



## **HONOR THY PARENTS: FILIAL PIETY, ONLINE HATE SPEECH AND THE CARLOS “CALOY” YULO PHENOMENON**

Sarah Jane R. Claro<sup>1</sup>, Haya Jane E. Elan<sup>2</sup>

*Student, College of Arts and Sciences, Holy Trinity College of General Santos City,  
Philippines<sup>1</sup>*

*Adviser, College of Arts and Sciences, Holy Trinity College of General Santos City,  
Philippines<sup>2</sup>*

### **ABSTRACT**

This qualitative content analysis explores hate speech targeting Filipino gymnast Carlos “Caloy” Yulo and his parents on Facebook. While existing hate speech research often focuses on platforms like Twitter and employs quantitative methods, this study addresses a critical gap by examining Facebook’s unique context and offering nuanced qualitative insights. Our findings reveal a significant intersection between digital discourse and deeply ingrained Filipino cultural values, specifically *utang na loob* (debt of gratitude) and *hiya* (shame). Online commentary frequently interpreted Yulo’s actions as causing *hiya* to his parents, manifested through insults, accusations, and blames. These comments subtly and overtly accused Yulo of violating cultural norms and shaming his family. Notably, identity-based hate speech such as race and religion was less prevalent. Instead, the primary driver of online vitriol was the perceived transgression of cultural expectations related to family honor and filial duty. The majority of comments reinforced traditional notions of filial piety, reflecting the deep-seated expectation of absolute obedience and gratitude from children to parents. Analyzing hate speech through this lens highlights language’s dual role: maintaining social order and serving as a weapon for public condemnation. This study provides crucial insight into how Filipino cultural values shape digital interactions and how social media amplifies both cultural reinforcement and conflict.

Keywords: *hate speech; filial piety; Yulo; Facebook; Philippines*

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Philippines erupted in pride and joy when Carlos “Caloy” Yulo, a Filipino gymnast, clinched two Olympic gold medals at the Paris Olympic Games. The archipelago of over 100 million people basked in the glory of his historic achievement. However, this triumph was quickly overshadowed with Yulo’s feud with his mother which has been making headlines for quite some time. The public airing of scandal has sparked a long-standing Filipino debate about *utang na loob* (debt of gratitude). Yulo’s decision to distance himself from his family, despite the deep-rooted cultural expectations of filial piety challenges the traditional Filipino value system that often prioritizes family loyalty above personal autonomy and well-being.



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

This has resulted in intense online discussions, with some comments veering into the realm of hate speech. This is not surprising given the propensity of social media platforms to amplify divisive rhetoric and facilitate the spread of harmful narratives.

The practice of filial piety in the Philippines is a complex and nuanced phenomenon. While Filipino individuals generally revere their elders and prioritize family values, instances of tension and resentment can arise, particularly among younger generations who may feel overburdened by the familial obligations imposed upon them (Gregorio et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2022).

By analyzing hate comments on Facebook, this study aims to investigate the prevalence and impact of hate speech targeting Carlos Yulo on social media platforms. This study also examines the intersection of Filipino culture and online hate speech, and how cultural factors can influence the language and discourse. Ultimately, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of online hate speech and its potential consequences, informing strategies for prevention and mitigation.

### METHODOLOGY

Content analysis was employed to analyze online discourse related to Carlos Yulo and the concept of filial piety. Through purposive sampling, 100 comments were selected from Yulo's official statement posted by Inquirer.net on Facebook. The comments chosen were those considered most relevant and with high engagement. The post has garnered 22 million views and 42,000 comments which allows the researchers to identify and analyze a diverse range of perspectives. Comments that were unrelated to this theme, such as general sports commentary or personal attacks not tied to filial piety, were excluded from the analysis.

The first step of the analysis involved coding and categorizing the collected comments based on Mondal et al.'s framework. This included identifying instances of direct attacks, discrimination, dehumanization, and incitement to violence. Additionally, the comments were categorized based on their emotional tone, such as anger, hatred, or sarcasm.

Further, to delve deeper into the underlying intentions of individuals who engage in hate speech targeting Carlos Yulo, Kreidler's theory of hate speech was applied. This theory identifies five primary intentions: mocking, accusing, blaming, insulting, and insinuating. By analyzing the comments, it was possible to identify which of these intentions were most prevalent and how they were used to attack Yulo's character and reputation.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of Facebook comments revealed a significant volume of hateful rhetoric targeting Carlos Yulo, frequently fueled by a toxic mix of personal attacks, dehumanization, and discriminatory language. The findings underscore the alarming prevalence of online harassment, demonstrating how readily accessible platforms like Facebook can be weaponized to spread hatred and incite prejudice.

#### Types of Hate Speech Prevalent in the Online Discourse Targeting Carlos Yulo

Table 1

*Types of Hate Speech Prevalent in the  
Online Discourse Targeting Carlos Yulo*



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

Types of Hate Speech	Code	Frequency (%)
Behavior	CMT-02, CMT-04,	30
	CMT-13, CMT-17,	
	CMT-21, CMT-23,	
	CMT-26, CMT-31,	
	CMT-32, CMT-36,	
	CMT-37, CMT-39,	
	CMT-47, CMT-51,	
	CMT-55, CMT-58,	
	CMT-59, CMT-66,	
	CMT-67, CMT-69,	
	CMT-73, CMT-75,	
	CMT-76, CMT-78,	
	CMT-79, CMT-82,	
	CMT-84, CMT-86,	
	CMT-87, CMT-88	
Class	CMT-03, CMT-05,	45
	CMT-06, CMT-08,	
	CMT-09, CMT-10,	
	CMT-14, CMT-15,	
	CMT-16, CMT-18,	
	CMT-19, CMT-20,	
	CMT-24, CMT-25,	
	CMT-27, CMT-33,	
	CMT-34, CMT-35,	
	CMT-40, CMT-41,	
	CMT-43, CMT-46,	
	CMT-48, CMT-53,	
	CMT-56, CMT-60,	
	CMT-61, CMT-62,	
	CMT-63, CMT-72,	
	CMT-74, CMT-80,	
	CMT-81, CMT-83,	
	CMT-85, CMT-90,	
	CMT-92, CMT-93,	
	CMT-94, CMT-95,	
Physical	CMT-96, CMT-97,	6
	CMT-98, CMT-99,	
	CMT-100	
	CMT-29, CMT-30,	
	CMT-38, CMT-42,	
	CMT-64. CMT-65	



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

<b>Disability</b>	CMT-01, CMT-07, CMT-12, CMT-44, CMT-45, CMT-48, CMT-50, CMT-57, CMT-70, CMT-71	10
<b>Gender</b>	CMT-54, CMT-28	2
<b>Religion</b>	CMT-11, CMT- 22, CMT-77	3

Table 1 presents the diverse types of hate speech identified within the Facebook comments analyzed for this study. The findings paint a disturbing picture of the online harassment faced by Carlos Yulo, revealing a multifaceted landscape of hate speech that extends beyond mere insults.

**Class.** Comments which belong in this type of hate speech often reflect judgments based on social and economic status, using class to demean or belittle the individuals involved. This use of class-based hate speech frequently serves to amplify negative stereotypes, painting individuals as unworthy or incapable based solely on societal prejudices tied to economic or social position. An illustrative example of this hate speech class is seen from CMT-06.

*Wala kang kwentang anak! Wala ka ngayon kung wala sila.* (You're a worthless child! You wouldn't be where you are now without them.)

The term “worthless child” is a direct assault on Yulo’s perceived quality or value as a person. It is not just criticizing an action; it is demeaning his entire being. The subsequent statement, “you wouldn’t be where you are without them,” while seemingly a statement of fact about his parents’ role, is used here to diminish his own achievements and attribute his success solely to his lineage. This subtly implies that his current standing is not a result of his own talent and hard work but rather a byproduct of his familial connections.

In CMT-34 as illustrated below,

*Bugok ang kapal mo magulang un kahit gastosin niya pera mo OK nanay mo yan hind ka sisikat kong wla magulang mo bugok ka suntukin ko mokam mo.* (You're stupid and thick-faced. That's your parent, even if they spend your money, it's okay, that's your mother. You wouldn't be famous if not for your parents, you're stupid. I'll punch your face.) the language is overtly derogatory and aggressive. Calling him “bugok” (stupid) attacks his intellectual capacity and, by extension, his perceived quality. The phrase “kapal mo” (thick-faced) suggests a lack of shame or refinement, further denigrating his social standing or class in terms of acceptable behavior. The argument that “even if they spend your money, it’s okay, that’s your mother” introduces a financial dimension, implying an obligation based on familial ties regardless of perceived fairness. The assertion “you wouldn’t be famous if not for your parents” directly undermines his individual merit and attributes his success - his current class or social standing - entirely to his parents. This



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

dismisses his own efforts and talents. The repetition of “bugok ka” reinforces the negative judgment of his inherent quality.

This type of class-based hate speech often draws upon societal norms and expectations around family, success, and gratitude. When individuals deviate from these perceived norms, they can become targets of harsh judgment and denigration, as seen in these comments. This again aligns with the study of Billingham and Parr (2020) stating that public shaming such as online hate speech enforces valuable social norms - rules of behavior that ought to govern our conduct relation to one another. Public shaming can highlight violations of these norms, reaffirm the importance of compliance, help in causing the norm violator to repent, and deter future violations.

**Behavior.** Behavior is another type of hate speech which is directed at an individual’s perceived actions or lifestyles. It is a crucial point to recognize that behavior, or rather, the perception and judgment of an individual’s actions and lifestyle, can indeed become a vehicle for hate speech. When scrutinizing the language used in the social media comment about Carlos Yulo through this lens, it can be identified how these statements, seemingly focused on Yulo’s choices, can devolve into harmful rhetoric. An example of this is evident in the CMT-51 and CMT-70,

*Putang ina mo . Wala Kang utang na loob. Nanay mo binastos mo. Magkakarma ka rin. Babagsak at babagsak ka dong. Trust and believe it's not right away but it's coming. Every tears nang nanay mo kapalit pagguho mo. (Son of a bitch. You have no gratitude. You insulted your mother. You will face the consequences. You will fall, and you will fall hard. Trust me, it might not happen right away, but it's coming. Every tear your mother shed will be repaid with your downfall.) (CMT-51)*

*Bwisit kang anak makakarma ka din saksak mo sa бага mo malunod ka. Tanga ka nanay mo un mas mahalaga sayo si Goldie. You're such a burden and karma will hit you soon. Keep it in your mind you will drown. You're such a stupid, that's your mother, what is important to you is Goldie. You're such an annoying child! You'll get what's coming to you, you'll choke on your words. You're so stupid, you'll drown. Your mother is more important than Goldie. You're such a burden and karma will hit you soon. Keep it in mind you will drown. You're such a stupid, that's your mother, what is important to you is Goldie. (CMT-70)*

The language used in CMT-51 is overly aggressive and dehumanizing right from the start with “son of a bitch.” This isn’t just strong disapproval; it’s a direct insult aimed at Yulo’s very being, likely intended to strip him of his dignity. The accusation of lacking gratitude and insulting his mother serves as the justification for the subsequent hateful pronouncements. The phrases “you will fall, and you will fall hard” and “every tear your mother shed will be repaid with your downfall” are not mere predictions; they are malicious wishes, bordering on curses. This kind of language creates an environment of hostility and projects a desire for the target’s suffering, all predicated on a specific perceived behavior.

Moving to CMT-70, this escalates the personal attacks. Calling Yulo an “an annoying child” and “stupid” are infantilizing and belittling. The threats become more visceral: “you’ll choke on your words, “you’ll drown.” These aren’t just abstract consequences; they evoke images of suffering and even death. The repeated assertion that “your mother is more important than Goldie”



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

attempts to dictate his emotional priorities and further condemn his perceived misbehavior. Labelling him a “burden” adds another layer of negative judgment, suggesting his existence itself is unwelcome. The invocation of “karma” reinforces the idea that he deserves negative repercussions for his actions.

The comments above suggest that the speaker believes that actions have consequences, particularly when they involve hurtful treatment of others, especially family members. Filipino culture often emphasizes family loyalty and utang na loob or a debt of gratitude, where children are expected to honor their parents by showing respect, obedience, and care.

In Filipino culture, the emotional suffering of a parent, particularly a mother, due to the actions of their child is often seen as a reflection of the child’s moral failings. It is commonly believed that a disrespectful or ungrateful child will face misfortune as a form of divine retribution or karmic consequence, in line with the idea that negative actions toward parents will eventually lead to personal downfall.

**Disability.** This type of hate speech specifically targets individuals based on their physical or mental disabilities or judgment that includes slurs, mocking language, and exclusionary rhetoric that reinforce negative stereotypes about people with disabilities. This is seen in CMT-01.

*Simula ng nung ipinanganak? sinong b ga alaga sayo, Wala kang betlog nakadifikit ka paka guess girlfriend mo Respotohin mo ang MAGULANG MO. (Since when were you born? Who took care of you? You have no balls, you’re still attached to your girlfriend. Respect your PARENTS.) (CMT-01)*

The phrase “wala kang betlog” literally translates to “you have no testicles.” In Filipino culture, and many others, this is often used metaphorically to imply a lack of courage, strength, or masculinity. While not directly a disability term, it taps into societal expectations and stereotypes about what it means to be “a real man.” It suggests weakness and inadequacy, which can unfortunately mirror how people with certain disabilities are unfairly perceived as less capable or “manly.” This is not about physical ability in a literal sense, but it uses a physical attribute, or the lack thereof, to attack someone’s character and perceived weakness.

Another comment (CMT-70) questions Yulo’s memory and his understanding of his relationship with his mother.

*Kaya di mo nakalimutan yon? Nanay mo yan,,, Ano kang klase?,,, puro ka Chloe,,, cno ba yan? Nanay mo yan,,,,, interview mo yan,, di sya dapat dyan,,,, tagalog pls,,,, Wala ka kcing klase ng anak,,, Chloe,, Chloe Chloe,,,,, di ba binili ng bahay,,,,, nakakahiya ka Caloy,,,,, magaling ka lang sa gymnastic Pero Wala kang utak. (So you can't forget that? That's your mother... What kind of person are you?... It's always Chloe... who is that? That's your mother... interview her... she shouldn't be there... Tagalog please... You're such a classless child... Chloe, Chloe, Chloe... didn't she buy a house?... You're embarrassing, Caloy... You're only good at gymnastics but you have no brain.)*

It was explicitly stated in the comment “you have no brain,” directly attacking his intelligence





## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

and cognitive function. The contrasting statement “you’re only good at gymnastics” further diminishes his overall worth, suggesting his physical skill is his sole attribute and that he lacks intellectual capacity. This is a blatant example of language that aligns with hate speech targeting disability. It uses a crude and dehumanizing term to deny his cognitive abilities. The “only good at...” construction is a common way to diminish the achievements of individuals from marginalized groups, suggesting their skills are somehow less valid due to a perceived deficit in other areas.

**Physical.** Hate speech that targets a person's or group's outward appearance, or behavior fosters harmful stereotypes and snap judgments. Essentially, it promotes the idea that someone's worth is determined by their looks, not their character. An example that demonstrates this type of hate speech is in the following statement from CMT-42:

*Kahit anong sabihin mo wala ka pa ring utang na loob kung ako ang nanay mo isusumpa kita wala kang kuwentang anak yang liit mo na yan ang liit din ng utak mo karmahin ka sana.* (No matter what you say, you still have no gratitude. If I were your mother, I would curse you. You’re such a useless child, so small and your brain is small. I hope karma comes your way.)

While the initial part of the comment reiterates the accusations of ingratitude and even threatens a curse, the phrase “you’re so small and your brain is small” is where the focus shifts to his physical stature in a derogatory and hateful manner. It’s an attempt to link his physical size to his intelligence, and by extension, his worth as a person.

By commenting on his physical appearance, the commenter is attempting to belittle and demean him on a fundamental level, something inherent and often outside of an individual’s control. This taps into a particularly insidious form of online hate speech because it targets something deeply personal and can contribute to feelings of inadequacy and shame.

The phrase “your brain is also small” is a particularly harmful extension of the attack on his physical size. It uses a physical attribute to make a sweeping and negative judgment about his intellectual capacity. This kind of language is designed to be deeply insulting and to strip away his dignity, not just as an athlete but as a human being. It plays harmful stereotypes and prejudices that equate physical size with intelligence or capability, which are often unfounded and discriminatory.

**Gender.** Gender hate speech is a powerful tool in perpetuating gender inequality and undermining efforts toward achieving gender equality and respect for all identities. An illustrative example of this behavior is evident in the comment CMT-28 and CMT-54:

*You and your big mouth bakla ka stupid pati yang girlfriend mo mukhang daga puro Pera kayo.* (You and your big mouth, you're gay stupid, even your girlfriend looks like a rat, all you care about is money.) (CMT-28)

The word “gay” in this context is used in a derogatory manner, implying that being gay is inherently negative or inferior. This usage reflects a harmful societal stereotype that associates



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

being gay with weakness, undesirability, or shame. Such language serves to marginalize LGBTQ+ individuals and perpetuates discrimination against them based on their sexual identity. Similarly, CMT-54 presents the same with the word “gay” used in a derogatory manner as exemplified in the excerpt below.

*Kapal din ng mukha mo bilang anak , ma kwenta kang tao magulang mo yan Madaldal ka rin caloy. magulang mo yan marites ka baka bakla ka.* (You have such a thick face as a child, you're a calculating person, those are your parents, you're also talkative Caloy. Those are your parents, you're a gossip (Marites), you might be gay.) (CMT-54)

On the surface, the phrase “baka bakla ka (you might be gay)” in CMT-54 might seem like just asking about someone’s sexual orientation. But in this context, especially the following string of negative remarks, it is loaded. It’s not a neutral question. Instead, it is being used as a potential insult. The implication is that being gay is somehow negative or less than, something to be ashamed of or used to demean someone. It suggests that if Yulo were gay, that would somehow validate the other negative things being said to him, like being “makwenta” or “madaldal.”

So, while the initial phrases are criticisms about personality, the final jab using “baka bakla ka” crosses the line into hate speech by employing gender in a derogatory and malicious way to malign Yulo. It is a stark reminder of how language can be weaponized to hurt and marginalize.

By using gay as an insult, the statement reinforces toxic masculinity by suggesting that any deviation from traditional heterosexual norms is something to be ridiculed or belittled. This perpetuates harmful gender norms that enforce the idea that there is only one "acceptable" way to express gender and sexual identity, typically tied to heterosexual and cisgender roles. The derogatory use of gay reinforces societal pressures to conform to these norms, contributing to a culture of intolerance and hostility toward those who do not fit within these rigid gender and sexual boundaries. This is a clear example of how hate speech targeting sexual orientation can reinforce harmful gender stereotypes and perpetuate a climate of exclusion and discrimination.

**Religion.** Religion is significant in the Philippines and often intertwined with sports. Many Filipino athletes, including Carlos Yulo, openly express their faith, which is generally accepted and celebrated. This context of national sporting achievement within a strongly religious cultural landscape sets the stage for examining instances of public commentary directed towards Yulo, particularly those that might employ religious elements in a potentially harmful manner.

In the light of this study, religion as a type of hate speech does not just talk about criticizing religious beliefs. Instead, it is about using religious concepts, doctrines, or accusations of violating religious laws to degrade or dehumanize an individual or group, incite hatred or violence, and discriminate or marginalize. CMT-22 exemplified this hate speech in the excerpt below.

*Walang kapatawaran sa BATAS ng DIOS ang ginagawa mo sa Nanay mo!!! Sana Hindi PIRANHA YANG NASA TABI MO. MAGSISISI KA RIN SA BANDANG HULI!!! TANDAAN MO.YAN UTO UTO.* (There is no forgiveness in the LAW of GOD for what you are doing to your mother!!! I hope the one beside you is not a piranha. You will regret this in the end!!! Remember that, you fool.)





## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

The comment immediately invokes divine law and declares the person's actions as unforgivable in the eyes of God. This is not just an opinion; it is presented as an absolute religious truth. This use of religious authority aims to shut down any possibility of understanding or reconciliation. It paints the person as being in direct violation of a sacred law, positioning them as morally and spiritually reprehensible.

By stating that there is "no forgiveness in the law of God," it contradicts fundamental religious teachings that emphasize divine mercy and redemption. It also weaponizes faith by invoking divine punishment "MAGSISISI KA RIN SA BANDANG HULI!!!" (You will regret this in the end!!!) as a means of control, instilling fear rather than encouraging spiritual growth. The aggressive tone and insults further strip the statement of any genuine religious guidance, turning it into an attack rather than a call for moral reflection.

### Types of Hate Speech Intentions on Facebook Online Comments Targeting Carlos Yulo

Kreidler's (2002) research on the intentions of driving hate speech provides a valuable framework for understanding the hate speech targeting Yulo. Table 2 below offers the frequency of occurrence of the hate speech directed towards the subject of this research, Carlos "Caloy" Yulo.

Types of Hate Speech Intentions	Code	Frequency (%)
Insulting	CMT-02, CMT-04, CMT-13, CMT-17, CMT-21, CMT-23, CMT-26, CMT-31, CMT-32, CMT-36, CMT-37, CMT-39, CMT-47, CMT-51, CMT-55, CMT-58, CMT-59, CMT-66, CMT-67, CMT-69, CMT-73, CMT-75, CMT-76, CMT-78, CMT-79, CMT-82, CMT-84, CMT-86, CMT-87, CMT-88	73
Accusing	CMT-03, CMT-05, CMT-06, CMT-08, CMT-09, CMT-10, CMT-14, CMT-15, CMT-16, CMT-18, CMT-19, CMT-	25



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

	20, CMT-24, CMT-	
	25, CMT-27, CMT-	
	33, CMT-34, CMT-	
	35, CMT-40, CMT-	
	41, CMT-43, CMT-	
	46, CMT-48, CMT-	
	53, CMT-56, CMT-	
	60, CMT-61, CMT-	
	62, CMT-63, CMT-	
	72, CMT-74, CMT-	
	80, CMT-81, CMT-	
	83, CMT-85, CMT-	
	90, CMT-92, CMT-	
	93, CMT-94, CMT-	
	95, CMT-96, CMT-	
	97, CMT-98, CMT-	
	99, CMT-100	
<b>Blaming</b>	CMT-29, CMT-	2
	30, CMT-38, CMT-	
	42, CMT-64. CMT-65	

---

**Insulting.** Kreidler (2002), in his work on hate speech highlights that one of its core aims is to insult - to intentionally offend, humiliate or belittle someone. It is not just about disagreeing with someone's actions; it is about attacking their worth and dignity through language. Hence, hate speech with the intention to insult constitutes a direct assault on an individual's dignity, character, and inherent worth. It employs derogatory language, slurs, and personal attacks to dehumanize the target, reducing them to stereotypes and negative labels.

Unlike other forms of harmful speech, insulting remarks often focus on personal humiliation or offense without necessarily inciting violence or action. The comments below are prime examples of this hate speech intention.

*Simula ng nung ipinanganak? sinong ba nag-alaga sayo, Wala kang betlog nakadikit ka pa sa girlfriend mo. Respotohin mo ang MAGULANG MO.* (Since you were born? Who took care of you? You have no balls; you're still clinging to your girlfriend. Respect your PARENTS.) (CMT-33)

In CMT-33, the statement, *"Wala kang betlog nakadikit ka pa sa girlfriend mo (You have no balls; you're still clinging to your girlfriend)"* is not a critique of Yulo's athletic performance or even his personal choices. Instead, it is a direct assault on his masculinity and independence. The phrase *"walang betlog"* is a deeply derogatory expression, questioning his courage and maturity. Linking him to his girlfriend

Meanwhile, the opening in CMT-09 immediately sets a derogatory tone. "Loslos" in this context conveys weakness, ineptitude, and a lack of substance. It is a direct attack on Yulo's



character, suggesting he is somehow deficient.

*Loslos nimo carlos! katiting lang yan sa naabot mo at kung paano ka nabubuhay Sa mundo kung bakit nariyan kana sa iyong kinaroroonan ngayon. Diba? Kong wala pa ang mga magulang mo or nanay mararating moba? Kabaliwan mo lang yN sa babae na suwail. Darating ang panahon na manlalamig ang bawat isa sa inyong relasyon at sana makayanan mo yan unang pagibig pa namn yan na iyong ikababaliw. ( You're so weak, Carlos! That's just a tiny fraction of what you've achieved and how you live in this world, which is why you are where you are now. Right? If your parents or mother weren't there, would you have reached this point? That's just your foolishness over a disobedient woman. The time will come when your relationship cools down, and I hope you can handle that since it's your first love that you're going crazy over.) (CMT-09)*

This is not constructive feedback; it is a personal belittlement. In the following statement (*That's just a tiny fraction of what you've achieved and how you live in this world, which is why you are where you are now*), it diminishes his accomplishments and current standing. By calling his achievements a “tiny fraction,” the commenter attempts to undermine his work and success. It implies that whatever he has achieved is insignificant, thus belittling his efforts and talent.

Similar to the previous comment, this subsequent statement, “Right? If your parents or mother weren't there, would you have reached this point?” questions Yulo’s self-sufficiency and attributes his success solely to his parents. It negates his own agency, dedication, and skill. This is a common tactic in insults - to strip away an individual’s personal merit and attribute their achievements to external factors.

Additionally, calling his affection for his partner “*kabaliwan*” is demeaning to his emotions and personal choices. Labeling his partner as “*suwail*” further adds a negative judgment, not just on his partner but implicitly on Yulo for choosing such a person. This delves into personal matters with the clear intention to criticize and humiliate.

CMT-67 opens a direct and emotionally charged accusation: “*Naku INGRATO ka (Oh, you INGRATE.).*” This is exemplified in the comment below:

*Naku INGRATO ka...kung wala na sayo yon bat Anjan ka dakdak ng dakdak...sa dami mong pera ngayon barya n lng yon..at nakita mo nm n ipinagawa ng bahay..ang masakit sa ina mo mas ponaboran mo yang Goldie girl mo..ipinalit mo sa pamilya mo. (Oh, you INGRATE...if you don't have it anymore, why are you still there blabbering on and on...with all your money now, that's just small change...and you've seen what was done to the house...what hurts your mother is that you favor that Goldie girl of yours more...you've replaced your family with her.)*

As discussed before, “ingrato” (ungrateful) is a particularly stinging insult in Filipino culture, striking at a deeply held value of reciprocity and appreciation for familial support. In the Philippine context, utang na loob refers to an obligation to appropriately repay a person who has done one a favor, one that is impossible to quantify as it involves a deep personal and internal dimension (Pe-Pua & Protacio-Marcelino, 2000). In the case of the comment, Yulo’s parents. Agaton (2017) said that upholding this moral obligation to the family is an implicit requirement as a form of gratitude for the favors received. In fact, a study has shown that feelings related to indebtedness



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

and shame are more present in a country that highlights the importance of togetherness (De Leersnyder et al., 2020)

This sense of indebtedness is something that a Filipino learns from his parents and community so much that if he fails to acknowledge or repay an utang na loob, he will be called “walang utang na loob,” which means “without utang na loob.” To be called walang utang na loob implies that a person is walang hiya, which means “without shame.” To be called “walang hiya” in the Philippines is a derogatory comment (de la Peña, 2024).

In addition, the statement “sa dami mong pera ngayon barya na lang yon” (with all your money now, that’s just small change) attempts to minimize the significance of the money used for the house renovations mentioned earlier. By calling it “barya lang”, the commenter implies that Yulo’s financial contributions are insignificant compared to the perceived emotional betrayal. This subtly shifts the focus from any positive action he might have taken to his alleged mistreatment of his family.

The emotional crux of the insult lies in “ang masakit sa ina mo mas ponaboran mo yang Goldie girl mo..ipinalit mo sa pamilya mo” (what hurts your mother is that you favor that Goldie girl of yours more...you’ve replaced your family with her). This is a direct accusation of prioritizing his romantic partner over his own family, particularly his mother. This emphasizes the powerful emotional bond between a mother and a child and accuses Yulo of a profound betrayal. It paints him as someone who has abandoned his familial obligations for a romantic relationship, a narrative likely to evoke strong negative reactions.

The language used in CMT-67 is deliberately chosen to inflict emotional pain and shame. The direct accusation of ingratitude, the dismissal of his voice, the minimization of his potential contributions, and the stark portrayal of him choosing his partner over his family are all designed to wound.

In essence, all these comments employ derogatory language, personal attacks, a disrespectful tone, and aim to humiliate Yulo, aligning directly with Kreidler’s concept of insulting as a primary intention within hate speech. They move far beyond any form of constructive feedback, instead focusing on inflicting emotional harm through demeaning and offensive language.

**Accusing.** While Kreidler’s work encompasses various forms of aggressive communication, the aspect most relevant here is how language can be used to attack someone’s character, values, and even their very being. Accusations, especially those laced with strong negative emotions and assumptions, fit squarely within this framework. This is illustrated in the following comments.

*Saksak mo sa bunganga mo ang pera mo sana hanggang dyan ka na lang mayabang ka sa pera , palibhasay now ka lang sa pera , dahil sa pera nakalimutan mo na may pamilya kang pinanggalingan, dahil sa pera sinira mo ang reputasyon ng pamilya mo sana d ka na lang binuhay ng mga magulang mo , ang sama mong anak naka pera ka lang lumaki ang ulo mo, tama ang mama mo kaya may dahilan syang hindi ka suportahan sa laban mo kasi yan ang ugali mo, kung ako lang ang magulang mo kinasuhan na kita sa paninirang puri ng pamilya mo mismo, mas naniwala ka sa babae mo kaysa sa magulang mo.* (Shove your money in your mouth, I hope you stay just like that, you’re arrogant because of money. It’s because you just got money, because of money you forgot the family you came from, because of money you ruined your family’s



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

reputation. I wish your parents hadn't even given birth to you, you're such a bad child, you just got money and your head grew big. Your mother is right, that's why she has a reason not to support you in your fight because that's your attitude. If I were your parent, I would have sued you for defaming your own family. You believed your girlfriend more than your parents.) (CMT-17)

The phrase “*mayabang ka sa pera*” (*you're arrogant because of money*) directly accuses Yulo of a negative character trait fueled by his financial success. The accusations escalate with claims that he has “forgotten the family you came from” and “ruined your family’s

reputation” because of money. This is a direct indictment of his character and actions, linking his success to moral failings and familial betrayal. The truly venomous line, “I wish your parents hadn’t even given birth to you,” is a complete rejection of his existence, a profound act of verbal aggression.

Calling him “*a bad child*” and stating his “*head grew big*” after getting money further solidifies the accusation of a spoiled, ungrateful

individual. The commenter even claims Yulo’s mother is justified in not supporting him because of his attitude, presenting this as an established negative truth. The hypothetical threat of a lawsuit for “defaming your own family” is another layer of accusation, suggesting criminal or at least severely damaging behavior.

Finally, the accusation that he “*believed your girlfriend more than your parents*” paints him as disloyal and misguided. The sheer volume and intensity of these accusations, coupled with the hateful wish for non-existence, strongly suggest a malicious intent beyond mere criticism.

Consequently, the comment below focuses on accusations of arrogance and lack of compassion.

*Lumaki n ang ulo mo, wala kang awa sa nanay mo.* Your head has grown big; you have no pity for your mother. (CMT-35)

The imagery of a “big head” is a common metaphor for arrogance and pride, directly attacking his humility. The accusation of having “no pity” for his mother is a serious moral judgment, portraying him as heartless and ungrateful towards a fundamental familial relationship. CMT-35 suggests a profound failing in his emotional and moral character.

Each of these comments, through their specific word choices and direct pronouncements, functions as an accusation against Carlos Yulo. They attack his character, his values, his relationships, and even his worth as a person. Words like “*mayabang*,” “*mukhang pera*,” “*lumaki ang ulo*,” “*walang awa*,” and “*immature*” are loaded with negative connotations, serving to condemn his behavior and paint him in a highly unfavorable light.

When viewed through the lens of Kreidler’s theory, these are not just opinions; they are verbal assaults intended to harm his reputation and emotional well-being, potentially stemming from a place of anger

and resentment, fitting the description of hate speech intention as it claims harmful and immoral conduct.

**Blaming.** Blaming is the act of transferring responsibility for a problem, mistake, or wrong to





## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

another person, which can happen in personal, professional, or societal settings. It can take many forms, including personal blame, structural blame, and victim blame. This is evident in the following comments.

*Maski Magkano, nanay mo yan. Wala ka dito kung wala ang nanay mo!’ Karma will soon be on your side. No matter what, that’s your mother. You wouldn’t be here if it weren’t for your mother! Karma will soon be on your side. (CMT-03)*

The first part “maski magkano, nanay mo yan” functions as a direct reminder of a fundamental filial obligation. It implies Carlos Yulo’s perceived focus on wealth or achievement is irrelevant when it comes to his relationship with his mother. It sets up a moral imperative: regardless of your success, your mother deserves your respect and consideration. This implicitly blames him for potentially acting in a way that disregards this obligation.

The second part, “Wala ka dito kung wala ang nanay mo!” is a powerful statement of origin and dependence. It highlights the mother’s foundational role in his very existence. By stating this so directly, the commenter is essentially saying, “You owe everything to your mother.” This creates a sense of indebtedness and, by extension, blames him if he is perceived to be disrespecting or neglecting the person who brought him into the world. It is a guilt-inducing statement that places the responsibility squarely on Carlos Yulo’s shoulders.

Finally, the ominous declaration, “Karma will soon be on your side,” isn’t just a prediction; it’s a moral judgment and a threat disguised as a natural consequence. By invoking karma, the commenter suggests that Carlos Yulo’s actions (or inactions) towards his mother are inherently wrong and will inevitably lead to negative repercussions. This is a clear act of blaming him for behavior that the commenter believes will be punished by a higher power or the universe itself.

In another comment, the statement directly places the blame for the continuation of the issue squarely on Carlos Yulo. The use of “if only” highlights a sense of regret and assigns responsibility to his actions (or lack thereof, in this case, not remaining silent).

*This issue should have stopped if only the son, CARLOS YULO, had opted to shut his mouth...no more clarification! But he preferred to talk in the guise of clarifying some embarrassing issues which involve mainly money matters. Somebody friends to both parties should go out of their way to help. KAHIIYA HIYA TALAGA! (Really embarrassing!) (CMT-14)*

The part “no more clarification! But he preferred to talk in the guise of clarifying some embarrassing issues which involve mainly money matters,” further intensifies the blaming by suggesting that Carlos Yulo attempts to clarify the situation were insincere (in the guise of clarifying). It implies that his motives were disingenuous and that his speaking out was a deliberate choice that exacerbated the problem, especially concerning “embarrassing issues which involve mainly money matters.”

In essence, the comments are structured to place blame on Carlos Yulo. It reminds him of his filial duty, his dependence on his mother, and predicts negative consequences for any perceived mistreatment. The language used is direct, emotionally charged, and leaves little room for interpretation - it unequivocally points the finger of blame at him.



### **The Intersection of Filipino Culture of Family Orientedness and Online Hate Speech and Its Effect to the Language Used in Social Media**

The initial analysis reveals a critical juncture where the revered tenets of Filipino family-orientedness collide with the often-unrestrained nature of online discourse, using the case of Carlos Yulo as a potent example. To further dissect this complex interplay, I delved deeper into the intricacies of filial piety and utang na loob, exploring how these cultural cornerstones shape expectations and fuel the vitriolic language observed in the digital sphere.

Menguin (2023) identifies “utang na loob” as a deeply valued and widespread behavioral norm in Filipino culture, common across various ethnic groups. Filipinos are taught this concept early in life, and it generally holds positive and significant influence. With the right mindset, Utang na Loob can manifest as acts of generosity and gratitude. Samuels (2020) connects the term to “Tanaw,” which means to glimpse, reflect upon, or look back. Growing up in the Philippines, it's a common experience to hear elders advice, “Huwag mong kalimutan tumanaw ng Utang na Loob,” urging one not to forget to acknowledge this debt of gratitude.

According to Uy (2023), the concept of filial piety stands as a prominent cornerstone of Filipino dynamics, underscoring the deep reverence and respect children are culturally obligated to exhibit towards their parents. In support, Garcia and Santos (2021) and Cruz (2020), assert that within Filipino culture, filial piety is a foundational principle demanding respect, gratitude, and a sense of duty directed at parents and elders. Filipino adults anticipate their offspring to provide care and support for their parents, driven by a sense of duty and obligation rooted in the Filipino value of “utang na loob” or debt of gratitude (Medina & Medina, 2023).

This cultural expectation extends beyond mere feelings, requiring children to demonstrate their honor through concrete actions of support for their parents as they transition into adulthood. This respect manifests in various ways, from using honorifics to seeking parental consent in major life decisions and, crucially, prioritizing the family's honor and well-being above individual desires.

These established cultural norms discussed above surrounding filial piety provide a crucial lens through which to understand the intense online backlash and hate speech directed at Carlos Yulo. The expectation within Filipino culture, as highlighted by Uy (2023) and further elaborated by Garcia and Santos (2021) and Cruz (2020), is that adult children carry a responsibility to honor and support their parents in tangible ways. When Yulo's public statements or actions are perceived as contravening this deeply ingrained cultural expectation - particularly concerning embarrassing issues which involve mainly money matters, as previous comments indicated - it triggers a strong sense of moral outrage among those who adhere to these traditional values. This perceived betrayal of familial solidarity becomes a lightning rod for online condemnation.

The hate speech directed at Yulo often employs language that directly attacks his perceived failure to uphold filial piety. Accusations of prioritizing “pera lang” (just money) over his mother, as seen in earlier comments, directly contradict the cultural emphasis on tangible support and the implied prioritization of parental well-being. The exclamation “KAHIYA-HIYA TALAGA!” (It's really shameful!) reflects the deep sense of cultural offense taken when an individual, especially in the public eye, is seen as disrespecting or neglecting their filial duties.

Furthermore, the concept of utang na loob adds another layer of complexity. This debt of gratitude owed to parents is not a finite obligation that can be repaid with material goods or



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

services. It is often considered lifelong and encompassing, rooted in the understanding that parents have provided the very foundation of one's existence and well-being. This creates an immense pressure to not only respect but to also to perpetually honor and care for parents. Any action that could be seen as causing them distress or jeopardizing their reputation can be interpreted as a profound act of ingratitude, a direct violation of *utang na loob*. The comment emphasizing, “Wala ka dito kung wala ang nanay mo!” powerful evokes this sentiment. It reminds Yulo, and the online audience, of the fundamental debt he owes, framing any perceived conflict as a deeply personal and almost existential betrayal. This cultural lens amplifies the perceived severity of Yulo's actions, transforming a potentially private matter into a public spectacle of perceived filial impiety. The harsh and blaming language used in the hate speech against Yulo often stems from this perception that he has not only failed to show proper respect but has also potentially betrayed the immense *utang na loob* he owes his mother.

The comments analyzed also reveal a tendency to conflate public persona with private obligations. Yulo's status as a “sport hero” ironically intensifies the scrutiny. In a culture that often values humility and downplays individual achievement in favor of collective family honor, his public profile makes any perceived misstep even more visible and, consequently, more harshly judged. The expectation is that his success should be a source of familial pride, and any action that seemingly undermines this pride, such as engaging in public disputes or being perceived as disrespectful towards family, is met with amplified disapproval. The comment stating, “sport hero ka na humility has a blessing from God. Pag ganyan ka Caloy you are just nothing,” highlights this expectation that public figures should embody not only talent but also exemplary adherence to traditional values, including filial piety.

Additional online comments analyzed earlier, such as the direct blaming for not “shutting his mouth” and the dismissal of his achievements when perceived filial piety is lacking (“you are just nothing”), demonstrate how deeply this cultural value influences the language used in the hate speech. The intensity and emotional charge

of these comments are rooted in the perceived violation of a fundamental cultural principle. The expectation is not just for private respect but also for a public demonstration of honoring one's parents, and any deviation can lead to harsh public judgment, particularly in the amplified and often unforgiving space of social media.

Moreover, the interpretation of Yulo's actions is often filtered through existing cultural narratives and biases. The comments referencing “money matters” hint at potential underlying societal anxieties about wealth, fame, and their impact on traditional family structures. There might be a suspicion that Yulo's success has somehow distanced him from traditional values or led to conflicts within the family. These pre-existing cultural anxieties can be easily projected onto Yulo's situation, further fueling the negative online commentary.

The religious undertones in some comments, such as the reference to loving one's mother as a biblical commandment, further underscore the moral weight attributed to filial piety in Filipino culture. The intertwining of religious and cultural values elevates the expectation of respect for parents to a sacred duty, making any perceived violation not just a social faux pas but a moral failing.

The digital realm acts as an accelerant in this dynamic. Social media platforms provide an immediate and often anonymous avenue for expressing outrage and moral judgment. The lack of



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

face-to-face interaction can lead to a disinhibition effect, where individuals feel more comfortable expressing opinions and resorting to harsher language than they might in person. The viral nature of online content allows negative sentiments to spread rapidly, creating a collective echo chamber that reinforces and amplifies the initial criticisms. This online mob mentality, fueled by shared cultural values, can quickly escalate into targeted hate speech, where blame morphs into personal attacks and character assassination, as seen in comments that questioned Yulo's motives and even his worth as an individual.

In conclusion, the online hate speech directed at Carlos Yulo is a complex phenomenon rooted in the deeply ingrained Filipino cultural values of filial piety and utang na loob. These values create a strong framework of expectations regarding familial respect, obedience, and gratitude. When Yulo's actions are perceived as transgressing these norms, particularly in the public eye, they trigger intense emotional responses, amplified by the immediacy and anonymity of social media. The language used in these online attacks, ranging from disappointment

and blame to outright condemnation and moral judgment, reflects the profound significance of these cultural values and the perceived severity of their violation. Understanding this cultural context is crucial not only for analyzing the specific case of Yulo but also for comprehending the broader dynamics of online hate speech within the Philippines and for developing culturally sensitive approaches to the intersection of tradition and modernity in the digital age, ensuring that cherished cultural values do not become instruments of online shaming and abuse.

The findings of this analysis emphasizes that while freedom of expression is a fundamental human right, it is not absolute. Hate speech, particularly when it incites discrimination, hostility, or violence, can directly undermine the dignity and rights of individuals and groups. In the context of online platforms, the rapid dissemination of and amplification of hate speech can have significant social and psychological consequences.

This research recognizes the inherent value of freedom of speech and expression. However, it acknowledges that the unchecked and harmful use of cyberspace to propagate hate speech and discrimination cannot be condoned in a civilized society. Online platforms, while offering valuable avenues for communication and information sharing, can also become breeding grounds for harmful rhetoric that targets individuals and groups, as potentially seen in the case of Carlos Yulo and his family. This study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the impact of online hate speech and the need for responsible online behavior that respects the dignity and rights of all individuals.

### CONCLUSION

The analysis of online hate speech targeting Carlos "Caloy" Yulo reveals a significant intersection between this digital phenomenon and deeply ingrained Filipino cultural values, specifically filial piety, utang na loob, and the concept of hiya. While the initial study correctly identifies the focus on personal behavior and societal expectations, a more nuanced understanding emerges by examining how these cultural constructs influence the language and framing of the negative comments.

The strong emphasis on honoring one's parents in Filipino culture creates a fertile ground for criticism when perceived deviations occur. Yulo's decisions or actions, when interpreted as disrespectful or ungrateful towards his parents, likely trigger strong emotional



## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

responses rooted in this cultural imperative. The concept of utang na loob further intensifies this, suggesting that children owe their parents an immeasurable debt for their upbringing and sacrifices. Consequently, any perceived failure to acknowledge or repay this debt can be met with harsh judgment.

The online commentary suggests that Yulo's actions were interpreted by some as causing *hiya* (shame) to his parents, thus justifying the harshness of their language. This is evident not just in direct insults but also in insinuations and blame, which subtly or overtly accuse Yulo of violating these cultural norms and bringing shame upon his family.

The relatively lower incidence of identity-based hate speech (race, religion, etc.) underscores that the primary driver of the online vitriol in this case is the perceived transgression of cultural expectations related to family honor and filial duty. These findings shed valuable light on the tendency of social media users to engage in judgmental and hostile interactions, emphasizing the need for responsible digital engagement and better moderation efforts to foster more constructive discussions online.

These findings not only provide insight into the nature of hate speech in social media discussions but also underscore the varied intentions behind negative comments, ranging from insults and accusations to subtle insinuations and blame, all of which contribute to an increasingly hostile online environment. The data highlights how emotional reactions often take precedence over rational discourse, shaping the way people engage with sensitive issues. This underscores the need for digital responsibility and constructive online interactions to foster a more respectful and meaningful public discussion.

Furthermore, the influence of Filipino cultural values plays a crucial role in shaping public discourse on this issue. Many negative comments reflect the deeply ingrained expectation that children must show absolute obedience and gratitude to their parents, reinforcing traditional notions of filial piety. This suggests that hate speech in this context is not only about personal opinions but also about societal norms and cultural conditioning that dictate how individuals should behave within family structures.

## REFERENCES

Agaton, S. I. (2017). *Vantage Points of Utang na Loob*. Social Ethics and Society Journal of Applied Philosophy, (3), 59-77.

Billingham, P. & Parr, T. (2020). *Online Public Shaming: Virtues and Vices*, Journal of Social Philosophy, 51(3) (2020): 371-390

Cruz, L. (2020). *The evolving sense of responsibility towards aging parents in Filipino culture*. Journal of Filipino Culture and Society, 38(3), 77-90.

de la Peña, M. (2024). *PHILIPPINIANA SACRA*, Vol. LIX, No. 178 ( January-April 2024, Special Issue) pp. 67-82

De Leersnyder, J., Kim, H. S., & Mesquita, B. (2020). *My emotions belong here and there: Extending the phenomenon of emotional acculturation to heritage culture fit*. *Cognition and Emotion*, 34(8), 1573-1590.

Garcia, M., & Santos, S. (2021). *The moral duty of children: Filial piety and utang na loob in Filipino culture*. International Journal of Filipino Culture, 25(3), 115-130.

Gregorio, J., et al. (2023). *Generational tensions and filial piety in Filipino families*.





## KAALAM: A MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

Philippine Journal of Family and Social Studies, 14(2), 54-69.

Kreidler, C. (2013). *Introducing English Semantics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Medina, B., & Medina, M. (2023). *The role of utang na loob in Filipino intergenerational relationships*. *Philippine Journal of Sociology*, 45(3), 76-88.

Menguin, A. (2022). *Understanding utang na loob: A Filipino cultural value with no end*. *Journal of Filipino Culture and Society*, 11(4), 34-48.

Mondal, M., Silva, L. A., & Benevenuto, F. (2017). A measurement study of hate speech in social media. HT 2017 - Proceedings of the 28th ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media, 85–94.

Pan, L., et al. (2022). *Generational conflicts in Filipino families: Challenges of filial piety in modern society*. *Filipino Journal of Social Psychology*, 18(2), 78-92.

Pe-Pua, R., & Protacio-Marcelino, E. A. (2000). *Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino psychology): A legacy of Virgilio G. Enriquez*. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(1), 49-71.

Samuels, R. (2020). The Two Faces of Utang Na Loob. Retrieved from <https://kalamansijuice.com/utang-na-loob>

Uy, L. (2023). *The evolving role of filial piety in Filipino families*. *Journal of Filipino Family Research*, 19(4), 204-220.