

**Verbal violence against women on TikTok: A feminist linguistic study**

**Imanuella Anastasia Brigitha Carneliaputri Dewanty\*, Djoko Saryono**

Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author; Email: [imanuella.anastasia.2002126@students.um.ac.id](mailto:imanuella.anastasia.2002126@students.um.ac.id)

---

**ABSTRACT**

This article explores verbal violence against women on TikTok to uncover the underlying factors contributing to the verbal violence. Using a qualitative approach, we examine verbal violence on the @bacotinajagpp TikTok account from March 2022 to December 2023. The analysis is grounded in feminist theory in Linguistics, which examines how language perpetuates gender-based oppression and reinforces patriarchal norms. Methodologically, the study utilizes a qualitative content analysis of TikTok posts to identify patterns in language use and strategies of verbal violence. The findings show that verbal violence represented in the language used in the account can be categorized into four types (sexual, appearance-related, intellectual, and character-based), manifested in five language variations (hate speech, abusive language, offensive language, aggressive language, and harassing language) and articulated through four strategies (general statements, personal attacks, intimidation, and manipulation). These patterns underscore the use of verbal violence to reinforce men's social dominance by threatening, insulting, and demeaning women, thereby perpetuating negative stereotypes. This article aims to raise awareness of these issues to reduce verbal violence on social media and mitigate negative stereotypes about women. By doing so, the study seeks to cultivate a more respectful online environment and diminish misogynistic attitudes.

**Keywords:** Verbal violence, feminist linguistics, TikTok

---

**Article history**

*Submitted:*

5 April 2024

*Accepted:*

24 July 2024

*Published:*

31 July 2024

---

**Citation (APA Style):**

Dewanty, I. A. B. C., & Saryono, D. (2024). Verbal violence against women on TikTok: A feminist linguistic study. *LITERA*, 23(2), 247-260. <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v23i2.72475>

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Verbal violence against women is often, yet it receives insufficient attention, especially on social media (Simbolon, 2012; Naco, 2019). In 2021, 1,721 cases of cyber verbal violence were reported, with many more likely unrecorded (Kompaspedia, 2022). This is reinforced by CATAHU 2023, which notes that the most common forms of violence are threats and verbal violence (Komnas Perempuan, 2023). Such violence spreads rapidly online, aided by anonymity, allowing abusers to use harsh or harassing language (Rezvan et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2012).

Verbal violence refers to using words intended to harm the targeted individual (Ariibah & Zhakiyyah, 2023; Akhvlediani & Moralishvili, 2021). In this context, language can be a tool to express power and control (Lakoff, 1973). Language can expose sexism and gender discrimination, making women targets of verbal violence due to their lower position in the power hierarchy (Blondé et al., 2022; Dai, 2024; Hafeez & Zahid, 2021). In simpler terms, verbal violence is an action carried out using language that is inappropriate and demeaning to another person.

The study of verbal violence is closely linked to linguistic and feminist perspectives, which highlight its role in perpetuating gender-based violence and systemic inequality (Brown, 2018; González, 2019; Pinto 2024). By examining the language used in cases of verbal violence, researchers can identify recurring patterns, linguistic features, and discursive strategies used to exert control, reinforce gender hierarchies, and undermine women's rights and dignity (Kirilina, 2021; Lismini, 2023; Mraović et al., 2021).

Feminism is characterized by its non-competitive nature, emphasizing collaboration over competition in striving for a gender-just society (Kirilina, 2021). Feminist linguistics, therefore, focuses on the role of language and discourse in addressing feminist issues within gender and women's studies

(Lazar, 2007; Ulianitckaia, 2021). Some scholars underscore the sociocultural and anthropocentric aspects of language, advocating for a feminist critique that challenges patriarchal norms and recognizes the full humanity of women and other non-masculine genders (Bakhtin, 2010; Gasparyan, 2023; Lazar, 2007; Mills & Mullany, 2011).

On the other hand, feminist linguistics explores how language both reflects and reinforces power dynamics, emphasizing how linguistic choices contribute to the marginalization of women and non-masculine genders (Mulyani, 2014, 2022; Lankiewicz & Wąsikiewicz-Firlej, 2016). This theory posits that language is a potent tool for perpetuating gendered oppression and violence. According to Cameron (1992), language is not neutral but a mechanism for sustaining power relations. Mills (2001) adds that verbal aggression and threats are used to assert dominance over women and marginalized groups. Lazar (2007) further highlights that such linguistic practices are essential in maintaining patriarchal structures, underscoring the need to analyze and challenge these expressions of verbal violence to disrupt cycles of gendered oppression. In this context, the use of derogatory language undermines women's confidence and agency, reinforcing traditional gender roles that subordinate them. Analyzing these interactions through a feminist lens reveals that verbal abuse is not just a personal attack but part of a broader societal pattern of gendered oppression.

This type of violence is often embedded in everyday language and discourse, further entrenching gender hierarchies and patriarchal norms (Lazar, 2007; Mills, 2001). Feminist scholars argue that it is crucial to examine how verbal violence contributes to the marginalization and oppression of women (Cameron, 1992; Ehrlich, 2004). Lakoff (1973, 2004) explains that language can compel women to speak in ways that reflect their subordinate status, revealing a broader dynamic of gender oppression. While language is a two-way process, its structures often position women in roles of lesser power, reflecting a form of gender discrimination (Ehrlich, 2004).

Blumer (1969) emphasizes the role of language and communication in shaping social reality. Building on this framework, this study incorporates multiple theoretical perspectives. First, Rezvan et al. (2020) identify five types of verbal violence: intellectual, sexual, racial, political, and appearance-based. Sexual verbal violence involves vulgar or explicit language that objectifies and degrades women. Intellectual verbal violence undermines women's abilities or opinions through sarcasm and derogatory remarks. Appearance-related verbal violence includes body shaming and negative comments about physical attributes, perpetuating stereotypes that reduce a woman's worth to her appearance (Rezvan et al., 2020; Boukemidja, 2018). Additionally, character-based verbal violence targets a woman's moral identity, using language that questions her integrity and values (Mann et al., 2017).

Second, the language features of verbal violence encompass its typology and variations. According to Waseem et al. (2017), verbal violence can be categorized into targeted and generalized. Rezvan (2020) identifies several language variations used to convey explicit and implicit verbal violence, including hate speech, abusive language, offensive language, aggressive language, and harassing language. Hate speech seeks to demean or belittle groups based on inherent characteristics such as gender (Rezvan et al., 2020; Elsherief et al., 2018). Abusive language involves personal attacks using harmful words (Talukder & Carburnar, 2018). Offensive language is impolite and condescending, aiming to provoke negative reactions (Davidson et al., 2017). Aggressive language is marked by hostility and seeks to cause discomfort or harm, while harassing language employs threats or intimidation to silence or control individuals (Chatzakou, 2017; Hosseinmardi et al., 2016; Rezvan et al., 2020).

The strategies of verbal violence typically involve issuing false or unverifiable general statements, launching personal attacks, intimidating through threats, and manipulating victims. These strategies reinforce harmful stereotypes and maintain patriarchal control by discrediting and subjugating women through language (Al-shammari et al., 2021; Aries, 1996; Cameron, 1992; Collins, 2018; Ford et al., 2024; Ehrlich, 2004).

Verbal violence significantly affect women's mental health, social interactions, and overall well-being, as examined through various lenses in contemporary research (Alkan et al., 2022). The digital landscape exacerbates this issue, with social media platforms becoming hotbeds for verbal violence. For instance, Elsherief et al. (2018) provide a linguistic analysis of hate speech on social media, revealing that targeted online abuse is a growing concern. Similarly, Dadvar et al. (2013) emphasize the importance of user context in improving cyberbullying detection, suggesting that personalized approaches can enhance intervention strategies. Additionally, Chatzakou et al. (2017) focus on detecting aggression and bullying on Twitter, underscoring the need for robust monitoring systems to protect

users, particularly women, from online hostility. The implications of these findings are far-reaching, affecting not only the victims but also the broader social fabric by normalizing gender-based violence and discrimination.

While previous research has extensively explored verbal violence on various social media platforms, this study focuses on TikTok, a platform that has not been widely examined for verbal violence against women. This study examines verbal violence on TikTok, specifically focusing on the account @bacotinajagpp. The ease with which users can access TikTok makes it a new venue for verbal violence. TikTok's unique user interaction, particularly among Indonesian young adults aged 18-24 (Santika, 2023), provides interesting insights into this phenomenon. The account, with 5,328 followers and 260,500 likes as of February 2024, is notable for its content containing verbal violence against women. Focusing on @bacotinajagpp account, this study seeks to investigate (1) types of verbal violence, (2) language features used, and (3) strategies of verbal violence.

## METHOD

This article adopts an empirical qualitative method that focuses on understanding social phenomena through the collection and interpretation of non-numerical data. This approach allows researchers to explore the subjective experiences and meanings individuals attach to social interactions, making it well-suited for analyzing complex issues like verbal violence (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). The data were obtained from the textual content embedded in the videos of the TikTok account @bacotinajagpp from March 2022 to December 2023. Data collection was done by observing @bacotinajagpp's posts and their transcripts. In the TikTok account, 231 posts were collected, 72 of which contained elements of verbal violence.

In this study, the interactive analysis model by Miles et al. (2014) is employed, which divides data analysis into three concurrent flows: data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. These analytical stages, when carried out thoroughly, are helpful for resulting in empirical and detailed analysis. The data reduction, in particular, is crucial because the social media data may be redundant. This stage is aimed at producing valid and relevant data. The steps were executed by collecting data from @bacotinajagpp's posts, defining the data contextually, organizing the data into three matrices (types, language features, and strategies of verbal violence), analyzing data based on the created matrix, compiling and explaining the analysis results, and finally, concluding.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

A close examination of the data has yielded rich findings which may help us understand how the social media post may reflect the practice of verbal violence through language. It is interesting to note that the practice is not always direct and blatant, thus it is important to include the context of the use to explain each expression of verbal violence comprehensively. Here, a detailed analysis of the types, language features, and strategies has helped provide empiric explanations of language in use on social media in its relevant social context.

**Table 1. Types and Typology**

Type	Quantity	Target	Quantity	Method	Quantity
Sexual	53	Targeted	46	Implicit	40
Intellectual	6	Generalized	26	Explicit	32
Appearance	5				
Character	8				
Total	72	Total	72	Total	72

A close examination of @bacotinajagpp's content shows sexual verbal violence as the most prevalent, underscoring the objectification of women's bodies. According to Lakoff (1973), such language reinforces patriarchal structures by reducing women to sexual objects. The use of implicit methods further normalizes and perpetuates these gendered power dynamics.

**Table 2. Language feature**

Variation	Amount
Hate Speech	11
Abusive Language	5
Offensive Language	32
Aggressive Language	14
Harassing language	10
Total	72

Table 2 shows that offensive language, is the most common variation of violent language, while abusive language is the least common.

**Table 3. Strategies of verbal violence**

Verbal Violence Strategy	Amount
General Statement	32
Personal Attack	23
Threat	4
Manipulation	13
Total	72

The most common strategy involves general statements that reinforce harmful gender stereotypes and uphold male dominance. Such generalizations marginalize women by perpetuating narratives that undermine their credibility and agency. Broad, unverifiable claims about women's behavior rely on sexist beliefs that justify their subordination. This strategy diminishes individual identities and reinforces stereotypes that sustain patriarchal control. Though less common, threats represent a more overt form of linguistic violence, explicitly aiming to intimidate and subjugate women.

## Discussion

### *Types of Verbal Violence*

As for the types of verbal language, only three types of verbal violence are found, namely sexual, appearance, and intellectual. Another type of verbal violence that is identified is verbal violence that insults or offends women's character. Rezvan et al. (2020) identify sexual verbal violence through the use of sexually explicit or suggestive language. This violence ranges from overt harassment, like in entry (2), to subtle objectification in entry (1), manifesting both online and in broader societal discourse (Boukemedja, 2018).

- (1) [@bacotinajagpp]: Minta mahar 100jt tapi **spek** sama kaya apk ijo 200k? (28/F1/SX)
- (2) [@bacotinajagpp]: Kamu itu kayak **kondom**, sekali **pake buang** (30/F1/SX)
- (3) [@bacotinajagpp]: info lomba agustusan yang hadiahnya **apem** ama **boba** dong!!! (39/F1/SX)

The three entries reveal elements of sexual verbal violence and explicit objectification of women. In entry (1), the term "spek" likens women to products that can be measured and traded. In entry (2), "kondom" reduces women to disposable objects, while entry (3) uses food metaphors like "apem" (vagina) and "boba" (breasts) to objectify women further. These instances position women lower in the power hierarchy, depicting them as "food," "tools," and "objects," while men are portrayed as "eaters," "gift recipients," and "users."

Blumer's (1969) symbolic interactionism highlights the role of language in shaping social interactions and reinforcing power dynamics, aligning with these examples. Feminist theorists like Butler (1990) and Spender (1980) argue that language actively perpetuates gender identities and male dominance. TikTok account @bacotinajagpp exemplifies how verbal violence is used to assert power and control, undermining women's dignity and autonomy (Alkan et al., 2022; Hunt et al., 2022). This

behavior mirrors Lakoff's (1973) assertion that men use verbal violence to dominate women, underscoring the need to challenge such harmful linguistic dynamics in society.

Appearance-related verbal violence, including body shaming and derogatory comments about physical attributes, was also prevalent (Rezvan et al. 2020; Boukemidja 2018).

- (4) [@bacotinajagpp]: Cewe **cantik** itu memang elit tapi nyari yang masih **perawan itu sulit** (51/F1/AP)
- (5) [@bacotinajagpp]: **Si Cantik ini**. Giliran yang ganteng di post terus, giliran yang jelek bilangnyanya pacaran ga harus diumbar pl4r lah haha (52/F1/AP)

Entries (4) and (5) reinforce harmful stereotypes by linking women's value to their beauty and virginity. The word "cantik" in entry (4) ties a woman's worth to appearance, promoting patriarchal norms that objectify women and uphold the "beauty myth" (Wolf, 1991; Washburn, 2018). Entry (5) satirizes women by implying they share photos of partners only if the men are attractive, perpetuating the stereotype that women prioritize looks over personality. This aligns with Kavanagh's (2019) assertion that appearance-based verbal violence reinforces harmful societal norms. In both entries, the word "cantik" is used negatively, illustrating Blumer's (1969) view that language perpetuates societal stereotypes.

From a feminist linguistic perspective, the recurrent use of sexual and appearance-related verbal violence in the @bacotinajagpp TikTok account exemplifies how language operates as a tool of patriarchal control. The language not only objectifies women but also reinforces their subordination by positioning them as sexual objects whose value is determined by their physical appearance. This aligns with Cameron's (1992) assertion that language is deeply implicated in the maintenance of gender hierarchies, where men use language to assert dominance over women.

Apart from sex and appearance, verbal violence arising from intellectual aspect (Rezvan et al., 2020). However, verbal violence against women's intellect, which was carried out implicitly as in previous studies, was not found in the TikTok account @bacotinajagpp. All data on this type of violence directly uses words that demean women's intelligence.

- (6) [@bacotinajagpp]: Katanya ngejer cita-cita eh malah ngejar yang gak cinta wkwk **tolol** (48/F1/IL)
- (7) [@bacotinajagpp]: **goblok banget** udah diperhatiin eh malah nyari perhatian dari org lain (49/F1/IL)

Verbal violence targeting women's intellect often uses sarcasm, cynicism, and derogatory comments to discredit their abilities, reinforcing stereotypes of incompetence (Nuttman-Shwartz et al., 2022; Watson, 2022). In entries (6) and (7), terms like "tolol" and "goblok" explicitly degrade women's intelligence, perpetuating gender discrimination and the belief in women's intellectual inferiority.

Entry (6) negatively assumes that women pursuing their dreams use this as an excuse to reject men's love declarations, suggesting their ambitions are mere pretexts. This not only demeans women but also creates a harmful view of women's ambitions. Similarly, entry (7) degrades women seeking attention by calling them "goblok," linking the desire for attention to low intelligence.

This statement not only demeans women in general but also creates a negative paradigm towards women's ambition and determination. It implies that their dreams and ambitions are merely excuses to reject men and that they cannot have the same ideals. Demeaning women by associating the desire for attention with a low level of intelligence is a form of gender discrimination and does not support women's positive development.

In addition to the types identified by Rezvan et al. (2020), verbal violence against women's characters is also observed. Character here refers to values like honesty, kindness, perseverance, and respect (Malihah, 2015; Wibowo et al., 2022). Verbal violence against characters may insults someone's moral identity, often manifested through statements with intense negative emotions (Mann et al., 2017).

- (8) [@bacotinajagpp]: Ingat **cewe cuma cinta sama cowo ganteng** (59/F1/KR)

Entry (8) stereotypes women as only caring about men's physical appearance, ignoring more

important values like personality and kindness. This stereotype is false. Research by Nopela et al. (2023) shows women prefer partners with higher income and stable jobs overlooks. Such language denigrates women, using stereotypes to insult and degrade their character (Blumer, 1969). This verbal violence aims to make women feel inferior, enabling men to exert control and power over them. This practice can be seen as a form of patriarchal discourse that perpetuates gender inequality (Hooks, 2000; Lakoff, 1973).

### *Features of Verbal Violence*

Language features in verbal violence encompass two aspects. The first is a typology that differentiates subcategories of verbal violence. The second aspect involves variations in the language used to execute verbal violence.

	Explicit	Implicit
Targeted	(9) [@bacotinajagpp]: Gada uang aja adek sayang,apa lagi ada uang pasti adek <b>ngangkang</b> (27/F2/OL)	(10)[@bacotinajagpp]: cie yang sekarang udah punya anak, gimana mirip siapa mukanya wkwk (37/F2/OL)
Generalized	(11)[@bacotinajagpp]: Wanita mana lagi yang harus percaya,walaupun sudah di <b>telanjangin</b> , dia tetap pergi bersama pria lain (22/F2/OL)	(12) [@bacotinajagpp]: info cewe setia mazed (2/F2/HS)

Many special pronouns are identified such as "adek", "kamu", "lu", and "ayang". Apart from using pronouns, many of the posts implicitly target specific individuals. In the generalized category, one gender group is specifically women. This is characterized by the use of the words "wanita", "cewek", and "nona".

Targeted verbal violence is aimed at specific individuals using personal language intended to hurt or intimidate (Davidson et al., 2017; Waseem & Hovy, 2016). For instance, entry (9) uses "adek" and entry (10) mentions "yang sekarang udah punya anak," directly identifying the targets, as noted by Nobata et al. (2016). In contrast, generalized verbal violence targets broader groups, like gender or religious groups (Davidson et al., 2017; Wimmer, 2013; Waseem & Hovy, 2016). Entries (11) and (12) use terms like "wanita" and "cewek" to refer to women collectively, highlighting generalized verbal violence.

Waseem et al. (2017) categorize verbal violence as implicit or explicit. Explicit verbal violence uses harsh, easily identifiable language associated with profanity or negative connotations (Davidson et al., 2017; Warner & Hirschberg, 2012). For example, entry (9) uses "ngangkang" and entry (11) uses "telanjangin," both explicit in their harshness. Implicit verbal violence, however, is subtler, using nuanced language, sarcasm, or indirect references (Dinakar et al., 2011; Dadvar et al., 2013; Sue et al., 2007). Entries (10) and (12) do not contain openly degrading words but imply negative assumptions. Entry (10) questions a woman's child's paternity, suggesting multiple partners, while entry (12) questions the existence of loyal women, indirectly undermining women's integrity and loyalty. These examples illustrate how abusive language variations are used to intimidate, hurt, or harm others.

Hate speech refers to speech (or in the context of this research, posts) that aims to demean or belittle a group of people based on inherent and protected characteristics (Rezvan et al., 2020; Elsherief et al., 2018). The findings show that there are two categories of people targeted, namely (1) the female gender and (2) "pure" women.

(13) [@bacotinajagpp]: Sesungguhnya **Allah** lebih sayang kepada umatnya yang pernah berbuat "Maksiat" dari pada umatnya yang paling merasa "**suci**" (1/F2/HS)

(14) [@bacotinajagpp]: **Rata-rata cewe** kalo udah berani post foto sama cowo nya di medsos pasti udah di **ewe** oleh cowonya (9/F2/HS) di **ewe** oleh cowonya (9/F2/HS)

In entry (13), the group comprises women who feel "suci". This post is satire at women who commented "mokondo" in previous posts. The author admitted that he had committed "maksiat" and

compared himself to women whom he considered "merasa suci". In entry (13), religious teachings and "Allah" are used as a cover for hate speech. It appears as if the perpetrator only intended to give advice but implicitly criticized and uttered hate speech against one group.

The word "cewe" in entry (14) includes aspects that offend the female gender group. Moreover, the generalization of the data can be seen from the use of the word "rata-rata". Therefore, entry (14) can be considered a form of hate speech with inappropriate generalizations. Explicitly, women who post photos with their partners on social media imply that they have had sexual intercourse. This assumption is wrong and unacceptable, as well as a negative stereotype in society towards women. This has the potential to reinforce views that demean and harm women in general because they discriminate against women.

Abusive language includes various forms of communication that involve misusing users' personal information, cyberbullying, and disseminating offensive, misleading, false, or harmful content (Talukder & Carburnar, 2018). Characterized by its harmful intent and the negative impact it can have on individuals or groups.

(15) [@bacotinajagpp]: **Katanya** ngejer cita-cita eh malah ngejar yang gak cinta wkwk **tolol** (15/F2/AB)

(16) [@bacotinajagpp]: **udah diperhatiin** eh malah **nyari perhatian dari org lain** (14/F2/AB)

Entries (15) and (16) fall into the category of abusive language. In these two entries, the account owner disseminated and used information that was not necessarily true to offend and demean the victim. There are two pieces of information contained in entry (16), namely "udah di perhatiin" and "nyari perhatian yang lain". Both pieces of information cannot be proven true and could represent the account owner's one-sided point of view. This sentence is then used to offend, indirectly referring to the female as an attention-seeker. Meanwhile, in entry (15), the word "katanya" used, which indicates verbal information conveyed to the account owner. However, this information is used to insinuate and demean the victim, as evidenced by the word "tolol." The statements in entry (15) reduce women to objects of humiliation and disregard their values and intellectual ambitions.

The next category is offensive language. Offensive language encompasses various communication tactics designed to insult, demean, or provoke negative reactions from specific individuals or groups (Davidson et al., 2017). This category of language is characterized by its impolite and condescending nature, which is often used with the explicit aim of causing offense (Chen et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2012).

(17) [@bacotinajagpp]: Gpp harga **sampoerna** naik yang penting **maharmu** jangan ikutan naik ya (21/F2/OL)

(18) [@bacotinajagpp]: Wanita yang udah **rusak** gak akan dapet laki-laki yang tulus (24/F2/OL)

Entries (17) and (18) reveal offensive language that devalues women. Entry (17) compares the price of cigarettes with a woman's dowry, suggesting that cigarettes are more valuable and reducing women to mere commodities. In entry (17), the price of cigarettes is used as an object of comparison with the price of a woman's dowry. "Gpp harga sampoerna naik" is juxtaposed with "yang penting maharmu jangan ikutan naik ya", implying that cigarettes are more valuable than women. This comparison undermines women's self-worth, dehumanizes women and reinforces patriarchal views.

Entry (18) uses the term "rusak" to describe women, implying their value is tied to perceived purity. This reduces women to objects whose worth is dependent on their sexual history, perpetuating harmful stereotypes and reinforcing gender inequality. Such derogatory language both offends and upholds oppressive societal norms.

Aggressive language in the account is characterized by open, confrontational, and often hostile communication, aiming to cause discomfort or harm to the victim (Chatzakou, 2017; Hosseinmardi et al., 2016). Direct and explicit expressions of anger, aggression, or hostility towards another person without subtlety or restraint mark this type of language.

(19) [@bacotinajagpp]: Dari pada sama **sasimo** mending gw jomblo **anjing** (51/F2/AG)

(20) [@bacotinajagpp]: Gada uang aja adek sayang,apa lagi ada uang pasti adek **ngangkang** (53/F2/AG)

Entries (19) and (20) use aggressive language to reinforce gendered power dynamics and societal norms that oppress women. Entry (19) employs the derogatory term “sasimo,” implying promiscuity and reducing women’s worth to their sexual behavior. The use of “anjing” as a swear word further reflects aggressive attitudes and dominance. Entry (20) uses “gaada uang aja” to belittle women, reducing their motivations for financial gain and reinforcing stereotypes that diminish their value in economic and sexual terms. From a linguistic feminist perspective, such expressions reinforce patriarchal norms by suggesting that women are willing to engage in demeaning behaviors (“ngangkang”) solely for money, thus perpetuating harmful gendered assumptions. As Cameron (1992) notes, language often reflects and perpetuates gender inequalities, and phrases like this one contribute to a culture that commodifies women's bodies and undermines their autonomy. Although it does not present a direct threat, the implication of conditional financial value highlights a sexist perspective that limits women's agency and reinforces discriminatory attitudes (Lazar, 2007; Leache, 2007).

As for the coarse language feature, harassing language, characterized by the use of violence, threats, or coercion to harm, humiliate, or intimidate others in the digital environment, is often used by individuals or groups with malicious intent to cause suffering to the victim (Chatzakou, 2017; Hosseinmardi et al., 2016; Rezvan et al., 2020).

(21) [@bacotinajagpp]: **Jangan sok nyindir"** deh poto + video masih tersimpan rapi (63/F2/HL)

(22) [@bacotinajagpp]: **Mau manasin gw?** dia lupa kalo apem nya pernah lecet oleh rudal gw (64/F2/HL)

Entries (21) and (22) employ harassing language to reflect and reinforce gendered power dynamics. Entry (21) uses “jangan sok nyindir” as a veiled threat, conveying intimidation and silencing dissent, thus asserting dominance. Threats to share personal images violate privacy and endanger victims' safety and self-esteem. Entry (22) features “Mau manasin gw?” as a direct intimidation, positioning the speaker as dominant and violent. The phrase “dia lupa kalo apemnya pernah lecet oleh rudal gw” implies threats of sexual violence, assertive dominance, and reinforcing gender-based power dynamics. These expressions underscore a disturbing exercise of power, reinforcing gender-based control and intimidation.

It has been demonstrated in the data that several variations of language are used to attack women. This indicates that verbal violence against women is still a significant problem in social media environments. This has the potential to manipulate victims and society to place women in a position of oppression (Ford et al., 2024). This phenomenon highlights how language functions as a tool of patriarchal control and power (Lakoff, 1973). Linguistic practices reflect, perpetuate, and reinforce gender inequalities. The use of derogatory and aggressive language against women on TikTok serves to sustain and propagate misogynistic attitudes, contributing to a culture that normalizes the subjugation of women (Wang et al., 2012). Through a feminist lens, it becomes clear that such linguistic behaviour is not just a series of isolated incidents but part of a systemic issue that upholds patriarchal values and undermines women's social standing and agency.

### ***Strategy of Verbal Violence***

Cameron (1992) and Collins (2018) explain that men use language to maintain power over women by imposing linguistic norms reinforcing gender hierarchies. This study identifies four strategies of verbal violence: (1) issuing false or unverifiable general statements, (2) launching personal attacks, (3) intimidating and issuing threats, and (4) manipulating the victim.

First, the strategy involves the account owner issuing general statements that are either false or unverifiable. The methods employed in this strategy include making exaggerated claims about their expertise or achievements (Aries, 1996; Cameron, 1992; Collins, 2018). This is a practice of fostering negative assumptions about women in the audience, thereby maintaining the image of men in a position of power.

(23) [@bacotinajagpp]: **info cewe setia** mازه (8/F3/PU)

(24) [@bacotinajagpp]: Gw emang gak ganteng tapi mantan gw yang mana yang gak pernah **cakarin bantal** (53/F3/PU)

Entries 23 and 24 perpetuate harmful stereotypes and serve to reinforce patriarchal power dynamics. Entry (23) made a statement that was, in general terms, inaccurate and that accused women of infidelity. However, Djamba and Kimuna (2020) posited that 12% of women and 23% of men have engaged in infidelity, indicating that women are statistically more loyal than men. Such inaccurate generalizations serve to undermine the integrity of women and reinforce gender biases that depict women as less trustworthy, thereby maintaining patriarchal control by discrediting women's fidelity.

Entry (24) contains unverifiable claims regarding the author's sexual prowess, employing the phrase "cakarin bantal" to describe a woman's response to orgasm. The phrase "cakarin bantal" implies that women are universally willing to engage in sexual activity with any individual, thereby objectifying them and reducing their worth to that of mere sexual availability. This perpetuates the stereotype that women's sexual satisfaction is contingent on male performance, thereby asserting male dominance and reinforcing the notion that men's abilities define women's pleasure. It is evident that language is employed in a manner that serves to reinforce patriarchal values, objectify women, and perpetuate gender stereotypes that marginalize women's experiences and autonomy.

Second, the account owner carries out personal attacks or insults against women to gain power or control. This is done by degrading the target's personality, criticizing their appearance, and insulting comments (Al-shammari et al., 2021; Cameron, 1992; Erhlich, 2004).

(25) [@bacotinajagpp]: Cewe itu seperti **pohon pisang**, punya jantung tapi tak punya hati (31/F3/SP)

(26) [@bacotinajagpp]: Kalo **paylater** itu beli sekarang bayar nanti, tapi kalo kamu **pake skrng dinikahin** nanti (37/F3/SP)

Entries (25) and (26) illustrate the use of pejorative and dehumanizing language toward women, reflecting deeply entrenched patriarchal attitudes. Entry (26) suggested that women are merely objects for sexual relations, devoid of any necessity for marriage. This perspective is further diminished by comparing women to commodities purchased on an installment plan, effectively reducing them to objects that can be acquired and utilized at one's discretion. This reflects the commodification of women, whereby they are treated as objects devoid of autonomy and intrinsic value. Such comparisons serve to perpetuate harmful gender stereotypes that diminish women's worth to their sexual availability and economic value.

Entry (25) employed a pejorative metaphor to denigrate women. This metaphor portrays women as lacking empathy, tenderness, or compassion, thereby reinforcing a demeaning stereotype that undermines the complexity and humanity of women. By dehumanizing women in this manner, the language serves to uphold patriarchal norms that deny women's emotional depth and subjectivity. Such comparisons not only insult women but also reinforce negative views and prejudices, perpetuating a societal narrative that devalues women's emotional experiences and contributions. The language used in these entries is a tool for maintaining patriarchal power structures, objectifying women, and perpetuating gender inequality.

Third, intimidating and threatening are means to gain power or control (Cameron, 1992; Rezvan et al., 2020; Wassem et al., 2017).

(27) [@bacotinajagpp]: **Untung lu anak bae bae**, kalo ga udah gw porting (50/F3/AN)

In entry (27), the account owner employs a form of verbal aggression, namely threats, in their communication. The phrase "Untung lu anak bae bae" suggests that the victim's safety depends on their adherence to certain behavioural norms. The threat "kalo ga udah gw porting" explicitly states that failure to comply will result in the individual being "ported," or expelled. This linguistic phenomenon exemplifies the use of fear and intimidation as a tool for enforcing patriarchal control and ensuring compliance with the perpetrator's standards. From a feminist linguistic perspective, it illustrates how language is utilized to exert control and domination, reinforcing patriarchal norms that dictate acceptable behaviour, particularly for women (Morikawa, 2019). This dynamic is illustrative of a broader societal

tendency to regulate women's behaviour and enforce conformity to patriarchal expectations. By threatening to "port" the victim, the perpetrator not only asserts dominance but also reinforces the notion that women must adhere to specific behavioural norms to avoid punishment or ostracism. This illustrates how verbal threats function as a means of maintaining patriarchal power structures, utilizing language to exert control and subjugation.

Fourth, the attacker manipulates the victim. Manipulation is a form of verbal abuse that can be used to oppress women (Ford et al., 2024). Men may use manipulation tactics to control women through deceptive language, denying experiences, or questioning the validity of women's emotions or perceptions (Cameron, 1992; Ford et al., 2024; Truman et al., 2013). This can be a form of psychological abuse that damages a woman's self-confidence and sense of reality. Attackers often use manipulation or deception to gain power or control (Lakoff, 1973). Manipulation can be carried out by lying, committing fictitious acts of avoidance, manipulating facts to gain advantage, and exploiting the beliefs or emotions of their targets to gain control (Bucholtz, 2004; Lakoff, 2004; Kiesling, 2004).

(28) [@bacotinajagpp]: **jangan bangga dulu nona, ngemis-ngemis itu hanya trik belaka, setelah apa yang dia dapat, giliran anda yang mengemis padanya (52/F3/MN).**

Entry (28) shows the act of manipulating by detailing a dishonest strategy in the relationship. The phrase "jangan bangga dulu nona, ngemis-ngemis itu hanya trik belaka" reveals that the account owner is aware and admits that "ngemis-ngemis" is just a strategy. Additionally, the statement "setelah apa yang dia dapat, giliran anda yang mengemis padanya" creates the impression that the speaker intends to manipulate the victim to harm them after getting something from them. This is a form of manipulation that aims to undermine women's self-confidence so that men can gain a position of power in the relationship.

## CONCLUSION

This study on the @bacotinajagpp TikTok account highlights how language reinforces patriarchal norms and gender inequalities, identifying four types of verbal violence and five forms of violent language. These findings emphasize language's role in perpetuating male dominance and societal gender-based oppression.

From a feminist linguistic perspective, language is a powerful instrument influencing power distribution within society. This underscores the importance of analyzing verbal violence through a feminist linguistic lens. The findings reveal that the language used in these TikTok posts is not merely a series of isolated incidents but part of a broader societal pattern that perpetuates gender-based oppression. Addressing these linguistic practices is crucial for challenging and dismantling the patriarchal structures that sustain gender inequality.

An analysis of these phenomena through a feminist lens reveals how verbal violence serves to reinforce patriarchal norms. This highlights the necessity of addressing verbal violence to promote gender equality. It would be beneficial for future research to explore comparative studies across platforms and develop effective intervention strategies.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our gratitude to Universitas Negeri Malang for their financial support and the reviewer of Litera for their insightful feedback.

## REFERENCES

- Akhvlediani, M., & Moralishvili, S. (2021). Verbal abuse of children. *Language and Culture*, 26, 154–158. <https://doi.org/10.52340/lac.2021.680>
- Alati, C. S. (2019). A theoretical exploration of feminist perspectives and art therapy for body image issues in adolescent females. [Graduate Projects (Non-thesis)] (Unpublished) <https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/id/eprint/985281/>
- Alkan, Ö., Serçemeli, C., & Özmen, K. (2022). Verbal and psychological violence against women in Turkey and its determinants. *PloS one*, 17(10), e0275950. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275950>

- Al-shammari, H.A., & Al-Khazraji, N.H. (2021). Ideological representation of women's oppression in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*. *Al-Adab Journal*, 3(138), 15-22. <https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v3i138.1771>
- Aries, E. (1996). *Men and women in interaction: Reconsidering the differences*. Oxford University Press.
- Ariibah, A. A., & Zakiyyah, H. (2023). Verbal abuse by netizens on social media against a Youtuber's childfree decision statement named Gita Savitri. In *RSF Conference Series: Business, Management and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 29-36. <https://doi.org/10.31098/bmss.v3i2.647>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2010). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Blondé, J., Gianettoni, L., Gross, D., & Guilley, E. (2022). Hegemonic masculinity, sexism, homophobia, and perceived discrimination in traditionally male-dominated fields of study: A study in Swiss vocational upper-secondary schools. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 24, 353-374. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10775-022-09559-7>
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Boukemidja, N.B. (2018). Cyber crimes against women: Qualification and means. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(3), 33-44. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejss.v1i3.p34-44>
- Brown, L. S. (2018). *Feminist therapy (Second edition.)*. American Psychological Association.
- Bucholtz, M. (2004). Changing places: Language and woman's place in context. In M. Bucholtz (Ed.), *Language and Woman's Place* (pp. 121–128). Oxford University Press New York, NY. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195167573.003.0003>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. Routledge. [https://lauragonzalez.com/TC/BUTLER\\_gender\\_trouble.pdf](https://lauragonzalez.com/TC/BUTLER_gender_trouble.pdf)
- Cameron, D. (1992). Silence, alienation and oppression: Feminist models of language (I). In *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22334-3\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-22334-3_7)
- Chatzakou, D., Kourtellis, N., Blackburn, J., De Cristofaro, E., Stringhini, G., & Vakali, A. (2017). Mean birds: Detecting aggression and bullying on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on web science conference*, 13-22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3091478.3091487>
- Chen, Y., Zhou, Y., Zhu, S., & Xu, H. (2012). Detecting offensive language in social media to protect adolescent online safety. *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Confernece on Social Computing*, 71-80. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SocialCom-PASSAT.2012.55>
- Collins, A. M. (2018). Language, power, and oppression in the LIS diversity void. *Library Trends*, 67(1), 39-51. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2018.0024>
- Dadvar, M., Trieschnigg, D., Ordelman, R., & De Jong, F. (2013). Improving cyberbullying detection with user context. In *Advances in Information Retrieval: 35th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2013*:693-696. Moscow, March 24-27, 2013: Lecture Notes in Computer Science. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-36973-5\\_62](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-36973-5_62)
- Dai, R. (2024). The causes, manifestations, and effects of benevolent sexism and how it contributes to the perpetuation of gender discrimination. *Communications in Humanities Research*, 22, 614-619. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v22i.13070>
- Davidson, T., Warmsley, D., Macy, M., & Weber, I. (2017). Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 11(1), 512–515. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v11i1.14955>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2018). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research (5th ed.)*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Dinakar, K., Reichart, R., & Lieberman, H. (2011). Modeling the detection of textual cyberbullying. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 5 (3), 11-17. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v5i3.14209>
- Djamba Y. K., Kimuna S. R. (2020). Racial and gender differences in extramarital sex in the United States in the last three decades. *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1). DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.12944/CRJSSH.3.1.03>

- Ehrlich, S. (2004). Linguistic discrimination and violence against women; discursive practices and material effects. In M. Bucholtz (Ed.), *Language and Woman's Place* (pp. 223–228). New York: Oxford University <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195167573.003.0017>
- Elsherief, M., Kulkarni, V., Nguyen, D., Wang, W.Y., & Belding-Royer, E.M. (2018). Hate lingo: A target-based linguistic analysis of hate speech in social media. *International Conference on Web and Social Media*. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-36973-5\\_62](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-36973-5_62)
- Ford, K., Ham, L. S., Nguyen, A. M. T., Moore, T., Bridges, A. J., & Quetsch, L. B. (2024). Victim centered, aggressor focused, and bystander friendly: A qualitative analysis of bystander intervention strategies and outcomes for sexual harassment or assault. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 39(1-2), 184–213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231195800>
- Gasparyan, D. (2023). Understanding the interpretation of bakhtin's ideas in feminist theory. *Philosophy Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 7(4), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.17323/2587-8719-2023-4-125-140>
- González, I. C. (2019). *Sentiment analysis: An approach to verbal violence & abuse against women on twitter*, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (España). Facultad de Filología. Departamento de Filologías Extranjeras y sus Lingüísticas. <https://espacio.uned.es/fez/view/bibliuned:grado-Filologia-EI-Icarretero>
- Hafeez, E. & Zahid, L. (2021). Sexism and gender discrimination in Pakistan's mainstream news media. In S. Jamil, B. Çoban, B. Ataman, & G. Appiah-Adjei (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Discrimination, Gender Disparity, and Safety Risks in Journalism* (pp. 60-89). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-6686-2.ch005>
- Hooks, B. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center*. Pluto Press.
- Hosseinmardi, H., Rafiq, R. I., Han, R., Lv, Q., & Mishra, S. (2016). Prediction of cyberbullying incidents in a media-based social network. In *2016 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)* (pp. 186-192). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ASONAM.2016.7752233>.
- Hunt, K. E., Robinson, L. E., Valido, A., Espelage, D. L., & Hong, J. S. (2022). Teen dating violence victimization: Associations among peer justification, attitudes toward gender inequality, sexual activity, and peer victimization. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 37(9-10), 5914–5936. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221085015>
- Kavanagh, E.J., Litchfield, C., & Osborne, J. (2019). Sporting women and social media: Sexualization, Misogyny, and Gender-Based Violence in Online Spaces. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 12, 552-572. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.2019-0079>
- Kiesling, S. F. (2004). What does a focus on “men s language” tell us about language and womans place? In M. Bucholtz (Ed.), *Language and Woman's Place* (pp. 229–234). New York: Oxford University. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195167573.003.0018>.
- Kirilina, A.V. (2021). Gender and gender linguistics at the border of the millennium. *Journal of Psycholinguistic*. <https://doi.org/10.30982/2077-5911-2021-49-3-109-147>
- Komisi Nasional Anti Kekerasan terhadap Perempuan. (2023). *Catatan Tahunan Kekerasan Terhadap Perempuan Tahun 2023 (CATAHU 2023)*. Jakarta: Komisi Nasional Anti Kekerasan terhadap Perempuan.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in society*, 2(1), 45-79. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500000051>
- Lakoff, R. T. (2004). *Language and woman's place: Text and commentaries* (Vol. 3). USA: Oxford University Press.
- Lankiewicz, H. & Waśkiewicz-Firlej, E. (2016). Insights into teacher language awareness with reference to the concept of self-marginalization and empowerment in the use of a foreign language. <https://doi.org/10.30827/Digibug.53895>
- Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis1. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 141–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900701464816>
- Leache, P. A. (2007). Reseña: Michelle lazar (Ed.) (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis. Gender, power and ideology in discourse. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.17169/FQS-8.2.256>
- Lismini, R. (2023). Netnographic study of online gender-based violence (KBGO) on Twitter. *Jurnal Syntax Admiration*. <https://doi.org/10.58471/scientia.v12i02.1430>

- Malihah, E. (2015). An ideal Indonesian in an increasingly competitive world: Personal character and values required to realise a projected 2045 “Golden Indonesia.” *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 14(2), 148–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2047173415597143>
- Mann, L., Feddes, A. R., Leiser, A., Doosje, B., & Fischer, A. H. (2017). When is humiliation more intense? The role of audience laughter and threats to the self. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 495. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00495>
- Menegakkan marwah kaum perempuan. (2022, August 19). *Kompaspedia*. <https://kompaspedia.kompas.id/baca/paparan-topik/menegakkan-marwah-kaum-perempuan>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (Third edition.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Mills, S. (2001). *Language and sexism* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755033>
- Mills, S., & Mullany, L. (2011). *Language, gender and feminism: Theory, methodology and practice*. Routledge.
- Morikawa, N. (2019). #YesAllWomen’s language: Women’s style shifting in feminist discourse on Twitter. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 28, 112-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2018.11.001>
- Mraović, I. C., Tomić, L., & Korad, M. (2021). Verbal and physical violence against athletes: gender differences and differences according to the type of sport. *Post Scriptum..* <https://ps.pfb.unbi.ba/index.php/ps/article/view/27>
- Mulyani, S. (2014). Language and gender: toward a critical feminist linguistics. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 2, 409-415. <https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/view/6734>
- Mulyani, S. (2022). Revisiting Feminist Strategies in Poetry: Gender, Genre, and Power Relation. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 22(1), 208-219. <https://doi.org/10.24071/joll.v22i1.4021>
- Naco. (2019). *Dalih menyesal, guru honor terdakwa ujaran kebencian menangis di depan hakim*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 10, 2024, from <https://www.borneonews.co.id/berita/138721-dalih-menyosal-guru-honor-terdakwa-ujaran-kebencian-menangis-di-depan-hakim>
- Nobata, C., Tetreault, J., Thomas, A., Mehdad, Y., & Chang, Y. (2016). Abusive language detection in online user content. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 145–153. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872427.2883062>
- Nuttman-Shwartz, O., Dekel, R., Gilbar, O., & Charak, R. (2022). Perpetrating cyber intimate partner violence: The role of gender and culture in an Israeli sample. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 32, 487 - 504. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2022.2082906>
- Pinto, M. (2024). Silvana tapia tapia: Feminism, violence against women, and law reform: Decolonial lessons from Ecuador. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 32(1), 99–103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10691-023-09537-6>
- Coelho, M. Q. M., & PereiRa, H. M. (2022). O impacto das experiências estigmatizadoras e autoestigma na saúde mental e no comportamento suicida: Um estudo em países de língua portuguesa. *Sağlık Akademisi Kastamonu*, 7(Special Issue), 155–156. <https://doi.org/10.25279/sak.1138655>
- Rezvan M, Shekarpour S, Alshargi F, Thirunarayan K, Shalin VL, Sheth A. (2020). Analyzing and learning the language for different types of harassment. *PLoS ONE*, 15(3): e0227330. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0227330>
- Santika, E. F. (2023). *Kelompok anak muda jadi pengguna terbesar tiktok, usia berapa mereka? / databoks*. (n.d.). Retrieved February 10, 2024, from <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2023/09/27/kelompok-anak-muda-jadi-pengguna-terbesar-tiktok-usia-berapa-mereka>
- Simbolon, M. (2012). Perilaku bullying pada mahasiswa berasrama. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 39(2). <https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/jpsi/article/view/6989>
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. USA : New York University Press. <https://archive.org/details/manmadelanguage00spen>
- Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: implications for clinical practice. *American psychologist*, 62(4), 271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271>

- Talukder, S., & Carburnar, B. (2018, June). Abusniff: Automatic detection and defenses against abusive facebook friends. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v12i1.14995>
- Tamfuh, W.M. (2022). The social media, human dignity and linguistic violence in Cameroon: A socio-pragmatic perception. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 10(7), 22-120. <https://tudr.org/id/eprint/1052/>
- Truman, A., Goldman, M., Lehna, C., Berger, J., & Topp, R. (2013). Verbal abuse of pediatric nurses by patients and families. *Kentucky nurse*, 61(1), 6-8. [https://epublications.marquette.edu/nursing\\_fac/277](https://epublications.marquette.edu/nursing_fac/277)
- Ulianitckaia, L.A. (2021). The critique of gender linguistics from the perspective of feminist linguistics. *Discourse*, 7, 135-155. <https://doi.org/10.32603/2412-8562-2021-7-2-135-155>
- Wang, W., Chen, L., Thirunarayan, K., & Sheth, A. P. (2012, September). Harnessing Twitter" big data" for automatic emotion identification. In *2012 International Conference on Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust and 2012 International Conference on Social Computing* (pp. 587-592). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SocialCom-PASSAT.2012.119>.
- Warner, William & Hirschberg, Julia. (2012). Detecting hate speech on the world wide web. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Language in Social Media*. Association for Computational Linguistics, LSM '12, pages 19-26. <https://aclanthology.org/W12-2103.pdf>
- Waseem, Z., Davidson, T., Warmsley, D., & Weber, I. (2017). Understanding abuse: A typology of abusive language detection subtasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.09899*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1705.09899>
- Waseem, Z. & Hovy, D. (2016). Hateful symbols or hateful people? predictive features for hate speech detection on twitter. In *Proceedings of the NAACL Student Research Workshop*. Association for Computational Linguistics, San Diego, California, pages 88-93. <https://aclanthology.org/N16-2013.pdf>
- Washburn, A. (2018). Beauty imbalance: Social media's dictation of worth. *Intuition: The BYU Undergraduate Journal of Psychology*, 13(3), 12. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1260&context=intuition>
- Watson, S. (2022). Investigating the role of social media abuse in gender-based violence: The experiences of women police officers. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 23, 829 - 844. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221087487>
- Wibowo, M.A., Subiyantoro, S., & Suryandari, K.C. (2022). Defining the study of humanistic personality psychology of the main character of the novel Si Anak Pelangi by Tere Liye: The value of character education and its relevance to learning. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*. 14(2), 1411-1418. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i2.1057>
- Wimmer, A. (2013). *Ethnic boundary making: Institutions, power, networks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Wolf, N. (1991). *The beauty myth*. Royal NSW Institute for Deaf and Blind Children.
- Yu, J., Zhang, Y., Zhao, Y., & Zeng, J. (2023). A probe into the visual elements in female illustrations from the perspective of feminism. *Highlights in Art and Design*, 2(2), 83-88. <https://doi.org/10.54097/hiaad.v2i2.7031>