

# Cases of Women's Hate Speech Due to the Use of Taboo Language on Social Media

Sutarsih

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Subyantoro\*

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Hari Bakti Mardikantoro

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Tommi Yuniawan

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

**Abstract**—Cases of hate speech linked to Indonesian women using taboo language on social media have risen, leading to many Indonesian women being subjected to criminal penalties. Therefore, research on taboo language must be conducted to resolve cybercrimes. This study discloses the type, category, and adverse effects of using taboo language from a legal perspective. The data were verdicts downloaded from the Supreme Court's directory. Data were analyzed using the intralingual equivalence method to examine linguistic features such as meaning, information, and speech context. Linguistic forensics was also applied to focus on the language that generates legal cases based on the Indonesian cultural environment according to Jay's classification of taboos. The results of the study revealed that the women on social media utilized prohibited language, including hate speech in Indonesian and indigenous languages. The taboo languages used by women on social media categorized as cases of hate speech were: 1) sexual references, 2) profane or blasphemous, 3) animal names, 4) ethnic-racial-gender slurs, and 5) references to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviations. The negative impact of using taboo language by women on social media from a legal perspective is a hate speech crime that violates the Indonesian Electronic Information and Transactions Law. This research contributes to handling legal cases by imposing language, gender stereotype theory, and taboo language as potential evidence in hate speech cases.

**Index Terms**—taboo language, woman, social media, cases, hate speech

## I. INTRODUCTION

A study by Robin Lakoff in 1973, "Language and Women's Place," compiled in a book of the same title in 1975 and focused on women's linguistic inequity in society, inspires the present study. Lakoff's analysis reveals that women face language discrimination in two main ways: firstly, in the way they are instructed to communicate, and secondly, in the way language portrays women overall. Lakoff asserts that women are portrayed as being in a disadvantageous position about language. Women are expected to speak kindly and courteously, a trait associated with femininity. He believes women's language reflects their powerlessness and dependency. Communicating in a manner not typical of their gender may lead to criticism of being unfeminine. When they express themselves based on their characteristics, they are considered weak, lacking clear thinking, and unable to think clearly. Moreover, they are supposed to speak about serious things (Kuntjara, 2003). From 2016 to February 2020, the Civil Society Coalition collected statistics indicating 744 criminal cases involving women's language use, with 676 cases resulting in incarceration (Putri et al., 2021). From 2018 to 2021, some Indonesian women faced criminal penalties for hate speech offenses due to their languages on social media. The case is documented in the court's decision in the Supreme Court directory (Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia, 2022).

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Cases of hate speech occurred during the first modification of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), the initial amendment since its enactment five years ago in 2016. Wainira et al. (2021) report that Indonesia is the country with the fourth-highest number of social media users globally. It corresponds to NapoleonCat's data. In November 2019, Indonesia had 61,610,000 million users, representing 22.6% of the total population. Women were chosen due to their significant presence on social media, representing 76% of women, with 41% accessing social media

---

\* Corresponding Author. Email: [bintoro@mail.unnes.ac.id](mailto:bintoro@mail.unnes.ac.id)

through mobile phones. Furthermore, women spend 30 % of their time communicating on social media, whereas men spend 26% (Lubis, 2014).

Pee (2012; in Lia, 2021) explains that using social media goes beyond mere personal expression, encompassing involvement in critical scenarios such as responses to natural disasters, government policies, and similar circumstances. Moreover, social media serves as a platform for disseminating hate speech. Within ten months of its launch, Instagram posts 150 million photos and garners the interest of 7 million new users (Mantan, 2010; Suryani et al., 2021). Waruwu and Vera (2020) note that hate speech is disseminated via Instagram posts, inciting others to repost or use hate speech themselves. Handono (2018) said that people on social media often use derogatory language while criticizing and commenting on others.

A forensic linguistics study analyzes language within a legal context. According to Coulthard et al. (2016), who examined the connection between language and legal cases from a forensic linguistics standpoint, language can be used as evidence in court. The study examines language, social media use, and court cases corresponding to previous research. However, the study focuses on the Indonesian women's language on social media platforms to demonstrate instances of hate speech, distinguishing it from previous research. It studies hate speech cases in terms of language forms, language characteristics, and adverse effects of women's language used on social media from a legal standpoint.

Previous research on language, social media use, and legal cases was conducted by several researchers, notably in criminal and civil cases influenced by a forensic linguistic background (Ariani et al., 2014). Fraser (2014) focuses on phonetic transcription. Colbran (2018) finds out that the growing use of social media has severe consequences for the integrity of crime reporting and democratic practices in the UK. Sousa-Silva (2018) analyzes corpus data with computer applications. Blaya (2019) reveals that through individual empowerment, law, technology, and education can be identified through counter-speech. Hipp et al. (2019) propose perpetrator detection and the location of Twitter users. Lee et al. (2019) state that the vocabulary of crime in the Malay corpus. Jaki (2019) studies culture and youth slang, and he finds out that the language of the Incel. group is interspersed with the language of subcultures and youth slang. The words used focus on physical appearance, sexuality, and gender. Nazifa et al. (2019) study polynomial kernel functions that exhibit superior gender recognition and prediction rates compared to linear and Gaussian kernel functions. Chatzakou et al. (2019) focus on cybercrime in the form of bullying and attacks on social media. Clarke (2019) argues that linguistic variation has two main dimensions: 'interactive versus noninteractive' and 'challenging versus non-curious.' Baror and Venter (2019) examine cybercrime research. Seyari and Bagheri (2019) study forensic linguistics in classical Iran, where the legal system inadequately protects people's legal rights, and forensic linguistics study programs need more application in Iran. Boucher and Perkins (2020) describe forensic linguistics cases in five fictional detective novels by Sherlock Holmes. Habiburrahim et al. (2020) analyze Aceh's implementation of Islamic Shari'a. Curiel et al. (2020) focus on Twitter user groups based on uploaded content trends. Lev-On and Steinfield (2020) find that social media is a valuable and effective platform for justice activists to challenge state authority and decisions made by the criminal justice system. Gierth and Bromme (2020) study on attacks on science through social media. Susanto and Deri Sis Nanda (2020) converge on the dimensions of language analysis in forensic linguistics related to two types of data: spoken and written. Zhuravel (2020) presents the concepts and terminology of criminal language.

The distinction between this linguistic-forensic research and previous studies is significant. It is expected to provide a new perspective on Lakoff's notion of women's gender stereotypes, stating that women are linguistically marginalized in comparison to men. Moreover, the new research shows that women's language on social media is considered hate speech.

### III. RESEARCH METHOD

This literature study began with classifying verdicts in the Supreme Court directory downloaded from <https://ujungan3.mahkamahagung.go.id/direktori.html> from 2018 to 2021. The chosen verdicts for this study must have met three criteria: involving hate speech cases, being committed by women, and occurring on social media. The selected verdicts were downloaded in PDF format. There were 108 verdicts in total, distributed as follows: 14 cases in 2018, 16 cases in 2019, 34 cases in 2020, and 42 cases in 2021. However, this article focused on cases of taboo language use as evidence of cases of hate speech committed by Indonesian women on social media.

Women's use of taboo language on social media was analyzed using forensic linguistic analysis to identify hate speech cases in verdicts. The verdicts included both written and spoken language data. The data on hate speech cases was displayed through quotations containing offensive language. Forensic linguistic analysis was performed to examine the evidence and understand the cultural context associated with ITE Law. Intralingual equivalent analysis was used, which explores the meaning, information, speech context, and impact of language on the ITE Law, among other language characteristics. The linguistic components are analyzed in multiple and single languages (Mahsun, 2017).

Forensic linguistics analyzed data at the outset to determine the meaning of words in their given context. Next, classification was to uncover the meaning and aim of the data based on the context and decision. This article limited the analysis to taboo language according to Jay's classification. The data analysis findings were displayed with detailed language excerpts as examples and explanations. The results of forensic linguistic analysis led to general conclusions.

## IV. CASE OF HATE SPEECH ON SOCIAL MEDIA

In this article, twelve quotes containing hate speech are found. The quotations are displayed in the source language and translation. The following is language evidence of hate speech cases by women on social media.

## Evidence 1

“Perempuan **lonte** yg **kegatalan**, suruh datangin aku dirumahku, karangrejo rt 12 nomor 55 pas dibelakang sd 018. Jangan berani dikandang aja, jangan sampai aku yg ke kandangmu mita cantik yah, yg harganya 150ribu” (An itchy whore! Tell her to come to my house, Karangrejo RT 12, Number 55, behind SD 018. Don’t only dare at your own turf! Don’t let me go to your place, lovely Mita. Huh, whose cost is 150 thousand rupiah.)

## Evidence 2

“**PELAKOR**. Dia cerai sama suaminya krn brapa kali di dpt selingkuh Sm suaminya Astagfirullah mmng ini **Perempuan** rusak yahhh **tidak puas dgn 1 kontol**.” (PELAKOR is an abbreviation for *perebut suami orang* or a woman who snatches somebody’s husband or a homewrecker.). She divorced her husband because he found her cheating on him several times. Astagfirullah! I seek forgiveness from God. It is genuinely a **nefarious woman; she is not happy with just one dick**.)

## Evidence 3

“Alhamdulillah lah Chika Hot ni dari zaman agik gadis imang dak inggin dak kek pol tu, dak, amit-amitku tanteku rumah e tempet nampung die, urang tempet kos-kosan die, urang la ku pada misal peng ku pu deng kek yang name e pol ok ku mandi aik tatung, alung ku **pekpek** ku buntu, agik e dak usah kawin, mending mun ku ade anak gadis mun pudeng kek die urang, ku sumpah ku anak gadis ku alung suruh **gadis tue** mun dak **dijual anak** dirik alung jadi **kinet** daripada kawin kek die urang jagok meres urang jagok selingkuh waw najis muah ku ningok e amit-amit ku cabang bayi, minta lilit minta lindung engak pulik petir siang yang ade matahari tu ngetet die urang macam satria baja hitam dak takut disumpah urang dak takut mati dak sadar diri ngeri ku ninggok die, urang die urang la bandit e die urang la sinnyu weww...” (“Alhamdulillah! Praise be to God. Chika Hot has disliked the police since she was a child. Oh, no, my goodness! My aunt owns the house where the cop temporarily lives. I told you I’d bathe in a ditch if I fall in love with a cop. It’s better if my **vagina** is without a hole. It will be better for me not to get married. I swear my daughter will be a **spinster** if she falls in love with a policeman. I’ll **sell** it or become an old maid. It will be better for her to be a **prostitute** than to marry a police officer. They are experts in extortion and fraud. It was disgusting to watch. I ask God for protection.)

## Evidence 4

**BANSA NA KAU YESUS TUHAN NU, BUKAN ALLAH KA KODI SIPA NU SANNA SIKALI KODINA**”. (People like you. **Jesus** your lord... not **Allah**... because of your ugly nature... so ugly”.)

## Evidence 5

Hahahhaaa khadir halid ibarat **iblis** pemangsa yang sangat ingin menghancurkan Gubernur NA, sampai melupakan dirinya sebagai Anggota dewan wakil rakyat, untung saja tak OPPO’makoo hadir Khalid kelaut Mao saja berenang sama hiiu!!!” Hahahhaaa, Khadir Halid is **like a predatory demon** who is obsessed with destroying the Governor of NA to the point that he forgets his role as a member of the people’s representative council. Luckily, Hadir Khalid is not selected again. Go to the Mao sea and swim with the sharks.

## Evidence 6

“Sial ge **asuk cina** ni ok, jukir to urg saro gale dipersulit e urg Yaa ALLAH Pak... ikak manusie ap babi nya, dk de aben hati nurani e urang to nyarik makan, ukan nyarik kayo” (“Damn, poor parking attendant. Traffic police, **Chinese purebred dogs!** I am a poor man; you make things difficult, Sir. Are you a human or a pig? Have no conscience! I work to earn a living, not to become rich.)

## Evidence 7

Ini **babi** yg ngana p komen se oleh2b singgung pa kt, krn kt dlu prnh bku inbox dgn ngana, ad bl;ng so apa nou bkng sombong p ngans, kt sja dr p buka mata orang tua kse sanang kt nda sombong, ngana dlu cmn hidop dgn b harap klpa jga ciri p sombong, jd ngana **babi** kt cmn kse inga jgn asal2 b komen **babi** Sastin Tangahu”. (“This **pig**, your comment offends me. I once messaged you, and you replied, what is wrong? It is not arrogant; I always keep my eyes open. I have made my parents happy, but I am not arrogant. Compared to you, who, in the past, only depended on coconuts, it was even arrogant. So, you, O, **pig!** I am just reminding you. Be careful with your reckless comments. O **pig**, Sastin Tangahu.)

## Evidence 8

Eh, **anjing** jangan kau pikir aku bodoh ya, aku bukan anak kecil yang bisa kau gibuli dengan statusmu itu. Jangan sempat aku datangin kau kerumahmu ya gara-gara statusmu ini. Jangan kau pikir aku takut dengan mamakmu yang sok galak itu.” (Eh, **dog!** Do not think I am stupid, okay? I am not a child who can be lied to by your posted status. Do not let me come to your house because of that. Please do not assume that I am afraid of your mother just because she might be pretentious.)

## Evidence 9

Eh, **Babi** kau nya yang ga tau sopan santun. Kalau memang kau punya etika dan sopan santun kenapa kau berani melawan guru dan kepekmu berarti kau kan yang ga pernah diajari si lon itu etika ia kan kan.” (Uh, **pig**, who does not know manners.). If you have ethics and manners, why dare you fight your teacher and headmaster? It means that you are the one who has never been taught by the whore, right?

## Evidence 10

“*Adoooh ng ibu guru Meity Lusje Mamahit... kyp ba saksi dusta dang... anak kmg dri dpe mami meninggal oma els n opa ruddi yg jaga komaan. kyp ng ba saksi dsni rentje deng merklin yang jaga dang, seorang guru model bagini, kong ba saksi le di pengadilaann.. sejak kapan kasiang ???*” (Uh, you are teacher MEITY LUSJE MAMAHIT; why **false witness**)? Mami’s son died, Oma Els and Opa Ruddy took care; why do you testify here whether Rentje and Merlin did it, (**A teacher with this model** testifies falsely in court, poorly since when?)

## Evidence 11

“*Kyp ngana rupa stel jga bku komen b singgung p kita? Apa ngana p maksud nou? Suka mo suru kase ciri ngana p gigi palsu itu? Kita ini biar bgni bkn 1 laki2 mai anak jga bku ganti akn, mangarti ngana nou Sastin Tangahu kt so brsaha b diam dg sabar sampe2 kt klu ada yg kt lia rupa laeng kt cmn jga inbox cmn kykx ngana tdk puas, ngana suka biar kt umbar di sosmed stau?*” Why do you often make comments that offend me? What exactly do you mean, Nou? Please show me your imitation teeth! I am loyal to my husband, and so are my children. Do you understand Nou Sastin Tangahu? I have tried to be quiet and patient. If there is anything else I just messaged, you are not satisfied. Would you like me to share it on social media?

## Evidence 12

*jang bicara orang lain pung pribadi. nanati orang lain bale bicara nyonya pung pribadi, nyonya seng kuat angka muka. Taru muka di tanah.. mau ungit balas budi? Hujan sehari lupa panas setahun. Bt pernah tolong nyonya pung hidup waktu dirumah tiga sana. Seng tau se tinggal dimana yang batul. Ingat masa lalu ka, karena masa lalu itu yang membentuk katong punya pribadi saat ini. Bicara orang pung pribadi sama saja nyonya tunjukkan nyonya pung karakter buruk tu, Bt seng perlu bicara secara detail nanti se Malu. Beta tutup rapat se pung aib tu. Beta tar kelas deng ose. Barang sapa seng tau se pung pribadi di negri ini ??? SE HUTANG BUDI SECARA PRIBADI DI BETA. TAPI BETA SENG PERNAH HUTANG BUDI DI SE. TAU MALU SADIKI !! MINTA TRIMA KASIH JUA BALOM. JANG PERNAH INKARI BT PUNG KEBAIKAN PAR SE DEWI DEWANTI ROLOBESSY. INGAT AKAN SAMPE MATI.*” (Do not discuss other personalities! Others later turn to discuss your personality, but the mistress could not lift her face. Place your chin on the ground. Did you return the favor? A day’s rain washes away the heat of the year. I once assisted the lady in Rumah Tiga. I do not know which one your lives are true. Remember the past because it shapes who we are today. The lady talks about somebody’s personality; it reflects your bad character. I will not go into detail because you will be embarrassed later. I will save your shame. I am not on par with you. In this country, who does not know who you are? YOU OWE ME PERSONAL DEBT, BUT I NEVER. KNOW A LITTLE SHAME!! SAY THANK YOU IS ALSO NOT. NEVER DENY MY KINDNESS, GODDESS COUNCIL ROLOBESSY! DO NOT FORGET TO DIE!”)

## V. USE OF TABOO LANGUAGE

This study discusses the use of taboo language by women on social media, a practice that may be classified as hate speech. The language used in this case is presented as evidence of transcription of written or spoken communications directed at a different person. The posts can be directed by the defendant or in response to another user. According to Jay’s (2009) classification of taboo language, the following categories include 1) sexual references, 2) profanity or blasphemy, 3) animal names, 4) ethnic, racial, or gender slurs, and 5) references that insult anything considered taboo, including psychological, physical, or social deviation. The findings of a forensic linguistic analysis about women who have been implicated in hate speech on social media platforms concerning the ITE Law are presented in this article.

## A. Sexual References

The words *lonte* and *kegatalan* are taboo sexual references. Lexically the word *lonte* means ‘bitch, slut, or whore’. The word *kegatalan* means being itchy. However, in conversational language, it has a figurative meaning of ‘like to have sex.’ In the context of these words, the words *lonte* and *kegatalan* refer to a woman named Mita. The woman in the context of the speech is accused of being a prostitute who likes to have sex with the husband of the woman who uploads the comment at a rate of only 150 thousand rupiah. So, the woman, Mita, is accused by the woman who uploaded the commenting evidence 1 prostituting her husband. In the Indonesian context, the words *lonte* and *kegatalan* are taboo languages. The taboo words are rude and unworthy of being uploaded on social media. The words are intended as an insult or defamation against Mita. Evidence 1, about the ITE Law, violates Article 27A by making public accusations that harm another individual’s reputation or good name.

*Pelakor* is an acronym for *perebut laki orang*. In conversational language, it means ‘woman snatching men, seducers and snatching someone’s husbands, or homewrecker.’ *Kontrol* is a word that has the lexical meaning ‘male genitalia or

penis'. As for the clause *tidak puas dengan 1 kontol*, it refers to the grammatical meaning of 'like to switch partners.' In the context of the speech, it refers to a woman mentioned by the woman who posted it. The woman is accused of being a woman usurping someone's husbands. In the Indonesian cultural context, they are taboo languages. It is considered rude and not worthy to post in public. The word is intended as an insult and/or defamation against the woman mentioned. Regarding the ITE Law, evidence 2 violates Article 27A. *Pelakor* and *kontol* are taboo words and group sexual references.

*Pekpek*, *gadis tue*, *dijual anak*, and *kinet* are taboo words, group sexual references. *Pekpek* is a word in the vernacular that has the lexical meaning of 'female pubic, vagina. *Gadis tue* phrases mean 'old and unmarried girl, spinster'. The word *kinet* is a word in the regional language that has the lexical meaning 'whore'. In the context of the speech, a woman expresses antipathy toward a man as a policeman. According to her, all police members are of bad character. Therefore, she considered that her daughter better off as a dead-end vagina, a spinster, or a prostitute than marrying a policeman. In Indonesian culture, the words are taboo languages. Taboo words are impolite and inappropriate for sharing on social media. The words are intended to insult and defame the police. Evidence 3 violates Article 28 paragraph (2) about instigating, inviting, or influencing others to generate feelings of hatred or hostility towards individuals and/or groups in certain societies.

#### B. Profane or Blasphemous

*Jesus* and *Allah* are names that refer to God. In the quotation, it is unclear if the two names refer to the name of God in the same or different religions. It becomes clear that the name God is used for a distinct faith based on the verdict statement. *Jesus* is the name of God for Christians/Catholics, while *Allah* is the name of God for Muslims. It states that they have different Gods that also make them different. Besides, the sentence continues that the person mentioned has a gruesome nature. The labeling of repulsive traits is repeated and accompanied by adding adverbs 'very and too.' One's faith is associated with these negative traits. In Indonesian tradition, the names of God, *Jesus*, and *Allah* as curses are considered prohibited due to the offensive terms associated with them that can provoke rage. The taboo word is a *blasphemous category* because it is more directed to insult God. Regarding Article 28, paragraph (2) of the ITE Law, evidence 4 can cause hatred/hostility toward individuals and/or specific groups of people based on religion.

The word *Iblis* denotes an invisible, evil creature. Lexically, the word is defined as a spirit creature that constantly attempts to mislead humans from God's guidance, namely Satan. Grammatically, *Iblis* refers to 'an evil person'. In the quotation, Khadir Halid is a council member who loses his composure and is compared to a demon. He is regarded as a predator and destroyer of the NA (Nurdin Abdullah) governor. The phrase suggests that the individual mentioned possesses a profoundly evil personality. Evil traits are labeled with successive words: devils, predators, and destroyers. In Indonesian culture, the term evil falls into the profane category due to its association with supernatural phenomena. When connected to Article 28, Paragraph 2 of the ITE Law, evidence 5 could incite feelings of hatred/hostility towards individuals and/or specific groups of people due to their religion.

#### C. Ethnic-Racial-Gender Slurs

*Asuk cina* in evidence 6 denotes a Chinese breed of dog commonly used as a guard animal in Chinese culture. However, in the speech, referring to traffic police officers of Chinese ethnicity as being servants is considered an insult. This usage is derogatory and defamatory. It promotes hatred and hostility towards Chinese people and law enforcement agencies. In Indonesian culture, using such language is considered taboo as it contains offensive words that can provoke anger. Evidence 6, if used in the context of the ITE Law, can incite racial hatred or hostility towards specific individuals or groups based on ethnicity, as outlined in Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law.

#### D. Animal Names

Instances of hate speech using derogatory terms for pigs and dogs can be found in evidence 7, 8, and 9. The compound *asuk cina* in evidence 6 means 'Chinese breed dog' lexically and grammatically signifies 'Chinese ethnic guard animal.' In the speech, the words *asuk China* refer to the police controlling traffic as if he has become a servant to the Chinese ethnicity. The speech also juxtaposes the police with pigs. In Indonesian culture, the use of dog and pig names as swear words is a taboo language because it includes vile words that can cause anger. When related to the ITE Law, evidence 6 can cause hatred/hostility of individuals and/or specific groups of people based on their professions/institutions, namely the police. Such speech may be subjected to Article 28, paragraph 2 of the ITE Law.

#### E. Insulting References to Perceived Psychological, Physical, or Social Deviations

Using the terms *false witness* and *teacher in this model* is taboo because they are associated with insulting the soul of a woman known as teacher Meity Lusje Mamahit. The expression *false witness* refers to someone who actively provides false information rather than doing so mistakenly. Lexically, the term refers to someone who gives false testimony in court. The words *teacher in this model* represent a teacher but grammatically convey the opposite meaning of 'unfit to be a teacher.' The woman is labeled untrustworthy or unsuitable to teach because she lacks verifiable evidence for her testimony. About the ITE Law, evidence 10 violates Article 27A.

*Gigi palsu* is a taboo word associated with remarks against someone's physical appearance. The phrase *gigi palsu* translates to 'artificial teeth,' but grammatically, it means 'toothless or disorderly teeth, so they must be camouflaged

with artificial teeth.' *Nou Sastin Tangahu*, the person named in Evidence 11 is labeled as having an unattractive appearance. Furthermore, the physical condition is associated with the contrasting behavior of a woman who posts the content. She claims to be a good woman loyal to a partner (never switching men). The woman who uploads the content believes that Sastin Tengahu has a physically unattractive appearance and is unfaithful. Evidence 11, if related to the ITE Law, violates Article 27A.

Evidence 11 is labeled as having an unattractive appearance. Furthermore, the physical condition is associated with the contrasting behavior of a woman who posts the content. She claims to be a good woman loyal to a partner (never switching men). The woman who uploads the content believes that Sastin Tengahu has a physically unattractive appearance and is unfaithful. Evidence 11, if related to the ITE Law, violates Article 27A.

The phrases *karakter buruk* and *tahu malu sedikit* are considered prohibited words referring to the slur concerning a woman's soul mentioned in evidence 12. The phrase of *karakter buruk* lexically and grammatically signifies 'a negative psychological disposition'. The phrase *tahu malu sedikit* means 'have a little shame,' but grammatically, it means 'have no shame.' The person named in evidence 12 has a malevolent demeanor and conduct. It can be seen from the supporting words in evidence 12 by mentioning behaviors such as gossiping, avoiding eye contact, feeling ashamed of prior actions being vogue about residence, and owing a debt of gratitude to the woman who posted the speech. She said that Dewi Dewanti Rolobessy has a negative character, lacks shame, disobeys good deeds, and enjoys spreading rumors. Dewi Dewanti Rolobessy believes that her reputation is humiliated and tarnished by the speech on social media. Evidence 12, concerning ITE Law, violates Article 27B paragraph (2) related to debt provision.

## VI. DISCUSSION

The language women use on social media needs to be studied, considering gender stereotype theory. Using taboo language on social media can serve as evidence of legal cases. Posting hate speech by women on social media violates the ITE Law. Legal cases involving women's language use on social media provide new perspectives on language use and gender stereotypes. Statistical analysis showed that gender does not affect the selection of civility strategies (Sharqawi & Anthony, 2020). Women are no longer restricted in language. Women may not always use polite language when giving compliments and may like other people's social media posts. Many women reject gender norms regarding language use proposed by Lakoff, which lack legal awareness and digital literacy. As a result, many women are subjected to legal sanctions for posting taboo language and engaging in hate speech.

Women engaging in hate speech violate Article 27A, 27B paragraph (2), and Article 28 paragraph (2) of the ITE Law. In Indonesian culture, using this term is considered disrespectful because it is prohibited. The forensic linguistic study supports the findings of Subyantoro and Apriyanto's (2020) research, which identifies a strategy of positive incivility, impolite language, and satire in expressing hate speech using polite language. Hate speech can manifest in various linguistic forms, such as words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and forms of discourse. Civility can be interpreted differently depending on the context, culture, or language. Polite delivery is required, but the meaning can vary depending on the context (Idemaru et al., 2020).

Research indicates that intimidating and aggressive social media users tend to use various hashtags to link their speech to specific topics discussed in hashtags. The study discovers the use of words from an Indonesian regional language in hate speech. Regional languages are used as a means of communication, even though Indonesian has largely replaced them in several domains (family domain, work domain, neighborhood environment) (Mardikantoro, 2016). Putri et al. (2021) developed a dataset for detecting abusive language and hate speech in regional languages.

Language considered taboo should not be used on social media. Women in Indonesia are facing hate speech charges for using taboo language in social media posts. Meanwhile, the ITE Law regulates the use of social media. Taboo is the sacred prohibition against touching, mentioning, or seeing objects or individuals and refraining from performing specific acts. Furthermore, if this ban is broken, it poses a risk (Resticka & Nurdianto, 2020). Taboos can be examined from different angles, including as a social ritual for obedience, restrictive behaviors in dangerous situations, a means of protecting individuals in danger and safeguarding society from those who pose a threat (Brodersen, 2019).

Sexual references are taboo languages associated with sex, sexuality, and sexual organs. Profane or blasphemous falls under a category related to religion. Profane pertains more to the supernatural, while blasphemous is more about insulting God. Animal names used are considered taboo words associated with harmful deeds. Ethnic-racial-gender slurs are derogatory terms that target ethnicity, race, and gender. Insulting references to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviations are taboo words relating to perceived psyche, physical, and social insults.

According to Jay (2009), taboo words are forbidden because they can cause harm. There are nine categories of taboo language: 1) sexual references, 2) profane or blasphemous language, 3) scatological references and disgusting objects, 4) animal names, 5) ethnic-racial-gender slurs, 6) insulting references to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviations, 7) ancestral allusion, 8) substandard vulgar terms, and 9) offensive slang. Consequently, the word taboo is restricted in its use by individuals and institutions. There are five taboo words in this article, according to Jay's category: 1) sexual references, 2) profane or blasphemous, 3) animal names, 4) ethnic-racial-gender slurs, and 5) insulting references to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviations. In contrast, Affini (2017), on the other hand, divides taboo words into seven categories based on Jay's statement. 1) Cursing is an attempt to harm others emotionally. 2) Profanity is the term used to describe the abuse of everything considered sacred. 3) Blasphemy is used as a severe

criticism of the church and religious figures. 4) Infidelity, once considered as obscenity in America, refers to as fuck. 5) Sexual harassment encompasses comments on an individual's performance, sexual conduct, or sexual orientation, references to bodily parts, derogatory remarks based on gender, or suggestive and unwelcome remarks. 6) Vulgar language is powerfully shaped by cultural factors such as intelligence, economic conditions, and values prevalent in the community.

Ningjue (2010) divided taboos into verbal and nonverbal categories. Verbal categories are taboos involving partial or complete violations in using certain words, expressions, and topics in social interactions. Nonverbal taboos, also called behavioral taboos, refer to communal daily behaviors restricted because of traditional values or social norms deeming them taboo. Based on Ningjue's perspective, the study centers on verbal taboos of words or word combinations used on social media.

Taboo language is a cultural phenomenon. Research on taboo words in the Kubitn Dayak language focuses on lexical, grammatical, and cultural implications. The study also explores euphemisms related to various aspects, such as circumstances, animals, spirits, body parts, kinship, and activities. Additionally, the research examines the roles of cursing, insulting, swearing, and jokes. Besides, the study analyzes how these taboo words are integrated into the Indonesian junior high school curriculum 2013 (Yunita et al., 2022). The article also finds that the cultural background and language of the commenter influence the use of regional languages.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The taboo language used by women on social media is hate speech in the form of regional languages and Indonesian. Both languages are in the form of standard languages, and some are in the form of nonstandard languages. The form of Indonesian nonstandard acronyms is commonly used in conversational language. Cases of language used by women uploaded on social media in court rulings are categorized as hate speech related to insults and defamation, tribes, religions, races, and intergroups (SARA). The taboo language used as hate speech is group *sexual references, profane or blasphemous, animal names, ethnic-racial-gender slurs, and Insulting references to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviations*. The results of this study can prove that women's language as a gender stereotype proposed by Lakoff is no longer relevant. Women's social media users are entangled in hate speech cases with the use of taboo language.

This research can be followed up by research on the tendency of choosing social media to carry out hate speech. Further research that is no less important is digital literacy. This research is expected to increase social media users' understanding of speaking wisely and avoid cases of hate speech.

Women's use of taboo language on social media, specifically in regional languages and Indonesian, constitutes hate speech. Both languages are standardized, whereas others are nonstandard. Indonesian nonstandard acronyms are frequently utilized in informal conversations. Instances of language used by women on social media that appear in verdicts are classified as hate speech involving insults and defamation based on tribes, faiths, races, and intergroups (SARA). Hate speech includes prohibited language such as *sexual references, profanity, blasphemy, animal names, ethnic, racial, and gender insults*, and insulting comments to perceived psychological, physical, or social deviations. This study's findings demonstrate that Lakoff's gender stereotype of women's language is no longer applicable. Female social media users are involved in hate speech incidents using offensive words.

Subsequent research could investigate the inclination to use social media for hate speech. Another crucial area of research is digital literacy. This study aims to enhance social media users' comprehension to communicate judiciously and prevent hate speech.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Affini, L. N. (2017). Analisis Kata Tabu dan Klasifikasinya di Lirik Lagu Eminem pada Album The Marshal Mathers [Analysis of taboo words and their classification in Eminem's song lyrics on the album The Marshal Mathers]. *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan dan Budaya*, 7(1), 93–113.
- [2] Ariani, M. G., Sajedi, F., and Sajedi, M. (2014). Forensic linguistics: A brief overview of the key elements. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 222–225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.078>.
- [3] Baror, S. O. and Venter, H. S. (2019). A taxonomy for cybercrime attack in the public cloud. *14th International Conference on Cyber Warfare and Security, ICCWS 2019*, 505–515.
- [4] Blaya, C. (2019). Cyberhate: A Review and Content Analysis of Intervention Strategies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 45, 163–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.006>.
- [5] Boucher, A and Perkins, R. (2020). The Case of Sherlock Holmes and Linguistic Analysis. *English Literature in Transition*, 63(1), 77–98.
- [6] Brodersen, E. (2019). *Taboo, Personal and Collective Representations: Origin and Positioning within Cultural Complexes* (Vol. 1). Routledge.
- [7] Chatzakou, D., Leontiadis, I., Blackburn, J., De Cristofaro, E., Stringhini, G., Vakali, A., and Kourtellis, N. (2019). Detecting Cyberbullying and Cyberaggression in Social Media. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 13(3), 1–51. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3343484>.
- [8] Clarke, I. (2019). Functional Linguistic Variation in Twitter Trolling. *International Journal of Speech, Language and the Law*, 26(1), 57–84. <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijsl.34803>.

- [9] Colbran, M. P. (2018). Policing, Social Media, and the New Media Landscape: Can the Police and the Traditional Media Ever Successfully Bypass Each Other? *Policing and Society*, 30(3), 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2018.1532426>.
- [10] Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., and Wright, D. (2016). *An Introduction to Forensic Linguistics: Language in Evidence* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- [11] Curiel, R. P., Cresci, S., Muntean, C. L., and Bishop, S. R. (2020). Crime and Its Fear in Social Media. *Palgrave Communications*, 6(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-0430-7>.
- [12] Fraser, H. (2014). Transcription of Indistinct Forensic Recordings: Problems and Solutions from the Perspective of Phonetic Science. *Language and Law*, 1(2), 5–21.
- [13] Gierth, L., and Bromme, R. (2020). Attacking Science on Social Media: How User Comments Affect Perceived Trustworthiness and Credibility. *Public Understanding of Science*, 29(2), 230–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662519889275>.
- [14] Habiburrahim, Rahmiati, Z., Muluk, S., Akmal, S., and Aziz, Z. A. (2020). Language, Identity, and Ideology: Analysing Aceh Sharia Law Implementation Discourse. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 599–607. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23210>.
- [15] Handono, P. Y. (2018). “Gaya Bahasa Komentar dalam Akun Instagram “Mimi Peri Rapunchelle” [The style of Comments on the Instagram Account “Mimi Peri Rapunchelle] *Linguista*, 2(2), 97–105. <http://doi.org/10.25273/linguista.v2i2.3697>.
- [16] Hipp, J. R., Bates, C., Lichman, M., and Smyth, P. (2019). Using social media to measure temporal ambient population: Does it help explain local crime rates? *Justice Quarterly*, 36(4), 718–748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2018.1445276>.
- [17] Idemaru, K., Winter, B., Brown, L., and Oh, G. E. (2020). Loudness trumps pitch in politeness judgments: Evidence from Korean deferential speech. *Language and Speech*, 63(1), 123–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830918824344>.
- [18] Jaki, S. (2019). Online Hatred of Women? Br?> in the Incels. Me Forum: Linguistic Analysis and Automatic Detection. In *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, Vol. 7, Issue 2, pp. 240–268. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00026.jak>.
- [19] Jay, T. (2009). The Utility and Ubiquity of Taboo Words. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(2), 153–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01115.x>.
- [20] Kuntjara, E. (2003). *Gender, Bahasa, dan Kekuasaan* [Gender, Language, and Power]. (I). Gunung Mulia.
- [21] Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and Woman’s place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45–80. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166707>.
- [22] Lee, J. C. L., Teh, P. L., Lau, S. L., and Pak, I. (2019). Compilation of Malay Criminological Terms from Online News. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*, 15(1), 355–364. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijeecs.v15.i1.pp355-364>.
- [23] Lev-On, A. and Steinfield, Ni. (2020). “Objection, Your Honor”: Use of Social Media by Civilians to Challenge the Criminal Justice System. *Social Science Computer Review*, 38(3), 315–333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439318771523>.
- [24] Lia, N. A. (2021). Demokrasi Virtual dan Hasrat dalam Menyampaikan Ujaran Kebencian di Media Sosial Instagram [Virtual Democracy and the Desire to Convey Hate Speech on Social Media Instagram]. *Jurnal An-Nida*, 13(1), 51–68.
- [25] Lubis, E. E. (2014). Potret Media Sosial dan Perempuan [Portrait of Social Media and Women]. *PARALLELA*, 1(2), 97–106.
- [26] Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2022). *Direktori Putusan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia* [Directory of Decisions of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia]. Retrieved August 11, 2023, from <https://putusan3.mahkamahagung.go.id/search.html>.
- [27] Mahsun. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Tahapan, Strategi, Metode, dan Tekniknya* [Language Research Methods: Stages, Strategies, Methods and Techniques]. (Vol. 9). Rajawali Pers. [www.rajagrafindo.co.id](http://www.rajagrafindo.co.id).
- [28] Mardikantoro, H. B. (2016). Pemertahanan Bahasa Jawa dalam Pertunjukan Kesenian Tradisional di Jawa Tengah [Maintaining the Javanese Language in Traditional Arts Performances in Central Java]. *LITERA*, 15(2), 269–280.
- [29] Nazifa, N. A., Fook, C. Y., Chin, L. C., Vijejan, V., and Kheng, E. S. (2019). Gender Prediction by Speech Analysis. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1372(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1372/1/012011>.
- [30] Ningjue, Z. (2010). *Taboo language on the Internet: An analysis of gender differences in using taboo language*. Kristianstad University.
- [31] Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2016). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi elektronik [Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 2024 concerning Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions]. In *UU No. 1 tahun 2024* (pp. 1–39).
- [32] Putri, S. D. A., Ibrohim, M. O., and Budi Indra. (2021). Abusive language and hate speech detection for Javanese and Sundanese languages in tweets: Dataset and preliminary study. *2021 11th International Workshop on Computer Science and Engineering, WCSE 2021*, 10(1), 65–69. <https://doi.org/10.18178/wcse.2021.02.011>.
- [33] Resticka, G. A. and Nurdianto, E. (2020). Kata Tabu dalam Bahasa Indonesia yang Mempunyai Makna Pelacuran (Kajian Leksikografi) [The Word Taboo in Indonesian which Means Prostitution (lexicographic study)]. *Prosiding Semnas LPPM Onsoed*, 169–178.
- [34] Seyari, A. and Bagheri, M. S. (2019). Perspectives of Forensic Linguistics Research in Iran 1. *Journal of Language Horizons*, 3(1), 187–205. <https://doi.org/10.22051/lghor.2019.27858.1172>.
- [35] Sharqawi, M. A. and Anthony, E. M. (2020). Analyzing Gender Effect on the Speech Act of Suggestion: A Pilot Study. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(4), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2020-0062>.
- [36] Sousa-Silva, R. (2018). Computational Forensic Linguistics: An Overview of Computational Applications in Forensic Contexts. *Language and Law/Linguagem e Direito*, 5(2), 114–143.
- [37] Subyantoro, S. and Apriyanto, S. (2020). Impoliteness in Indonesian language hate speech on social media contained in the Instagram Account. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 11(2), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jal.v11i1.8655>.
- [38] Suryani, Y., Istianingrum, R., and Hanik, S. U. (2021). Linguistik forensik ujaran kebencian terhadap artis Aurel Hermansyah di media sosial Instagram [Forensic linguistics of hate speech against artist Aurel Hermansyah on Instagram social media]. *BELAJAR BAHASA: Jurnal Ilmiah Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.32528/bb.v6i1.4167>.

- [39] Susanto and Deri Sis Nanda. (2020). Dimensi analisis bahasa dalam linguistik forensik [Dimensions of language analysis in forensic linguistics]. *IJFL (International Journal of Forensic Linguistics)*, 1(1), 17–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22225/2.1.1603.1-6>.
- [40] Wainira, M. A. D., Liliweri, Y. K. N., and Mandaru, S. S. E. (2021). Pemanfaatan Instagram sebagai media komunikasi pemasaran dalam membangun brand image (Studi deskriptif kualitatif pada akun @kopipapaganteng) [Utilisation of Instagram as a marketing communication medium in building brand image (Qualitative descriptive study on the @kopipapaganteng account)]. *Communio*, 10(2), 140–150.
- [41] Waruwu, D. F. M., and Vera, N. (2020). Ujaran kebencian di media sosial (studi netnografi di akun Instagram @prof.tjokhowie) [Hate speech on social media (netnographic study on the Instagram account @prof.tjokhowie)]. *AGUNA: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 1(1), 55–69.
- [42] Yunita, M., Simanjuntak, H., and Jupitasari, M. (2022). Kata-kata tabu (mali) dalam bahasa Dayak Kubitn di Serawai [Taboo words (mali) in the Dayak Kubitn language in Serawai]. *Katulistiwa*, 11(5), 1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v11i5.54533>.
- [43] Zhuravel, V. A. (2020). Criminalistics' language: Concept-terminological apparatus formation. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 27(1), 162-176. [http://dx.doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.27\(1\).2020.162-176](http://dx.doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.27(1).2020.162-176).



**Sutarsih** was born in Demak, Central Java, in 1974. She is a postgraduate in the Language Education Science doctoral program at Semarang State University, sutabindeku@students.unnes.ac.id. She is a senior researcher at the Research Center for Language, Literature and Community, National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia. Her research area is language, literature, oral tradition, folklore, and cultural studies. Email: suta015@brin.go.id



**Subyantoro** was born in Salatiga, Central Java, in 1968. He is a Professor at Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni, Semarang State University. He is the promoter of Sutarsih's dissertation. He is Sutarsih's dissertation promoter. He is a professor of Psycholinguistics. Email: bintoro@mail.unnes.ac.id



**Hari Bakti Mardikantoro** was born in Magelang, Central Java in 1967. He is a professor at the Faculty of Language and Art at Semarang State University. He is the co-promoter of Sutarsih's dissertation. He is a professor of Sociolinguistics. Email: haribaktim@mail.unnes.ac.id



**Tommi Yuniawan** was born in Brebes, Central Java, in 1975. He is a professor at the Faculty of Language and Art at Semarang State University. He is the co-promoter of Sutarsih's dissertation. He is a professor of Ecolinguistics. Email: tommyuniawan@mail.unnes.ac.id