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The general problem of this research was how students respond to hate speech. The purpose of the study was to obtain an overview of (1) perceptions; (2) attitudes; and (3) student actions/participation towards hate speech. The research approach used was quantitative and descriptive with survey method. The population of this study was all the administrators of the student executive board in UNTAN, IAIN, and IKIP PGRI Pontianak totaling 162 students. The number of research samples was 115 students determined by Slovin formula. The respondents were chosen randomly. Data collection used a questionnaire. Data analysis used percentage quantitative descriptive analysis techniques. The general conclusion of the study shows that student responses to hate speech are good. Specific conclusions of the study are: (1) student perceptions (knowledge) of hate speech are on average 78.26% know and 21.74% do not know about the utterances of hatred; (2) student attitudes towards hate speech are on average 78.14% students do not agree with hate speech and 21.86% agree; and (3) student actions or participation in hate speech are on average 78.51% students never take acts in hate speech and 21.49% ever.

Keywords: hate speech, student response, student executive board

Introduction

Since the reform period, Indonesia has experienced a euphoria of excessive freedom, including freedom of expression. One of the negative effects of freedom of expression that is excessive is the rise of hate speech and the spread of hoaxes in the community. Based on data during 2017 the National Police handled 3,325 cases of hate speech while in February 2018 having arrested 12 perpetrators. The number of sites indicated spread of hate speech and hoaxes is around 800,000 (Pratama, 2016). Several studies have shown that generally hate speech occurs in countries that apply the principles of democracy. As if the principle of democracy gives everyone the legitimacy to freely express opinions and participate in public discourses (Cohen-Almagor, 2019; Mårtensson, 2015). However, there are also phenomena of hate speech triggered by the presence of the state which limits freedom of expression, primarily through laws and other laws (Mchangama, 2015).

The phenomenon of hate speech is not only a social problem in the country of Indonesia but also a social phenomenon almost in other countries throughout the world. In Mongolia, there is a phenomenon of anti-Chinese hate speech. Mongolians discriminate against ethnic Chinese as part of Mongolian history to defend and fight for independence (Billé, 2013). In addition to the ethnic minorities, hate speech is also often
leveled at minority sexual groups. In one study, it was explained the phenomenon of hate speech and even torture of a gay man in France (Heinze, 2009). In several countries in Africa such as Namibia, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Swaziland, Uganda, Zambia, and Egypt, there are also hate speech in the form of homophobia that threatens democracy and violates human rights (Reddy, 2002). Phobias of several religions also often trigger hate speech. For example, it was finding a variety of content on social media that contains the expression of Islamophobia (Vidgen & Yasseri, 2020). In Norway, there is an act of racism by radical groups who claim Muslims are not part of the Norwegian ethnic group so that it is not treated equally with other ethnicities (Mårtensson, 2015). The most horrific phenomenon is the involvement of political figures in carrying out utterances of hatred and hoaxes that trigger the occurrence of various criminal acts and political polarity (Piazza, 2020).

Facing this phenomenon, various laws and laws on hate speech have been instituted. Several studies have shown that law enforcement against various criminal acts, including hate speech is carried out in several Western European countries and the United States (Bleich, 2011). The constitution of hate speech has also been developed in several countries such as Britain, Germany, Austria, New Zealand, Canada, France, and Scandinavia (Feldman, 2013). Some regions in East Asia have also developed policies to combat hatred (Wolman, 2019), for example, Turkey, which since 2010, has implemented a hate speech supervision commission on social media (Onbaş, 2015). Even the United Nations, through the Human Rights Act of 1689 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, has firmly protected every human being from acts that violate human rights, including protection from various forms of negative actions such as hate speech.

Even so, such hate speech will never end. Lately, almost every day, cyberspace and social media in Indonesia show utterances of hatred. The issue of hate speech is rampant and has disrupted the lives of the cited community. Hate speech is now rife through online social media (Reed, 2009). The comments column on several social media has become a massive media in spreading hate speech (Erjavec & Kovačić, 2012; Malmasi & Zampieri, 2018). Social networks serve as an effective platform for spreading user ideas easily and efficiently (Alkiviadou, 2019) even for ideas that contain hate activities (Banks, 2010). Even though cyberspace content has been monitored and regulated through technology and communication laws, it seems that this effort faces obstacles, because cyberspace users are categorized as global citizens. Therefore, the involvement and cooperation between the government and citizens is the most effective way to reduce the danger of hate speech (Banks, 2010).

The world of education becomes a perfect medium that has the opportunity to teach solidarity and tolerance so that the world of education becomes a medium that is effective enough to prevent utterances of hatred (Collier, 1995). Some universities have become examples, as a place to avoid various forms of discrimination, including crimes of hate speech. Some universities have made restrictions on hate, the racial, sexual expression on campus (Sandmann, 1994). For example, universities in America impose a campus code of ethics to prevent discrimination and hatred (Collier, 1995). But in fact, not a few of the universities that have imposed a code of ethics and a prohibition on expressing hatred failed in carrying out their mission. This is as represented by several researchers, who noted the phenomenon of fights and attitudes of hate that still occur on campuses (Cornwell & Orbe, 1999; Fraleigh, 1995; Klepper & Bakken, 1997). Therefore, the study of student attitudes and behavior in various tertiary institutions is very relevant to be studied or researched.
Research on responses to hate speech itself has so far not been found, especially the reactions or responses conducted by students. Research on student responses to hate speech is important because students, as part of a community group, may play a role in spreading hate speech through cyberspace and the mass media. Student groups wherever and whenever they are should always be a very important strategic group because they are not only a part of the community but also a group of reformers who can think critically and who will be the successor and determinant of the future of the community. In the context of the rise of hate speech in the midst of society, including perhaps in the community of West Kalimantan at this time, it is interesting to study how the responses or views of student groups against hate speech. The response or view of the student group will be a portrait or general picture of the public’s view of the utterance of hatred itself. Through this portrait, we can indirectly see patterns of relationships and the future of society. If in the portrait, for example, students respond positively or agree with hate speech, then it can be predicted that social relations and community sustainability can be disrupted and vice versa.

Material and Method

This research was carried out in Universities in Pontianak which included University of Tanjungpura (UNTAN), the State Islamic Institute (IAIN), and the PGRI Teacher Training and Education Institute (IKIP PGRI). The approach used was quantitative and descriptive, with survey methods (Sugiyono, 2018). This study aimed to describe students’ responses to hate speech that develops in the midst of society. The study population was all active students who were administrators of the student executive board at Tanjungpura University, Pontianak State Islamic Institute, and the PGRI Pontianak Teacher Training and Education Institute, totaling 162 people. A sample of 115 students was determined according to the Slovin formula, namely \( n = \frac{N}{1 + \left( \frac{N}{n} \right)^2} \). Samples of each college are taken proportionally with the following calculations (see Table 1):

| Name of the university | Number of students | Sample proportion | Number of samples for each university |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| UNTAN                  | 60                 | 6                 | \( 6/16.2 \times 115 = 42.59 = 43 \) |
| IAIN                   | 50                 | 5                 | \( 5/16.2 \times 115 = 35.49 = 35 \) |
| IKIP PGRI              | 52                 | 5.2               | \( 5.2/16.2 \times 115 = 36.91 = 37 \) |
| Total                  | 162                | 16.2              | 115 students                        |

Note. Source: Processed from BEM Administrators data, 2020.

After determining the number of samples and sample distribution for each university, the next step is to select students who are sampled at each university according to the prescribed quota. The selection of students was done randomly or by raffling. Students whose names were chosen randomly then were determined to be the research sample. The technique of collecting data in this study used indirect communication techniques. The data collection tool was a questionnaire that has been validated and tested reliability with the help of Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) program version 2.2. The results of product moment correlation calculations for each questionnaire item (r count) are with r table. In this study the table was obtained through a significance level of 0.05 with a 2-sided test and \( N = 112 / df = 110 \). Next, comparing the calculation with r table. It turns out that all items are bigger than r table (0.40), so the questionnaire is valid. Reliability testing uses the help of the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) program version 2.2 with Alpha
Cronbach’s technique. From the calculation results it turned out that the questionnaire was categorized as reliable because the calculation results were 0.76 above 0.70. If the calculation results are less than 0.60 then the reliability was categorized as not good, whereas if the calculation results were 0.70 categorized it can be accepted and if above 0.80 it is categorized as good.

Data analysis used percentage techniques. The percentage technique used is by dividing the number of actual scores with the ideal maximum number of scores. The percentage formula used is:

\[ X\% = \frac{n}{N} \times 100\% \]

Information:
- \( n \) = actual score
- \( N \) = ideal maximal score
- \( X\% \) = percentage number searched

**Results and Discussion**

**The Concept of Hate Speech**

Various forms of hate speech especially related to Tribe, Religion, Race and Intergroup (SARA) are very easy to find in cyberspace (Gagliardone, Gal, Alves, & Martinez, 2015). Hate speech is also often heard from the pulpit of religion, during religious sermons. Lecturers often express utterances of hatred by blaming other groups both intra- and inter-religious. Actually freedom of expression and religious freedom are guaranteed in the universal declaration of human rights. Even freedom of expression is a prerequisite for religious freedom. But the problem is that freedom of expression does not mean wild freedom and an irresponsible freedom which is used to broadcast hate speech. Indeed freedom of expression and freedom of religion is not unlimited freedom. In freedom of expression and religious freedom there is always the right of others not to be resisted by various forms of speech of hatred (Awan, 2014).

The government through the Chief of Police of the Republic of Indonesia (Kapolri) has arranged about handling the hate speech. In accordance with the circular letter (SE) of the National Police, there are seven forms of hate speech, namely: humiliation, defamation, defamations, unpleasant acts, provoking, inciting, and spreading false news. All acts of hate speech are intended or have an impact on acts of discrimination, violence, disappearance of life, and or social conflict. In the circular letter stated, hate speech aims to incite hatred towards individuals and or groups of people differently in aspects: ethnicity, religion, religious teachings, beliefs, race, class, color, ethnicity, gender, disability, and sexual orientation.

Hate speech can be conveyed through various media, including: speeches on campaign (political) activities, banners, social media networks, public expressions (demonstrations), religious lectures, print and electronic mass media, and pamphlets (Santoso, 2016). The National Police has also established procedures for handling hate speech. If preventive measures have been taken but the problem remains unresolved, the settlement is carried out through law enforcement in accordance with KUHP, Law No. 1/2008 concerning ITE, Law No. 40/2008 concerning the Elimination of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination, Law No. 7/2012 concerning Social Conflict Management, and National Police Regulation No. 8/2013 concerning Technical Management of Social Conflict. Not only in Indonesia, almost all countries in the world, including the freest ones such as the United States and Western European countries, have laws or other regulations regarding handling hate speech. The European Union, for example, issued a manual on hate speech: Manual of Hate Speech (Weber, 2009). This
The hate speech that is currently rampant has the potential to harm respect for pluralism and diversity which is the main value of the Indonesian people. As identified by the National Human Rights Commission, hate speech opens opportunities for the development of discriminatory practices and violence against religious, racial, and ethnic minority groups, even if left unchecked can encourage acts of violence against minority groups. Because of its existence that threatens respect for the diversity of Indonesian society, efforts to counteract the spread of hate speech, especially those circulating in cyberspace and social media are important steps in encouraging open society in Indonesia. Looking at outstanding cases lately, in addition to the government, the role of all parties in the community including religious leaders, educators, youth, and students is important. Resistance to utterances of hatred must begin early and enter into the family area. The community must also be willing to open their minds to the differences that exist.

Gagliardone et al. (2015) stated that hate speech is an expression of incitement to harm (specifically discrimination, hostility, and violence) against the target of certain social or demographic groups, for example words that defend, assimilate, or encourage acts of violence. This concept is often extended to the expression of prejudice and intolerance which is assumed to be the fuel of discrimination, hostility, and violent attacks. In other words, the definition of speech hate tends to expand, sometimes even including words that insult the ruler or the individual. At crucial moments such as during the Election, hate speech is often manipulated. Allegations of arousing hatred are often traded between political opponents or used by those in power to curb differences of opinion and criticism. Weber (2009) stated that the expression of hatred includes all forms of expression that are spread to incite, promote, or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-semitism, or other forms of hatred rooted in intolerance, including intolerance expressed nationalism and aggressive ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility towards minority and immigrant citizens. Weber says that the utterance of hatred is essentially rhetorical to annoy and provoke the opponent anger. Even though it was only through words of speech that hatred was aimed at eliminating or killing the opponent. As a result, the dialogue or discourse becomes jammed. There is no willingness to respect and listen to the other person. There is no willingness to be open, learn, and change.

The National Police Chief in his Circular Letter Number SE/06/X/2015 concerning the handling of hate speech confirms that the elements of hate speech include: insult, defamation, humiliation, incitement, provocation, unpleasant acts, and false news directed at groups ethnicity, religion, creed, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation (Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia, 2015). Then in the Criminal Code and Complete Article by Article Comments, Soesilo (1991) explained: (1) Insult is attacking someone’s honor. The object of humiliation is self-esteem or dignity/respect for individuals both individual and communal (group); (2) defamation is an act of defaming a person’s reputation or honor through expressing something through oral or written; (3) defamation is words, behaviors, writings, or shows that are prohibited because they can lead to acts of violence and prejudice whether on the part of the perpetrator of the statement or the victim of the action. Blasphemy is also meaningful as an act carried out by accusing someone or a group of committing a certain act with the intention that the accusation is revealed (known by many people). The alleged action does not need to be a punitive act such as stealing, embezzling, and adultery. Enough with ordinary deeds, it is certainly a shameful act. Then blasphemy can also be with a letter, namely an accusation made with writing (letter) or picture; (4) unpleasant actions are acts that offend other people; (5) provoking is an action taken to arouse anger
by inciting, provokes anger, aggravation and makes people who are incited have negative and emotional thoughts; (6) instigating is encouraging, inviting, arousing, or burning people’s enthusiasm to do something, in which the meaning “intentionally” is contained. Instigating is harder than “luring” or “persuading” but there is no element of “force”; and (7) spreading hoax is broadcasting news and it turns out that the news broadcast is empty, incorrect, or not in accordance with the incident (Soesilo, 1991).

Studies of the hate speech have actually been carried out both domestically and abroad. Several studies on hate speech have been conducted by Awan (2014), Santoso (2016), Setara Institute (2017), Bartlett (2015), Rogers (2013), and Pamungkas (2016). These studies generally relate to the spread of hate speech through online social media and the control of hate speech through media literacy. This research is different from the previous studies because what we want to reveal in this study is student responses, namely about their perceptions, attitudes, and actions related to hate speech.

**Student Perception of Hate Speech**

A response is a reaction both positive and negative given by the community (Sarwono, 2013). The response will arise after a person or group of people first feels the presence of an object and is carried out, then interprets the object that was felt earlier. It means in this case that the response is basically the process of understanding what happens in the environment with humans and their behavior, is a reciprocal relationship, interrelated and influencing each other. Then Kartono (1994) interpreted responses as impressions that were experienced if the stimulator was gone. When the observation process has stopped and there are only impressions, the events are called responses. Therefore, response is a memory image of observation. Sarwono (2013) suggested there are three factors that influence a person’s response, namely: (1) The person concerned sees and tries to interpret what he sees, he is influenced by his attitudes, motives, interests, and expectations; (2) the target of the response, in the form of people, objects, or events. The characteristics of the target usually affect the response of the person who sees it. In other words, movement, sound, size, follow-up, and other characteristics of the target response also determine the way people perceive; and (3) situation factors, responses can be seen contextually meaningful in situations where responses arise also get attention. Situation is a factor that plays a role in the formation or response of a person.

Someone views his positive response through the stages of cognition, affection, and psychomotor. Conversely, someone can see negative responses if the information heard or changes in an object do not affect their actions, or even avoid or hate the object. The response was confirmed by Beum (2002) as a reciprocal behavior or attitude that became a manifestation. Furthermore responses are stimulating organizing processes, where proximal stimuli are formed in the human mind, organized and then generated through the interpretation of the object that receives the stimulation (Sarwono, 2013). Beum (2002) defined responses as a behavior or attitude that embodies detailed understanding, judgment, influence, rejection, likes or not, and the use of a phenomenon. Responses are also interpreted as a stimulating organizing process where proximal stimuli are organized in such a way that a phenomenal representation of certain proximal stimuli occurs. Morgan, King, and Robinson (1994) suggested that language plays an important role in forming community responses. Certain responses are tied to words. Therefore speech can function as a mediator or determine which hierarchy works. This means that socialization that uses language, both oral and written, is a strategic medium in forming community responses. Whether the response is formed positive or negative responses, it very much depends on the socialization of the object to be responded.
Furthermore, according to Morgan et al. (1994), the most important and necessary thing in measuring responses is knowing perceptions, attitudes, and participation. In other words to find out the response of a person or group of people to something, it is necessary to know their perceptions, attitudes, and participation in something.

To find out the people’s response to something is usually through perception, attitude, and participation. The response is basically preceded by someone’s attitude, because attitude is a person’s tendency or willingness to behave if he faces a certain stimulus. According to Morgan et al. (1994), the part where we see, hear, feel, smell the world around is called perception. Perception is also interpreted as a symptom experienced by humans. James (2004) stated that perception is formed on the basis of the data we obtain from the environment absorbed by our senses, and some others. Perception is obtained from the management of memory and then reprocessed based on the experience of someone.

Perception is a cognitive process experienced by everyone in understanding information about the environment both through vision, hearing, feeling, and acceptance. Perception is a unique approach to the situation and not to a correct record of the situation. The analysis shows that perception is an individual or community understanding of an object that is still in his mind.

Individual perceptions will influence individual attitudes towards a development program. In a development program there are new ideas or new ways that are socialized into a community, hoping to change the thinking patterns and ways of acting by the people affected by the program. These changes are processed and manifested in changing attitudes.

As in this study, testing of students’ responses and perceptions of some actions in the form of hate speech has been carried out. The response and perception were tested with 7 indicators formulated in the form of statements. These indicators are formulated based on the phenomenon of hate speech that generally occurs. Students are asked to express their responses by understanding the question and then express their perception with the statements very know, know, do not know, and strongly do not know. Based on the results of a questionnaire about 115 students of BEM of Higher Education in Pontianak, the answers are obtained as shown in Table 2 as follows:

Table 2

Student Perceptions of Hate Speech

| No. | Questions                                                                 | Respondents answer percentage |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1.  | Insulting other people/groups means doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 36 (31.30%) 54 (46.96%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
| 2.  | Defaming other people/groups is the same as doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 36 (31.30%) 54 (46.96%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
| 3.  | Defeating other people/groups is the same as doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 36 (31.30%) 54 (46.96%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
| 4.  | Doing unpleasant things to other people/groups means doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 30 (26.09%) 60 (52.17%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
| 5.  | Provoking other people/groups is the same as doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 36 (31.30%) 54 (46.96%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
| 6.  | Inciting other people to commit crimes against other people/groups means doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 30 (26.08%) 60 (52.17%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
| 7.  | Spreading false news about other people/groups is the same as doing hate speech to other people/groups. | 36 (31.30%) 54 (46.96%) 25 (21.74%) 0 |
|     | Average                                                                  | 27.57% 50.69% 21.74% 0     |

Note. Remarks: VK = Very Know; K = Know; DK = Don’t Know; and SDK = Strongly Don’t Know.
Based on the data as shown in Table 2 above, it can be seen from 115 respondents that on average 78.26% know and 21.74% do not know about the utterances of hatred.

**Student Attitudes Towards Hate Speech**

Regarding attitude, Sarwono (2013) interpreted it as a tendency or willingness to behave if he faced a certain stimulus. Attitude is an organization of opinions, a person’s beliefs about objects or situations that are relatively accompanied by certain feelings, and provide a basis for certain people to make responses or behave in certain ways that they choose. Attitude is the tendency or willingness of a person to behave in a certain way if he faces certain stimuli. The intended assistance can be in the form of an internal stimulus such as self-actualization, and can also be in the form of physical as well as development results and efforts. Changes in attitudes can illustrate how a person responds to certain objects, such as environmental changes to other situations. The attitude that appears can be positive, which tends to like, approach the object, or appear negative attitude that is avoiding, hating an object.

In this research, a test has been conducted on the students’ attitudes towards some actions in the form of hate speech. The attitude of the students was tested with 7 indicators formulated in the form of statements. These indicators are formulated based on the phenomenon of hate speech that generally occurs. Students are asked to express their responses by understanding the question and then express their attitude with the statements of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Based on the results of a questionnaire towards 115 student board administrators of BEM Universities in Pontianak, it obtained student attitudes towards hate speech, as shown in Table 3 as follows:

**Table 3**

| No. | Questions                                                                 | Respondents answer percentage |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1.  | Insulting other people/groups may be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression for every citizen. | 0 (0%) 23 (20%) 30 (26.09%) 62 (53.91%) |
| 2.  | Defaming other people/groups may be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression for every citizen. | 0 (0%) 23 (20%) 30 (26.09%) 62 (53.91%) |
| 3.  | Defeating other people/groups can be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression for every citizen. | 0 (0%) 26 (22.61%) 30 (26.09%) 59 (51.30%) |
| 4.  | Doing unpleasant things to other people/groups may be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression of every citizen. | 0 (0%) 26 (22.61%) 30 (26.09%) 59 (51.30%) |
| 5.  | Provoking other people/groups can be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression for every citizen. | 0 (0%) 26 (22.61%) 30 (26.09%) 59 (51.30%) |
| 6.  | Inciting other people/groups may be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression for every citizen. | 0 (0%) 26 (22.61%) 30 (26.09%) 59 (51.30%) |
| 7.  | Spreading false news about other people/groups can be done because it is in accordance with human rights and freedom of expression for every citizen. | 0 (0%) 26 (22.61%) 30 (26.09%) 59 (51.30%) |
|    | Average                                                                   | 0 (0%) 21.86% 26.09% 52.05% |

**Note:** Information: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; and SD = Strongly Disagree.

Based on data as shown in Table 3 above, it is found that on average 78.14% of students disagree with hate speech and 21.86% tend to agree with the utterances of hatred.

**Student Actions/Participations in Hate Speech**

Participation in English means taking part. Participation is a process of mental attitude where people or
members of the community actively contribute to their creativity and initiative in an effort to improve their quality of life. Sarwono (2013) further stated that participation is very important and absolutely necessary if we want to know or measure the response of a person or group of people to something. The participation approach relies on the strength of the community to actively participate in the development process as a whole. The active participation of the community in implementing development programs requires the same awareness and interests. For the success of a development program, the community is led to participate not only in the cognitive and practical aspects but also emotional involvement in the program. In general, it can be seen the formulation of factors that influence community participation, namely: the condition of the community, the activities of development programs, and the state of the surrounding environment. Dayakisni and Hudaniah (2003) stated that in terms of motivation, community participation occurs for several reasons: (1) afraid to be forced. In terms of the first motivation, participation is forced by fear. Usually due to orders from superiors the community seems to be forced to carry out the determined plan; (2) follow. Motivation for participation is only driven by a high sense of solidarity among fellow citizens as a manifestation of togetherness; and (3) awareness. This arises from the personal will of members of the community, marked by the desire of conscience. This form of participation is expected to be developed in society (Dayakisni & Hudaniah, 2003). With the participation based on business awareness, the community can be invited to maintain and feel the object of development. There are many failures in development programs simply because they do not feel they have the obligation to jointly build and maintain them.

Regarding participation, the most influential thing is the extent of people’s knowledge about something. The level of knowledge a person has about something can determine an intention to carry out an activity. This knowledge then influences attitudes, intentions, and behavior. The knowledge of the benefits of a thing will cause someone to have a positive attitude towards it. A positive attitude will affect the intention to participate in an activity related to this. The intention to carry out an activity ultimately determines whether the activity is truly carried out. This activity that has been done is called attitude and behavior.

In this research, a test has been conducted on the participation of students in carrying out acts and utterances of hate. The involvement of these students was tested with 7 indicators formulated in the form of statements. These indicators are formulated based on the phenomenon of hate speech that generally occurs. Students are asked to express their responses by understanding the statement and then state their involvement with the statements of often, sometimes, never, and never really. Based on the results of a questionnaire about 115 students of BEM of Higher Education in Pontianak, student involvement in hate speech obtained is as shown in Table 4 as follows:

**Table 4**

*Student Actions in Hate Speech*

| No. | Questions                                      | Respondents answer percentage |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|     |                                              | O    | S             | N             | NR            |
| 1.  | Insult other people/groups.                   | 0    | 26 (22.61%)  | 30 (26.09%)  | 59 (51.30%)  |
| 2.  | Defame other people/groups.                   | 0    | 23 (20%)     | 30 (26.09%)  | 62 (53.91%)  |
| 3.  | Blasphemy against other people/groups.        | 0    | 23 (20%)     | 30 (26.09%)  | 62 (53.91%)  |
| 4.  | Doing unpleasant things to other people/groups.| 0    | 26 (22.61%)  | 30 (26.09%)  | 59 (51.30%)  |
Based on the data as shown in Table 5, it was found that 78.51% of students were not involved in or did not act in hate speech and 21.49% sometimes do the utterances of hatred.

**Discussion**

**Student Perception of Hate Speech**

Based on the research data on student perceptions of hate speech, almost 78.26% of respondents said that they knew about hate speech, only 21.74% said that they did not know. The findings of this study are consistent with the results of previous studies conducted by Setara Institute (2017), Bartlett (2015), Rogers (2013), Awan (2014), Santoso (2016), and Pamungkas (2016). This is certainly not surprising because the issue or problem of hate speech has been very crowded and viral recently and discussed in various mass media and social media, even discussed in university.

Based on the research data, it can be explained that students in Pontianak already know about hate speech including their elements or aspects such as: insulting, defaming, blaspheming, doing unpleasant things, provoking, inciting, and spreading hoax. The results of this study indicate that students as intellectual beings are very natural to know about hate speech, especially the issue of hate speech is very rampant and viral and discussed in various mass media and social media even discussed on various lecture opportunities. The answers given by students in Pontianak show that activists can still be categorized as objective and honest, because it is impossible for them as activists to not know about a very massive and viral issue discussed in the community lately. Conversely, if they stated that they did not know the information about hate speech, it was precisely a big question from many parties. The problem is how well the quality or level of knowledge of students towards hate speech. Considering that in this study it was not disclosed about this matter, it would be better to do separate research on other occasions.

**Students’ Attitudes Towards Hate Speech**

The results of the study on student attitudes towards hate speech showed 21.86% of students tend to agree and 78.14% disagree in saying hate speech to other people/groups. The results of this study indicated that most of the university students in Pontianak disagree with the utterances of hatred but fraction tend to agree. In other words, student attitudes towards hate speech are still categorized as good because majority of students do not agree with hate speech that develops in the community.

In terms of attitudes, the findings of this study are in line with the results of previous studies conducted by Setara Institute (2017), Bartlett (2015), Rogers (2013), Santoso (2016), and Pamungkas (2016). Previous studies indicated the tendency of some young generations to support hate speech.

Based on the results of the questionnaire data, it can be explained that: (1) College students in Pontianak tend to disagree with hate speech that develops in the community but fraction tend to agree. The attitude of
the students is actually reasonable because they are a group of intellectuals who can distinguish between good and bad. However, on the other hand, it was very unexpected considering that there were quite a lot of students in several other universities who indicate that they did hate speech both directly and through social media; (2) the attitude of disagreement of students in Pontianak towards hate speech that developed in the community was probably due to the research sample being the administrators of BEM. BEM administrators are people chosen by other students through multilevel and layered filters. It could be that those who were selected as BEM administrators were those who did not like hate speech or perhaps the BEM administrators who were chosen as the sample of this study were those who were not affected by the hate speech; (3) this research is a quantitative research, using questionnaires as a data collection tool. One of the weaknesses of the questionnaire as a data collection tool is the limited answers of respondents, because respondents only choose the answers that are already available. As a result, other information outside of the available answers cannot be revealed; and (4) based on the analysis, the disagreement of students in Pontianak with hate speech might be due to the fact that the research samples were not involved in the hate speech even though they knew it.

Student Actions/Participation in Hate Speech

The results of research on student actions or participation in hate speech show that 78.51% of students were not involved in or did not act in hate speech and 21.49% were involved in hate speech. In terms of action, the findings of this study are in line with the results of previous studies conducted by Setara Institute (2017), Bartlett (2015), Rogers (2013), Santoso (2016), and Pamungkas (2016). Previous studies showed the tendency of some young generations to be involved in acts of hate speech.

For such findings, it can be explained that: (1) Majority of university students in Pontianak have never been involved in acts of hate speech and only fraction ever did it. The action of students in Pontianak was very unexpected considering that there were quite a number of students in other universities who were detected to be involved secretly or openly in the actions of hate speech; (2) that majority of students in Pontianak have never involved in activities of hate speech was probably due to the research sample being administered by BEM administrators. BEM administrators are people chosen by other students through multilevel and layered filters. It could be that those who were selected as BEM administrators were those who did not have a hate speech ideology or perhaps BEM administrators who were selected as the sample of this study were not affected by hate speech; and (3) this study used questionnaires as a data collection tool. One of the weaknesses of the questionnaire as a data collection tool is the limited answers of respondents, because respondents only choose the answers that are already available. As a result, other information outside of the available answers cannot be revealed.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the research and discussion presented above, it can be concluded that most of the students in Pontianak have good perceptions about hate speech, have an attitude of disagreement with hate speech developing in the community and never do hate speech.

While specific conclusions from this study are as follows:

(1) As many as 78.26% of university students in Pontianak know well about hate speech and 21.74% do not know. Based on the data, it means that students’ perceptions or knowledge of hate speech are good;
(2) A total of 78.14% of university students in Pontianak disagree and 21.86% agree with hate speech that develops in the community. Based on these data, it means that most of the students have an attitude of disagreement with hate speech that develops in the community;

(3) A total of 78.51% of students in Pontianak have never really committed hate speech to other people/groups but 21.49% ever did it. Based on these data, it means that most of the students in Pontianak have never taken acts of hate speech, in other words, from the aspect of students hate speech acts in Pontianak are considered good.

**Recommendations**

Although the results of the study showed that currently students in Pontianak have a good perception (knowledge), have an attitude of disagreement and have never done hate speech, remembering the issue or problem of hate speech is something that is very dynamic, which follows changes and dynamics in the community, and considering the hate speech is very dangerous because it can damage the life of the community, nation and state, it is advisable for each leader of the College to always:

1. Beware of the emergence and development of these hate speech on campuses. For this reason, socialization of hate speech and their dangers to the entire academic community is necessary;
2. Monitoring, controlling, and fostering all students and academics to avoid saying hate to other people/groups;
3. Conduct further research with a comprehensive and integrative approach to student resilience and hate speech control strategies on their respective campuses.
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