Hate Speech In Election 2019: Case Study Of Youth Organizations

Harsih Setiawandari
harsihsetiawandari93@gmail.com

Adis Imam Munandar
School Of Strategic and Global Studies University Of Indonesia, adis.imam@ui.ac.id

Recommended Citation
Setiawandari, Harsih and Munandar, Adis Imam (2021) "Hate Speech In Election 2019: Case Study Of Youth Organizations," Journal of Strategic and Global Studies: Vol. 4 : No. 1 , Article 10.
DOI: 10.7454/jsgs.v4i1.1037
Available at: https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/jsgs/vol4/iss1/10
Hate Speech In 2019 Presidential Election: Case Study of Youth Organizations

Harsih Setiawandari1* and Adis Imam Munandar2

1,2Master of National Resilience Studies, School of Strategic and Global Studies, Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Technology advance such as social media utilization to communicate, to express opinions, to interact with each other, and to discover and share information, but this also has its own susceptive. Its positive effect, social media can be used to accelerate the spreading of information, but the negative effects are the spreading of radical ideas, hate speech, hoaxes, etc. which can threaten the national defense and the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia. This research used complex models and a limited amount of samples so that in the data analysis using Smart-PLS software. Smart-PLS using the bootstrapping methods or random multiplication. The results of the research show that knowledge has a positive impact and significant to the attitude of PMII cadre towards hate speech in the 2019 presidential election with the value of P-Values <0.05 in the amount of 0,000 and value of T-Statistics> 1,98 in the amount of 14,148. This result shows that the higher knowledge of the cadre about the hate speech in the presidential election 2019, the better attitude of PMII cadres to respond to hoaxes and hate speech in the presidential election 2019 to not make, spread, and affected by the hoaxes and hate speech
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1. Introduction

Digital technology advance nowadays more and more advancing make people easier to access the information through the social media freely, without the limit of space and time. The media social advance brings the positive and negative effects. The positive effect is the social media advance can accelerate the spreading of information, but the negative is the spreading of radical ideas, hate speeches, hoaxes etc. which can threaten the national defense and the sovereignty of Republic of Indonesia.

The social media also an alternative for the politicians to communicate with the society (Golbeck, Grimes, & Rogers , 2010); (Graham, Jackson, & Broersma, 2016); (Conway, Kenski, & Wang, 2015). The social media frequently used to spread the informative contents, such as a publication of candidate demonstrations agenda, but the latest research showed that social media also used to spread the false information as a part of politic propaganda (Cerf, 2017); (Chatfield, Reddick, & Choi, 2017)).
The Chief of Presidency Staffs General Retired of Indonesia National Army (TNI) Moeldoko mention that the hoaxes and the hate speeches are challenges itself in the execution of national election in 17th of April 2019. The hate speeches, and the contents which contains false information were spread around, bring to conflict, unsettling the society, and disrupt the nation (Nugroho & Puspita, 2019).

The threatening of Cyber Crime in the form of hate speech is all of the contents which attack people based on race, ethnic, nation, religion, sex, sexual orientation, disability or actual and perceived disease. The legal literatures and academic commonly defines the hate speech to the person or a group of people due to the characteristics they have collectively, or the group which being their parts (Saleem, Dillon, Benesch, & Ruths, 2017).

![Picture 1. Total mentions which contain Hate Speech](source: Drone Emprit)

Based on data above, it can be seen that how much mentions in twitter which contain hate speech in amount of 202,744 mentions during the campaign period until the determination of the results of the KPU (The Commission of National Election) since 23rd of September 2018 to 26th June 2019.

The technology advance such as social media utilization to communicate, to express the opinion, to interact with other, and to discover and sharing the information (Kwok & Wang, 2013), has its own susceptible. The social networking is an easy and efficient communication space, but social networking also take role as a space to spread the hate speech virtually. This
is due to the open platform of popular social networking such as Twitter to distribute hate speech content, sensitive information and disputed topics. The survey of internet users showed that online hate speech has seriously offline consequences either for groups or individuals (Vigna, Cimino, Dell’Orletta, Petrocchi, & Tesconi, 2017). In Kenya, practice of social networking during the post-election not only to support peace and justice, but also as a channel to spread hate speech to the certain groups (Mäkinen & Kuira, 2008). Worry that the danger speech can trigger the violence and force the social media corporation to arrange the policy to stop the spreading of online hate speech (Perry, 2017) (Ross, et al., 2017).

Picture 2. The Sentiment Issues of Hate Speech in Social Media (Twitter)

From the diagram above, it can be seen that in 23rd of September 2018 to 26th of June 2019 was obtained positive sentiment in amount of 3%, negative in amount of 56% and neutral in amount of 41%. Through the Drone Emprit application, the positive sentiment mostly posted on May, negative sentiment mostly posted on the end of January till the start of February and May, while the neutral sentiment mostly posted on October 2018, end of January – start of February, and May.

As a response to it, Pergerakan Mahasiswa Islam Indonesia (Indonesian Moslem Students Movement) – PMII as part of youth generation is required to actively take role to avoid hate speech spreading which can threaten the sovereignty of Republic of Indonesia.
2. Literature Review

2.1. Election

Governance is a skill such as other things: Politicians and public officials are variated in how much they have the skill. Some of them are effective to solve problem and build the consensus, while other committed to public goods and inspiring the trust and confident. The great leaders have all of the characteristics above, and the bad are have not. The important function of the democratic election is to choose the best leader, and the noblest one (Besley, Montalvo, & Reynal-Querol, 2011).

The election in Indonesia is regulated in Undang-Undang Nomor 8 tahun 2012 pasal 1 ayat (1) – Act No. 8 year 2012 article 1 verses (1) Election is a medium of implementation of people sovereignty in The Unitary State of The Republic of Indonesia which based on Pancasila and Undang-Undang Dasar (Constitution) of Indonesia.

The purpose of election in its implementation based on Undang-Undang Nomor 8 tahun 2012 pasal 3 (Act No. 8 year 2012 Article 3) is to select member of DPR, DPRD of Province and DPRD of City/Regency in The Unitary State of The Republic of Indonesia which based on Pancasila and Undang-Undang Dasar (Constitution) of Indonesia 1945.

The definition of election based on the descriptions above is a mechanism to select the leaders of government either in executives (government) or legislative, and to form the democratic, strong government and supported by the society.

2.2. Hate Speech

Hate speech is a speech that has bias motivation, hostility, and bad which addresses to an individual or group of individuals due to their several actual given characteristics or felt (Cohen-Almagor, 2013). The hate speech is all form of expression, verbal or written, which spreading, provoking, promoting or justifying the hate based on intolerant or also based on religion (Pálmadóttir & Kalenikova, 2018). This hate speech commonly spreads through the social media and quickly spreads, so that it can be establishing wrong information, and triggers the wrong assumptions. This can be happened because the state is too late to response through the regulations for the information technology development, especially social media which being a seeding for the hate speech (Banks, 2010).
The form of hate speech which regulated in Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP) – Criminal Law Code and other criminal provisions out of the KUHP in National Committee of Human Rights (2015), are:

- **Insult**

  According to R. Soesilo (2009) in his book “Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP) serta Komentar-Komentarnya Lengkap Pasal Demi Pasal dalam penjelasan Pasal 310 KUHP”, explain that: Insulting is assaulting the honor and reputation of a person.

- **Defamation**

  The definition of Defamation of Reputation in KUHP also known as defamation, is an action to slander the good reputation or honor of a person through the stating expression either verbally or written.

- **Blasphemy**

  Blasphemy is forbidden behavior because can trigger the violence and prejudice, either from the subject of the statement or the victims of the behavior, while according to the Article 310 verse (1) of KUHP, Blasphemy is an action which done by accusing a person or group has done certain act in the intention of accusations can be spread (known by the public). The accused act not only an act that objected by the law such as stealing, defrauding, fornicate, etc.

  The blasphemy with letter is regulated in the Article 310 verses (2) KUHP. As the mentioned, if the accusation has done by the writing (letter) or pictures, so the crime is named blasphemy with letter.

- **Unpleasant Acts**

  A behavior which is offends others feelings. KUHP Article 335 verses (1) regulating about the Unpleasant Acts. Article 335 verse (1): Threatened by imprisonment in longest one year or with forfeit at the most four thousands five hundreds rupiahs.

  Whoever legally against and force person to do, to not do or let something, with
violence other actions or unpleasant acts, or threats of violence, other actions or unpleasant treatment, either to their own selves or other people. (2) Whoever forcing other people to do, to not do or letting somethings with the defamation threats or written defamation.

- Provoking

According to the Big Dictionary of Bahasa Indonesia (KBBI) provoking means an act which done to trigger the anger with instigate, provoke the anger, aggravation and make the people instigated has negative ideas and emotions.

- Instigating

According to R. Soesilo, Instigating means motivate, persuade, or triggering the people to do something. In the word of “instigating” is implied a nature of “purposely”. Instigating is harsher than “attracting” or “persuading” but not “forcing”. The criminal law which regulates about instigation or instigating is in Article 160 of KUHP.

- Spreading Fake Information/News

Spreading of false information according to the National Committee of Human Rights (2015) is spreading the news or information where the information or the news is a lie. What is assumed as fake news is not only informing fabrication news but also telling fake phenomena. All of those actions have certain purpose or affecting to the discriminations, violence, deprivation of life and/or social conflict.

As a part of Indonesia, so that we have to actively take role to keep the peace and unity of the nation. Therefore, we have to against the hate speech together, because the danger of these hate speech is (Nursahid, et al., 2019):

- Humiliating the honor of human being, even the instigation frequently targeted the vulnerable and marginal people;
- Enriching the prejudice and discrimination, instigation of hate can affect the exclusion and discrimination;
- Able to trigger the violence/hostility of hate, material loss and the violence victims based on identity frequently bigger than other violence;
• Able to trigger the conflict, instigation can be broader to be a conflict between groups and the worst is can caused ethnic-cleansing;
• Opposed to the Pancasila and Bhinneka tunggal Ika.

Table 1. The Pole of The Hate Speech in The Presidential election 2019

| No. | Hate Speech                  | Jokowi - Maaruf       | Prabowo - Sandi       |
|-----|------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1   | Name calling                 | Cebong                | Kampret               |
| 2   | Bandwagon/hashtags #Tagar    | #Jokowi2Periode       | #2019GantiPresiden    |
|     |                              | #DiaSibukKerja        |                       |
| 3   | Discourse                    | Nasioalisme -Islam    | Radikal – Anti NKRI   |
| 4   | Constituents                 | Islam                 | Islam                 |

Source: (Tahir, Kusmanto, & Amin, 2020)

3. Method

The method which used in this research is quantitative method. The researchers are wanted to understand the situation deeply and want to analyze further about the implication of knowledge towards PMII cadre behavior to response the hate speech in the Presidential election 2019 which could not be known by quantitative research. The technic of data collecting which used in this research is questionnaire fulfilment. The questionnaire in this research is spread by google form.

This research has complex model and limited sample amount, so that in the data analysis using software SmartPLS. SmartPLS is using bootstrapping method or random multiplication. Therefore, the normality assumption will not be a problem. In the other hand, with the bootstrapping, so the SmartPLS does not require the minimum amount of the samples, so that can be applied to the research with the small amount of samples.

According to the (Ghozali & Latan, 2015), the purpose of PLS-SEM is to develop the theory or buil the theory (prediction orientation). PLS is used to explain is there exist or not the relation between the laten variables (prediction). PLS is a powerful analysis method due to not assume data stream with the measurement of certain scales, small sample amount.
H1: Knowledge of the hate speech has positive and significant implication to the behavior of PMII cadres to response the hate speech in presidential election 2019.

H2: Knowledge of hate speech has no positive and significant implication to the behavior of PMII cadres to response hate speech in presidential election 2019.

4. Result

Survey and analysis to the social media utilization was done in PMII cadres about hate speech in the presidential election 2019 to know the implication of knowledge to the behavior of PMII cadres to response hate speech in presidential election 2019.

To know the implication of knowledge to the behavior of PMII cadres to response hate speech in presidential election 2019, there are several things that we need to do as mention below:

| No. | Variables   | AVE   | Cronbach’s Alpha | Composite Reliability |
|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.  | Knowledge (X) | 0.624 | 0.802             | 0.869                 |
| 2.  | Behavior (Y)  | 0.571 | 0.758             | 0.841                 |

Based on data above is shown that the value of AVE from both variable > 0.5 with the amount of value of Knowledge variable is 0.624 and value of Behavior variable is 0.571. Beside this, the value of cronbach alpha also > 0.7, with the value of knowledge variable in amount of 0.802 and behavior variable 0.758. While for the value of composite reliability, all of the variable in this research also > 0.7, with the value of knowledge variable in the amount of 0.869 and behavior variable in the amount of 0.841. It means that all the variables in this research have the good validity and reliability or all the variables used as tools in this research were consistent. So that the next data analyzing can be continued.
Table 3. Validity Examination and Reliability

| Coefficient | Path Coefficient | P Values | Explanation        |
|-------------|------------------|----------|--------------------|
| Knowledge → Behavior | 0.682 | 0.000    | Significantly implied |

*Path Coefficient* is coefficient value or relation between the construct implication with the latent variable. The result of the examination in this research is obtained *P-Value* between the exogen variable implied to the endogen variable (Y), where the value of *Path Coefficient* in coefficient X (Knowledge) is 0.682 with the *P-value* in the amount of 0.000. The Data above shows that the generated implication is positive due to the *Path Coefficient* that shows positive results. The X value shows the significant implication to Y, because the value of *P-value* of the exogen variable < 1.

![Picture 4. Result of The Examination of Path Coefficients]

Based on data processing which had been done with the smartPLS program 3.0, that is obtained the value of *R-Square* below:

Table 4. Result of *R-Square*

| Variabel          | R-Square |
|-------------------|----------|
| Behavior (Y)      | 0.466    |

Table above shows that value of the *R-Square* or the coefficient of determination of Variable Y in amount of 0.466. This means that the endogen variable (Y) can be implied by the exogen variable (X) in amount of 46.6% while the rest are implied by other variables exclude this research.

Based on the data processing which had been done, the result can be used to answer the hypothesis in this research. The hypothesis examination of this research was done by seeing the *T-Statistics* and value of *P-Values*. The research hypothesis can be stated accepted if the
value of $T$-Statistics > 1.98 and value of $P$-Values < 0.05. The result of hypothesis examination which obtained in this research through the inner model:

| Hypothesis | Variable       | $T$-Statistics | $P$-Values | Result  |
|------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------|
| H1         | Knowledge $\rightarrow$ Behavior | 14.148         | 0.000      | Accepted |

Based on data presentation on the table 4 above, it can be known that from the hypothesis which proposed in this research, can be accepted because it has implication which shown by the value of $P$-Values < 0.05 and value of $T$-Statistics > 1.98. So that can be stated that the independent variable to the dependent has significant implication.

5. Discussion

The analysis of survey result which done by showing the existing of correlation between knowledge towards behavior. Knowledge is important thing that have to be done to educate people as an effort to solve the problem of the spread of hate speech and build the convincing stereotype (Gadd, 2009)).

The spread of fake news in the internet is one of cause big concern for all of the part of the society, including government, policy maker, organization, and the citizens. The fake news specially arranged to plant the distrust seeds and aggravating the existing social and cultural dynamics with manipulation of political underset, regional and religion (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2018). The online media or news sites are media mostly used by the respondents to get information. Due to the news sites are easily accessed through the smart phone. And nowadays, almost all of the corporations of news site have account in variety of social media, so it must be easier for the people to get the information.

The communication scope is the important factor to be considered, especially because it implied the possibility of people will be exposed by the different social and/or politic (Barnidge, Liu, Zúñiga, & Huber, 2018); (Barnidge, Exposure to Political Disagreement in Social Media Versus Face-to-Face and Anonymous Online Settings, 2016), which make it more possible to process social identity producing perception of hate speech (Leets, 2001). The broader communication networking is tent to contains weaker bond, tend to express
difference of social and politic. The expose of political difference is more tend to push the identification in the group and difference outside the group (Huddy, 2002).

If it is related to the concept of knowledge according to Bloom in (Fitriany, Farouk, & Taqwa, 2016)it can be said that most parts of the respondent were included in the category of “understand” which is the second level of knowledge. The first level of knowledge level is "know" and it is the lowest level, while "understand" or "understanding" is the ability to interpret some of the material correctly and able to explain the known object correctly.

This result analysis shows that knowledge has significant implication to the PMII Cadre behavior to response the hate speech in presidential election 2019. It can be seen from the value of $P-Values < 0,05$ in amount of 0,000 and value of $T-Statistics > 1,98$ in the amount of 14,148. That means if the knowledge of the cadre about hate speech getting higher, so the behavior of PMII cadre will get better. This finding is appropriate to the research result of Kaiser et al (1999), Flamm (2009), Leeuw (2015), and Casaló (2018, 2019), they concluded that knowledge of the individual can push the environment behavior, and environment behavior can increase the environment pro-behavior. There are many factors which affected the people behavior depends on the influencing factors, not only from knowledge factors, but also from factors such as, individual experience, other people influent, or the culture of the environment (Azwar, 2011).

6. Conclusion

This research is purposed to know how big the implication of the knowledge to the behavior of PMII cadre to response hate speech in presidential election 2019. The result of the research showed that knowledge has positive and significant implication to the behavior of PMII cadre to response the hate speech in presidential election 2019 with the value of $P-Values < 0,05$ in the amount of 0,000 and the value of $T-Statistics > 1,98$ in the amount of 14,148.

This is described that the higher the knowledge of cadre about the hate speech in presidential election in 2019, the better behavior of PMII cadre to response hoaxes and hate speech in the presidential election 2019 to not making, spreading, and influenced by the hoaxes and hate speech.
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