenas of emotional exhibition rather than spaces for reflection.

The interaction among users shows a contagious effect. One aggressive comment often sparks dozens of similar responses, creating a spiral of hostility. This imitation effect fosters a sense of collective participation in hate. Users mimic each other's tone and vocabulary to gain social approval. Linguistically, such patterns illustrate how hate speech spreads through social reinforcement and algorithmic visibility.<sup>20</sup> The result is a self-perpetuating loop where hostility becomes normalized and empathy progressively disappears from public conversation.

Some users adopt rhetorical questions to veil their derision, such as “so bole minta akan aer ini?” (“Can she even give us water?”) or “S macam Tuhan Nn ini b tau-tau bencana yang m terjadi” (“You act like God, pretending to know disasters”). These *mock questions* appear inquisitive but are meant to humiliate. Pragmatically, they do not seek information but perform ridicule. Such rhetorical strategies display sophistication in linguistic aggression: they harm reputations subtly, cloaked in the guise of curiosity or critique.

Taken together, the comments portray language as both a weapon and a mirror of social dynamics in digital space. Hate speech here does not always manifest through overt profanity; it often hides beneath sarcasm, humor, or moral judgment. Each word contributes to shaping public perception and constructing symbolic power relations. When circulated widely, such discourse transforms social media into a performative stage where domination and exclusion are enacted through language—often unconsciously, yet with profound effects on personal dignity.

### Linguistic Analysis and Legal Implications of Hate Speech

Language in digital spaces no longer serves merely as a medium of communication—it has become a mechanism of power that can humiliate, intimidate, and cause psychological harm. In the case of the comments directed at “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan,” the use of words and phrases such as “*pukima*,” “*ketuanya setan*,” and “*tanya kasana dia mo mati di keadaan seperti apa*” reveals deliberate aggression. These utterances are not accidental expressions but manifestations of collective anger that accumulate through online interaction.<sup>21</sup> When hatred is repeatedly expressed in public, language loses its dialogic function and transforms into a symbolic weapon used to reject and stigmatize those perceived as different.

---

19 Jean Mathieu Tsoumou, “Analysing Speech Acts in Politically Related Facebook Communication,” *Journal of Pragmatics* 167 (October 2020): 80–97, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.004>.

20 Sandip Modha et al., “Detecting and Visualizing Hate Speech in Social Media: A Cyber Watchdog for Surveillance,” *Expert Systems with Applications* 161 (December 2020): 113725, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113725>.

21 Amitabha Palmer, “How to Get Angry Online...properly: Creating Online Deliberative Systems That Harness Political Anger's Power and Mitigate Its Costs,” *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 23, no. 3 (August 3, 2024): 295–318, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470594X231222539>.

The comments demonstrate two dominant linguistic functions: emotional expression and social instruction. An utterance like *“jangan banyak ngomong tante”* (“don’t talk too much, auntie”) operates both as a command and an insult. This dual purpose creates a subtle yet forceful form of pressure disguised as spontaneous commentary. Such language thrives on social media because it gives users a sense of control—the illusion that they can correct, mock, or even condemn others without accountability.<sup>22</sup> Words become tools for exerting dominance rather than for fostering understanding.

These comments also illustrate the erosion of politeness norms in online discourse. Social values that once guided respectful speech—showing humility, giving consideration, and maintaining empathy—are often replaced by harsh and mocking tones. Statements like *“matanya aja juling, sok lihat masa depan”* (“she claims to see the future, but her eyes are cross-eyed”) not only reject the content of the statement but also publicly ridicule a person’s physical identity. This trend reflects how online “bravery” is often equated with the freedom to insult, while politeness is dismissed as weakness.

In legal terms, such comments fall within the scope of defamation and humiliation as regulated under Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law), as amended by Law No. 19 of 2016. Article 27 paragraph (3) states: *“Every person who knowingly and without right distributes, transmits, and/or makes accessible electronic information or documents containing insults and/or defamation shall be punished.”* Utterances containing direct insults—such as *“ketuanya setan”* (“leader of demons”)—clearly meet this criterion, as they are disseminated publicly online without legal right and with the intention to degrade another person’s dignity.<sup>23</sup>

Comments that include threats, such as *“tanya kasana dia mo mati di keadaan seperti apa”* (“ask her in what condition she wants to die”), also carry legal consequences. They fall under Article 29 of the ITE Law, which reads: *“Every person who knowingly and without right sends electronic information containing threats of violence or intimidation directed personally shall be punished.”* The inclusion of the word “mati” (“die”) conveys psychological intimidation and induces fear. This type of utterance may also violate Article 335 of the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP), which prohibits coercion or intimidation that causes fear or discomfort to another individual.<sup>24</sup>

Comments infused with religious undertones—such as *“melawan Tuhan”* (“defying God”) or *“menduakan Tuhan”* (“betraying God”)—represent a more complex form of hate speech. These expressions may violate Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law, which states: *“Every person who knowingly and without right disseminates information aimed at inciting hatred or hostility against individuals or groups based on ethnicity, religion, race, or intergroup (SARA) differences shall be punished.”* Although directed at an individual, the invocation of religious language broadens the potential harm, as it can provoke emotional reactions from a larger community and escalate private contempt into collective hostility.

22 Jonathon Reinhardt, “Social Media in Second and Foreign Language Teaching and Learning: Blogs, Wikis, and Social Networking,” *Language Teaching* 52, no. 1 (January 21, 2019): 1–39, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000356>.

23 Yuri Zaika et al., “Protection of Honour and Dignity: Theoretical and Practical Issues,” *International Journal of Public Law and Policy* 8, no. 3/4 (2022): 202, <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPLAP.2022.124423>.

24 M. Rizki Yudha Prawira, “Regulation Act of Torture in Criminal Code: Opportunity and Challenge to Improve Human Rights Situation in Indonesia,” *JUSTISI* 11, no. 1 (November 2, 2024): 17–35, <https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i1.3653>.

The rise of hate speech is deeply intertwined with the nature of digital communication—its anonymity, immediacy, and viral dynamics. Hidden behind screens, users feel liberated to express thoughts they would never dare to utter face-to-face. Comment sections often operate as *echo chambers*, where each hostile remark reinforces the next, creating an illusion of collective courage and unity.<sup>25</sup> In reality, this mechanism amplifies verbal violence and erodes social empathy. Aggression becomes contagious, spreading rapidly through repetition and validation from others.

Another key factor sustaining this behavior is the low level of legal awareness and digital literacy among internet users. Many are unaware that what seems like casual online commentary can lead to criminal charges. Article 310 of the Indonesian Criminal Code (KUHP) clearly states: *“Whoever intentionally attacks the honor or reputation of another person by accusing them of a certain act, with the intention that such accusation becomes known to the public, shall be punished for defamation with imprisonment for up to nine months.”* When people fail to distinguish between criticism and insult, freedom of expression turns into a justification for symbolic violence. Without awareness of ethical and legal boundaries, social media continues to normalize verbal hostility as a form of entertainment rather than a violation of human dignity.

## CONCLUSION

The study reveals that hate speech in the comment section of the Instagram account @gtlo.karlota, directed at the figure of “Ibu Ratu Pantai Selatan,” appears in various linguistic forms—ranging from direct insults, physical mockery, and religious sarcasm to explicit threats. Most comments contain expressive and directive speech acts that function to attack, demean, or exert psychological pressure. Language, in this context, becomes an outlet for emotional release and social positioning rather than a means of rational exchange. These findings show that social media has yet to mature into a space for constructive dialogue; instead, it operates as a medium that amplifies hostility, normalizes ridicule, and erodes politeness in digital communication.

Based on the findings, a systematic effort is needed to strengthen ethical awareness and digital literacy among users. Education on communication responsibility, limits of free expression, and the legal consequences of online hate speech must be made more accessible to the public. Government bodies and educational institutions can play a pivotal role by disseminating the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law) in language that is clear and widely understandable. This research contributes by mapping the linguistic patterns of hate speech, providing insights that can guide law enforcement, educators, and researchers in developing preventive strategies grounded in forensic linguistics and ethical communication.

Future studies should broaden the scope by comparing hate speech across multiple social media platforms such as TikTok, X (Twitter), and YouTube to identify differences in linguistic form and user context. Interdisciplinary approaches that integrate forensic linguistics, social psychology, and media studies will also be valuable for understanding the psychological and cultural factors underlying digital hostility. Moreover, subsequent research is encouraged to explore the development of linguistic-based detection systems for hate speech, ensuring that academic findings translate into practical applications that foster safer, fairer, and more empathetic online communication environments.

---

25 Natalia E. Tapsak, “An Icon of Dialogic Courage: Response to the Absurd of the Unity of Contraries,” *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 32, no. 3 (May 26, 2024): 454–70, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2023.2182438>.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Alduais, Ahmed, Mohammed Ali Al-Khulaidi, Silvia Allegretta, and Mona Mohammed Abdulkhalek. "Forensic Linguistics: A Scientometric Review." *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 10, no. 1 (December 31, 2023). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2214387>.
- Chandratama Priyatna, Centurion, Agus Rahmat, Nindi Aristi, and Eny Ratnasari. "Analyzing Network Dynamics and Dominant Hate Speech Types in Twitter Conversations during Professional Football Matches." *Retos* 73 (December 15, 2025): 78–96. <https://doi.org/10.47197/retos.v73.116541>.
- Chetty, Naganna, and Sreejith Alathur. "Hate Speech Review in the Context of Online Social Networks." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 40 (May 2018): 108–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.003>.
- Cover, Rob. "Digital Hostility, Subjectivity and Ethics: Theorising the Disruption of Identity in Instances of Mass Online Abuse and Hate Speech." *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 29, no. 2 (April 14, 2023): 308–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565221122908>.
- Forment, Mar, and Cristina Illamola. "May the Force Be with You... Gesturality of the Barcelonians Associated with Mockery, Insult and Protection." *Languages* 9, no. 6 (May 23, 2024): 191. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9060191>.
- Heydon, Georgina. *Researching Forensic Linguistics: Approaches and Applications*. Routledge, 2019.
- Hunt, Jodi. "Righteousness and Truth: Framing Dignity of Persons and Digital Discipleship as Religious Educational Forms of Response to Cyberbullying." *Religions* 12, no. 4 (March 24, 2021): 227. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12040227>.
- Hussain, Talib, and Dake Wang. "Social Media and the Spiritual Journey: The Place of Digital Technology in Enriching the Experience." *Religions* 15, no. 5 (May 16, 2024): 616. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15050616>.
- Joshi, Avnesh Kumar, Hitesh Kumar Patel, and Pratik Kumar Mewada. "Multiclass Classification of Hate Speech Based on Large Language Models." In *AI and Sustainable Transformations*, 40–47. London: CRC Press, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003642886-6>.
- Marin, Lavinia, and Sabine Roeser. "Emotions and Digital Well-Being: The Rationalistic Bias of Social Media Design in Online Deliberations." In *Religion and Philosophy Philosophy and Religion (R0)*, 139–50, 2020. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50585-1\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50585-1_7).
- Mjelva, Mathilde B., Sebastian Schutte, Helga Malmin Binningsbø, and Francesca R. Jensenius. "Beyond Hate Speech: Online Rumors and Out-Group Resentment in Divided Societies." *Comparative Political Studies*, September 29, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00104140251381753>.
- Modha, Sandip, Prasenjit Majumder, Thomas Mandl, and Chintak Mandalia. "Detecting and Visualizing Hate Speech in Social Media: A Cyber Watchdog for Surveillance." *Expert Systems with Applications* 161 (December 2020): 113725. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.113725>.
- Palmer, Amitabha. "How to Get Angry Online...properly: Creating Online Deliberative Systems That Harness Political Anger's Power and Mitigate Its Costs." *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 23, no. 3 (August 3, 2024): 295–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470594X231222539>.
- Prawira, M. Rizki Yudha. "Regulation Act of Torture in Criminal Code: Opportunity and Challenge to Improve Human Rights Situation in Indonesia." *JUSTISI* 11, no. 1 (November 2, 2024): 17–35. <https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v11i1.3653>.

- Progovac, Ljiljana, and Antonio Benítez-Burraco. "From Physical Aggression to Verbal Behavior: Language Evolution and Self-Domestication Feedback Loop." *Frontiers in Psychology* 10 (December 18, 2019). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02807>.
- Purnomo, Aji Susanto Anom. "Mitosis Peziarahan Pantai Selatan Melalui Perspektif Pseudo-Etnofotografi." *Jurnal Bahasa Rupa* 7, no. 3 (August 31, 2024): 139–49. <https://doi.org/10.31598/bahasarupa.v7i3.1530>.
- Rahmat, Khansa Thifal, and Kokom Komariah. "Proses Pengelolaan Media Sosial Instagram Trans Studio Mall Bandung Sebagai Media Penyebaran Informasi." *CONVERSE Journal Communication Science* 2, no. 2 (September 28, 2025): 10. <https://doi.org/10.47134/converse.v2i2.4967>.
- Reinhardt, Jonathon. "Social Media in Second and Foreign Language Teaching and Learning: Blogs, Wikis, and Social Networking." *Language Teaching* 52, no. 1 (January 21, 2019): 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000356>.
- Schäfer, Svenja, Michael Sülflow, and Liane Reiners. "Hate Speech as an Indicator for the State of the Society." *Journal of Media Psychology* 34, no. 1 (January 2022): 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000294>.
- Setya, Yanto Azie, Arief Helmi, Dwi Kartini, and Yevis Marty Oesman. "Impulsive Buying Behavior on Instagram among Generations Y and Z in Indonesia." *Retos* 15, no. 30 (September 26, 2025): 341–161. <https://doi.org/10.17163/ret.n30.2025.09>.
- Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Dan RD*. Cet. ke 23. Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta, 2016.
- Tapsak, Natalia E. "An Icon of Dialogic Courage: Response to the Absurd of the Unity of Contraries." *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 32, no. 3 (May 26, 2024): 454–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870.2023.2182438>.
- Tsoumou, Jean Mathieu. "Analysing Speech Acts in Politically Related Facebook Communication." *Journal of Pragmatics* 167 (October 2020): 80–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.004>.
- Zaika, Yuri, Oleksandr Kukhariev, Volodymyr Skrypnyk, Serhii Burlakov, and Oleh Ilkiv. "Protection of Honour and Dignity: Theoretical and Practical Issues." *International Journal of Public Law and Policy* 8, no. 3/4 (2022): 202. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPLAP.2022.124423>.
- Ziegele, Marc, Teresa K Naab, and Pablo Jost. "Lonely Together? Identifying the Determinants of Collective Corrective Action against Uncivil Comments." *New Media & Society* 22, no. 5 (May 17, 2020): 731–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819870130>.