



Analysis of Hate Speech in the Comments Column of the Instagram Account @ahmadsahroni88: A Pragmatic Study

Sahrina Putri Utami^{1*}, Eko Muharudin², Laily Nurlina³, Isnaeni Praptanti⁴

¹²³⁴Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

*E-mail : sahrinapu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe and classify the forms of hate speech found in the comment section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88 during the period of September to October 2025 based on illocutionary speech acts within a pragmatic framework. This research employs a descriptive qualitative method. The object of the study is hate speech containing elements of insult, defamation, blasphemy, and provocation. Primary data sources were obtained from the comment columns of posts on the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88, while secondary data were derived from books, journals, and relevant academic articles. The population includes all comments posted during the specified period, with samples taken using random sampling techniques based on hate speech criteria. The research instrument was the researcher as a human instrument, supported by a documentation instrument table. Data collection techniques involved documentation and note-taking methods. The validity of the data was tested using theoretical triangulation by comparing the data with Searle's theory of illocutionary speech acts. The data analysis tool followed the Miles, Huberman, and Saldana model through three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The results of the study indicate that the forms of hate speech identified include (1) representative illocutionary speech acts containing insults, defamation, and blasphemy; (2) directive illocutionary speech acts containing insults, blasphemy, and provocation; and (3) expressive illocutionary speech acts containing insults, defamation, and blasphemy.

Keywords: hate speech, comment column, instagram, pragmatic study

Analisis Ujaran Kebencian pada Kolom Komentar Akun Instagram @ahmadsahroni88: Kajian Pragmatik

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan dan mengklasifikasikan bentuk ujaran kebencian dalam kolom komentar akun instagram @ahmadsahroni88 periode September-Oktober 2025 berdasarkan tindak tutur ilokusi dalam kajian pragmatik. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif dengan objek berupa ujaran kebencian yang mengandung unsur penghinaan, pencemaran nama baik, penistaan, dan provokasi. Sumber data primer diperoleh dari kolom komentar unggahan akun Instagram @ahmadsahroni88, sedangkan data sekunder berasal dari buku, jurnal, dan artikel ilmiah relevan. Populasi penelitian adalah seluruh komentar pada periode tersebut, dengan sampel diambil secara acak (random sampling) berdasarkan kriteria ujaran kebencian. Instrumen penelitian adalah peneliti sendiri sebagai human instrument, dibantu dengan tabel instrumen dokumentasi. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan metode dokumentasi dan teknik catat. Keabsahan data diuji dengan triangulasi teori, yaitu membandingkan data dengan teori tindak tutur ilokusi Searle. Alat analisis data mengacu pada model Miles, Huberman, dan Saldana melalui tiga tahap: reduksi data, penyajian data, serta penarikan kesimpulan dan verifikasi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa bentuk ujaran kebencian yang ditemukan meliputi (1) tindak tutur ilokusi representatif dengan unsur penghinaan, pencemaran nama baik, dan penistaan; (2) tindak tutur ilokusi direktif dengan unsur penghinaan, penistaan, dan provokasi; serta (3) tindak tutur ilokusi ekspresif dengan unsur penghinaan, pencemaran nama baik, dan penistaan.

Kata kunci: ujaran kebencian, kolom komentar, instragram, kajian pragmatik

Submitted
07/05/2026

Accepted
12/05/2026

Published
17/05/2026

Citation	Utami, S. P., Muharudin, E., Nurlina, L., & Praptanti, I. (2026). Analysis of Hate Speech in the Comments Column of the Instagram Account @ahmadsahroni88: A Pragmatic Study. <i>Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra, Volume 5, Nomor 3, Mei 2026, 2165-2174</i> . DOI: https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v4i3.1453
----------	---

Publisher
Raja Zulkarnain Education Foundation

INTRODUCTION

Social media has significantly changed public communication patterns. The ease of access and freedom of expression offered is directly proportional to the rise of communication deviations, one of which is hate speech (Guntara & Herry, 2022). Hate speech not only deviates from ethical norms but is also dangerous because it can trigger social conflict and is considered an unlawful act under Article 28 Paragraph (2) of the ITE Law and Circular Letter of the Chief of Police Number SE/6/X/2015 (Ramadhani & Hasibuan, 2024).

Public figures, especially politicians, are vulnerable targets of hate speech. The Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88, belonging to a member of the Indonesian House of Representatives (DPR RI), Ahmad Sahroni, was chosen as the research object due to its high level of interaction and a tendency for increasing intensity of hate speech. This phenomenon is reflected in netizen comments containing insults, defamation, blasphemy, and provocation. Social media is often used as an outlet for emotions, giving rise to interesting forms of language use worth studying.

Pragmatics was chosen because it can reveal the implicit meaning behind speech (Evizariza, 2024). Pragmatics integrates the speaker's intent, context, and communication target, enabling researchers to understand not only what is said but also the social and psychological impact of the speech (Gustama, 2023). Therefore, this study aims to identify hate speech against public figures on social media through a pragmatic approach.

Based on this background, the research problem is formulated as follows: What forms of hate speech appear in the comments section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88 as viewed from illocutionary speech acts?

In line with the research problem formulation, the purpose of this study is to describe and classify the forms of hate speech found in the comments section of the Instagram account

@ahmadsahroni88 as viewed from illocutionary speech acts.

This research is expected to provide theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, this research contributes to the understanding and classification of hate speech characteristics from a linguistic perspective. Practically, this research is beneficial for: (a) other researchers as an empirical basis for similar studies, (b) students as a learning reference for the application of pragmatic theory, (c) teachers/lecturers as teaching materials on language ethics and digital literacy, and (d) the general public to increase awareness of digital literacy in using language wisely and responsibly.

This research uses a pragmatic approach. Yule (2006:3-4) defines pragmatics as the study of meaning conveyed by speakers and interpreted by interlocutors. Sumarlam et al. (2023) add that pragmatics encompasses the context beyond language that shapes the meaning of utterances. A central study in pragmatics is speech acts. Austin (1975) stated that speaking is essentially an act. Searle et al. (1980) categorizes illocutionary speech acts into five types: representative, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative.

Hate speech is defined as any communication expression containing insults, provocation, discrimination, or hatred toward an individual or group (Pasaribu & Wulan, 2020). The National Police Chief's Circular Letter No. SE/6/X/2015 also emphasizes that hate speech can take the form of written text, images, symbols, or other digital content. Royani (2018) adds that hate speech can lead to discrimination, violence, and even social conflict.

There are three relevant studies worth discussing. First, Hutabarat and Radhiah (2025) analyzed hate speech on Anies Baswedan's Instagram account based on the categories in the National Police Chief's Circular Letter. The difference is that that study focused solely on identifying the form, while this study conducted an in-depth analysis using a pragmatic approach to uncover the illocutionary intent. Second, Amalia

and Sirulhaq (2025) examined linguistic impoliteness on Gibran Rakabuming's Instagram account. That study focused on impoliteness in general, while this study specifically examines hate speech from a pragmatic and legal perspective. Third, Stefani Manurung et al. (2025) analyzed hate speech on social media platform X, on the account "Habis Nonton Film," in an entertainment context. This study differs in that it took a politician (Ahmad Sahroni) as its subject within a sociopolitical context and employed pragmatic analysis as the primary analysis to systematically examine illocutionary speech acts.

METHOD

This study employed descriptive qualitative methods. This approach was chosen to identify, categorize, and describe in detail the various types of hate speech found in the comments section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88. The research procedure followed the model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014), which consists of three stages: (1) data reduction, (2) data presentation, and (3) drawing conclusions and verification. The operational steps included collecting data in the form of comments containing hate speech, identifying and classifying the data based on the categories of hate speech forms and illocutionary speech acts, analyzing the meaning of the illocutionary speech acts, and drawing conclusions.

This research was designed as a qualitative descriptive study with a pragmatic approach. The pragmatic approach is used to analyze speech not only from the aspect of literal meaning but also encompassing the speaker's purpose (intent) and the impact it has on the communication situation. Specifically, the pragmatic framework focuses on illocutionary speech acts, which are classified according to Searle et al.'s (1980) theory into five types: representative, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. The object of this research is forms of hate speech, including insults, provocation, blasphemy, and defamation.

This research was conducted on the Instagram social media platform, specifically in the comments section of the @ahmadsahroni88 account. Primary data collection focused specifically on the period from September to October 2025. This timeframe was chosen based on the increasing intensity of hate speech during that period.

The primary instrument in this study was the researcher herself (human instrument), who played a role in observing, classifying, recording, and analyzing the data. The study also utilized documentation instruments in the form of an instrument table that recorded categories of hate speech (insults, defamation, blasphemy, and provocation) in illocutionary speech acts. The data collection technique employed the documentation method (Mardawani, 2020:52) by collecting and citing screenshots or digital archives of relevant posts and comments. The initial data collection process was conducted randomly (random sampling) during the specified period, followed by note-taking techniques (Sudaryanto, 2015) to record, identify, and classify the data into an analysis table. The documentation instrument is in the form of a hate speech classification table as presented in Table 1 and Figure 1, a screenshot of comments from the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88.



Figure 1
Screenshot of Comments about People's Representatives



Figure 2
Screenshot of a Comment on Someone's Facial Expression



Figure 3
Screenshot of Comments on the Mockery

The data analysis technique refers to the model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) through three stages. First, data reduction, which involves collecting data in the form of comments containing hate speech from posts on the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88. Second, data presentation, which involves identifying and classifying data based on the categories of hate speech forms and illocutionary acts used by netizens. Then, each data point is analyzed by outlining the meaning of the illocutionary acts within the hate speech. Third, conclusion drawing and verification, which involves drawing conclusions from the analysis to obtain a comprehensive picture of the forms and meanings of hate speech. Data validity was tested using theoretical triangulation, comparing hate speech data with Searle et al.'s (1980) theory of

illocutionary speech acts. Insults and defamation are associated with expressive illocutionary acts, defamation with representative acts, and provocation with directive acts.

RESULTS

Based on data analysis of comments containing hate speech in the comments section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88 for the period September-October 2025, various forms of hate speech were identified, classified according to three types of illocutionary acts: representative, directive, and expressive. The results of this study address the research problem regarding the forms of hate speech that emerge from these illocutionary acts.

1. Forms of Hate Speech in Representative Illocutionary Acts

Representative illocutionary acts in this study take the form of statements, judgments, or accusations conveyed by the speaker as if they were true. The findings in these speech acts include the following three elements of hate speech:

- a. Insults: found in the statements "A people's representative but his Instagram looks like Jamet, who hasn't gone to school," "Wow, this people's servant is hedonistic," "A market thug's face becomes a member of the House of Representatives," "A jerk," "This is what happens when his mind is only filled with people's money, he can't think, he doesn't dare to debate," and "Being humble to improve his quality ? being humble because he's low-quality ?." Insults are realized through the words "jamet," "maid," "market thug," and "jerk," which demean the target.
- b. Defamation: found in the statements "Buying luxury goods from the common people's taxes is a matter of pride," "Roni won't survive without the people's money," "Gosh, the people's money, the proceeds of corruption," "If you want to live healthily, you won't be healthy, just eat dirty money," and "Breakish even eating people's money, you're so proud,



you're so proud, hell is ahead, you smell of the earth." These statements are accusations of corruption and misuse of public funds without evidence. c. Blasphemy: found in the utterance "Sahroni is the messenger of Satan, the son of the Dajjal, the most stupid human on earth." This utterance uses the religious symbols "Satan" and "Dajjal" which insult moral and religious values.

2. Forms of Hate Speech in Directive Illocutionary Acts

The directive illocutionary acts in this study aim to influence the addressee to take action. The findings of these speech acts include three elements of hate speech, as follows:

- a. Insult: found in the utterances "Sharpen your brain, sir. Sharpening your brain is indeed difficult, sir" and "This is all there is to it???????? Remember there is an afterlife!!! Ugh." These utterances take the form of advice or reprimands that belittle the target's intellectual abilities.
- b. Insult: found in the utterance "I hope you die soon, Roni, so Indonesia will be safe." This utterance is an extreme death wish and contains a cruel, inhumane prayer.
- c. Provocation: found in the utterances "If you meet this person, just burn him on the spot" and "Burn down the DPR." Both of these utterances contain calls for violence and destruction that could trigger conflict.

3. Forms of Hate Speech in Expressive Illocutionary Acts

Expressive illocutionary acts in this study directly convey the speaker's emotional feelings, such as anger, hatred, or dislike. The findings in these speech acts include three elements of hate speech, as follows:

- a. Insults: found in the utterances "You're ugly, stupid, people think you're so good-looking," "Members of the House of Representatives are assholes," "I'm annoyed with Sahroni's empty brain," "You use our money for illegal reasons,"

and "Flexing is proud of the people's money." Insults attack the target's physique, character, intellectual abilities, and dignity with harsh language.

- b. Defamation: found in the utterances "You use our money for illegal reasons" and "Flexing is proud of the people's money." These utterances contain serious accusations against the target, even though they are delivered as emotional outbursts.
- c. Blasphemy: found in the utterances "Hopefully, I'll be punished, eh, I'll definitely be," "The faces of the inhabitants of hell," and "The creature that the fires of hell long for." These utterances use the religious symbols of "punishment," "hell," and "creature" to attack the target's morals and spirituality.

DISCUSSION

The research results show that hate speech in the comments section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88 from September to October 2025 was classified into three types of illocutionary speech acts according to Searle et al. (1980): representative, directive, and expressive. These three types of speech acts contain elements of insult, defamation, slander, and provocation. The following discussion will elaborate on each finding using a more in-depth pragmatic approach, encompassing the context of the speech situation, the speaker's intention (illocutionary act), and the resulting effect (perlocutionary act) on the interlocutor and the reading public.

Representative Illocutionary Speech Act: Accusations Disguised as Facts

Representative speech acts are defined by Searle (in Leech, 2016) as speech acts that bind the speaker to the truth of the proposition being uttered. In a pragmatic context, representative acts function to convey the speaker's beliefs, opinions, or conclusions regarding a situation. However, in this research, the term "representative" is used as a tool to spread unsubstantiated accusations, veiled insults, and defamation disguised as objective statements.

a. Insults in Representatives

Statements such as "People's representative but his Instagram looks like Jamet, who didn't go to school" and "Market gangster's face becomes a member of the House of Representatives" are literally statements. However, from a pragmatic perspective, the illocutionary meaning behind these utterances is insulting by belittling the target's social status, education, and physical appearance. The use of the words "jamet" (an abbreviation of "jajal metal," which refers to a village lifestyle and lack of education) and "market gangster" embodies strong negative stereotypes in Indonesian society. The speaker deliberately uses this diction so that the listener (reader) and the public understand that the target deserves to be insulted because he is deemed unfit to hold the position of member of the House of Representatives.

From a contextual perspective (Yule, 2006), these utterances appeared between September and October 2025, when Ahmad Sahroni was actively flaunting his luxurious lifestyle on Instagram. This social context is what triggers netizens to make comments that attack individuals, rather than simply criticize policies. Thus, representative speech acts in the form of insults function not only as judgments but also as strategies for damaging reputations in the digital public sphere.

b. Defamation in Representative Speech

Statements such as "Wow, people's money, the result of corruption" and "I'm proud to eat people's money, hell is ahead, the smell of earth" are representative because the speaker presents the accusation as true. However, according to pragmatic theory, these utterances violate the principle of politeness (Leech, 2016) because the speaker lacks sufficient evidence. The illocutionary intent of these utterances is to irresponsibly accuse and defame the target in the eyes of the public.

From a perlocutionary perspective (Austin, 1975), the resulting effect is very dangerous. Other readers unaware of the facts may believe that Ahmad Sahroni is corrupt. As a result, public opinion is formed negatively, which can fuel collec-

tive hatred. In the context of social media, these accusations spread quickly and are difficult to eradicate, even if their truth remains unproven. This is in line with the findings of Hutabarat and Radhiah (2025) that baseless accusations often appear on politicians' accounts.

c. Blasphemy in Representation

The utterance "Sahroni, the messenger of Satan, the son of the Dajjal, the most stupid human on earth" is the most extreme form of representation. Illocutionarily, the speaker intends to insult by equating the target with symbols of religious evil (Satan and the Dajjal). According to Sholihatin (2019:114), blasphemy falls into the category of hate speech based on ethnicity, religion, race, and intergroup relations (SARA), which is subject to legal sanctions. From a pragmatic perspective, the use of religious symbols is intended to amplify the effect of hatred and dehumanize the target, so that the public perceives them as a common enemy to be avoided.

The advantage of this analysis is its ability to distinguish between (constructive) criticism and insults, defamation, and blasphemy. A limitation is that this study only took a two-month sample, so it cannot depict long-term trends in hate speech.

Directive Illocutionary Speech Acts: Covert calls to violence

Directive speech acts aim to influence the addressee to do something (Searle et al., 1980). In ideal communication, directives can take the form of neutral or positive requests, suggestions, or commands. However, in this research, directives have been transformed into provocations, insults, and insults aimed at inciting hatred and violence.

a. Insults in Directives

The utterance "I'm sharpening my brain, sir. It's hard to sharpen my brain, sir" is a suggestion. However, from a pragmatic perspective, the illocutionary intent is actually to insult the target's intellectual abilities. The speaker uses the directive structure (suggestion) as a shield to prevent



his remark from sounding too harsh, but still condescending. This indicates that the speaker is aware of politeness norms but intentionally violates them subtly. This phenomenon is known as indirect impoliteness (Amalia & Sirulhaq, 2025).

b. Insults in Directives

The utterance "I hope you die soon, Roni, so Indonesia will be safe" is a directive because it contains a hope (an indirect form of a command). However, the illocutionary intent is blasphemy and extreme bad wishes. According to Royani (2018), wishing death on someone is a form of hate speech because it contains deep hatred and inhumanity. In a pragmatic context, this utterance violates Grice's cooperative principle (in Yule, 2006) because the speaker fails to provide a relevant and polite contribution to the communication.

c. Provocation in Directives

The utterances "If you meet this person, just burn him on the spot" and "Burn down the House of Representatives" are the most dangerous forms of directives. Their illocutionary intent is to encourage others to commit acts of violence and damage state facilities. From a perlocutionary perspective, these calls have the potential to incite anarchy in the real world, especially if many readers are provoked. This aligns with the findings of Stefani Manurung et al. (2025) that hate speech on social media often contains calls for violence.

Expressive Illocutionary Speech Acts: Destructive Emotional Venting

Expressive speech acts function to express the speaker's psychological feelings, such as anger, happiness, disappointment, or hatred (Leech, 2016). In everyday communication, expressiveness naturally emerges as a form of emotional honesty. However, in the context of social media, expressiveness often turns into verbal attacks, defamation, and slander because speakers are not constrained by face-to-face norms.

a. Expressive Insults

The utterances "Your face is ugly, you idiot, people thought you were so good-looking huh" and "Members of the House of Representatives are the jerks" openly convey emotions of anger and irritation. The illocutionary intent is to insult the target's physical appearance and character. There is no attempt to hide the emotion or couch it in polite language. This demonstrates that social media is often used as a means of catharsis (emotional outlet) without regard for language etiquette. According to Hardianti (2024), low digital literacy makes it easy for netizens to spew hate speech as a form of expression of momentary anger.

b. Expressive Defamation

The utterances "You use our money for illegal reasons" and "Flexing is proud of the results of eating the people's money" convey emotions of dislike and suspicion. However, behind these emotions lies the illocutionary intent of making accusations without evidence. Although delivered as an outpouring of feelings, the perlocutionary effect is just as harmful as the representative one: damaging the target's reputation in the eyes of the public. This proves that expressive speech acts are not always "just feelings," but can function as destructive social actions.

c. Blasphemy in Expressions

The utterances "Wajah-jah wajah penduduk ini mah" and "Makhluk yang menyikikan api hell" are the most violent forms of expressive speech. The illocutionary intent is to insult by associating the target with punishment, hell, and cursed beings. The use of these religious symbols aims to spiritually humiliate the target while inciting collective hatred within a particular religious community. According to Royani (2018), SARA-based blasphemy is a serious violation because it can trigger horizontal conflict in society.

Overall, the findings of this study reinforce Searle et al.'s (1980) theory that illocutionary speech acts can be distinguished based on their communicative function. However, this study also

shows that in the context of social media, the boundaries between types of illocutionary acts are often blurred. For example, representative can function like expressive (emotionally charged judgments), directive can function like representative (invitations based on accusations), and expressive can function like directive (emotions aimed at influencing others).

Furthermore, context plays a crucial role. The period of September-October 2025 was chosen because at that time there was an increase in the intensity of hate speech, possibly triggered by political issues or Ahmad Sahroni's controversial lifestyle. Without understanding context, pragmatic analysis will be incomplete. This aligns with Sumarlam et al.'s (2023) opinion that pragmatics must consider aspects beyond language, such as the situation, social relations, and cultural background.

This research systematically uses theoretical triangulation (Searle), unlike previous research that was only descriptive without in-depth illocutionary analysis.

This discussion not only identifies the form of hate speech, but also reveals the speaker's intention (illocutionary) and the resulting effect (perlocutionary), thus providing a holistic understanding.

First, the sample size was only two months, so it cannot capture the long-term dynamics of hate speech. Second, this study did not analyze the speakers' social backgrounds (age, education, political affiliation), which are crucial for understanding the motivations behind the speech. Further research incorporating a sociolinguistic approach is recommended. This is the weakness of this research.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and discussion outlined above, the conclusion of this study addresses the research question regarding the forms of hate speech that appeared in the comments section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88 from

September to October 2025, as seen from the perspective of illocutionary acts. In general, three types of illocutionary acts were found to contain hate speech: representative, directive, and expressive. All three types of speech acts contain elements of insult, defamation, slander, and provocation.

First, representative illocutionary acts were found in the form of statements, judgments, or accusations conveyed by speakers as if they were true. Elements of hate speech that emerged in this speech act included insults through derogatory terms such as "jamet," "babu," "market thug," and "fuck." Defamation included accusations of corruption and misuse of public funds without evidence. Blasphemy also included the use of religious symbols such as "satan" and "dajjal."

Second, directive illocutionary acts were found in the form of suggestions, reprimands, hopes, and invitations aimed at influencing the interlocutor. Elements of hate speech that emerged included insults through suggestions that demean the target's intellectual abilities. Blasphemy included extreme death wishes. Provocation included calls for violence and destruction, such as "burn them down on the spot" and "burn the House of Representatives."

Third, expressive illocutionary acts were found in the form of direct expressions of the speaker's emotional feelings, such as anger, hatred, and dislike. Elements of hate speech that emerged included insults about the target's physical appearance, character, and intellectual abilities. Defamation included accusations delivered as an emotional outburst. Blasphemy also included bad prayers and the use of religious symbols such as "doom," "hell," and "creature."

Thus, it can be concluded that hate speech in the comments section of the Instagram account @ahmadsahroni88 during the September-October 2025 period manifested itself in three forms of illocutionary acts: representative, directive, and expressive, each of which contained elements of insult, defamation, blasphemy, and provocation.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Eko Muharudin, his supervisor, for providing guidance, direction, and input in the writing of this article. He would also like to thank his parents and family for their constant prayers and support, as well as his friends for their encouragement throughout the writing process.

REFERENCES

- Amalia, R., & Sirulhaq, A. (2025). Fenomena Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa pada Kolom Komentar Akun Instagram @Gibran_Rakabuming. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*, 14(1), 1–10.
- Armaya, A. A., Yasmin, A. S., Agustina, D., & Nurbaiti, N. (2023). Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Pengembangan Komunitas Virtual. *Madani: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 11(1), 2645-2652.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How To Do Things with Words*. Havard: Harvard University Press.
- Evizariza, E. (2020). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Penerapannya*. Editor: Tita Yunia Zalni. Padang: Gemilang Press Indonesia.
- Feroza, C. S., & Misnawati, D. (2020). Penggunaan Media Sosial Instagram pada Akun @Yhoophii_Official sebagai Media Komunikasi dengan Pelanggan. *Jurnal Inovasi*, 14(1), 32–41.
- Guntara, B., & Herry, A. S. (2022). Hak Kebebasan Berpendapat di Media Sosial dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 4(6), 6945–6961. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jpdk.v4i6.9432>
- Gustama, A. (2023). Analisis Tindak Tutur Pernyataan Pelaku Penyiraman Air Keras terhadap Novel Baswedan Kajian Pragmatik. *Jurnal Skripta*, 9(1), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.31316/skripta.v9i1.1926>
- Hanif, M., Salim, H., Widjojoko, Tiurlina, & Fatihaturusyidah. (2023). The Use of Social Media Technology in Educational Research at COVID-19 Time: Accounts and Problems. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, 9(7), 226–233. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9i7.4557>
- Hardianti, L. T. (2024). Literasi Digital dan Berkembangnya Hate Speech di Media Sosial dalam Pilpres 2024. *Filosofi: Publikasi Ilmu Komunikasi, Desain, Seni Budaya*, 1(4), 61–72.
- Hutabarat, K. D., & Radhiah, R. (2025). Ujaran Kebencian pada Kolom Komentar Media Sosial Akun Instagram Anies Baswedan. *Kande: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 69–78.
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Manurung, S. G., Kristin, D., Sukma Ayu, D., Sitorus, E., Simanjuntak, J., Fildawati, E., Siallagan, L., & dan Konseling, B. (2025). Analisis Ujaran Kebencian Netizen di Media Sosial X pada Postingan Akun “Habis Nonton Film”. <https://jicnusantara.com/index.php/jiic>
- Mardawani, M. (2020). *Praktis Penelitian Kualitatif Teori Dasar dan Analisis Data dalam Perspektif Kualitatif*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Maulidia, Y., & Martadireja, S. (2024). Analisis Bentuk Aktivitas Citizen Journalism melalui Facebook dan Instagram yang dikelola PT. Rejang Land Media. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial*, 6(1), 623–634. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v6i1.3385>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. New York: Sage Publications.
- Nurfajriani, W. V., Ilhami, M. W., Mahendra, A., Afgani, M. W., & Sirodj, R. A. (2024). Triangulasi Data dalam Analisis Data Kualitatif. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 10(17), 826–833.

- Pasaribu, R. G. M., & Wulan, G. A. (2020). Pencegahan Kejahatan Ujaran Kebencian di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Kepolisian*, 14(3), 171-188.
- Putradi, A. W. A., & Supriyana, A. (2024). *Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Putri, I., Dendi, Syukerti, N., Mulyadi, A. I., & Maulana, I. (2022). Media Sosial sebagai Media Pergeseran Interaksi Sosial Remaja. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Balayudha*, 2(2), 1–10.
- Rafiq, A. (2020). Dampak Media Sosial terhadap Perubahan Sosial Suatu Masyarakat. *Global Komunika: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 3(1), 18–29.
- Ramadhani, W., & Hasibuan, Z. L. M. (2024). Tinjauan Hukum Atas Perbuatan Ujaran Kebencian. *Indonesian Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (IJCLC)*, 5(2), 57–65. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ijclc.v5i2.21915>
- Razak, A. (2017). *Metode Riset: Menggapai Mixed Methods Bidang Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Pekanbaru: Ababil Press.
- Royani, Y. M. (2018). Kajian Hukum Islam terhadap Ujaran Kebencian/Hate Speech dan Batasan Kebebasan Berekspresi. *Jurnal Iqtisad*, 5(2), 211–237.
- Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F., & Bierwisch, M. (1980). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics* (Vol. 10). Springer.
- Sholihatin, E. (2019). *Linguistik Forensik dan Kejahatan Berbahasa*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sudaryanto, D. P. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa [Method and Technique of Language Study]*. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sumarlam, S., Pamungkas, S. R. I., & Susanti, R. (2023). *Pemahaman dan Kajian Pragmatik*. Solo: Buku Katta.
- Waruwu, M. (2024). Pendekatan Penelitian Kualitatif: Konsep, Prosedur, Kelebihan dan Peran di Bidang Pendidikan. *Afeksi: Jurnal Penelitian dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 5(2), 198–211.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.