



An Analysis of Netizens' Hate Comments Toward Joe Biden's Speech "Biden Delivers Memorial Day Message" on Fox News's YouTube Channel

Nur Faridatul Hidayah¹, Wiwit Sariasih²

¹nurfariatulhidayah@gmail.com

²dosen01268@unpam.ac.id

^{1,2} Universitas Pamulang

Abstract

Keywords:
bias, comment, hate, speech, toxicity

This study aims to examine how social bias and toxicity are manifested in hate speech directed at Joe Biden's speech on YouTube. The object of this study is the comments section of the video entitled "Biden Delivers Memorial Day Message" published in 2024 on Fox News's YouTube channel. This study employs a qualitative descriptive method, with data collected through in-depth reading and analysis of words, phrases, and sentences found in the comments. The study applies Won's theory (2001), which identifies two types of bias—gender bias and other biases—and three types of toxicity: hate, insult, and offensive expression. The findings reveal that 11 instances of bias were identified in the comments, with "other biases" being the most dominant type. Additionally, 69 instances of toxicity were found, with insults emerging as the most frequent category. The dominance of other biases and insults suggests that hate comments on social media tend to focus on personal attacks against the speaker as a way of expressing anger and hostility, rather than critically engaging with the content of the speech itself.

© 2026 Universitas Pamulang

✉ Corresponding author:

B3 Building, Kampus Viktor, Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan
Indonesia 50229 E-mail: nurfariatulhidayah@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Social media has become one of the primary platforms for individuals to express their freedom of speech. It offers convenience, allowing users to comment on virtually anything without much deliberation. As Howard (2019) states, “although free speech is an important value, it is not the only one.” While the principle of free expression is widely embraced across social media, this freedom often extends to content that is hostile or derogatory. Many users feel empowered to express hatred without fear of consequence.

One key factor enabling such behavior is the ease with which individuals can conceal their identities. Through the use of secondary accounts or carefully curated personal branding—such as presenting a highly religious image—users can obscure their true selves. This anonymity creates a sense of safety and freedom, leading some to perceive hate speech as a normal exercise of their rights. In contrast, more conscientious users may reflect carefully before commenting, mindful of the impact their words may have.

While many would not openly mock or belittle others in person, the same restraint does not always extend to online behavior. Fingers on a keyboard, devoid of tone or face-to-face accountability, can produce comments far harsher than what might be spoken aloud. Hateful remarks are often directed at individuals or groups based on perceived traits or lifestyle choices. For instance, a working mother may be targeted simply for not adhering to traditional expectations of full-time caregiving.

YouTube, in particular, has become a platform where such behavior can escalate. Comment sections can foster collective negativity, enabling users to form communities centered around mocking or bullying a specific target. Green et al. (2025) explain that “people who see themselves as members of a social group often categorize others as either belonging to their own group (the in-group) or to a different group (the out-group).” This in-group/out-group dynamic normalizes hostility toward those perceived as different, making hateful comments seem justified in the eyes of the commenter.

In many cases, negative comments are not a response to what was said, but to who said it. The substance of a message may be overlooked entirely, while the identity of the speaker becomes the focus. For example, hate comments directed at Joe Biden often target his character or persona rather than the content of his speeches. The commenter’s own background, beliefs, and biases shape both the intent and interpretation of their words.

This phenomenon underscores the importance of analyzing hate speech in context. This study examines hate comments directed at Joe Biden’s speech “Biden Delivers Memorial Day Message,” posted on the Fox News YouTube channel. The goal is to better understand why individuals continue to post hateful content online and how different types of hate speech function based on their intent and target. The analysis draws on the framework of hate speech proposed by Megersa and Minaye.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design, as it is well-suited for examining the phenomenon of hate comments in digital spaces. The primary focus is to analyze the types of hate comments specifically social bias and toxicity as categorized by Won (2001) and Green et al. (2025), and to explore how these forms of hate speech function in user responses to Joe Biden’s speech titled “Biden Delivers Memorial Day Message,” posted on the Fox News YouTube channel.

Qualitative research enables an in-depth examination of complex social phenomena, such as online hate speech, by allowing for nuanced interpretation of language and intent. According to Creswell and Poth (2007), “qualitative research is an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem.” This approach is therefore appropriate for analyzing both the content and the underlying functions of hate comments in this study.

Data were collected through documentation, following established protocols for qualitative data gathering. As Creswell (2023, p. 228) explains, “the data collection procedures include setting the boundaries for the study through sampling and recruitment, gaining permissions, collecting information through multiple forms (e.g., observations, interviews, documents, visual and social media), and developing protocols or guides for collecting the data.” In line with this, the data set was delimited to user comments responding directly to the specified video, and only those comments identified as containing hate speech were included for analysis.

The data were analyzed using a framework informed by Won (2001) and further supported by Cho and Moon (2021). Won’s taxonomy categorizes hate comments according to types of social bias including gender bias, other biases, and none as well as levels of toxicity, such as hate or insult, offensive expression, and none. Each comment was examined to determine which type(s) of bias and toxicity it exhibited, as well as the communicative function it served within the context of the speech. To ensure the reliability and depth of the analysis, the researcher conducted multiple rounds of review and cross-checking, consistent with best practices in qualitative data analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings of the qualitative content analysis. The study focuses on analyzing the types of social bias and toxicity found in netizens’ comments on Joe Biden’s speech entitled “*Biden Delivers Memorial Day Message*” published on Fox News’s YouTube channel. The data consist of 65 English-language comments collected between January 10, 2025, and April 17, 2025. The results are presented as follows;

Table 4.1 Types of Social Bias and Toxicity

No	Types of Social Bias	Frequency	Types of Toxicity	Frequency
----	----------------------	-----------	-------------------	-----------

1.	Gender Bias	0	Hate	0
2.	Other Biases	11	Insult	46
3.	None	0	Offensive Expression	9
Total		11		66

The table above presents the results of the study. The findings address the research objectives, namely to identify the types of social bias and toxicity employed by netizens in commenting on Joe Biden’s speech entitled *“Biden Delivers Memorial Day Message”* on Fox News’s YouTube channel. The analysis applies Cho and Moon’s theory (2021) to categorize types of social bias, supported by Fan et al. (2021) for the classification of toxicity.

Based on the first research question, the findings reveal three categories of social bias and three categories of toxicity identified in the comments. Regarding social bias, no English comments were categorized as gender bias, 11 comments were classified as other biases, and none were categorized as neutral (none).

In terms of toxicity, no comments were identified as hate, 46 comments were categorized as insults, and 9 comments were classified as offensive expressions. Overall, 11 English comments were found to contain social bias, while 55 English comments contained elements of toxicity.

Gender Bias

An individual sometimes deals with unequal treatment, expectations and judgments in their daily life, it happens for both woman and man, in a way of offline term or online term. In daily life case let’s prove from workplace, it happens when a person cannot get the same opportunity as others just because of the gander. It is supported by Ward and McLoughlin (2021, p.4) state that “women were more likely to receive comments referencing their appearance, marital status, and emotional tone, while men were more likely to receive comments about their leadership or competence in office.”

Other Biases

Some possible categories of social characteristics may guide someone to do a bias comment particularly in media social. Those are race, ethnicity, skin color, political stance and other. Other biases are categorized to be three part those are political, religion and also skin color that will be delivered in the analysis.

Political Bias

Political bias happens when someone shows preference or support for a certain political party, belief or viewpoint over others which can influence how information is shared or understood.

Excerpt 1

SpringGhost6521

fake news

(Fox News 2025)

In this excerpt, the phrase fake news used by netizen shows how the commentator is not at the same point of view as Biden's as he is a president which has a lot contribution toward the political structures during his period so it leads to other biases especially political bias. Based on the comment, the writer analyzed that it contains a bias which specifically in the types of other biases. The comment describes that the person wrote it disagrees toward what Biden delivers even basically the whole speech delivered is about how Biden respects his heroes which is a good thing to do as a leader. This comment is included into other biases because the whole context of the message is only a prejudice with no authentic evidence to show that what he said is a fact.

Toxicity

Toxicity means behavior or attitudes that harm others and make the environment unhealthy. This can include things such as constant negativity, rude or hostile comments, insults or showing disrespect that leave people feeling uneasy, stressed, or unwanted.

Hate

Hate is one of communication types whether in the term of spoken, written, visual, or symbolic. The target of hate is putting down someone or a group because of who they are. It can be based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, background, or disability.

Stigmatization

Stigmatization happens when people are judged or treated unfairly just because they are seen as different or connected to something that society often looks down on. This can be based on things such as mental health, illness, disability, race, gender, sexuality, religion or personal experiences. When someone is stigmatized, they might be left out, misunderstood or discriminated against which can make them feel ashamed or isolated. Stigmatization spreads negative stereotypes, making it harder for those affected to find support or speak up about what they are going through.

Insult

An insult is a term of communication whether spoken, written, or expressed through behavior that is intended to offend, demean, or show disrespect toward another person. It usually targets personal traits such as intelligence, appearance, behavior, or social status and means to cause emotional harm or discomfort. Insults can be in direct term such as when calling someone in an insulted name probably it happens in daily life either in private or public place.

Harassment

Harassment is a kind of unwanted behavior meant to upset, threaten, or hurt someone

emotionally, mentally, or even physically. It often shows up as repeated actions or comments aimed at a person or group, usually because of things such as their race, gender, religion, political beliefs, or identity. Harassment can happen everywhere probably at work, in school or possible also in online. It is more than just disagreeing with someone, it becomes harassment when the behavior is ongoing, aggressive or makes someone feels unsafe or disrespected.

Excerpt 12

caseyjones8203

Blah blah slobber blah blah studder blur. Embarrassing. Go take your meds

(Fox News 2025)

According to the comment, the writer analyzed that the phrase Go take your meds suggests he is mentally unstable or unwell. This phrase feeds into harmful stereotypes about older people and their mental health that the commentator think old people are not capable in doing something important. The comment does not just criticize Biden's policies or ideas. It attacks him personally, focusing on his way of speaking, his mental health, and physical traits. According to academic definitions, this kind of message is considered online harassment, especially when it mocks disabilities such as stuttering or makes harmful assumptions about mental illness.

Offensive Expression

Offensive expression is a kind of speech, behavior, or content that can hurt, insult, or disrespect others. It often involves harsh words, offensive jokes, slurs, or harmful stereotypes aimed at someone's race, religion, gender, sexuality, beliefs, or personal traits. While people have the right to share their opinions, offensive expression crosses the line when it spreads hate, causes emotional harm, or puts others down. Even if it is not meant to offend but it can still make people feel excluded, angry, or embarrassed.

Excerpt 58

DOUBLEZZRANCH Who's speech did he use this time? FJB, TRAITOR!

According to the comment Who's speech did he use this time? FJB, TRAITOR! aimed at President Joe Biden on Fox News' YouTube video of his Memorial Day speech can be seen as a clear instance of offensive expression toward the comment contains a vulgar comment such as FJB that stands for Fuck Joe Biden and . The question Who's speech did he use this time? suggests that Biden lacks the ability to write or deliver his own speeches, implying either dishonesty or mental incompetence an offensive claim meant to discredit and disrespect him personally. The acronym FJB widely understood as Fuck Joe Biden is a direct vulgar and aggressive insult, showing contempt rather than offering any form of constructive political criticism. Labeling him a TRAITOR is especially serious case as it accuses him of betraying the country without providing any context or evidence, making it not just offensive but dangerously inflammatory. From the perspective of a university student analyzing online political discourse, this comment would fall into the category of offensive expression because it targets the individual with personal attacks and inflammatory language rather than engaging with ideas or policies.

(Fox News', 2025)

Based on the results of this analysis, various types of social bias and toxicity were identified in netizens' comments directed at President Joe Biden's Memorial Day speech on Fox News's YouTube channel. Using Won's theory (2001), the study classified social bias into gender bias and other biases, and toxicity into hate, insult, and offensive expression. The findings indicate that netizens' comments tend to focus more on the speaker as a person rather than on the content of the speech itself.

The analysis demonstrates that the production of social bias and toxicity in comments is largely influenced by the individual being targeted. In this case, Joe Biden, as a well-known public figure, inevitably attracts both supportive and opposing audiences. These opposing views often manifest in social media comments through biased and toxic expressions. Although President Biden's Memorial Day speech was intended to honor fallen heroes and convey respect and remembrance, many netizens still responded with negative comments expressing anger, disrespect, disappointment, and hostility.

The significance of this study lies in its attempt to explain why hate comments and their various forms emerge in both online and offline contexts. Social bias and toxicity function as mechanisms through which netizens express hate, particularly when comments target an individual's personal characteristics rather than the message being conveyed. In political contexts, public figures are especially vulnerable to such attacks due to their visible political activities, which often generate polarized opinions. These opposing perspectives encourage netizens to express agreement or disagreement through comments that may become socially biased or toxic.

These findings are consistent with Won's (2001) theory, which emphasizes that meaning in comments—whether online or offline—is shaped by how commentators perceive the intended target. Social bias and toxicity act as tools that enable commentators to frame their intentions, whether to mock, criticize, or provoke. For example, insults are often used to demean the targeted individual through labels such as *garbage* or *fake*, while stronger reactions may involve vulgar or highly offensive expressions such as *traitor* or *repulsive*. Such biased and toxic comments are predominantly found in political discourse, where they are used to express disagreement and to emotionally harm or provoke public figures.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of this research identified 11 instances of social bias, all of which fall under the category of other biases, particularly political bias. In addition, 59 instances of toxicity were found, consisting of 6 cases of harassment (categorized as insults), 42 cases of hostility (also categorized as insults), and 10 cases of offensive expressions. The most dominant type of comment was hostile insult, which was frequently found in netizens' responses to President Joe Biden's Memorial Day speech on Fox News's YouTube channel. These hostile insults were directed personally at President Biden, aiming to demean and undermine him both psychologically and symbolically. When commentators focus on an individual they dislike, their comments tend to shift toward personal attacks, as their primary intention becomes harming the targeted individual rather than engaging with the substance of the speech.

Furthermore, in a different context of analysis, the study demonstrates that Nick's use of taboo language is closely associated with violations of gender-based norms, particularly the concept of Male Gender Taboo. Nick's inability to fulfill traditional masculine roles—such as being a financial provider and an authoritative husband—results in feelings of vulnerability and

identity crisis. Consequently, he engages in various forms of social taboo behavior, including dishonesty, manipulation, and emotional deception, as strategies to preserve his public image and reassert his masculine identity. These findings suggest that taboo language and behavior in the novel function not merely as expressions of impoliteness, but as sociolinguistic reflections of masculine insecurity and the pressures imposed by rigid gender expectations.

Reference

- Auwal, A. M. (2018). Social media and hate speech: Analysis of comments on Biafra agitations, Arewa youths' ultimatum and their implications on peaceful coexistence in Nigeria. *Media and Communication Currents*, 2(1), 54–74.
- Banik, N., & Rahman, M. H. H. (2019, December). Toxicity detection on Bengali social media comments using supervised models. In *2019 International Conference on Innovation in Engineering and Technology (ICIET)* (pp. 1–5). IEEE.
- Calderón, F. H., Balani, N., Taylor, J., Peignon, M., Huang, Y. H., & Chen, Y. S. (2021). Linguistic patterns for code word resilient hate speech identification. *Sensors*, 21(23), 7859. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s21237859>
- Cho, W. I., & Moon, J. (2021, December). How does the hate speech corpus concern sociolinguistic discussions? A case study on Korean online news comments. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Natural Language Processing for Digital Humanities* (pp. 13–22).
- Creswell, J. W., Hanson, W. E., Clark Plano, V. L., & Morales, A. (2007). Qualitative research designs: Selection and implementation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35(2), 236–264. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006287390>
- Danesi, M. (2017). *Language, society, and new media: Sociolinguistics today*. Routledge.
- Fadhilah, N., Suswanto, B., & Utami, Y. P. (2023). Forensic linguistics: Netizens' hate speech implicature on the issue of the 2024 presidential election (TikTok social media case study). *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 50, 204–214.
- Fan, H., Du, W., Dahou, A., Ewees, A. A., Yousri, D., Elaziz, M. A., & Al-qaness, M. A. (2021). Social media toxicity classification using deep learning: Real-world application UK Brexit. *Electronics*, 10(11), 1332. <https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics10111332>
- Gumperz, J. J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (2008). Studying language, culture, and society: Sociolinguistics or linguistic anthropology? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(4), 532–545.
- Howard, J. W. (2019). Free speech and hate speech. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051517-012343>
- Husda, A., & Saragih, E. L. L. (2021). Taboo words in hate speech through social media. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 17, 510–517.

- Jaspal, R., & Coyle, A. (2009). Reconciling social psychology and sociolinguistics: Language and identity among second-generation British Asians. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(3), 505–521.
- Kunst, M., Porten-Cheé, P., Emmer, M., & Eilders, C. (2021). Do “good citizens” fight hate speech online? Effects of solidarity citizenship norms on user responses to hate comments. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 18(3), 258–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2020.1871142>
- Pedersen, R. T., Petersen, N. B. G., & Thau, M. (2025). Online abuse of politicians: Experimental evidence on politicians’ own perceptions. *Political Behavior*, 47(1), 119–139.
- Romaine, S. (2000). *Language in society: An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Saleh, H., Alhothali, A., & Moria, K. (2023). Detection of hate speech using BERT and hate speech word embedding with deep model. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2023.2166719>
- Tahir, I., & Ramadhan, M. G. F. (2024). Hate speech on social media: Indonesian netizens’ hate comments of presidential talk show on YouTube. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 27(1), 230–251.
- Wiana, D. (2019). Analysis of the use of hate speech in social media in the case of the 2019 presidential election. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 3(2), 158–167.
- Yule, G. (2022). *The study of language* (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.