

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings and discussion based on the analysis of the data collected from Middle East Eye's Instagram account on two main aspects of analysis: (1) categorizing the types of speech acts found in comments containing hate speech, and (2) factors contributing to the emergence of hate speech in comments. Speech Act Theory (Searle, 1969) and Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) were used to examine the data. The purpose of this chapter is to present the research findings systematically and objectively, followed by an in-depth discussion to interpret the findings in relation to the research objectives.

A .Findings

This section presents the results of data analysis from comments on Middle East Eye's Instagram account related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. From a total of 1,000 comments, 17 were identified as containing hate speech and selected for further analysis. The analysis focuses on identifying the types of speech acts in hate speech and the factors that influence its occurrence. The data is categorized and interpreted based on the relevant theoretical framework to provide a clear and objective picture of the research findings.

1.Types of Speech Act found in Hate speech

Using Searle's Speech Act Theory (1969), the Researcher analyzed ten selected hate speech comments. The types of illocutionary acts found were:

No.	Comment	Types Speech Act
1	The slaughter still continues, they just can't help themselves	Assertive
2	Sniper kills intentionally, no stray bullets, killing a child? what moral are you having chosen people?	Assertive + Expressive
4	It's not war, it's one sided genocide, merciless killing of innocent children, burning men, women and babies live	Assertive
5	Israel is a genocidal state. Racist mass murdering maniacs. Free Palestine from occupation. No more apartheid	Assertive
6	Radical Jewish terrorism	Assertive
7	Not a war. Never was just a sick murdering entity funded by my government and allowed by the entire world	Assertive
8	Palestine must be liberated from the barbarian colonial genocidal Israel occupation	Assertive
9	Israhell is terrorist in the world	Assertive
10	Israhell satans dogs on earth	Assertive + Expressive
11	Israel go to hell	Directive
12	Get lost this is not a war. It's Genocide	Directive + Assertive
13	Death Death to the IDF	Directive
14	Damn, terrorist!!! The most documented and most denied genocide, you have a safe place in hell	Directive + Expressive
15	Shame on you mother fuckers	Expressive
16	Wow and they didn't shoot the donkey? Thought they shot everything that moves	Expressive
17	IDF are just evil bastards!	Expressive + Assertive

2 .Social Factors Contributing to the Emergence of Hate Speech

In this section, researchers examine the social factors that contribute to the emergence of hate speech in the analyzed Instagram comments. Social Identity Theory is used in this analysis to explain how intergroup attitudes are influenced by group identity. These attitudes include hostility and hatred. According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), people categorize themselves and others into in-group (us) and out-group (them). This categorization can lead to prejudice, stereotyping and hostility towards people outside their group. The four main components mentioned in the commentary are: In-group Favoritism, Out-group Hostility, Perceived Threat, and Moral Justification.

No.	Comment	Factor contributing
1	Israel go to hell	Outgroup Hostility
2	The slaughter still continues, they just can't help themselves	Outgroup Hostility
3	Shame on you mother fuckers	Outgroup Hostility
4	Damn, terrorist!!! the most documented and most denied genocide you have a safe place in hell	Outgroup Hostility + Moral Justification
5	IDF are just evil bastards!	Outgroup Hostility
6	Radical Jewish terrorism	Outgroup Hostility
7	Death Death to the IDF	Outgroup Hostility
8	Israhell is terrorist in the world	Outgroup Hostility

9	Israhell satans dogs on earth	Outgroup Hostility
10	Wow and they didn't shoot the donkey? Thought they shot everything that moves.	Perceived Threat
11	Sniper kills intentionally, no stray bullets, killing a child? what moral are you having chosen people?	Perceived Threat
12	This is not a movie, this is horror in real, the west has created monsters who are killing children.	Outgroup Hostility + Perceived Threat
13	Not a war. Never was just a sick murdering entity funded by my government and allowed by the entire world	Perceived Threat + Moral Justification
14	Get lost this is not a war. it's Genocide	Moral Justification
15	It's not war, it's one sided genocide, merciless killing of innocent children, burning men, women and babies live	Moral Justification
16	Israel is a genocidal state. Racist mass murdering maniacs. Free Palestine from occupation. No more apartheid	Moral Justification
17	Palestine must be liberated from the barbarian colonial genocidal Israel occupation	Moral Justification

B. Discussions

1. Types of Speech Acts Found in Hate Speech

In this research, the analysis of speech act types in hate speech is based on Speech Act Theory developed by John Searle (1969). Searle divides illocutionary acts into five main categories, namely: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives. Each has a distinctive communication function and reflects the speaker's intentions in a particular social context. The results show that of all the hate speech comments analyzed, only three main types of speech acts appear, namely: assertives, expressives, and directives. The other two categories, commissives and declaratives, were not found. The types of speech acts found are presented as follows:

a. Assertive

Assertive is a type of speech act in which a person states what he believes to be true. In Searle's (1969) speech act theory, assertive is used to convey a statement, opinion, or belief. So, this utterance does not ask others to do something, but rather conveys personal views as if they were facts. assertive speech acts have the purpose of stating something about the world that the speaker believes in. in the context of hate speech, such as the comments above, assertive is used to state negative accusations or opinions against other groups, and they are conveyed as if they were facts. They convey extreme accusations against Israel as if they were true, create an ideological narrative that Israel is a perpetrator of genocide and racism that instills hatred, generalize religious groups (Jews) as perpetrators of terrorism, use derogatory terms ("Israhell"), and portray Israel as a world terrorist by attacking national identity through the media. This use of assertiveness in hate speech shows that hate speech is not just an expression of emotion; it is a discursive strategy used

to shape public opinion, seed hostility, and define group identity based on ideological beliefs.

b. Expressive

Expressive is a speech act that expresses the speaker's feelings towards a certain situation. According to Searle (1969) expressive is a type of speech that is used to express the speaker's feelings, emotions, or psychological attitude towards something. This speech does not aim to provide information or ask others to do something, but only shows how the speaker feels in a particular situation. These comments are full of anger, sarcasm, and outright insults. Expressive speech acts in hate comments show that hate speech is also an emotional performative act. Emotion in expressive is not only a reflection of feelings, but also a rhetorical strategy to provoke, shame, and arouse group solidarity.

c. Directive

Directive is a speech act that aims to make the listener do something. According to Searle (1969), directive has a direction of fit in the form of world towards, namely the world must be adjusted to the speaker's words. In the analysis of hate speech conducted on comments on the Middle East Eye Instagram account, some comments contain harsh commands, calls for hatred, or calls to reject or attack certain groups. These comments show that in the context of hate speech, directive speech acts do not always take the form of polite explicit invitations, but can appear in the form of insults, threats, curses, or aggressive exclamations because even

though they are not direct physical actions, they can trigger a real reaction from the listener, especially in the context of conflict or violence.

d. The Absence of Commissive and Declarative Acts

In addition to the three types of speech acts found in hate speech comments, namely assertive, expressive, and directive, there are two other types of speech acts in Searle's (1969) theory, namely commissive and declarative. However, from the results of the data analysis, no comments were found that belonged to these two types. First, commissive speech acts are types of utterances that express a willingness to do something in the future, such as an oath or promise. Comments like "I will get back at them" on social media are usually spontaneous, emotional, and reactive rather than indicating a personal intention to act.

Second, declarative speech acts are types of utterances that can only be used by people who have official authority to change the status of something, such as saying, "I declare you fired" or "I hereby punish you." Ordinary social media users do not have such authority. They cannot make statements that change someone's legal or social status, so it is natural that declaratives are absent from comments. Therefore, the hate speech data does not show speech acts of commitment and declaration; there are more spontaneous expressions of feelings and opinions than long-term commitments or official decisions.

e. The Dominance of Assertive Speech Acts in Hate Speech

Based on the analysis of 17 comments containing hate speech, it was found that assertive speech acts were the most dominant form used by Instagram users to

express their hatred towards opposing groups. These assertive speech acts generally appeared in the form of statements, accusations, and ideological claims that were presented as if they were objective truths. The emergence of assertive speech acts in the form of accusations of genocide, terrorism, racism, and dehumanization against certain groups shows that hate speech on social media is not merely an outburst of emotion, but also a discursive strategy used to shape public opinion and reinforce ideological narratives. This finding reinforces the position that hate speech in the digital realm is often used to delegitimize opposing groups through the presentation of opinions constructed as facts.

B. Factors Contributing to the Emergence of Hate Speech

This section discusses the social factors that contribute to the emergence of hate speech in the Instagram comments analyzed, particularly those related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Based on Tajfel and Turner's (1979) Social Identity Theory framework. In this theory, individuals tend to categorize themselves and others into two groups, the in-group and the out-group. Often, group division leads to prejudice, stereotypes, and antipathy towards other groups. Based on the results of the analysis, there are four main factors that contribute to the emergence of hate speech:

a. Out-group Hostility

Direct expressions of hatred, anger and contempt towards those perceived as enemies or opponents show a form of hostility towards the opposing group. In the comments analyzed, this form of hostility is seen in the use of harsh words, insults,

and negative labeling. These comments indicate a deep-seated hatred of the opposing group. The use of abusive and symbolic words such as “devil dog” suggests that the opposing party is not only opposed, but also dehumanized. This reinforces the boundary line between “us” and “them,” and fuels sharp social polarization.

b. Perceived Threat

Perceived threat is the feeling that the opposing group is physically, ideologically, or morally dangerous. When someone feels that another group threatens their group's existence, security, or values, hate speech emerges as a form of defense or reaction. These comments show fear and concern, especially for the safety of children or civilians. Phrases such as “monster” or “killing children” suggest that the opposing group is seen as particularly dangerous and lacking in moral values, which can fuel resentment stemming from fear or trauma.

c. Moral Justification

Moral justification arises when hatred is considered a legitimate reaction to injustice or violation of moral values. In this context, hate speech is not perceived as negative and is positioned as a form of righteous resistance, and a form of defense or struggle against injustice. In these comments, the hatred arises because of a strong moral narrative. The commenter feels that the opponent has committed an extraordinary crime (e.g. genocide), so the hatred directed towards them is considered right and even necessary.

d. No Group Favoritism Found

In Social Identity Theory, in-group favoritism refers to a person's tendency to praise, defend, or show support for their own group. However, in the data analysis results, no comments were found that explicitly showed this attitude. Instead, most of the comments focus more on attacking the out-group such as Israel, IDF, or Jews, without any praise or defense of one's own group such as Palestinians or Muslims. This shows that the hate speech that appears is reactive and confrontational. Users prefer to express anger towards their opponents rather than building a positive image of their own group. This is also influenced by the characteristics of social media such as Instagram, which tends to encourage emotional and provocative expressions to get attention. As a result, hateful narratives are used more to attack than to strengthen group identity.

e. The Most Prominent Factors in Hate Speech

An analysis of the social factors underlying the emergence of hate speech shows that out-group hostility is the most frequently found factor in the comments analyzed. Comments containing hostility are characterized by the use of harsh words, explicit insults, and dehumanization of groups perceived as opponents, such as Israel, the IDF, or the Jewish community. Out-group hostility reflects the existence of a sharp social identity construction between “us” and “them,” as explained in Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Comments falling under this category not only demonstrate emotional hatred but also reveal the formation of a confrontational and exclusive group identity.