



SOCIOPRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH IN HILARION HEAGY'S CONVERSION NEWS ON TWITTER

M. Ferizqo Fahdiansyah, Susiati*

Department of English Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and
Education, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research discusses the phenomenon of hate speech in Hilarion Heagy's conversion news on Twitter. Hilarion Heagy, a former Orthodox priest who later embraced Eastern Catholicism before ultimately converting to Islam, has sparked significant controversy within religious circles, eliciting varied reactions, especially on social media. This research addresses a significant gap in the literature by examining hate speech in the context of religious conversion. Therefore, this research aims to identify types of hate speech and find out the intent behind hate speech. This research utilizes the National Police Chief's circular number SE/6/X/2015 to identify types of hate expressions and uses Searle's illocutionary speech act theory to explain the meaning behind hate expressions. In this research, data was taken from comments on Twitter related to the news of Hilarion Heagy's conversion. The results of the research found that the expressions of hatred in the news about Hilarion Heagy's conversion were related to religious issues. The outcomes found five types of hate speech, with the most performed being Blasphemy (17 times), followed by Provoking (11 times), Defamation (10 times), Insult (7 times), then the least one being Spreading fake news (5 times). As for the types of illocutionary acts, the most dominant was Assertive (40 times), followed by Directive (7 times) and Expressive (3 times). There were no Commissive and Declaration types found at all.

E-ISSN: 2621-9158
P-ISSN: 2356-0401

*Correspondence:
sus249@ums.ac.id

Submitted: 15 December 2023
Approved: 4 April 2024
Published: 4 June 2024

Citation:

Fahdiansyah, M F., & Susiati. (2024).
Sociopragmatic Analysis of Hate
Speech in Hilarion Heagy's
Conversion News on Twitter. *Celtic:
A Journal of Culture, English
Language Teaching, Literature and
Linguistics*, 11(1), 125-139. Doi:
10.22219/celtic.v11i1.30342

Keywords: *Hate speech; Hilarion Heagy; Socio-pragmatic; Twitter*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini membahas tentang fenomena ujaran kebencian dalam pemberitaan perpindahan agama Hilarion Heagy di Twitter. Hilarion Heagy, seorang mantan pendeta Ortodoks yang kemudian memeluk Katolik Timur sebelum akhirnya berpindah ke Islam, telah memicu kontroversi signifikan dalam lingkaran keagamaan, memunculkan reaksi yang beragam, terutama di media sosial. Penelitian ini mengatasi kesenjangan signifikan dalam literatur dengan meneliti ujaran kebencian dalam konteks konversi agama. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis ujaran kebencian dan mengetahui maksud di balik ujaran kebencian. Penelitian ini memanfaatkan surat edaran Kapolri nomor SE/6/X/2015 untuk mengidentifikasi jenis-jenis ungkapan kebencian dan menggunakan teori tindak tutur ilokusi Searle untuk menjelaskan makna di balik ungkapan kebencian. Dalam penelitian ini data diambil dari komentar-komentar di Twitter terkait pemberitaan pindah agama Hilarion Heagy. Hasil penelitian menemukan bahwa ungkapan kebencian dalam pemberitaan perpindahan agama Hilarion Heagy berkaitan dengan isu agama. Hasilnya ditemukan lima jenis ujaran kebencian, yang paling banyak dilakukan adalah Penodaan Agama (17 kali), disusul Provokasi (11 kali), Pencemaran Nama Baik (10 kali), Penghinaan (7 kali), dan yang paling sedikit adalah Menyebarkan

berita bohong (5 kali). Sedangkan untuk jenis tindak ilokusi yang paling dominan adalah Asertif (40 kali), disusul Direktif (7 kali), Ekspresif (3 kali), dan tidak ditemukan jenis tindak Komisif dan Deklarasi.

Kata Kunci: *Hilarion Heagy; Sosio-pragmatis; Twitter; Ujaran kebencian*

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, people have been connected with the help of social media platforms. Social media has become one of the most popular ways to receive news and communicate with others through digital platforms, which are highly accessible and effective. One of the most popular ways to receive news and communicate with others is through digital platforms, which are highly accessible and effective. However, with all of social media's excellence, a huge threat occurs within social media. As a virtual medium of communication, people can express themselves without any restrictions. Guiora and Park (2017) point out that "social media is how and where contentious public issues are played out.". Moreover, Tontodimamma, et al (2021) stated, "Social media have become a fertile ground for heated discussions which frequently result in the use of insulting and offensive language."

Recently, Hilarion Heagy, a priest, suddenly announced his conversion to Islam, which made lots of people question his faith. The conversion news quickly spread on Twitter and got various responses. Some people congratulate him for his brave action, while others show hateful speech for his actions. However, some of the hateful speeches that people made were not only directed at him but also directed at Islam, the religion he converted to. For example, one of the people's comments is "They must've paid him handsomely". The use of the word "They" in the sentence refers to Muslims and assumes that Muslim people bribe priest Heagy to join Islam. The hateful speech within Heagy's conversion news comment sections eventually indicates a strong islamophobia of Western people. The researcher found this phenomenon interesting, and it is important to investigate the intention of the hateful comments and categorize the form of hate speech in the hate speech comments. Therefore, based on the hate comments on Priest Heagy's conversion news, the researcher willingly wants to investigate this phenomenon using the Socio-Pragmatic approach, which made this research title "Socio-Pragmatic Analysis of Hate Speech Found in Priest Hilarion Heagy's Converting to Islam News on Twitter". The study aims to analyze and identify the types of hate speech found in Hilarion Heagy's conversion news and intends to find out the intention behind the hateful comments.

Socio-pragmatics is one of the general pragmatic branches, which concerns the way people comprehend, and produce a communicative act in a speech situation (Fauziati, 2016). Socio-pragmatic acculturate sociology, linguistics, and pragmatics. Sociopragmatics is also known as the combined version of Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics. Culpeper and Haugh (2014) stated that "sociopragmatics concerns itself with any aspect of the social context that is specific to the pragmatic meanings of particular language use". Sociopragmatics put more attention on the meaning of utterances that are contextually related to social context.

Hate Speech is one of the social phenomena related to the realm of linguistics, specifically related to Speech acts. Howard (2019) defines hate speech as "a term of art, referring to the particular expressions of hatred against particular (groups of)

people in particular contexts.”. hatred is the desire to harm, humiliate, or even kill its object—not always instrumentally, but rather to cause harm as a vengeful objective in itself (White, 1996, as cited in Fischer et al., 2018). Seglow (2016) defines hate speech as “speech that attacks (and is intended to attack) its targets because of their race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, religion, and so on, and which conveys intense feelings of antipathy”. In short, hate speech can be defined as a phenomenon when people use hurtful language to attack others because of their race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, or religion. which intended to cause harm and spread strong feelings of hatred. In the case of Heagy’s conversion, it can be categorized as religious hate speech based on Seglow’s definition of hate speech.

There are various kinds of hate speech. Parekh (2012, As cited in Faiq & Noori, 2022) points out three features of hate speech, (1). hate speech that is directed against individuals or groups, (2). labels or stigmatizes a specific group whether indirectly or directly. (3). portrays the targeted group as unwelcome and justifiably subject to hostility. The action taken due to hatred is called a hate crime. In addition, Yong (2011, as cited in Seglow, 2016) distinguishes four main hate speech categories: 1. Vilification toward a certain target, 2. Spread vilification, 3. Organized political advocacy for exclusionary and/or eliminationist policies, and 4. Expressions containing facts or values that denigrate a racial or religious group that can be identified. According to the Circular Letter of the Indonesian Chief of Police SE/6/X/2015 concerned about handling hate speech. There are 7 types of hate speech, namely; 1. Insult, 2. Defamation, 3. Blasphemy, 4. Unpleasant acts, 5. Provoking, 6. Instigating, and 7. Spreading fake news. Based on the categories of hate speech mentioned above, and looking at the case that is being discussed in this article, the types of hate speech can be categorized as, Personal attack hate speech. Such as insulting. Stigmatize hate speech such as spreading false information and mocking others' beliefs. Dehumanizing hate speech such as expressing extreme hatred, and widely spreading it. Exclusion of hate speech, such as provoking, instigating, or encouraging hostile action.

The Speech Act Theory proposes that the use of language not only conveys information but also performs various types of action. Austin (1962) distinguishes three levels of speech acts, namely, locutionary act refers to the literal meaning of an utterance, such as the words and grammar used. An illocutionary act refers to an utterance's intended meaning or function, such as making a request or giving an order. Perlocutionary act refers to an utterance’s effect on the listener, such as persuading or convincing them to do something. Austin (1962) classified Illocutionary acts into Verdictives, Exercitives, Commissive, Behavitives, and Expositives.

Searle (1979) stated that Austin’s five categories of illocutionary acts are not the classification of illocutionary acts but of English illocutionary verbs. Moreover, Searle mentioned six weaknesses in Austin’s taxonomy, “There is a persistent confusion between verbs and acts, not all verbs are illocutionary verbs, there is too much overlap of the categories, too much heterogeneity within the categories, many of the verbs listed in the categories don't satisfy the definition given for the category and, most important, there is no consistent principle of classification”. Therefore, Searle (1979) presents his categories of illocutionary acts into 5 categories (1) Assertives refer to the kinds of speech act which state the speaker’s

beliefs. Example; stating, suggesting, and complaining. (2) Directives refer to speech that attempts to make the listener do an action. Example; ordering, commanding, and requesting. (3) Commisives refer to the speaker's committing future action. Example; promising, vowing, offering (4) Expressive refers to speech that states the speaker's psychological condition, or feelings. Example; congratulating, blaming, accusing, etc. (5) Declarations refer to kinds of speech acts that could bring changes via utterance. Example; resigning, sentencing, etc.

As mentioned before, social media is the place where everyone is free to express their thoughts. Not only that, the fact that social media lets people choose whether to use their real identity or become anonymous while using social media encourages people to be bolder, more straightforward, or even impolitely express their opinions, or feelings, especially regarding some quite sensitive matters like racial, religious, politics or other social conflicts. The latest research reveals that throughout the entire election period, there was a widespread presence of "harmful" online communication within the social media circles of celebrities and their followers (Aporbo, 2023). This was mainly characterized by the frequent use of strong and offensive language. The use of offensive language within social media is surely related to the occurrence of hate speech. The rise of the Internet and the use of social media have been crucial in spreading hate because hate messages now have a worldwide audience (Fischer et al., 2018). In the case of spreading hate speech, Wiedlitzka et al., (2023) on their research found that offline acts of hate speech allow, and encourage others to express hateful speech virtually.

One of the core characteristics of hate is that hate lasts longer than the event that initially evoked it (Fischer et al., 2018). As for the example, Islamophobia grows as the reaction toward Islamic terrorism on the event of 9/11, and discrimination of the African-American community by US white supremacists are examples of long-lasting hatred. McDevitt, Levin, & Bennett distinguish four categories of hate crimes based on the motivations of the perpetrators; namely, (1) thrill-seeking, (2) defense, which is based on anger and fear to defend against intruders, (3) retaliation which is an act of revenge, and (4) mission to destroy or inflict harm on the other groups. (McDevitt et al., 2002, as cited in Poursanidi, 2022; Nurhadiyanto et al., 2023). Navarro (2013, as cited in Septiana et al., 2024) mentioned that there are two factors at the root of hatred, the devaluation of the victim, and the ideology of the hater itself. Not only that, Hatred could also grow from personal experience, and even be sparked by the influence of strong leadership. Marek Górká (2019) arranged a survey and found that the motives for hating are, to relieve tension and get rid of frustration, and the desire to hurt and humiliate others. Moreover, verbal violence occurs due to the hater's helplessness, so people tend to hate others to fight for respect in their environment, in other words, hate is a way of gaining power, and justifying their grounds.

Currently, there is a lot of research discussing the Hate Speech issue. Beltrán, Walker, and Jara (2023) in their research titled "Hate and Incivilities in Hashtags against Women Candidates in Chile (2021–2022)" discuss the violence found in social networks toward women candidates of Chilean constitutional process in 2021 to 2022. an automated detection method was used to collect the data. The result shows that most of the interactions with women politicians on their Twitter accounts contain violent speeches of different natures. Though the hashtags used

do not carry hate messages, but have a close link with incivilities. Aporbo (2023) examined celebrities' posts on social media through The Five Dimensions of Online Persona (2017) theory, and examined fans' hostile comments through Crystal's Theory of Language and Technology (2001), and Culpeper's Impoliteness Theory (2011). The result of the study shows that most celebrities use the public dimension (41%) while the fans' hostile comments employed graphology (88%) to express their hostility, moreover, Bald-on record and Sarcasm (33%) are used for the impoliteness strategies.

Jaradat, Al Hammouri, Bani-Khair, Zuraiq, Abu-Joudeh, and Al-Momani (2023) investigate hate speeches found in Bumper stickers in Jordan and attempt to discover the components and the sources of hate speech and classify the types of hate speech found in the bumper stickers. The result of the study reveals that out of the 220 stickers, 54.5% of stickers exhibit hate speech at the thematic level, and 22.5% of the total number exhibit hate speech at the structural level. In addition, for the thematic level, there are 5 themes namely direct threats, challenges, disappointment, despair, or misery, indifference towards others, and indirect hate speech. For the structural level, contain imperative in the structure of the speech.

Baladrón-Pazos, Correyero-Ruiz, and Manchado-Perez (2023) examine Spanish political communication on Twitter during the Russian invasion of Ukraine, which aims to identify and categorize any messages on Twitter related to the Ukraine invasion delivered by political parties in the Spanish parliament, and also to discover how much it contributed to promoting hate speech and polarization of the Ukraine invasion. software named T-Hoarder is used to automatically collect the data on Twitter, using several keywords. The result shows that Spanish political parties used Twitter to express their opinion and defend their ideological positions, while still avoiding tensions.

Aldamen (2023) investigates the role of social media in creating xenophobia and hate speech against Syrian refugees, the causes of xenophobia, the negative effects, and the way refugees respond to hate speech. The findings showed that the causes of the xenophobic speech occurrence were the otherization and demonization of refugees, by continuously spreading fake news and negative representation of the refugees. The psychological effect is the negative impact, and the Syrian refugees either defend themselves by replying to the hate speech or just prefer to keep silent.

Breazu (2023) examines the manifestation of Romaphobia on YouTube within the context of the 2016 UK Referendum on EU membership. The data was collected using a custom-developed PHP script which could identify videos by keywords, time frame, likes, dislikes, and number of comments. The findings reveal that the use of emojis allows people to express emotion simply, but visually striking, thus contributing to the anti-Roma sentiment. Moreover, the simplicity of emojis made the sentiment look harmless and even funny, which made it more normalized.

Oktaviani, and Alam (2022) examine the Illocutionary Speech Acts and Types of Hate Speech that are found in the Comments on @Indraakenz's Twitter Account. The researcher used the illocutionary speech act theory by Searle to determine the types of speech acts and in classifying the types of hate hatred, the researchers used the Circular Letter of the Chief of Indonesian Police Number SE/6/X/2015. The result of the study found three types of illocutionary acts: Assertive, Directive, and

Expressive. The most frequent one that appeared is the Directive. The type of hate speech, which is classified according to the Circular letter of the chief of police number SE/6/X/2015 is insult, which is the common one, blasphemy, and unpleasant act.

Magano and D'Oliveira (2023) discuss the issue of antigypsyism (discrimination against Roma people) in Portugal, particularly in social networks. It analyzes hate speech and racist comments on social media platforms in response to news about the poverty and social exclusion faced by the Roma community. The article highlights the historical and current discrimination faced by Roma people in Portugal and the impact of antigypsyism on their access to employment, education, health, and housing. It emphasizes the need for national strategies to combat antigypsyism and promote the integration of Roma communities.

Määttä and Vernet (2023) analyze an online discussion thread on homophobia in France, examining the arguments and grammatical devices used by participants to oppose homophobia. The study finds that while there is strong antagonism between pro-LGBTQ and homophobic stances, there is also variation within pro-LGBTQ posts, highlighting the fuzzy boundaries between heteronormativity and homophobia. The analysis reveals different categories of arguments, personal attacks, ambivalent expressions of empathy, and reductive interpretations of LGBTQ individuals.

From the review of the previous studies above, it can be concluded that in general, the research regarding hate speech is mostly related to the computer science fields, as the research focused on how to track hate speech using an automatic hate speech detection system. This is in line with Azman, and Zamri (2022) who found out that most previous study of hate speech focused on the field of computer science, rather than focusing on the term communication. Therefore, compared to previous studies, the current study is conducted to fill the gap by focusing on analyzing hate speech through the communication field. The research aims to identify and classify the hate speech comments found in the case of Hilarion Heagy's conversion news found on Twitter based on the types of hate speech mentioned in Circular Letter of the Indonesian Chief of Police SE/6/X/2015 and relying on the Linguistic Theory of Illocutionary Speech Act (Searle, 1979) to analyze the intention of the hateful speech. It is hoped that this research can contribute to practical aspects, as a reference in analyzing and understanding expressions of hate in daily life, as well as theoretical aspects, as a reference for future research on hate speech.

METHOD

A qualitative approach was conducted in this research, precisely a content analysis, as the research discusses the social phenomenon of hate speech on social media. Therefore, the qualitative approach explores and understands the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The subject of the research is the hateful speeches found in Hilarion Heagy's conversion news on Twitter and the object of the research is types of hate speech and the intention of hate speech in the comments of the news. The source of the data is the comments on any news regarding Heagy's conversion posted on Twitter. The data collection technique used documentation by capturing screenshots of the

hate comments and writing down the data for analysis. Investigator triangulation was used as the data validation technique. The data obtained were categorized based on the research questions and then cross-checked by the research supervisor. The data that had been obtained and written down were analyzed based on the (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) data analysis procedures, which consist of five steps. First, prepare the screenshots of the hateful comments, and then organize the data by writing the comments down on a table. Second, read all the data that had been written down. Third, classify the data by highlighting, and labelling any word with the types of Hate speech based on the Circular Letter of the Indonesian Chief of Police SE/6/X/2015, and the types of Illocutionary speech acts based on Searle's Illocutionary Speech Acts Theory (Searle, 1979). Fourth, the data that had been classified were shaped into a general description. Fifth, represent the description in a narrative passage to convey the findings of the analysis by describing the types of hate speech and the type of Illocutionary speech act contained in the comments.

FINDINGS

There were 50 comments collected and analyzed, based on the classification of hate speech written in the circular letter of the Indonesian Chief of Police, six types of hate speech were found, namely Insults, Defamation, Blasphemy, Provoking, and Spreading fake news. As for the intention of hateful speech, based on Searle's types of Illocutionary Speech Acts, there were three types found, they are Assertive, Directive, and Expressive.

The data collected in this research were obtained from the comment section of tweets regarding the issue of Hilarion Heagy's conversion, and it is acknowledged that the content of these tweets was shared openly within the public domain. However, the researchers intend to anonymize the usernames of the comments to protect individuals' privacy.

Types of Hate Speech

Table 1. The Types of Hate Speech

No	Types of Hate Speech Circular Letter of the SE/6/X/2015		
	Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Insult	7	14%
2.	Defamation	10	20%
3.	Blasphemy	17	34%
4.	Unpleasant Acts	0	-
5.	Provoking	11	22%
6.	Instigating	0	-
7.	Spreading Fake News	5	10%
Total		50	

Blasphemy

Blasphemy can be defined as disrespectful speech or talk regarding something sacred, commonly related to religious matters (Knechtle, 2017). In the

case of Hilarion Heagy, the finding shows that blasphemy has occurred 17 times, also, the blasphemy was not only directed toward matters around Islam, the religion Heagy converted to but also directed at Catholicism, even attacking both religions.

(1) @D****K**** wrote, "I am in shock. I don't get it. Islam is such a crock. It's the Mormonism of the Middle East. And how can any Christian give up Jesus?"

(2) @x***_c***** wrote, "Right now he's just relieved he can stop wearing that ridiculous costume"

(3) @f*****86 wrote, "If you enter one cult, must be easy to convince u to join another"

(4) @J*****69****81 wrote, "Also if I remember correctly, he became a Shia, a Muslim branch way peaceful than Sunnis"

In the first comment, @D****K**** stated that Islam is a false religion from the Middle East. The second comment implied that "The cassock" or the clothes used by a priest for liturgical events is absurd, or weird. The third comment attacks both Islam and Catholicism by referring to "Cult" which indicates that Islam and Catholicism are considered heretical. The fourth comment is rather unique, it says that "Shia is way peaceful than Sunnis" which implies that among those two branches of Muslim, one is better than the other.

Provoking

According to Miroslaw Banko's dictionary as cited in (Karwat 2021), provocation is an action performed by people intended to trigger anger, aggression, or any other emotion, and inflict harm on others. As in the case of Heagy's conversion, some of the comments were indicated as provocation, either towards Muslims, or Christians.

(5) @k*****256 wrote, "I hope he does not become a terrorist"

(6) @O*****I****4 wrote, "Now he can have wives and enjoy life... Alhamdulillah"

In the first comment, @k***r****6 provoked by mentioning the word terrorist, as if all Muslims were terrorists, in the second comment, @O*****I****4 satirized the sacred rule regarding Catholic priests not being allowed to marry and implied that Hilarion Heagy had not enjoyed his life before. Both of the comments were intended to trigger people's anger by mentioning the stigmatization of each religion. The occurrence of provocation could.

Defamation

Defamation is the act of attacking others intended to damage others' reputations (Garner, 2016). The major factor which causes the occurrence of defamation is the use of malicious language (Alkhayat, and Al-Aadili, 2023). In the case of Heagy's conversion, the comments defamed Heagy and accused him of being a pedophile, and the others were about marriage or women. some of the comments are;

(7) @a***d** wrote, "Maybe he is into little girls?"

(8) @N****fi wrote, "Maybe he wanted to marry 3 or 5 women. That's y"

In the first comment, @a***d** accused and suspected Heagy of being a pedophile. The comments were related to the stigmatization of Catholic priests, which according to Verhoeven (2023) in the period 1891 to 1913, there were 180 investigations of priests who were accused of sexually abusing children. Moreover, in the second comment, @N****fi accuses Heagy as if he is interested in the polygamy issue, which is permitted in Islam.

Insult

Insult is a kind of verbal speech that is intended to attack someone personally. According to Fischer et al. (2018), Insult can be categorized as hate at an interpersonal level and an intergroup level. In the case of Heagy's conversion, some people personally insulted Heagy for his conversion, and some others insulted Muslims who congratulated Heagy's conversion.

(9) @S***T**B***S*** wrote, "Okay, one nut job converted. The rest of the priests look at the koran and wonder, why a billion people can be so homophobic & stupid, and violent".

(10) @I***N**** wrote, "World cheer for any scientific breakthrough, Meanwhile, these morons get org@sm after getting one more member in their circus"

The first comment, @S***T**B***S*** insulted both Heagy and Muslims, as he referred to Heagy as "One nut job" and Muslims as "homophobic & stupid, and violent". In the second one, @I***N**** uses the words "These Morons" to refer to Muslims.

Spreading Fake News

Fake news can be defined as news that is written to mislead audiences intentionally (Wang, 2020). The huge access to information in social media contributes to the spread of fake news (Olan, Jayawickrama, Arakpogun, Suklan, & Liu., 2022). As for the case of Heagy's conversion, there are only a few comments that are categorized as spreading fake news, they are;

(11) @d*****l**** wrote, "Couldn't fiddle kids anymore under Christianity, so decided to join Islam where it is legal."

(12) Context (someone questioning about priests that always revert to Islam, but no Sheikhs go out of Islam) @l*****i replied "Because people who leave Islam can get killed for it."

In the first comment, @d*****l**** wrote that Heagy as a former priest could no longer play with children (in a sexual context), not only that, he also implied that Islam permitted the act of sexually abusing children. In the second comment, @l*****i states that Muslims who leave Islam or apostate will be killed, this statement is classified as false information based on his own beliefs. Both of the comments could mislead others

Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts

Table 2. The Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts

No	Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts Searle (1979)		
	Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Assertive	40	80%

No	Types of Illocutionary Speech Acts Searle (1979)		
	Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
2.	Directive	7	14%
3.	Commissive	0	-
4.	Expressive	3	6%
5.	Declarations	0	-
Total		50	

Assertive

The first type of Illocutionary act, Assertive, is mainly used to convey information, make statements, or express the speaker's beliefs toward the case. In the case of Heagy's conversion, 80% of the hateful comments obtained were categorized as assertive, which can be concluded that the findings show that most people reacted to news of Heagy's conversion by giving statements based on their thoughts regarding Hilarion Heagy's conversion.

(13) @G***9*E*** wrote, "Cool. He traded one nonsense belief for another."

(14) @S*****1 wrote, "There will always be some people, like Hilarion, who forsake truth for falsehood."

In the first comment, @G***9*E*** responded by writing "cool" which is usually used to praise others, however, in this context, she did praise Heagy for the conversion but in a sarcastic way. Not only that, the sentence "*One nonsense belief for another*" indicates that she does not believe in both religions. In the second comment, @S*****1 stated that there will always be people who convert from one to another religion.

Directive

The second type of Illocutionary act found is Directive, which the illocutionary point of directive type is to make the hearer do an action. The finding shows that the comments found on Heagy's conversion news are rarely categorized as directive types. Some of the comments seem to be written to confuse others by giving false information about Islam.

(15) @M***L**R*****d wrote, "Will he get a bomb-making manual with the conversion or does that come later?"

(16) @d*****8 wrote, "Was he suffering from any mental illness?"

Both the comments were categorized as fake news, and intentionally written to trigger others. In the first comment, @ M***L**R*****d mentioned the "*bomb-making manual*" which is related to the many cases of terrorism involving extremist Muslims. In the second comment, @d*****8 questioned if Heagy has any mental illness as if he wants others to believe that Heagy is mentally unstable.

Expressive

The third type of Illocutionary act, is expressive, which relates to the expression of the speaker's psychological states regarding the case or condition. Similar to the directives, the expressive types are also rarely found, even fewer than the directive types. Some of the Expressive comments were like cursing Heagy's conversion, which shows hateful emotion toward Heagy.

(17) @v****es*****78 wrote “Cun*”

(18) @S****d***2 wrote “Filthy Apostate”

Both the comments are indicated as expressive types as both @v****es*****78 and @S****d***2 use swearing words “*Cunt*” & “*Filthy*” which are directed at Heagy, as the response to Heagy’s conversion.

DISCUSSION

Types of Hate Speech

The study findings regarding Hate speech on Hilarion Heagy’s conversion news on Twitter showed that among 7 types of Hate Speech based on Circular Letter of the Chief of Indonesian Police Number SE/6/x/2015, people performed only 5 of the 7 types of hate speech. Blasphemy was the type of hate expression that appeared most often (17 times). The results are different from the findings of Oktaviani, and Alam (2022) which found that the most performed hate speech is Insult. The difference in the result analysis possibly occurred due to the difference in the issue taken in the study, Oktaviani, and Alam (2022) examined hateful speech toward a public figure who made a controversial statement regarding poverty, while the current study researched the issue of a former priest’s conversion to Islam which related to religious issues. In addition, the result of the current study is also different from the other research regarding hate speech on political issues, such as Wiana (2019) found that provoking and Inciting are the most appeared forms of hate speech, and Siroj (2019) found defamation as the most performed hate speech. The study of hate speech on the presidential issue found that the forms of hate speech were insult, accusation, intimidation, blaming, swearing, and denouncing (Bachari, 2019; Bajari et al., 2021).

Furthermore, Fischer et al (2018) divide hate into two different social levels namely, the Interpersonal level, and the Intergroup level. The result of the analysis shows that the occurrence of hate speech on Heagy’s conversion news is mostly directed toward Islam, the religion Heagy converted to, while the rest of the hateful comments were directed personally on Hilarion Heagy, and even toward Catholicism, Heagy’s former religion. So on, the hateful speech in the case of Hilarion Heagy’s Conversion is categorized as Hate at the Intergroup level, which specifically related to the indications of Islamophobia, shown by most of the comments showing hate toward Islam, the religion Heagy converted to, only a few comments that attacked Hilarion Heagy personally. In this case, Islamophobia itself is a prejudice toward Muslims, but aimed at Islam, the religion, which occurred as the reaction towards terrorism involving Islam, such as the events of 9/11 (Sadek, 2017). For example, data (7) and (15) which mentioned terrorist and bomb-making manuals.

As for the motive for the hate speech, by looking at the findings, most of the comments seem to contain a grudge against Islam, which possibly is the result of the people’s fear of Islamic terrorism, as intergroup hatred is characterized by the presence of an assessment of danger or malicious intent on part of an outgroup, which reflects their evil nature. which can eventually culminate in the goal of revenge and eventually kick out a group from within one's environment (Fischer et al., 2018). The general motives that can be seen from the findings are the act of revenge, which occurred due to the fear and anger towards past experiences

(Navarro, 2012, as cited in Septiana et al., 2024), and the act of defense with the tendency to overpower the outgroups, or simply justify their grounds (Marek Górká, 2019), is in line with McDevitt, Levin, & Bennett's Typology of Hate Crime Offenders, namely the Act of defense, which is based on anger and fear against intruders or in this case Muslims, and retaliation or act of revenge. However, some personal motives could also contribute to the hate in the case of Heagy's conversion, such as to relieve and get rid of tension and frustration (Marek Górká, 2019).

Types of Illocutionary Acts

As for the type of illocutionary speech act, the Assertive is the one that appears most often, with 80% of the comments being categorized as assertive type. The result is in line with the findings of (Ananta, 2023; Rangkuti et al., 2019; Yuliyanti et al., 2020) who also found that the Illocutionary act of Assertive is the most appeared among the other illocutionary acts. The presence of Assertive illocutionary acts on Hilarion Heagy's conversion news is used to state people's thoughts regarding Heagy's conversion. Some people stated their hate by mocking Heagy's conversion, such as data (3) and (6) which mocked Heagy's faith, and intention to convert, the assertive act of stating is similar to the findings of Yulistiana (2020) who found that the assertive act of stating is the most performed. Furthermore, the overall result shows that there were no Commissive and Declaration types found at all among the comments, which is similar to the findings of Oktaviani, and Alam (2022) who only found Assertive, Directive, and Expressive.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the types of hate speech and the intention of hate speech comments on Hilarion Heagy's conversion news on Twitter. The result shows that among the seven types of hate speech, five were performed, with blasphemy as the most appeared, then followed by provoking, defamation, insult, and the least one is spreading fake news. The occurrence of blasphemy as the most performed hate speech correlates with the issue that is being discussed, which is religion, specifically related to Islamophobia. People vent their hate on Heagy's conversion due to their past experience, and hatred that has lasted for years. As for the intention of hate speech according to Searle's illocutionary speech act theory, people threw their hatred by using the assertive function, as an act of stating.

This study focuses on the types of hate speech, and the intention of the hate speech on Hilarion Heagy's conversion news. researcher hopes that this study could contribute to research of hate speech, and raise people's awareness regarding hate speech in social media. Therefore, these findings indicate that there is a need for further research regarding the phenomenon of hate speech on religious issues, especially regarding the motives behind hate speech.

REFERENCES

- Aldamen, Y. (2023). Xenophobia and Hate Speech towards Refugees on Social Media: Reinforcing Causes, Negative Effects, Defense and Response Mechanisms against That Speech. *Societies*, 13(4), 83.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13040083>

- Alkhayat, A. A., & Al-Aadili, N. M. (2023). An Ideological Analysis of Defamation in Selected YouTube Videos: A Critical Discourse Analysis Study. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(8), 267. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n8p267>
- Ananta, Benny Dele Bintang. (2023). Illocutionary Act Analysis of Jokowi Three Periods on CNBC News 2022: Critical Discourse Analysis. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 10(1), 14-28. Doi: 10.22219/celtic.v10i1. 24931
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words: The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (1. ed., [repr.]). Harvard Univ. Press.
- Azman, N. F., & Zamri, N. A. K. (2022). Conscious or Unconscious: The Intention of Hate Speech in Cyberworld—A Conceptual Paper. *International Academic Symposium of Social Science 2022*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2022082029>
- Bachari, A. D. (2019). Analysis of Form and Theme of Hate Speech Against President Joko Widodo on Social Media: A forensic linguistic study. *Proceedings of the Second Conference on Language, Literature, Education, and Culture (ICOLLITE 2018)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icollite-18.2019.49>
- Bajari, A., Koswara, I., & Erlandia, D. R. (2021). Hatenography: An Analysis of Hate Speech on Facebook in 2019 Indonesian Presidential Campaign. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 37(4), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2021-3704-08>
- Baladrón-Pazos, A. J., Correyero-Ruiz, B., & Manchado-Pérez, B. (2023). Spanish Political Communication and Hate Speech on Twitter During the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. *Politics and Governance*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v11i2.6328>
- Beltrán, J., Walker, P., & Jara, R. (2023). Hate and Incivilities in Hashtags against Women Candidates in Chile (2021–2022). *Social Sciences*, 12(3), 180. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12030180>
- Breazu, P. (2023). Entitlement Racism on YouTube: White injury—the licence to Humiliate Roma migrants in the UK. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 55, 100718. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2023.100718>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design. Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th edition). SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book255675>
- Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2014). *Pragmatics and the English language*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Faiq, A. M., & Noori, M. S. (2022). Hate Speech Forms and Implications in English and Kurdish Social Media. *Journal of University of Human Development*, 8(4), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.21928/juhd.v8n4y2022.pp80-88>
- Fauziati, E. (2016). *Applied Linguistics Principles of Foreign Language Teaching, Learning, and Researching* (2nd ed.). PT. Era Pustaka Utama.
- Fischer, A., Halperin, E., Canetti, D., & Jasini, A. (2018). Why We Hate. *Emotion Review*, 10(4), 309–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073917751229>
- Garner, B. A. (2016). *Garner’s modern English usage* (Fourth edition). Oxford University Press.
- Guiora, A., & Park, E. A. (2017). Hate Speech on Social Media. *Philosophia*, 45(3), 957–971. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11406-017-9858-4>

- Howard, J. W. (2019). Free Speech and Hate Speech. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22(1), 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051517-012343>
- Jaradat, A. A., Hammouri, R. N. A., Bani-Khair, B., Zuraiq, W. M. S., Abu-Joudeh, M. I. M., & Al-Momani, H. (2023). Hate Speech in Bumper Stickers in Jordan. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(2), 353–361. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1302.09>
- Karwat, M. (2022). Theory of provocation: In light of political science. Peter Lang.
- Knechtle, J. C. (2017). Blasphemy, Defamation of Religion and Religious Hate Speech: Is There a Difference That Makes a Difference? In J. Temperman & A. Koltay (Eds.), *Blasphemy and Freedom of Expression* (1st ed., pp. 194–222). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108242189.009>
- Määttä, S., & Vernet, S. (2023). Reacting to homophobia in a French online discussion: The fuzzy boundaries between heteronormativity and homophobia. *Discourse & Society*, 34(5), 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265231168760>
- Magano, O., & D'Oliveira, T. (2023). Antigypsyism in Portugal: Expressions of Hate and Racism in Social Networks. *Social Sciences*, 12(9), 511. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12090511>
- Marek Górka. (2019). Hate Speech – Causes and Consequences in Public Space. *TASK Quarterly*, 23(2), 233–244. <https://doi.org/10.17466/tq2019/23.2/e>
- Nurhadiyanto, L., Meliala, A., & Sulhin, I. (2023). Social Discourse of Cyber Hate in Indonesia: The Potential Transition from Hate to Crime. *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1991.06.02.416>
- Oktaviani, A., & Nur, O. (2022). Illocutionary Speech Acts and Types of Hate Speech in Comments on @Indraakenz's Twitter Account. *International Journal of Science and Applied Science: Conference Series*, 6(1), 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.20961/ijsascs.v6i1.69943>
- Olan, F., Jayawickrama, U., Arakpogun, E. O., Suklan, J., & Liu, S. (2022). Fake news on Social Media: The Impact on Society. *Information Systems Frontiers*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10242-z>
- Poursanidi, K. (2022). Living as a “difference” in a decidedly racist society: The case of immigrants in Athens, Greece [Utrecht University]. <https://rgdoi.net/10.13140/RG.2.2.17756.67205>
- Rangkuti, R., Pratama, A., & Zulfan, Z. (2019). HATE SPEECH ACTS: A CASE IN BATU BARA. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 3(2), 225–233. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v3i1.1998>
- Sadek, N. (2017). Islamophobia, shame, and the collapse of Muslim identities. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 14(3), 200–221. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aps.1534>
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts* (Nachdr.). Cambridge Univ. Pr.
- Seglow, J. (2016). Hate Speech, Dignity and Self-Respect. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 19(5), 1103–1116. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-016-9744-3>
- Septiana, N. Z., Muslihati, M., Atmoko, A., Rahayu, D. S., Dewi, E. R., & Setyorini, S. (2024). Understanding the Dynamics of Online Hatred and Mental Health

- Issues Among Adolescents: Exploring Factors, Impacts, and Alternative Strategies. 175–188. <https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2435-5240.2024.14>
- Siroj, M. (2019). Analysis of Hate Speech in Social Media on Indonesian Politics. Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Indonesian Politics, SIP 2019, 26-27 June 2019, Central Java, Indonesia, Semarang, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.25-6-2019.2288001>
- Tontodimamma, A., Nissi, E., Sarra, A., & Fontanella, L. (2021). Thirty years of research into hate speech: Topics of interest and their evolution. *Scientometrics*, 126(1), 157–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-020-03737-6>
- Verhoeven, T. (2023). Clerical Child Sexual Abuse and the Culture Wars in France, 1891–1913. *The Historical Journal*, 66(4), 842–863. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X23000249>
- Wang, C.-C. (2020). Fake News and Related Concepts: Definitions and Recent Research Development. *Contemporary Management Research*, 16(3), 145–174. <https://doi.org/10.7903/cmr.20677>
- Wiana, D. (2019). Analysis of the use of the hate speech on social media in the case of presidential election in 2019. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 3(2), 158–167. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v3i2.1541>
- Wiedlitzka, S., Prati, G., Brown, R., Smith, J., & Walters, M. A. (2023). Hate in Word and Deed: The Temporal Association Between Online and Offline Islamophobia. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 39(1), 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-021-09530-9>
- Yuliyanti, T., Subyantoro, S., & Pristiwati, R. (2020). Form of Hate Speech Comments on Najwa Shihab Youtube Channels in The General Election Campaign of President and Vice President of The Republic of Indonesia 2019. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 9(3), 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v9i3.42513>
- Yulistiana, F., & Widyastuti (2022). Assertive illocution acts on interruption by Joe Biden in the 2020 first presidential debate. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 9(1), 135-148. Doi: 10.22219/celtic.v9i1.21208