



Working title: Hate speech on social media platforms during the US presidential elections

Dana Ebermann, M.A.

TU Chemnitz
English and American Studies
English Language and Linguistics

e-mail: dana.ebermann@phil.tu-chemnitz.de



The language of @realDonaldTrump that the African continent, Haiti and El Salvador are "shithole countries" is extremely unfortunate. We are certainly not a "shithole country". We will not accept such insults, even from a leader of a friendly country, no matter how powerful.

9:18 PM - Jan 13, 2018

3,275 23,796 59,852



Follow

Never said anything derogatory about Haitians other than Haiti is, obviously, a very poor and troubled country. Never said "take them out." Made up by Dems. I have a wonderful relationship with Haitians. Probably should record future meetings - unfortunately, no trust!

5:48 AM - 12 Jan 2018



Donald J. Trump ✓ @realDonaldTrump · 1h

So interesting to see "Progressive" Democrat Congresswomen, who originally came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world (if they even have a functioning government at all), now loudly.....

8,687 11.7K 45.5K



Donald J. Trump ✓ @realDonaldTrump · 1h

....and viciously telling the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth, how our government is to be run. Why don't they go back and help fix the totally broken and crime infested places from which they came. Then come back and show us how....

4,093 10.2K 43.3K



Donald J. Trump ✓ @realDonaldTrump · 1h

....it is done. These places need your help badly, you can't leave fast enough. I'm sure that Nancy Pelosi would be very happy to quickly work out free travel arrangements!

7,306 10.6K 47.1K



- no consistent definition of *hate speech* in literature (Sirsch, 2013)
- problem of definition:
 - defining hate speech by legal texts?
 - defining hate speech by language features?
- issue with the term *hate speech* in itself (Waldron, 2014)
 - *hate* falsely implies legislation tries to alter people's mindsets and control their thoughts
 - researchers only interested in speech?
 - or also in written & printed language?

- no focus on intention of the speaker/writer and no focus of impact of the message on the perceiver (Waldron, 2014; Sirsch, 2013)
 - every message could then be perceived as offending
 - therefore, differentiation between *offensive speech* and *hate speech*
- in general, *hate speech* = “singles out an individual or a group of individuals on the basis of certain characteristics” (Parekh, 2006, p. 214)
- more specific, Unger’s (2013) categorization into:
 1. **medium** (spoken/written),
 2. **addressee(s)**,
 3. **conventionality** (obvious vs. implied linguistic means) and
 4. **context** (where, when & how)
 5. (+ Meibauer’s (2013) ***hate crime***)

- focus on US presidential elections 2016 & 2020
 - Trump's tweets from 2009 to 2021 (up until January 8 when account was suspended) \approx 53,000 tweets
 - rally speeches by Trump from 2015/16
 - + addition rally speeches from 2019/20
 - transcripts of 3 TV debates from 2016 (Trump vs. Clinton) & 2 TV debates from 2020 (Trump vs. Biden)
- 1. quantitative: classification according to Unger (2013)
- 2. qualitative: analysis according to the discourse historical approach (Wodak & Reisigl, 2016)
 - nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization & intensification or mitigation

- majority of *hate speech* is indirect and implied (cf. Unger's (2013) conventionality)
- tweets and rally speeches contain most *hate speech*, whereas TV debates contain fewest
 - may be due to audience, i.e. rally speeches for supporters (cp. Blommaert's (2018) *vox populism* = manufactured representations of the voice of the people)
 - may be due to addressee(s) and genre (TV debates = immediate contact to addressee; tweets = no immediate contact to addressee(s))

- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2018). Trump's tweetopoetics. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, 203, 1–5.
https://pure.uvt.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/32304945/TPCS_203_Blommaert.pdf
- Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. London, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Esser, F., Strömbäck, J. (2012). Comparing election campaign communication. In Esser, F., Hanitzsch, T. (Eds.) *The Handbook of Communication Research*. London & New York, NY: Routledge, 289-307.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* .2nd ed. London New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In Van Dijk, T. (Ed.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 357-379.
- Klinker, F., Scharloth, J., Szczek, J. (2018). *Sprachliche Gewalt: Formen und Effekte von Pejorisierung, verbaler Aggression und Hassrede*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- McGowan, M. K. (2019). *Just words: On speech and hidden harm*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Meibauer, J. (2013). Hassrede – von der Sprache zur Politik. In Meibauer, J. (Ed.) *Hassrede/Hate Speech: Interdisziplinäre Beiträge Zu Einer Aktuellen Diskussion*. Gießen: Gießener Elektronische Bibliothek, 1-16.
- Parekh, B. (2006). Hate speech: Is there a case for banning? *Public Policy Research*. 12 (4): 213–223.
- Sirsch, J. (2013). Die Regulierung von Hassrede in liberalen Demokratien. In J. Meibauer (Ed.), *Linguistische Untersuchungen: Vol. 6. Hassrede: Hate speech : Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einer aktuellen Diskussion* (2nd ed., pp. 165–193). Giessen: Giessener Elektronische Bibliothek.
- Unger, D. (2013). Kriterien zur Einschränkung von hate speech: Inhalt, Kosten oder Wertigkeit von Äußerungen? In Meibauer, J. (Ed.) *Hassrede/Hate Speech: Interdisziplinäre Beiträge Zu Einer Aktuellen Diskussion*. Gießen: Gießener Elektronische Bibliothek, 257-285.
- Waldron, J. (2014). *The harm in hate speech* (First Harvard University Press paperback edition). *The Oliver Wendell Holmes Lectures, 2009*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=597462>
- Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA & London, UK: Sage.