

ANALYSIS OF HATE SPEECH FRAMING IN RELATION TO THE 80TH INDEPENDENCE DAY LOGO ON INSTAGRAM SOCIAL MEDIA

I Nyoman Farendika ¹⁾, Nuning Indah Pratiwi ²⁾

¹² Universitas Pendidikan Nasional

email:

ifarendika@gmail.com
nuningindahpratiwi@undiknas.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine how hate speech is constructed and framed by netizens toward the 80th Indonesian Independence Day (HUT RI) logo on Instagram. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach and Robert Entman's framing analysis model which encompasses four key elements: defining problems, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and offering treatment recommendations this research explores the construction of digital public discourse through content observation, in-depth interviews with key informants, and document analysis. The findings reveal that the framing of hate speech manifests in two primary forms, namely symbolic and linguistic, expressed through humor, sarcasm, and parody visuals that highlight public resistance toward the government. The public frames the logo as a symbol of governmental failure to represent the spirit of independence, thus positioning hate speech as a form of social and political expression of collective disappointment. This phenomenon indicates that the digital sphere has evolved into an arena where the meaning of freedom of expression shifts from rational criticism toward emotional and resistant expression. The study underscores the importance of digital literacy and ethical public communication to ensure that freedom of expression on social media remains productive, balanced, and reinforces national values in the digital era.

Keywords: *Hate Speech, Framing, Social Media Instagram*

INTRODUCTION

The development of mass media continues to evolve alongside technological advancements. This transformation is marked by a shift from conventional media such as newspapers, radio, and television toward digital media that is faster, more interactive, and more personalized (Siahaan et al., 2021). The internet has become the cornerstone of this change, enabling the *real-time* and global distribution of information. Social media has further strengthened the role of technology in influencing the patterns of information consumption among the public. The speed of access, ease of information production, and algorithms that can adjust to user preferences make technology the main driver of today's media dynamics. Social media gives its users the freedom to post and share content as they wish, making it easier to meet various community needs (Pratiwi & Husen, 2021).

Instagram provides various features such as photo and video uploads, *stories*, *reels*, *Direct Messages* (DMs), enabling very fast and widespread content distribution. These features support social interaction and self-expression, showing that active use of Instagram, such as sharing photos, can increase users' positive emotions (Fahrezi

et al., 2025) . This makes Instagram an important space for political participation, social mobilization, and advocacy on public issues. However, Instagram's open nature and minimal moderation also pose challenges, such as the spread of misinformation, hate speech, and *hate speech*. The platform's algorithm, which personalizes content based on user preferences, can create filter *bubbles* and *echo chambers*, exposing individuals to information that aligns with their own perspectives, narrowing their viewpoints, and potentially reinforcing existing biases (Taib et al., 2024).

According to Eriyanto (2018) in (Bukhroni & Aisyah, 2020) , *hate speech* is a form of marginalization, in which certain individuals or groups are perceived negatively. The characteristics of *hate speech* include the use of insulting language, threats, incitement to violence, spreading negative stereotypes, and discrediting. The impact of hate speech can cause fear, discomfort, and psychological trauma for victims, to the point of triggering social conflict, discrimination, and violence in the real world (Barlian & Wijayanto, 2021) . The phenomenon of *hate speech* is supported by the environment on social media platforms, one of the most common forms being offensive comments, where users leave hate speech on posts or public discussions, either directly or covertly through insinuations or sarcasm. Additionally, visual content, such as memes, images, or videos, is often used to convey hateful messages more effectively, as visual content tends to be more attention-grabbing and easier to share . Essentially, the reasons for *hate speech* stem from various factors and issues within social media, particularly Instagram.

The controversy surrounding the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo became a case of *hate speech* because netizens' criticism did not stop at aesthetics or visual humor, but developed into hate speech directed at the government and the logo designer. The controversy surrounding the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo began when the government officially released the theme and visual identity on July 23, 2025. The meaning of the numbers 8 and 0 was designed to merge to form an infinity symbol to emphasize the continuity between unity, sovereignty, and prosperity towards an advanced Indonesia (Chasanah, 2025) . The choice of red and white colors signifies courage, purity, and the spirit of struggle for the prosperity of the people and the ideals of the nation (Chasanah, 2025) . However, when the logo was released, it became a topic of discussion and spread widely on social media, including Instagram, triggering criticism, parodies, and hate speech from netizens, who turned its meaning into a representation of socio-political issues such as corruption. This implied criticism of the real conditions felt by the community, especially disappointment with corruption and social inequality. When flipped or rotated, it forms a face or a human face. Netizens noted that the 80th Independence Day logo resembles Keroppi, a frog character created by the Japanese company Sanrio. One widely shared example came from the Instagram account @buschoo. On July 28, 2025, this account uploaded a parody carousel featuring the number "80" as a face, with the words "SENSOR" on the "eyes" and "SILENT" on the "mouth". The post received around 24,000 likes and sparked hundreds of comments, some of which emphasized the impression of "eyes closed, mouth silenced," implying criticism of the real conditions felt by the public, especially disappointment over corruption and social inequality. The controversy surrounding the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo as a phenomenon of hate speech shows that national symbols can trigger polarization and insults, negative stereotypes, and calls to bring down or attack individuals or groups (Prasetyo et al., 2024) .

According to Ahmad (2021) in (Amanda & Lexianingrum, 2024) *Framing* theory is a theory in communication science that focuses on individuals, groups, and mass media selecting, organizing, and presenting information to shape public understanding of an issue. This theory does not merely convey information, but also emphasizes certain aspects of an issue, highlights a particular point of view, emphasizes specific aspects, and focuses attention on a particular perspective of a reality, thereby influencing the public's interpretation and response to the issue (Bukhroni & Aisyah, 2020) .

This study uses Robert Entman's *framing* analysis, which frames an issue by identifying the problem, diagnosing the causes, providing moral judgments, and suggesting solutions. Robert Entman's *framing* provides an in-depth description of an issue or phenomenon, including *hate speech*, framed to influence how reality is constructed. Through the process of selecting and emphasizing certain elements in communication, *framing* allows message makers to direct public attention to specific aspects of an issue. In the context of *hate speech*, *framing* is used by perpetrators to define the target group as the source of the problem, diagnose them as the cause of social problems, give negative moral judgments that reinforce stereotypes, and suggest harmful or discriminatory actions against the group (Muayad et al., 2020) . This process shows that *framing* not only creates harmful narratives but also influences public perceptions and attitudes toward the target group (Amanda & Lexianingrum, 2024) . Researchers seek to examine the elements of *framing* used in *hate speech* on this issue to understand how reality is constructed in digital public discourse.

RESEARCH METHOD

Qualitative research aims to understand a social phenomenon in depth by focusing on the interaction and communication processes carried out by researchers with the phenomenon being studied (Fadli, 2021) . This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach with the aim of understanding in depth the *framing* construction of hate speech against the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo on Instagram social media. The analysis is based on Robert Entman's *framing* model, which emphasizes four main elements: *defining problems*, *diagnosing causes*, *making moral judgments*, and *treatment recommendations*. Through this approach, the researcher seeks to explain how netizens frame the issue of *hate speech* in the digital space and its implications for the formation of public opinion.

The research was conducted through several systematic stages, including data collection through observation and digital documentation on Instagram in the form of screenshots, in-depth interviews with informants who understand the issue of hate speech on social media, In addition, literature such as books, scientific journals, and online articles were used to strengthen conceptual and theoretical analysis, and data analysis by organizing, reducing, and interpreting data based on Robert Entman's *framing* elements, as well as verifying the analysis results with source triangulation techniques and techniques to maintain the validity of the findings.

The selection of informants used the *purposive sampling* method, in which the selection of informants was considered to provide relevant and in-depth information related to the research topic (Sugiyono, 2023) . This study used *purposive sampling* to collect authentic data by involving informants who had relevant competence and

understanding of the issues and research studies. The key informants selected to seek information were Instagram users who were active consumers of *hate speech* content. The research location focused on the social media platform Instagram, specifically the @buschoo account, which was the main source of primary data. This location was chosen based on the popularity of the account in spreading parodies of the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo, which sparked public discussion and responses in the form of hate speech.

Data collection: researchers used three main methods: (1) observation, which involved directly observing the form, content, and context of comments containing hate speech; (2) interviews with key informants consisting of active Instagram users who commented on the phenomenon of *hate speech* against this logo to understand perceptions of the phenomenon of *hate speech*; and (3) documentation studies, namely literature searches and digital archives related to *framing* theory and hate speech on social media.

The operational definitions consist of: (1) Instagram social media is a photo and video-based digital platform that allows users to interact online through comments, uploads, and sharing features. (2) *Hate speech* is a form of verbal or nonverbal expression that is degrading, defamatory, or provokes hostility towards individuals or groups based on certain identities. (3) Robert Entman's *framing* is understood as the process of highlighting certain aspects of the reality of communication to define problems, determine causes, make moral judgments, and provide solutions to the issues being framed.

Data analysis techniques are carried out through four main stages, namely data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and verification. Data obtained from observations, interviews, and documentation are organized to find patterns and themes, then analyzed with reference to Entman's four *framing* elements. The validity of the research is maintained through triangulation of sources and techniques, by comparing the results of interviews, observations, and supporting documents. This process ensures that the interpretations produced are accurate, consistent, and reflect the reality of the phenomenon of hate speech occurring in the digital space.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study show that social media, especially Instagram, plays an important role in shaping public perception of national symbols. Freedom of expression in the digital space provides a great opportunity for the public to express their opinions, but it also opens the door to hate speech and negative *framing*. In this case, netizens predominantly view the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo as a representation of poor government performance. As a result, the logo, which should be a symbol of celebration and national pride, has become a subject of ridicule, insults, and hateful comedy. Observations show that these negative expressions appear in various forms of symbolic and linguistic comments, such as "80DOH," which contains a pun on the number commemorating independence; "eyes closed, mouth silenced," which represents the lack of freedom of expression; and expressions such as "it looks like Keroppi" and "is there no other symbol? ugly as a pig," which show visual insults to the logo and its creators. These comments not only show dislike for the design but also become a form of public hate speech framed in humor, sarcasm, and symbolic ridicule. Such negative comments form a collective narrative that reinforces negative

perceptions of the logo and government authority. Thus, this study confirms that *the framing* of hate speech on Instagram is symbolic and linguistic, where hate speech is used as a means to assert social position, channel disappointment, and display public resistance to government authority.

Table 1
Interview Results Based on Robert Entman's *Framing Elements*

| Informant Name | <i>Define Problems</i> | <i>Diagnose Causes</i> | <i>Make Moral Judgment</i> | <i>Treatment Recommendation</i> |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Munadji | Hate speech arose due to public disappointment with the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo, which was considered inappropriate and gave rise to negative interpretation. | The main causes are the public's feeling of being belittled due to the logo's careless design and fatigue with the government. | Morally unacceptable, but understandable as an outburst of public emotion. It began as free expression, then developed into hate speech. | The solution is to replace the logo, acknowledge the mistake, and implement a hate speech moderation policy without restricting freedom of expression. |
| Dela | Hate speech occurs because the public is disappointed with the meaning of independence that is not reflected in the logo. | The contributing factors are poor government performance and a logo design that does not meet public expectations. | The public is free to express themselves, and it is considered legitimate as long as it is not excessive because it reflects disappointment. | The government needs to explain the philosophy behind the logo, the public should seek information before commenting, and designers should conduct an evaluation. |
| Pram | It is understandable due to the public's lack of understanding and disappointment with the government. | The lack of education about the meaning of the logo, as well as the heated political climate. | This action is an expression of freedom and a form of criticism against the government. | The government opened a voting space for the design and provided an explanation of the logo's meaning publicly. |

| | | | | |
|-------|--|---|---|--|
| Ratih | Hate speech arises from disappointment and dissatisfaction with the logo design, which is perceived as a symbol of restrictions on people's freedom of expression. | Public fatigue and declining trust in the government; cultural factors of criticism through humor/satire. | On one hand, it is inappropriate, but it is understood as a form of public expression regarding the socio-political situation. | Providing digital education and transparent public communication; the government and designers must listen to the aspirations of the people. |
| Amel | Hate speech reflects public disappointment with the logo design, which is considered to fall short of public expectations. | Public expectations are too high and sociopolitical factors are strong in Indonesia. | Public reactions are excessive, but they are understood as a form of freedom of expression that encourages the government to engage in introspection. | The government/designers should engage in introspection, hold the next logo competition, and educate the public to remain calm in the face of criticism. |
| Riski | Hate speech is triggered by the country's current problems and a logo that fails to represent the spirit of independence. | The main causes of the poor logo design are political factors and the spontaneous culture of Indonesian netizens. | Netizens' actions are seen as a form of freedom of expression, but if taken to extremes, they become unethical. | The government and designers need to explain the meaning of the logo wisely, and the public needs to be more selective in their comments. |
| Aulia | Hate speech arises from disappointment and confusion over the meaning of a | Low public trust in the government and a lack of public communication from the | Creative criticism is still acceptable, but personal attacks or rude comments are | The government must be transparent and explain the meaning of the logo; the public needs to be wiser and more |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| | logo design that is deemed inappropriate. | logo designers. | considered unethical. | polite in their comments. |
|--|---|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|

Source: Compiled by Researchers, 2025

Robert Entman's *Framing Analysis*

Robert Entman defines *framing* as a communication process that selects and highlights certain elements of reality to focus on how problems are defined, causes are identified, moral judgments are made, and solutions are proposed (Boer et al., 2020). Through the four main elements of *framing*, namely *Define problems*, *Diagnose causes*, *Make moral judgments*, and *Treatment recommendations*, we can interpret how hate speech is formed in the digital space and how the public frames the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo as a national symbol.

Define Problems

The problem definition stage serves to determine what is considered to be the core issue in a particular matter, so that the issue becomes the main focus of public communication (Aisyah, 2024, p. 69). The main issue that arises in this case is the discrepancy between the symbolic meaning of independence and the visual form of the logo released by the government. The public believes that the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo fails to represent the spirit of nationalism because its form is considered not to reflect the values of independence. In fact, it evokes negative associations, such as fictional characters and symbols that satirize the government.

"The main problem is clearly the logo itself. Its shape is strange, unclear, and some even say it resembles an animal or the cartoon character Keroppi. It's as if there was no serious intention to create a symbol of the country's independence" (Interview with Munadji, October 31, 2025).

"It is natural that the country is facing many problems, coupled with the inauguration of a logo that is lacking, which has triggered negative comments. The people are upset/disappointed, especially on Independence Day, which should be a time of prosperity, peace, and joy. But instead, they were given a logo that does not even represent the true state of Indonesia" (Interview with Riszqi, October 31, 2025).

According to the *framing* theory proposed by Entman (2007) in Zawawi & Kee(2020), defining the problem is the initial stage in the process of framing reality, where the media or the public highlights certain aspects of an issue to emphasize a particular meaning. Netizens view the logo as a symbol of the government's failure to understand public sensitivity.

These findings are in line with research by Bukhroni & Aisyah(2020), which shows that the media and the public often highlight the controversial aspects of an event to reinforce negative perceptions of authority. The logo for Indonesia's 80th

Independence Day then became a trigger for expressions of social dissatisfaction, framed through hate speech and humorous satire. This process shows how digital space plays a role in producing symbolic narratives that transform the meaning of national pride into public ridicule.

Diagnose Causes

The diagnosis stage emphasizes public efforts to identify who or what is considered to be the source of the problem. The main causes are directed at the government and the logo designer. The government is considered responsible because it is perceived to have made a unilateral decision, without opening up space for public participation or clear communication about the philosophical meaning behind the logo. And the designer is considered incapable of producing a logo that represents independence, as well as unable to meet the expectations of netizens amid the current advances in the digital era.

"Apart from the design itself, there is a sense of boredom among the public. Many are already skeptical of government projects, so even the smallest symbol can immediately be labeled as negative. Added to that is our netizen culture of spontaneous and joking comments, so it's very easy for hate speech like that to emerge." (Interview with Ratih, October 24, 2025)

Expectations were too high. With the times changing and digitalization, we naturally had high hopes for the 80th Independence Day logo. On Instagram or X, there are many creators who are more flexible in expressing the spirit of independence through the logos they create. (Interview with Amel, October 25, 2025)

As explained by Amanda & Lexianingrum(2024) , framing not only conveys information but also determines the actors responsible for an issue by highlighting certain aspects. In this case, the public frames the government as the main actor responsible for the problem because it is considered incapable of managing communication with the public. Designers are also positioned as parties who have failed to meet public aesthetic expectations, especially in the midst of a digital era that is full of creativity.

This phenomenon is consistent with the findings of Sadat et al. ((2022)), who found that hate speech on social media is often triggered by accumulated dissatisfaction with government policies, with national symbols serving as a medium for the public to channel their collective frustration.

Make moral judgments

At the stage of *making moral judgments*, the public gives moral assessments to those deemed responsible. Based on interview findings, netizens position themselves as parties who have the moral right to assess and criticize the government. Comments that are sarcastic, humorous, or even insulting toward the logo are considered a form of moral and social expression of public disappointment with the government's ongoing performance.

"Basically, the public is expressing their disappointment with something that is considered not in line with expectations. Everyone has the right to express their opinion, especially on social media, which is an open public space for anyone to express their opinion. In fact, this shows that the public is increasingly

concerned and the government should be prepared to accept it, because it is the result of their decisions" (Interview with Dela, October 26, 2025).

It s a form of freedom of expression towards the government because many of the parodies and comments have been turned into satire directed at the government (Interview with Pram, October 21, 2025)

These findings indicate the existence of moral legitimacy constructed by the public in the digital space, where hate speech is considered valid as a form of "social expression." This is in line with the view of Muayad et al. ((2020)) that *framing* in social media allows users to justify aggressive or satirical actions as a form of moral identity expression on certain issues.

Framing hate speech on Instagram serves as a form of informal social control, where the public uses sarcasm and political humor to pressure those in power. This pattern reinforces the idea of "as proposed by that moral *framing* often becomes a tool of digital resistance against authorities who are perceived as failing to represent the interests of the people.

Treatment recommendation

Treatment recommendation relates to how the public or informants interpret solutions to emerging issues. Based on the interview results, the most frequently proposed solutions are increasing public education and government transparency in explaining the logo's philosophy and its creation process.

"Respond calmly and focus on educating the public about the philosophy behind the logo, avoid getting emotionally involved, and perhaps hold an educational session/open dialogue" (Interview with Amel, October 25, 2025)

The informant believes that the government should respond to public reactions wisely by providing open and educational clarification so that the public understands the context of the design, rather than simply judging it based on its visual appearance. This is in line with the findings of Naufal (and , which emphasize the importance of digital literacy in reducing the spread of hate speech, as well as the importance of two-way communication between the government and the public.

However, observation of Instagram comment columns shows that the majority of netizens do not offer concrete solutions, but rather express their emotions through sarcasm and parody. The absence of solutions has become part of public *framing*, where the logo issue is treated more as political humor and an expression of public hatred than as productive discussion. This shows that digital spaces often function more as a venue for venting dissatisfaction than as a space for constructive public deliberation. *Treatment recommendations* do not appear explicitly in public discourse, but are brought up through the reflective interpretations of informants who emphasize the importance of the government's role in educating the public.

Framing Patterns and Representations of Hatred

The *framing* patterns of hate speech that emerged in the case of the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo on Instagram show that negative representations are not only expressed verbally through comments, but also symbolically through

visuals, wordplay, and digital humor. Representations of hatred take two forms, namely (1) symbolic and (2) linguistic, both of which serve to reinforce feelings of disappointment and public resistance to state authority.

Symbolic Representation

Figure 1
Symbolic Representation Comments



Source: Instagram/bushcoo, 2025

Figure 1 above is the result of observations showing that social media users use symbols and visuals to convey messages in a satirical and sarcastic manner. The most prominent examples are modifying the number "80" to "80DOH", or visualizations with the words "eyes closed, mouth shut". These representations are a form of symbolic expression of hatred towards a government that is considered untransparent and restricts freedom of expression.

According to the process of *framing* through visual symbols can construct a new reality by highlighting aspects that have a high emotional resonance in the eyes of the public. This study reveals that visual modifications to logos function as a "code of resistance" in which people use humor and symbols to express messages in a veiled but still powerful way.

This phenomenon is also reinforced by the findings of Prasetyo et al. (2024) which state that hate speech in digital spaces often utilizes non-verbal forms such as images, emojis, and memes because they are considered more effective in evoking collective emotions. These symbols become a means of *visual framing* to reinforce negative narratives against linguistic objects.

Linguistic representation

Figure 2
Linguistic Representation Comments



Source: Instagram/bushcoo, 2025

Hatred is also represented through the use of harsh, mocking, and sarcastic sentences. Phrases such as "looks like *Keroppi*" and "is there no other symbol? It's as ugly as a *pig*" show how language is used to belittle, ridicule, and negate the national meaning of state symbols.

According to Nole & Lauterboom, (2024) , hate speech is often manifested through dehumanizing and stereotypical language, in which the criticized party is attached with a shameful or humiliating image. In this case, the use of the words "Keroppi" and "pig" is not merely a form of humor, but part of a linguistic *framing* that delegitimizes national symbols through negative emotional and visual associations.

This form of representation shows that the public is not only commenting on the design, but also creating an emotional distance between themselves and the state. By framing the logo as an object of ridicule, the public indirectly forms a resistant identity against authority, reinforcing the view of that public *framing* on social media can be a means of political identity where expressions of hatred serve to reinforce the boundaries between "us" (the people) and "them" (the government).

Freedom of Expression on Instagram

The phenomenon of hate speech against the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo on Instagram is closely related to the broader social context, namely freedom of expression in the digital space. Instagram serves as a space for the public to actively participate in public discourse, whether through posts, comments, or creative content creation. This space allows each individual to express their opinions openly, but on the other hand, this freedom also opens up opportunities for extreme forms of expression such as sarcasm, ridicule, and hate speech. Social media has now become the main platform for the public to express their aspirations, criticize policies, and build public opinion quickly and massively (Hakim et al., 2024) .

According to social media is a multi-directional communication space that gives users the freedom to represent themselves and interact freely without space and time limitations. Freedom of expression on Instagram has become part of digital culture, which positions every user as an active communicator. They are not only consumers of information, but also producers of meaning who help frame social and political issues. Instagram has become a "mini democracy" where every user feels they have equal rights to assess, approve, or reject public symbols. The participatory nature of social media is also often accompanied by impulsive and emotional behavior, so that expressions that were originally rational criticism can shift into emotional hate speech (Thulhidjah et al., 2024) .

In the case of the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo, netizens took advantage of this freedom of expression as a means to articulate their social and political dissatisfaction. Forms of expression such as *memes*, parodies, and satirical comments became symbolic mechanisms for channeling hate speech without having to explicitly attack specific individuals. This shows that while the digital space is free, in practice, this freedom has led to the "normalization" of hate speech. This phenomenon is in line with the findings of Taib et al. (), (2024) , which explain that social media has a major influence on changes in communication behavior, as media

algorithms encourage spontaneous and sensational expressions to gain public attention.

Freedom of expression on Instagram has shaped a new communication culture characterized by openness, spontaneity, and broad participation. However, this culture is also vulnerable to misinterpretation due to the lack of clear boundaries between criticism, humor, and hatred. Fahrezi et al., (2025) notes that active use of Instagram can increase positive emotions and social engagement, but when this space is used to channel negative emotions without reflection, it becomes an arena for digital polarization.

Freedom of expression on Instagram is recognized as a democratic right of citizens, but this right must be exercised within the bounds of communication ethics. Handayani, (2023) emphasizes that uncontrolled hate speech has the potential to cause social conflict, reinforce discriminatory practices, and trigger forms of violence in the digital space. Therefore, there needs to be collective awareness that every form of public comment or post has real social implications. Social media users do not only communicate with algorithms, but also interact with humans who have different feelings, identities, and social positions.

Therefore, digital literacy is key to ensuring that freedom of expression does not shift into destructive hate speech. Based on *this framing*, this freedom is a double-edged sword: it can be a means of social control over power, but it can also be a tool for spreading hatred that erodes the values of digital democracy itself.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the phenomenon of *hate speech* against the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo on social media, particularly Instagram, not only reflects the public's dislike of the visual design, but also serves as a means of expressing social and political dissatisfaction framed in the form of humor, sarcasm, and symbols of hatred. The results of the analysis show that the public uses digital space to assert their position and identity as citizens who are critical of the government. Through Robert Entman's *framing* theory, it was found that the process of forming this meaning of hatred takes place through four main elements, namely problem definition, cause determination, moral judgment, and solution recommendations. Problem definition focuses on the assumption that the logo fails to represent independence, while the cause is attributed to the government and official designers who are considered untransparent and do not involve the public in the creative process. The public's moral judgment is evident through the use of sarcastic remarks and insults as a form of symbolic resistance, while recommendations for solutions arise from reflective views that emphasize the importance of digital literacy and open public communication.

This study confirms that *the framing* of hate speech that appears on Instagram is symbolic and linguistic in nature. These two forms of representation show that hate speech in the digital space is not merely a spontaneous reaction, but part of a social *framing* process in which society consciously uses symbols and language as a means of resistance and collective identity formation. Thus, this phenomenon confirms that social media functions as an arena for public emotional expression that frames dissatisfaction and disappointment with the government in a form that is satirical, creative, and destructive to the meaning of national symbols.

Instagram shows that freedom of expression in the digital space has consequences in the form of extreme expressions such as sarcasm, ridicule, and hate speech, which replace rational criticism with collective emotional outbursts. The culture of digital communication, characterized by spontaneity and openness, has made it easier for the public to channel social and political dissatisfaction through symbolic forms such as *memes*, parodies, and satirical comments, which ultimately normalize hate speech in the public sphere.

Overall, this study shows that *hate speech* on Instagram is a complex form of social communication that reflects collective emotions, political resistance, and a crisis of trust in state symbols. The digital space functions as an arena where freedom of expression transforms into an open debate between social criticism and hate speech. Thus, the phenomenon of hate speech against the 80th Indonesian Independence Day logo confirms a shift in the meaning of digital nationalism, from a spirit of togetherness to an expression of public resistance against authority. These findings emphasize the importance of improving digital literacy and public communication ethics so that freedom of expression on social media can be directed towards a more constructive, reflective space that supports the strengthening of national values in the digital age.

REFERENCES

- Aisyah, S. (2024). Analysis of Robert N. Entman's Framing in the Coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict on Kompas.com Online Media, October 7-9, 2023 Edition. *Journal of Dakwah*, 18 (1), 69 76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24260/jhjd.v18i1.3063>
- Amanda, M. D., & Lexianingrum, S. R. P. (2024a). Analysis of Social Media Framing on Public Opinion in the Context of Elections. *IJM: Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 2 (4), 346 353. <https://journal.csspublishing.com/index.php/ijm>
- Amanda, M. D., & Lexianingrum, S. R. P. (2024b). Analysis of Social Media Framing on Public Opinion in the Context of Elections. *IJM: Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 2 (4), 346 353. <https://journal.csspublishing.com/index.php/ijm/article/view/798>
- Anaissi, A., Akram, J., Chaturvedi, K., & Braytee, A. (2025). Detecting and Understanding Hateful Contents in Memes Through Captioning and Visual Question-Answering. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 15904 LNCS, 134 146. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-97629-2_10
- Barlian, Y. A., & Wijayanto, P. W. (2021). Analyzing Hate Speech Phenomenon Research in Indonesia: a Systematic Review. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 10 (1), 203 212. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i1.5371>
- Boer, K. M., Pratiwi, M. R., & Muna, N. (2020). Analysis of Framing of Millennial Generation and Government News Related to Covid-19 in Online Media. *Communicatus: Journal of Communication Science*, 4 (1), 85 104. <https://doi.org/10.15575/cjik.v4i1.8277>
- Bukhroni, F. L. W., & Aisyah, V. N. (2020). Framing Hate Speech Cases on Television. *Global Communication Journal*, 9 (1), 80 96. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jkg.v9i1.15990>
- Chasanah, Z. (2025). *The 80th Indonesian Independence Day Logo and Visual Identity Guidelines*. Dinamika. <https://www.dinamika.ac.id/forums/download-logo-hut-ri-80/>
- Fadli, M. R. (2021). Understanding qualitative research design methods. *Humanika*, 21 (1), 33 54. <https://doi.org/10.21831/hum.v21i1>
- Fahrezi, E. A., Sujarwo, & Safitri, D. (2025). Phenomenological Analysis of Active Instagram Users for Generation Z. *Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia*, 2 (4), 7525 7532. <https://jicnusantara.com/index.php/jiic>
- Fitriani, Y. (2021). Utilization of Social Media as a Medium for Presenting Educational Content or Digital Learning. *Journal of Information System, Applied, Management, Accounting and Research*, 5 (4), 1006 1013. <https://doi.org/10.52362/jisamar.v5i4.609>
- Hakim, H. I., Polin, I., & Rwansyah. (2024). The Role of Instagram Social Media as a Medium of Information in Society 5.0. *Wahana Pendidikan Scientific Journal*, 10 (23), 287 300. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14564263>
- Handayani, D. A. D., Budiarta, I. N. P., & Widiati, I. A. P. (2023). The Existence of Digital Literacy in Hate Speech from the Perspective of Human Rights and Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions. *Journal of Legal Construction*, 4 (2), 155 160. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jkh.4.2.6793.155-160>
- Handayani, D. A. D., I Nyoman Putu Budiarta, & Ida Ayu Putu Widiati. (2023). The Existence of Digital Literacy on Hate Speech from the Perspective of Human

- Rights and Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Information and Electronic Transactions. *Journal of Legal Construction*, 4 (2), 155 160. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jkh.4.2.6793.155-160>
- Muayad, A., Mayasari, & Siti, N. (2020). Analysis of Framing by Tirto.id and Kumparan in Reporting the Habib Bahar Hate Speech Case. *Lontar Journal*, 8 (1), 84 93. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30656/lontar.v8i1.2296>
- Naufal, H. A. (2021). Digital Literacy. *Perspectives*, 1 (2), 195 202. <https://doi.org/10.53947/perspekt.v1i2.32>
- Nole, O. A., & Lauterboom, M. (2024). The Potential of Interreligious Education to Minimize Hate Speech on Social Media. *Panangkaran: Journal of Religious and Social Research*, 8 (1), 123 146. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/panangkaran.v8i1.3786>
- Prasetyo, R. A., Sidarta, D. D., Borman, M. S., & Subekti. (2024). Characteristics of Hate Speech Through Social Media. *INNOVATIVE: Journal of Social Science Research*, 4 (4), 9013 9025. <https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i4.14203>
- Pratiwi, N. I., & Husen, A. (2021). Analysis of TikTok Application Use Among Adolescents in Denpasar During the Pandemic. *The Source: Journal of Communication Science*, 3 (1), 27 33. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36441/thesource.v3i1.667>
- Rustandi, R., & Muchtar, K. (2020). Analysis of Framing Counter Narratives of Terrorism and Radicalism on Social Media (Case Study on the @dutadamaijabar Account). *Jurnal Komunikatif*, 9 (2), 134 153. <https://doi.org/10.33508/jk.v9i2.2698>
- Sadat, A., Lawelai, H., & Suherman, A. (2022). Social Media Sentiment Analysis: Hate Speech Against the Government on Twitter. *PRAJA: Journal of Government Studies*, 10 (1), 69 76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55678/prj.v10i1.584>
- Siahaan, C., Tampubolon, J. A., & Sinambela, N. B. (2021). Dissemination of Information Through Online Media as a Transformation of Conventional Media. *Signal Journal*, 10 (2), 322 324. <https://doi.org/10.33603/signal.v9i2.6288>
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods* (Second Edition). ALFABETA, cv.
- Taib, Z., Septriawan, M. R., & Rozi, F. (2024). Social Media Influences Changes in the Social Behavior of Urban Youth in Medan in the Digital Age. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Social and Humanities*, 1 (2), 84 102. <https://doi.org/10.70585/jmsh.v1i2.47>
- Thulhidjah, M., Hilmiah, M., & Nurdyansa. (2024). The Behavior of Spreading Hoaxes and Hate Speech Among Students on Instagram Social Media. *Core: Journal of Communication Science*, 2 (2), 8 22. <https://journal.unpacti.ac.id/index.php/CORE/>
- Zawawi, J. W. M., & Kee, C. P. (2020). A Concept of Mediator and Moderator on News Frame Setting in Communication. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10 (15), 1 10. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i15/8221>