CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This chapter provided the methodology utilized to conduct the study. This chapter outlines five parts of the research procedure, namely research design, setting and object, data collection, data analysis, and place and time of research. More details are described below.

A. Research Design

The design of this study used a qualitative approach as it presented the findings in the form of descriptive writing. According to Dörnyei (2007), qualitative research emphasizes the subjective opinions of the participants themselves, making it relevant to the researcher's goal in this study. Abbot and Mckinney (2013) states that the qualitative method presented the results of the analysis in the form of descriptive sentences whether they came from written or oral sources. In line with this, the data obtained in the form of a document was re-interpreted and written up descriptively. In addition, qualitative methods also provided flexibility in interpreting data based on the social context and language used in social media, especially X.

Aligning with the researcher's goal of analyzing assumptions behind the posts of the hashtag, the researcher employed a discourse analysis design. According to (Taylor, 2013), discourse study was a research approach that examined language as evidence of broader social phenomena. This explanation is aligned with Kamalu and Osisanwo (2015), whose discourse study focuses on analyzing language in social and cultural contexts, both written and spoken. Therefore, although a text reflects the speaker's personal feelings and situation, it also reflects the values, norms, and social structure of the person or group, for example through language style, topics that are considered important, or the perspective toward an issue that was considered problematic. Thus, discourse study viewed language as a window to understanding the social context, culture, and ideology behind it. In line with this concept, this research analyzed words, phrases,

and sentences in relation to social phenomena that occurred. The pragmatics analysis technique, especially presupposition analysis, was used to identify and describe the types of presuppositions that appeared in hate speech.

B. Setting and Objects

This study focused on the flexible use of social media, with X (formerly Twitter) being selected as the platform for analysis. X was a free-to-use social media platform accessible to various user groups. The study was conducted within the online discourse on X, where the data was collected in the form of all phrases, sentences, punctuation marks, and emoticons in a specific language, such as English. The primary focus was on the hashtags #hatespeech and #freedomofspeech, which were widely used on the platform. This hashtag not only appeared in posts that contained hate speech but also in posts that promoted hate speech prevention itself, so that a separate analysis is needed to sort out posts between those that contain hate speech and those that do not contain hate speech. This study specifically focused on hate speech content on X, particularly posts containing sarcasm, opposition, insult, and humiliation. The analysis was conducted using presupposition theory to reveal the implied meaning and show how hate speech was formed in digital discourse.

C. Data Collection

The data used in this study was collected through a web scraping process using Apify, a platform that allows automatic extraction of data from posts containing #hatespeech and #freedomofspeech hashtags from the X platform. The data collection process involved several steps. First, the researcher opened the Apify website using chrome and selected the X hashtag scraper as the tool for collecting data. Then, the relevant hashtags were entered, and the platform's cookie was added to allow access. After that, the number of posts to be collected was set. Finally, the data was exported.

The data was collected over a period of 21 days. All data was collected on 13 January, while the trial use of the website was conducted on 23 February. As a result, 42 posts were obtained, written in English and contained the hashtag #hatespeech and #freedomofspeech. However, all the data cannot be confirmed to contain hate speech, so a separate analysis is needed to identify any indication of negative intent in each post. This verification stage is important so that the data analyzed is truly relevant and in accordance with the focus of the study. Out of the 42 post initially collected, all written in English and containing hashtags #hatespeech and #freedomofspeech, 16 were identified as containing hate speech. In addition, each post is analyzed not only based on its textual content but also considering the context and possible implied meaning it convey. The following is an example of the analysis of posts that are categorized as hate speech and those that are not hate speech.

Table 1. The example of hate speech analysis

Comment	Account Name	Target	Context	Explicit or Implicit Meaning	Purpose
U want tarrifs, then take away income taxes like in 1913! Fuck @elonmusk & Fuck @realDonaldTrump & Fuck @Tesla! #BoycottTe	H****9	Individual	Political	Explicit meaning	Criticism-insult

sla

#FreedomO

fSpeech

#1stamend

ment

#FuckElon

Musk

#FuckTesla

#nazi

#boycott

#Tesla

#SwastiCar

#swasticars

#muskolini

#FuckTrum

p

#FuckDonal

dTrump

#FuckMaga

Can only imagine your Jewish friends must have been devastated by this vicious attack from a fellow Jew.	A****o	Group	Soci al- cultu ral	Implicit meaning	Criticism

Nothing
more
frightening
than when
you are
turned on
by your
own.
#HateSpeec
h

The first post in the table can be categorized as hate speech because the post contains quite harsh language and direct insults. In addition, the utterances in this post can be categorized as verbal abuse that dehumanizes a person and a certain group. On the other hand, the purpose of this post is to incite and attack, not to present an argument. This can be proven by the absence of any attempt to convey rational criticism, which tends to highlight emotions and vulgar insults without building constructive discussions. Such hate speech is very dangerous because it can trigger discriminatory actions, spread hatred more widely, and reinforce negative stereotypes against certain groups. In the context of social media, the spread of hate speech is often difficult to control because it spreads quickly. Therefore, it is important for users to be able to think critically to sort out the words that will be conveyed so that, in the end, it does not lead to hate speech.

While the second post aims to criticize an action, it cannot be categorized as hate speech. This is because the post did not contain insults, degrading speech, or direct threats. In addition, this post did not have a negative bias toward the intended group but rather expressed a sense of disappointment in the actions that are considered hurtful from within the group. This proved that even the presence of the #hatespeech hashtag is not enough to prove that the content contained hate speech. Even so, it is possible that the author used the hashtag to comment on or highlight the existence of hate speech committed by others, not himself. This showed that the

context and intention behind a sentence were very important to consider before labeling it as hate speech. Users of the same hashtag could have had different intentions depending on the purpose and situation. Therefore, careful and contextual analysis was needed to avoid misinterpretation in categorizing a post as hate speech.

In addition, at this stage, the analysis focused on how actors are represented in the text, both as perpetrators and as a target of hate speech. Actors in this context refer to certain individuals, groups, or parties that are part of the discourse raised through posts on the X platform. The representation of actors is analyzed through actual events or issues, namely issues that trigger public responses in the form of hate speech spread on social media, thus allowing the identification of certain attitudes, judgments, or stereotypes directed to the actor. The data used are posts that are categorized as hate speech and contain hashtags #hatespeech and #freedomofhatespeech. By examining the source of the speech, the way it is delivered, and the choice of words used in each post, this analysis reveals how the actor is constructed- whether as a party that is supported, criticized, cornered, or even contradicted with the values of freedom of speech.

Table 2. Actor representation analysis example

Comment	Account Name	Target	Context	Explicit or Implicit Meaning	Purpose
They only cry #Freedom OfSpeech when it suits their agenda, but stay silent	3****t	Group	Social-political	Implicit meaning	Criticism-sarcasm

when

they're the

ones

maligning

others. It's

all about

using that

excuse to

spread lies

& destroy

reputation

s, but

when the

tables turn

& their

own words

come

under

scrutiny,

suddenly

they play

the victim.

The speech from the post above conveys a sharp and demeaning judgment of a group of actors, with a choice of words that contain stereotypical accusations. This speech explicitly contrasts actors with the value of freedom of speech. Actors are not represented as defenders of freedom but as abusers of freedom of expression. They are accused of using freedom of speech as a shield to attack, not as a universal right. Therefore, the actors in this speech can be categorized as negative, which can form hateful sentiments. This is because the utterances in this post build a representation of personal agendas, commit defamation and, spread lies, and those

who act as perpetrators when attacking others, but act as ethical victims when attacked back. After knowing the stages of how the data is collected, the data is sorted and categorized as hate speech, and the actor representation analysis, the resulting data will then be analyzed using presuppositions. This analysis helped reveal the implicit intentions and assumptions conveyed by the speaker.

D. Data Analysis

In this study, the main object to be analyzed is all sentences, phrases, punctuation marks, and emoticons containing hate speech in the posts of #hatespeech and #freedomofspeech hashtags. Meanwhile, all the posts collected are not necessarily categorized as hate speech. Therefore, according to Nascimento and Cavalcanti (2023), hate speech can be categorized as sarcastic, demanding, insulting, or even promoting attacks and inciting violence. Such speech is often directed to an individual, group, or situation. Furthermore, hate speech may be delivered either implicitly or explicitly and is frequently triggered by social or political phenomena. Therefore, it is important to carefully screen and analyze each post to avoid mistakes in classifying hate speech. In this case, the researcher not only looks at the linguistic forms used but also considers the social context and communicative intent of the author of the post.

Furthermore, comments that have been categorized as hate speech will be analyzed using the presupposition developed by Yule (2006). He categorized presupposition into six types, including existential presupposition, highlighting the existence of an entity implied within hate speech comments. Factive and non-factive presuppositions explore whether hate speech reflects factual information or not. Lexical presupposition focuses on the implied meaning or specific words used in the hate speech. Structural presupposition examines how hate speech can be believed to be true through the definite word structure. Last is counterfactual presupposition reveals assumptions about contrary reality that are embedded in the hate speech.

In this analysis, the different types of presuppositions have been implemented to identify and explore the types of presuppositions that appeared on the post. In addition, this analysis also identified how hate speech can influence perceptions towards an assumption aimed at a particular individual, group, or situation. This analysis was done by looking at the implied meaning contained in hate speech, especially how a statement can carry certain assumptions that are taken for granted by the reader. By using presupposition, the researcher can reveal the intentions behind utterances that may seem ordinary but actually hold discriminatory or offensive messages. To demonstrate the application of the theory, the following is an example of an analysis of one of the data from the comments that have been categorized as hate speech, focusing on the relevant types of presuppositions in each sentence.

Table 3. Examples of each type presupposition

Presuppositions	Sentence or phrase
Existential presupposition	#SuperBowlLIX #KendrickLamar's "song" Tarrifs Elon Musk Donald Trump
Factive presupposition	That's is not #music!
Non-factive presupposition	That's an obligation to #WhiteSupermacy!
Structural presupposition	Caucasians can sit back & just enjoy the game. #AfricanAmericans have to be subjected to #HateSpeech! U want tarrifs, then take away income taxes like in 1913!

Lexical presupposition	Vomits
	F**k
	BoycottTesla
	#SwastiCar
	#muskolini
Counterfactual presupposition	Then take away income taxes like in 1913!

Table 4. The example of presupposition analysis

Account Name	Post
r****o	#SuperBowlLIX halftime minstrel show!
	#KendrickLamar's "song" —#NotLikeUs, vomits the #Nword 13 times!
	That is not #music!
	That's an obligation to #WhiteSupermacy!
	Caucasians can sit back & just enjoy the game
	#AfricanAmericans have to be subjected to #HateSpeech!

Based on the post, several types of presupposition were identified, including existential presupposition. The existential presupposition from the post is that there was a performance at Super Bowl LIX involving Kendrick Lamar, in which Kendrick Lamar performed a song entitled Not Like Us which in the song uses the word 'N-Word' 13 times. The use of the word was considered excessive and is the main highlight of the criticism conveyed in the song. In addition, there are differences between Caucasians and African Americans when watching this event. This post implied that white people could enjoy the performance while African Americans had to deal with the emotional or social impact of the song's message.

Factive and non-factive presuppositions are also found in the post. The factive presupposition is reflected in the statement "That's is not #music!" which assumes that there is a certain standard for music that this song does not fulfill. On the other hand, the sentence "that's an obligation to #WhiteSupermacy!" represented a non-factive presupposition. It expressed a subjective view that presumed a connection between the performance and white supremacy, which is not necessarily supported by objective facts. Another non-factive presupposition was found in the sentence "#AfricanAmericans have to be subjected to #HateSpeech!" which implied a coercive situation in which African Americans are inevitably exposed to hate speech.

Structural and lexical were also prominent in the post. The structural presupposition appeared in the sentence "Caucasians can sit back & just enjoy the game" which assumed that white people are not affected by issues contained in Kendrick Lamar's performance and just enjoy it. Similarly in "#AfricanAmericans have to be subjected to #HateSpeech!" The sentence structure presupposed that hate speech is an unavoidable reality for African Americans. Lexical presuppositions were evident in the use of the word 'vomits' in the sentence "vomits the #Nword 13 times!" which implied that the repetition of the 'N-word' is excessive and repulsive. Additionally, the phrase "#SuperBowlLIX halftime minstrel show!" used the term 'minstrel show' to presuppose that the performance was degrading and racially offensive, drawing on the historical connotation of minstrel acts as a form of racial mockery.

Table 5. The example of presupposition analysis

Account Name	Post
h****9	U want tarrifs, then take away income taxes like in 1913! Fuck @elonmusk & Fuck @realDonaldTrump & Fuck @Tesla! #BoycottTesla #FreedomOfSpeech #1stamendment

> #FuckElonMusk #FuckTesla #nazi #boycott #Tesla
> #SwastiCar #swasticars #muskolini #FuckTrump
> #FuckDonaldTrump #FuckMaga

Based on the existing posts, there are several types of presuppositions, one of which is existential presupposition. The existential presupposition from the post is that there are tariffs that are desired by Elon Musk, who is the owner of Tesla, and Dolad Trump, who was the American president at the time. The post also contained the presupposition that the 1913 income tax is a significant part of American economic history. By mentioning the year 1913, the author of the post assumed that the tax system existed and was a reference for comparison to current conditions. This showed the shared knowledge assumed by the author and the reader about the fiscal history of the United States.

Besides existential presupposition, counterfactual presupposition is also found in the post, it can be seen in the sentence "then take away income taxes like in 1913!" mentions that tax in 1913 was withdrawn, but in reality, the tax in 1913 was not really withdrawn or abolished. This counterfactual presupposition emphasized the author's view of the current tax system as something that should not apply if tariffs are introduced. Furthermore, a structural presupposition appeared in the sentence "U want tarrifs, then take away income taxes like in 1913!" that assumed a causal relationship between tariffs and income tax, where if one wants tariffs then income tax should be removed. On the other hand, lexical presupposition hand, this post also contained lexical presupposition. The use of the word "F**k" toward Elon Musk, Donald Trump, and Tesla assumes that the author has a negative sentiment towards them. In addition, hashtags like "BoycottTesla, #SwastiCar, #muskolini, #swasticars" assume that Tesla is associated with certain symbols or ideologies, for example, Zionism and Fascism. The word choices and hashtags depict an explicit attempt to build a narrative of hatred and resistance towards the figures and institutions in question.

E. Research Schedule

The study was conducted in the English Education Department, Faculty of Educational Sciences and Teacher Training, Siliwangi University, located at Siliwangi Street No. 24, Kahuripan, Tawang, Tasikmalaya City of West Java.

Table 6. Research timeline

Description	Oct/ 2024	Nov/ 2024	Dec/ 2024	Jan/ 2025	Feb/ 2025	Mar/ 2025	Apr/ 2025	May/ 2025	June/ 2025	July/ 2025
Research proposal writing	▓	▓								
Research proposal examination			▓							
Data collection				▓	▓					
Data Analysis					▓	▓				
Report							▓	▓		
Thesis report seminar									▓	

Thesis examination	