

Hate Speech Forms and Implications in English and Kurdish Social Media

Aseel Muhammad Faiq, Midya Subhi Noori

Department of English, College of Languages, University of Sulaimani, Sulaymaniyah, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Abstract— Social media platforms have become a favorable way of communication, sharing opinion and views about different topics around the world freely. Freedom of expression or free speech is the right to say whatever one likes; it has been sometimes conflated with hate speech. The latter is a public communication that expresses hate or advocates violence toward a person or group based on their race, religion or sex. The aim of the current study is to see the reactions of Kurdish and English commentators on similar political posts on Facebook platform, and what forms of hate speech were used more in each of them based on Bahador's (2020) Intense Scale of Hate Speech model. After analyzing three similar posts, it has been concluded that the majority of the English commentators used negative character, while the majority of the Kurdish commentators used Dehumanization and Demonization, in which it was only found in one comment on the English posts.

Index Terms— Facebook, Free speech, Hate speech, Political posts, Social media.

I. INTRODUCTION

Social media has become a priority in our daily lives, and has made it easy for people to communicate with each other. Through the social media, users express their feelings freely. Personal communication, news consumption, and entertainment have all shifted to social media. Simultaneously, social media reflects the rising of ideological division that can be seen in politics, religion, the environment, and issues of gender and sexuality. In recent years, people have shown their anger and disagreements by using hate speech in their comments on various posts. Hate speech is not a new phenomenon, but has unique qualities that provide new challenges in the online platforms (Santos, Amaral & Simoes, 2020).

Coliver (1992) refers to hate speech as any expression and manifestation that is directed to abuse, insult, intimidate or harass, led by an open or underlying message of violence, discrimination and hatred towards an individual's belonging to a group of different race, nationality, ethnicity or religion, etc.

According to the definition by the Council of Europe (1997) hate speech is any type of language that spread, encourages, support, or excuse racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, as

well as other types of discrimination based on intolerance, which include: aggressive nationalism and racialism, discrimination and hatred towards minorities, migrants, and individuals of immigrant background.

Moreover, another definition of hate speech made by Bahador (2012), states that to begin any definition of hate speech, it is necessary to look at the two main words individually: hate and speech. Hate is an emotion of human that may be triggered or heightened by certain sorts of information. Hate is defined by a long-term hate, a lack of empathy, and even a wish to hurt specific targets. Hate speech is commonly considered to be directed towards persons or groups who share immutable characteristics such as nationality, religion, race, gender, age, or sex. Speech, on the other hand, encompasses a wide range of mediums, including spoken words or utterances, text, pictures, videos, and sometimes even gestures. In fact, hate speech is typically defined widely, and involves insults, discrimination, dehumanization, demonization, and violent instigation. However, because of the term's concentration on the human feeling of hate and its overall vagueness, a number of philosophers have questioned its use and proposed more precise language, such as dangerous, fear, and stupid speech (Bahador, 2012).

II. FREE SPEECH VS. HATE SPEECH

Dealing with the meaning and forms of 'hate speech', one has to mention free speech. Since both hate and free speech are concerned with the expression of ideas and feelings, some individuals may find it difficult to distinguish between the two. The ability to say anything one wants is known as free speech. It is acceptable to have opinions and to disagree with other's opinions. The right to free speech, sometimes known as the right to be heard, allows people to express themselves without fear of retaliation, censorship, or interference from the government. In a democratic society, this freedom may be subject to formalities, conditions, limits, and penalties by the law. This right includes freedom for the press to present their opinions and liberty of the citizens to express their grievances through petitions or protests (Article19, 2020). Hate speech, on the other hand, is any form of expression that intends to attack a person or a group by inciting violence or prejudice on the basis

of attributes such as race, religion, ethnicity, sex, disability, sex, and others. Some perceive it as a part of free speech and is either legal or illegal depending on the governing administration (Kibler, 2015).

Despite the thin line between free and hate speech, they should not be conflated with each other. Free speech is often referred to as freedom of speech or freedom of expression, notwithstanding their distinctions. It is mainly described as encouraging debate by liberally but politely presenting the two sides of an issue, respecting limitation and protecting minority groups by practicing tolerance and respecting the diversity that each group brings. It is also against hate crimes, and is more humane. People may publicly express their ideas, opinions, and beliefs due to free speech. Having these characteristics, free speech leads to the society's growth. On the flip side, hate speech leads to the community's deterioration by inciting harm or violence against others. It discriminates the minority by disseminating offensive remarks. Consequently, it creates unnecessary factions within a society due to the aggressive content which may further encourages violence by deliberately offending the other party and supporting discriminatory acts. In sum, hate speech incites abuse, degrades society and often leads to social punishment (O'Sullivan, 2019).

III. HATE SPEECH IN THE SOCIAL MEDIA

With the spread of online hate culture in the social media and the demand for effective responses growing louder, study in the topic has recently accelerated. Studies look into the content and tactical operation of online hate speech. Academics provide ways to deal with the harmful phenomena based on their findings. Whereas digital communities were formerly unimportant to those researching far-right communications, they are now an essential element of the field of study on hostile politics (Bogerts & Fielitz, 2019).

Jaki and Smedt (2018) analyzed over 55,000 tweets that include hate speech by German users during a period of nine months in order to give an insight into the most targeted people in social media. Jaki and Smedt found that the Muslim refugees are the most targeted group by social media hatred in Germany. According to their findings, hate speech is characterized by several forms of persuasive speech actions, including expressive speech (angry speech frequently accompanied by emoji), directive speech (asks for action followed by hash tags), as well as forceful, commissive, and indirect speech.

One of their main insights is that extreme right groups around the world are assertively cooperating to achieve shared goals, like trying to keep refugees out of Europe, cancelling hate speech laws, and electing far-right populist politicians by adopting common online interaction techniques, such as "in-group jokes and memes, idioms, and military vocabulary." Another method used by fans of online hate society is the intentional spreading of rumors and fake information to build a poisonous image (Ibid).

Hate groups nowadays use the internet and social media to reach a larger audience. People can tell who wrote a piece of paper if they write their name on it. Similarly, if someone gives a speech, everyone can see who is speaking. On the other hand, on the internet, anyone can use any name they choose and build

any website they want - all while remaining anonymous. Anonymity frees internet users from obligations, allowing them to express themselves in ways they would not dare to utter in person. Because the users remain anonymous. (Tsesis, 2001).

Oboler (2019) states that, the more the content is available, the more harm it may do to the victims and the offenders will be empowered. One can restrict the exposure if one deletes the information early on. It is the same as cleaning up litter; it does not make people quit polluting. However, if one does not address the issue, it will continue to grow and worsen.

IV. FORMS OF HATE SPEECH

Around the world, hate speech is on the rise, and the language of exclusion and marginalization has crept into media coverage, online platforms and national policies. Communities are facing problematic levels of intolerance and prejudice to the extent that hate speech began to be conflated with hate crimes (Article 19, 2020).

Different classifications have been proposed by different scholars to classify 'hate speech' according to the intensity of hate. Parekh (2012) states that there are specific characteristics that differentiate hate speech from other types of speech, first, it is directed toward a specific group or individuals with irrelevant characteristics. Second, by stigmatizing the target group, the target group need to change those features which is considered as unacceptable in order to be accepted. Finally, the target group is considered as unwelcomed member of a group not trusted and is accused to be dangerous to the society.

Waldron (2012) identifies two dangerous types of messages in hate speech that expose different groups to vulnerability. The first message is directed at the victims and intends to dehumanize or ridicule them and to make them feel unwelcome in the society. Similar to this, hate speech's overall aim is to defame its targets by labeling them as terrorists, supporting their removal from society, depriving them of their human rights, holding them responsible for the conduct of other group members, using double standards, etc. (Jakubowicz et al, 2014). The second message, on the other hand, is aimed at the rest of the society and intends to encourage people into thinking that there are some like-minded individuals who agree with the idea that the certain groups of society should be excluded and not tolerated (Waldron, 2012).

Post (2009), states that hate speech can be defined in terms of the harms it will cause, such as physical violence or discrimination; or it can be defined in terms of its intrinsic properties, such as the type of words it uses; or it can be defined in terms of its relation to dignity principles; or in terms of the ideas it conveys. Each of these concepts has its own set of benefits and drawbacks.

V. BAHADOR'S (2020) MODEL OF HATE SPEECH

Bahador (2020) presented six categories of hate organized into three typologies based on the "us vs. them" dichotomy. In these three typologies, there are other groups that differ in strength. A color, number, title, explanation, and examples for each category were assembled into a Hate-Speech Intensity Scale and presented as a table to make the scale easier to

understand. These six different types are described in the next section. The "early warning" typology encompasses categories 1 to 3; category 4 contains the dehumanization/demonization typology; and categories 5 and 6, the most serious, entail incitement to violence and murder. These are shown in table (1) below:







Color	Title	Description	Examples
	6. Death	Rhetoric includes literal killing by group. Responses include the literal death/elimination of a group	Killed, annihilate, destroy
	5. Violence	Rhetoric includes infliction of physical harm or metaphorical/aspirational physical harm or death. Responses include calls for literal violence or metaphorical/aspirational physical harm or death	Punched, raped, starved, torturing, mugging
	4. Demonizing and Dehumanizing	Rhetoric includes subhuman and superhuman Characteristics. There are no responses for #4.	Rat, monkey, Nazi, demon, cancer, monster
	3. Negative character	Rhetoric includes nonviolent characterizations and insults. There are no responses for #3.	Stupid, thief, aggressor, fake, crazy
	2. Negative actions	Rhetoric includes nonviolent actions associated with the group. Responses include nonviolent actions including metaphors.	Threatened, stole, outrageous, act, poor treatment, alienate
	1. Disagreement	Rhetoric includes disagreeing at the idea/belief level. Responses include challenging claims, ideas, beliefs, or trying to change their view.	False, incorrect, wrong, challenge, persuade, change minds

Table 1. Hate-Speech Intensity Scale. (Adopted from Bahador, 2020).

The three typologies that govern the whole dimensions are explained more in the following subsections:

A. DEHUMANIZATION AND DEMONIAZATION

Dehumanization is the act of treating people like pigs, rats, monkeys, or even trash or diseases. Rwanda is a notable case in point because of its long-standing conflict between the Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groupings. The nation's Hutu-led revolt in 1959 marked the beginning of the crisis. The Tutsis have been viewed as inferior and helpless ever since, sometimes being referred to as cockroaches. Kangura is the name of a newspaper published by the government. It has a significant impact in stoking hatred between the two major ethnic groups. In 1994, the tension resulted in a genocide (Jakubowicz et al, 1994). The presentation of some groups, particularly the out-group, as less than human is known as dehumanization. They should be viewed as a hated single creature that has been stripped of its own identity and humanity. The in-group exists on the periphery, freed of all responsibility for encouraging or engaging in violence against them. After all, the aggression is now focused at inferior, generally hated, and already disposable organisms rather than at other people (Ibid).

On the other side, demonization is the representation of a group as superhuman, such as a monster, robot, or even fatal diseases like cancer, which pose a serious threat to the in-group. When seen in this way, the elimination of the opposition is not only permissible but also useful to the organizations that are already there. Demonization and dehumanization are extreme examples of negative group characterization and a considered trying method of justifying political violence, therefore they merit their own category apart from less extreme negative group characterizations (Bahador, 2020).

B. VIOLENCE AND INCITEMENT

Dehumanization and demonization are extremely harmful concepts for groups of people, yet they do not call for violence to be committed against them. On the other hand, inciting violence is a particular kind of hate speech. In numerous nations, it is against the law to incite violence against a certain community. In the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (UN), which specifies that "any action of national, racial, or religious hatred that represents incitement to discrimination, hostility, or violence shall be banned by law," encouragement is particularly named as being prohibited. Inciting "imminent lawless action" when such conduct is both imminent and likely is regarded as a felony, even within the US where the First Amendment mostly defends free speech (Bahador, 2020).

C. EARLY WARNING

"Early warning" refers to a third kind of communication that commonly verges on hate speech. Usually more restrained and controlled, group-based hate speech generally starts with dehumanization or incitement. On the other side, recognizing these early warning signs can help to prevent the employment of more harsh language. To this end, the creation of a "us" vs. "them" dynamic and the differentiation of "them" as a distinct group with diverse ideas and values is a very early precursor to hate speech. This might result in criticisms of the outright bad behavior of the group, since certain individuals' actions may be mistaken for those of the entire group (Bahador, 2020).

Finally, negative behaviors that are solely focused might develop into a negative description of the entire group. These are less harmful than dehumanizing and demonizing people, and they may involve calling people in certain groups stupid, lazy, or dishonest, or linking them to nonviolent crimes like theft or fraud. Such analogies can encourage the emergence of hatred towards marginalized groups, making it easier over time to employ hate speech that is more intense (Ibid).

Disagreement is the first and most obvious warning sign, and it involves opposing a certain group's viewpoints or ideologies. While there is nothing wrong with having opposing opinions or views, the rise of the "us vs. them" paradigm makes this category a forerunner of future hate speech. This is particularly troublesome since it frequently entails oversimplification and stereotyping of the out-group, despite the fact that very few people inside the group have the same opinions or worldview. The second kind of early-warning discourse concentrates on non-violent unfavorable actions associated with the out-group, such as allegations that the out-group robbed from or withdrew from a positive event. The use of peaceful negative metaphors or stated behaviors that are unclear concerning the use of violence fall under this category. By voting them out or holding protests against them, the in-group should use nonviolent means to combat the out-group. The third early-warning typology includes negative characterization or insults. This is more harmful than merely using negative nonviolent actions that are destructive since it implies something fundamental about the entire group rather than just a single incident. Since this category is not action-oriented, there are no answers. The second typology's fourth category, which involves dehumanization and/or demonization, is an extreme kind of negative characterization. The third and this category both lack replies. The third and most extreme typology includes the fifth

and sixth categories, which deal with violent actions and death. Non-lethal violence against out-groups in the past, present, or future is the subject of the fifth category. Both non-lethal and lethal metaphorical or aspirational violence falls under this category. As a reaction, nonlethal aggression is encouraged, such as assaulting the outsiders. The sixth category includes irrationally labeling members of minority groups as killers (past, present, and future). Based on the responses, the out-group is anticipated to be killed by the in-group (Ibid).

VI. DATA COLLECTION

Political posts on social media are usually targeted by commentators who write hate speech against political figures and situations. In this paper, three similar political posts are taken in both the English and Kurdish public news pages from Facebook platform, for each language 5 comments are analyzed to show the different types of hate speech used based on Bahador's (2020) intense Scale of Hate speech. The English posts and comments were collected from the Sky News, Fox News and The Raz Man public pages on Facebook, and the Kurdish posts and comments were collected from Rudaw and Politic Press public pages on Facebook. Both posts are about the "G7 summit, The Afghan people flee from Afghanistan and the Guards of UK's Queen knocking a child".

VII. DATA ANALYSIS

The qualitative analysis was adopted to explain what forms of hate speech used more in English and Kurdish comments on different political posts based on Bahador's model of hate speech.

Table 2. English Comments of Hate speech and its intense Scale number and type

No	English Comments	Hate speech	Type	Intense number
Post 1				
1	Lies lies and more lies.	Lies	Disagreement	1
2	A room full of fools. Long live Russia.	Fools	Negative character	3
3	More lies	Lies	Disagreement	1
4	G idiots	Idiots	Negative character	3
5	Gathering rats.	Rats	Dehumanization	4
Post 2				
1	Put a mask on when you travel via airplane you savages	Savage	Negative character	3
2	Guarantee you a bunch of them are terrorists!	Terrorists	Negative character	3
3	Terrorist	Terrorist	Negative character	3
4	How many terrorists in the picture?	Terrorists	Negative character	3
5	How many terrorists are hiding in that crowd? COVID?	Terrorists	Negative character	3
Post 3				
1	Disrespectful parents	Disrespectful	Negative character	3
2	It is the negligence of the boy's parents/guidance	Negligence	Negative character	3
3	Problem is parents suck.	Suck	Negative actions	2
4	Horrible parenting	Horrible	Negative character	3
5	Slavery still does exist	Slavery	Negative character	3

Table 3. Kurdish Comments of Hate speech and its intense Scale number and type

No.	Kurdish Comments	English translate	Hate speech	Type	Intense number
Post 1					
1	Grwpy şaytanakân	/Satan group/	Şaytan	Demonization	4
2	Baça dacadakân	/Sons of anti-Christ/	Daçal	Negative character	3
3	Karêty dasty pêkrdawa	/Acting like donkey starts again/	Kar	Dehumanization	4
4	Aw hamw şaytana pysâna	/All those dirty Satan/	Şaytan	Demonization	4
5	Syâsaty dwnya badast am xwêryânawaya	/The world's politics is under the control of these stupid/	Xwêry	Negative character	3
Post 2					
1	Dro akan gawâdana labar xâtry eyqâmâyâna	/these pimps are lying, they do it for the sake of residency/	Dro, gawâdana	Disagreement & Negative character	1, 3
2	Etr haryakaw kaysêky boxoy drwst krêwa hamwêy dro w dalasaya	/Each of them made a case for themselves and all are lies/	Dro	Disagreement	1
3	Hamwy dro akan bêna awrupa mîzgawt bar nâdan	/they are all lying, when they come to Europe they do not leave the Mosque.	Dro	Disagreement	1
4	Hamwy xwêryn	/All are stupid/	Xwêry	Negative Character	3
5	Nafrat la tâfîbân	/Damn Taliban/	Nafrat	Negative action	2
Post 3					
1	Dw Kar	/Two donkeys/	Kar	Dehumanization	4
2	Kar darwâ	/donkey is walking/	Kar	Dehumanization	4
3	Haywân	/they are animals/	Haywân	Dehumanization	4
4	Kara englîzy xwêry	/English stupid donkey/	Kar xwêry	Dehumanization & negative character	4, 3
5	Kar har kara bibayta landaniş	/Donkey is a donkey even if you take it to London/	Kar	Dehumanization	4

VIII. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Based on Bahador's (2020) Intense Scale of Hate Speech, on the English posts 11 comments out of 15 comments used negative characters such as (fools, idiots, savage, terrorists, etc.). While the other 4 comments includes 2 disagreements, one dehumanization and one negative action. The Kurdish posts, on the other hand, includes 8 dehumanization and demonization such as (kar (donkey), Haywan (animal), şaytan (Satan), etc.) in which two of them only were demonization, the other comments include 5 negative characters like (xwêry (stupid), daçal (Anti-Christ), gawâd (Pander), etc.) three disagreement and one negative action. Two of the Kurdish comments include both dehumanization and negative character and disagreements as a result the number of hate speech in the Kurdish comments are 17 hate speeches.

The English and Kurdish commentators use different ways to show their hate, the majority of English commentators prefer to use negative character to show their hate, this form of hate speech is considered as the third early-warning typology. This is worse than only negative nonviolent actions, since it makes an essential claim about the group as opposed to a one-off action claim. However, the majority of Kurdish commentators use dehumanization and demonization to show their hate, this is considered as the fourth early warning typology which is more serious than the negative character. The dehumanization

and demonization was only used once by the English commentators which shows that the English commentators do not prefer using this form of hate speech. The second most used form of hate speech used by the Kurdish commentators was negative character. This shows that Kurdish commentators prefer using both dehumanization and negative characters to show their hate toward political figures and situations.

CONCLUSION

Examining hate speech and its different forms shows that as language is a means of communication where speech can be used to show good feelings or present good image of a certain individual or group, it can also do the reverse by becoming a carrier of hate and a means used to harm its target. This hate is triggered due to specific factors as one's disability, religion and race ethnicity, gender, religion, nationality, or sexual orientation.

In a nutshell, the data shows that the majority of English commentators used negative character in their comments to show their hate toward a political figure or situation. Some of the commentators also used disagreement about the situation.

Kurdish commentators mainly used dehumanization and demonization in their comments to show their hate to political figures or situations, and this is more serious early warning typology than the negative character. The second most used type of hate speech was the negative character. The least type used in both English and Kurdish comments was the disagreement and negative actions. Moreover, both English and Kurdish commentators used the negative actions only once.

REFERENCES

- Article19 (2020). *'Hate Speech' explained: A summary*. Retrieved May 10, 2022, from <https://www.article19.org/resources/hate-speech-explained-a-summary>
- Bahador B. (2020), Classifying and identifying the intensity of hate speech. Retrieved August 28, 2021, from <https://items.ssrc.org/disinformation-democracy-and-conflict-prevention/classifying-and-identifying-the-intensity-of-hate-speech/?fbclid=IwAR17n7gXGAY3gradzM4jS9jmyVz3VtuW0Qv4khTCmkgUKemA0y5JZ67Lpxo>
- Bahador B. (2012), *Rehumanizing enemy images: Media framing from war to peace. Forming a culture of peace: Reframing narratives of intergroup relations, equity and Justice*. Palgrave Macmillan. 195–211.
- Bogerts, L. & Fielitz, M. (2019), *Post-digital cultures of the far right: Online actions and offline consequences in Europe and the US*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Coliver, S. (1992). *Striking a balance: Hate speech, freedom of expression and non-discrimination*. London: University of Essex.
- Council of Europe – Committee of Ministers (1997). *Hate Speech*. Retrieved August 28, 2021 from <https://rm.coe.int/1680505d5b>

- Jaki, S. & De Smedt, T. (2018), *Right-wing German hate speech on Twitter: Analysis and automatic detection*. Retrieved October 20, 2021, from <http://www.organisms.be/downloads/jaki2018.pdf>
- Jakubowicz, A. Goodall, H. Martiner, J., Mitchell, T. Randal, L. and Senerierahte, K. (1994), *Racism, ethnicity and the media*. Allen and Unwin Pty Ltd.
- Kibler, A. (2015), *The long history of hate speech*. History news network. Retrieved October 20, 2021, from <https://historynewsnetwork.org/articles/158866>
- Oboler, A. (2019) *Confronting antisemitism in modern media, the legal and political worlds*. Retrieved July 5, 2021, from <https://opr.degruyter.com/confronting-antisemitism-in-modern-media-the-legal-and-political-worlds/andre-oboler-solving-antisemitic-hate-speech-in-social-media-through-a-global-approach-to-local-action/>
- O'Sullivan, D. (2019). *There are differences between free speech, hate speech and academic freedom – and they matter*. Retrieved May 10, 2022, from <https://theconversation.com/there-are-differences-between-free-speech-hate-speech-and-academic-freedom-and-they-matter-124764>
- Parekh, B. (2012). "Is there a case for banning hate speech?" in Michael Herz, and Peter Molnar (Eds.). *The content and context of hate speech: Rethinking regulation and response*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 37–56
- Post, Robert, 2009, "Hate speech," in Ivan Hare and James Weinstein (Ed.), *Extreme speech and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Santos, S., Amaral, I, Simoes R., (2020), *Hate speech in social media: Perceptions and attitudes of higher education students in Portugal*. Retrieved July 20, 2022, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340126201_HATE_SPEECH_IN_SOCIAL_MEDIA_PERCEPTIONS_AND_ATTITUDES_OF_HIGHER_EDUCATION_STUDENTS_IN_PORTUGAL
- Tsesis, A. (2001), *Hate in cyberspace: Regulating hate speech on the internet*. San Diego: Law.
- Waldron, J. (2012), *The harm in hate speech*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

APPENDIX 1

A. English post 1.



English Comments

1.

Lies lies and more lies.
8h Like Reply
2.

A room full of fools. Long live Russia.
5h Like Reply 3
3.

More lies
11h Like Reply
4.

G idiots
10h Like Reply
5.

Gathering rats.
11h Like Reply

A. Kurdish Post 1.



Kurdish comments

1.

گروپی شه‌بیطانەکان.
10h Like Reply 15

 (Satan groups)
2.

بە چکە دە جالە کان
2h Like Reply

 (Sons of Anti-Christ)
3.

کەریەتی دەستی پێکردووه
1d Like Reply

 (Acting like donkey starts again)
4.

ئە هەموو شه‌بیطانە بیسانە
10h Like Reply 4

 (All those dirty Satan)
5.

سیاسەتی دۆنیایاوبە دە س ئە م خۆپیرایە وه.
10h Like Reply 7

 (The world's politics is under the control of these stupid)

B. English Post 2.



English Comments

1. Put a mask on to travel via airplane you s@vages. 5h Like Reply 2
2. Guarantee you a bunch of them are terrorists! 5h Like Reply 1
3. Terrorist 12m Like Reply 1
4. How many terrorists in this picture? 6h Like Reply 7
5. How many terrorists are hiding in that crowd? COVID? 5h Like Reply 6

A. Kurdish Post 2.



Kurdish comments

1. درۆگه‌ن که‌وادانه‌ له‌به‌ر خاتری ئیقامه‌بانه‌ بۆ له‌وه‌ی له‌به‌ر مناله‌کانه‌ی له‌وایش برۆن See Translation 18w Like Reply (These panders are lying, they do it for the sake of residency)
2. ئیتر هه‌رێه‌که‌وه‌ که‌یسیکی یه‌ خوی دروستکردووه‌ هه‌مووشی درو و دقه‌سه‌یه‌ See Translation 45w Like Reply 1 (Each of them made a case for themselves and all are lying)
3. هه‌موی درو نه‌که‌ن بینه‌ له‌وروا مرگه‌ت به‌ر ئاده‌ن See Translation (they are all lying, when they come to Europe they do not leave the Mosque)
4. هه‌می خویرن 39w Like Reply (All are stupid)
5. نه‌فهرت له‌تالیبان 44w Like Reply (Damn Taliban)

B. English post 3.



English comments

1. Disrespectful parents
1d Like Reply 7
2. It is the negligence of the boys parents/guidance.
1d Like Reply 5
3. Problem is parents suck. Parents need to teach their children to be respectful and stand out of the way. Educate your kids on the places you're going.
21h Like Reply 4
4. Horrible parenting. Sad the child has to pay the price for bad parenting. He will not be in their way again. People need to catch a clue.
23h Like Reply 4
5. Slavery still does exist
1d Like Reply 7

C. Kurdish Post 3.



Kurdish comments

1. دوو کەر
37m Like Reply (Two donkeys)
2. که ز ده روا
21h Like Reply (donkey is walking)
3. حەیانان
17h Like Reply (They are animals)
4. که زه انگیزی خویری
21h Like Reply 1 (English stupid donkeu)
5. که رهه که ره بیبه پته له نده نیش
13h Like Reply (Donkey is a donkey even if you take it to London)

APPENDIX 2

Key to Kurdish Phonemic Symbols

Consonants

پ	/P/	/p/	is a voiceless bilabial stop/plosive as in PAPULA butterfly
ب	/B/	/b/	is a voiced bilabial stop as in BRO eyebrow
ت	/T/	/t/	is a voiceless dental stop/plosive as in TĀC crown
د	/D/	/d/	is a voiced dental stop as in DĀR tree
ک	/K/	/k/	is a voiceless velar stop/plosive as in KĀLAK melon
گ	/G/	/g/	is a voiced velar stop as in GŪE flower
ف	/F/	/f/	is a voiceless labio-dental fricative as in FROKA plain
ڤ	/V/	/v/	is a voiced labio-dental fricative as in MIROV human
س	/S/	/s/	is a voiceless alveo-dental fricative as in DAST hand
ز	/Z/	/z/	is a voiced alveo-dental fricative as in BARIZ high
ش	/Š/	/ʃ/	is a voiceless alveo-palatal fricative as in BĀS good
ژ	/Ž/	/ʒ/	is a voiced alveo-palatal fricative as in ŽIR wise
چ	/Ç/	/ç/	is a voiceless alveo-palatal affricate as in ÇI what
ج	/C/	/c/	is a voiced alveo-palatal affricate as in CAMANA turban
م	/M/	/m/	is a voiced bilabial nasal as in MANUSA don't write
ن	/N/	/n/	is a voiced dental nasal as in NĀBIST deaf
نگ	/D/	/ŋ/	is a voiced velar nasal as in DĀD sound
ه	/H/	/h/	is a voiceless glottal fricative as in BĀHĀR spring
ح	/H/	/ħ/	is a voiceless pharyngeal fricative as in HĀUT seven
ل	/L/	/l/	is a voiceless velarized lateral as in LEW lip
ل	/L/	/l̥/	is a voiced dental lateral as in BĀĒN promise
ر	/R/	/r/	is a voiced alveolar flap as in PANIR cheese
ڕ	/R̥/	/r̥/	is a voiced alveolar trill as in RĀD color
خ	/X/	/x/	is a voiceless velar fricative as in XEZĀN family
غ	/X/	/ɣ/	is a voiced velar fricative as in XĀMBĀR sad
ق	/Q/	/q/	is a voiceless uvular stop as in LAQ foot
ی	/Y/	/y/	is a palato-alveolar glide as in YĀR lover
و	/W/	/w/	is a labiovelar rounded glide as in WUSBA be quite

Vowels

ئا	/Ā/	/ā/	low central unrounded long vowel as in RĀW hunting
ئێ	/Ē/	/ē/	mid very close front unrounded long vowel as in SĒ three
ئێ	/I/	/i/	high close front unrounded short vowel as in MIL neck
ئێ	/Ī/	/ī/	high close front unrounded long vowel as in FRĪ flew
و	/U/	/u/	high open back rounded short vowel as in KURT short
وو	/Ū/	/ū/	high close back rounded long vowel as in SUD profit
ئۆ	/O/	/o/	mid open back rounded short vowel as in GŌST meat