

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION

**The Psychological Impact of Hate Speech on Audiences: The case of Political
Television Talk Shows on ETV, LTV and OMN and Posted on YouTube and
Audience Reaction Evaluated**

By Bilen Tewabe

Addis Ababa

June 2020

**The Psychological Impact of Hate Speech on Audiences: The case of Political
Television Talk Shows on ETV, LTV and OMN and Posted on YouTube and
Audience Reaction Evaluated**

By Bilen Tewabe

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL OF
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN JOURNALISM AND
COMMUNICATION**

Advisor: Teshager Shiferaw (Ph.D.)

June 2020

Addis Ababa

Ethiopia

Declaration

I, the undersigned, pronounce that this thesis is my original work and every one of the wellsprings of materials utilized for the thesis has been properly recognized.

Name: Bilen Tewabe

Signature: _____

Date of submission:

Place of submission: Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Approval

The undersigned certify that they have read and hereby recommend to Addis Ababa University to accept the Thesis submitted by Bilen Tewabe and entitled - The psychological impact of hate speech on audience: The case of political television talk shows on ETV, LTV and OMN and Posted on YouTube and Audience Reaction Evaluated in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of a Master's Degree in Journalism and Communication.

Name of Head Department

Signature

Date

Advisor

Signature

Date

External examiner

Signature

Date

Internal examiner

Signature

Date

Acknowledgements

Foremost I am thankful to the almighty God.

I would like to express my special thanks of gratitude to my teacher Teshager Shiferaw (Ph.D.), who gave me the golden opportunity to do this project on the topic of the psychological impact of hate speech on audience: The case of political television talk shows on ETV, LTV and OMN and Posted on YouTube and Audience Reaction Evaluated, which also helped me in doing a lot of research and I came to know about so many new things I am really thankful to them. Secondly I would like to thank my parent and friends who helped me a lot in finalizing this project within the limited time frame.

Abstracts

The psychological impact of hate speech on audiences: The case of political television talk shows of ETV, LTV and OMN OMN and Posted on YouTube and Audience Reaction Evaluated, 2020. This study aimed to hate speech and its psychological impact on audience by looking into selected political talk shows in Ethiopian media houses. It has been tried to address the root causes of hate speech and enable effective government responses to the impact of hate speech on audiences. To this end, qualitative research methods were employed to realize the stated objective. According to the data, ethnicity-based hate speeches are the major type of hate speech among Ethiopians in addition to political-based hate speech. The online hate speech landscape among Ethiopians appears to be serious and requires attention and some kind of interference by the government and society at large.

List of tables							Page
Table 1: Selected program from LTV	51
Table 2: Selected program from OMN	52
Table 3: Selected program from EBC	52

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACHR - American Convention on Human Rights

ADHD - Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder

DSM 5 -Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, fifth edition

ECHR - European Convention for Human Rights

EPRDF- Ethiopian People's Democratic Front

ICC -International Criminal Court

ICCPR- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

ICERD- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

PTSD -Post-traumatic stress disorder

UNESCO- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UN-United Nation

USHMM- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

EBC - The Ethiopian Broadcasting Corporation

LTV - Life (leading) Television

OMN – Oromia Media Network

Definition of term

Hate speech is speech that attacks a person or a group on the basis of protected attributes such as race, religion, ethnic origin, national origin, sex, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Freedom of speech is a principle that supports the freedom of an individual or a community to articulate their opinions and ideas without fear of retaliation, censorship, or legal sanction.

Hate-based crimes are often preceded or accompanied by prejudice, including negative stereotypes and distortions, and discrimination, including acts.

YouTube: allows commenting and subscribing videos

Ethnic hate speech: when the post is abusive, unapproachable, degrading or intended to incite violence or prejudice against a person or a group of individuals based on calling or mentioning ethnic identity.

Religious hate: when the post is insulting, intimidating, degrading or intended to incite violence or prejudice against a person or a group of individuals based on calling or mentioning their religion

Blaming on history: when the hate speech post has statements regarding on historical or current replica or whispered crimes or wrongs of one group or individual against the other and make guilt other groups

Words of negative expression: words used for creating negative image of other group or individual through expression of downbeat words (excluding of dehumanizing)

Dehumanizing: when the hate speech post has statements of dehumanization and equate one group with animals.

Intentional: when the hate speech post has statements which indicate intention to take on in advocacy to hatred; purpose to target a group on the basis of a protected characteristic.

Intense: when the hate speech post statements is clear with the public nature of the expression, the means of the expression and the intensity or magnitude of the expression in terms of its frequency or volume.

Incitement: when the hate speech post statements whether contained direct or indirect calls for discrimination, hostility or violence.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
List of tables.....	iii
Abstracts	iii
Acronyms.....	iv
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. Introduction	1
1.2. Statement of the problem	3
3.1. General objective.....	5
3.2. Specific objective	5
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND	8
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1. Introduction	8
2.2. Theory to understand hate speech	8
2.2.1. Social theory	8
2.3. Television and its impact on audience	11
2.4. What is freedom of expression?.....	12
2.5. Importance of freedom of expression.....	13
2.6. Can and should freedom of expression be limited?	14
2.7. What does hate speech mean?.....	15
2.8. Legislation around hate speech	16
2.9. Deeply offensive expression	17
2.10. Prohibited Hate speech.....	19
2.11. Xenophobic hate speech.....	21
2.12. Does hate speech harm?.....	22
2.12.2. Manifestation of violence based on hatred	24
2.13. Hate speech in Ethiopia and the new proclamation	24
2.13.1. The content of the Ethiopian hate speech law	24
2.13.2. Debate Regarding the Draft Press Law	25
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	27
3. Methodology	27
3.3. Research approach.....	28

3.4.2. Selection of mainstream media platforms and their contents	29
3.4.2. Selection of mainstream media users and professional	30
3.5. Sample size.....	30
3.6. Data collection tools.....	31
3.6.1. Data source	31
3.6.2. Content analysis.....	32
3.6.3. Survey.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.6.4. In-depth Interviews.....	32
3.7. Data presentation and analysis techniques	33
3.8. Coding and Inter coder reliability	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER FOUR DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.....	34
4.1. Introduction	34
4.2. Background about the selected television stations.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3. How the chapter presented	34
4.4. Demographic status of the interviewee	35
4.5. List of the titles of the twelve interviews	35
4.5.1. ETV	35
4.5.2. OMN.....	36
4.5.3. LTV	36
4.6. Nominated program.....	36
4.6.1. Selected program from LTV.....	36
4.6.2. Selected program from OMN	37
4.6.3. Selected program from EBC.....	38
4.7. Blaming on history	38
4.8. Dehumanization	43
4.9. Religion-based hate	45
4.10. Political view based.....	46
4.11. Insulting.....	47
4.12. Incites to violence.....	55
4.13. Interview.....	57
4.13.1. Understand by the term Freedom of Expression	57
4.13.2. Understanding how hate speech cause violence.....	57

4.13.3. Consequence of hate speech in the society psychological makeup.....	59
4.13.4. Hate speech law in Ethiopia	60
4.13.5. Critical remarks of hate speech differentiated from other	62
4.13.6. Types of ‘hate speech’ should be prohibited.....	63
4.13.7.The bigger picture for the country	64
CHAPTER FIVE	70
5. Conclusion and recommendation	70
5.1. Conclusion.....	71
5.2. Recommendation.....	72
Reference	73
Annex 1	78
Coding guide	78
Anex 2.....	83

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which says that the right to freedom of expression carries “special duties and responsibilities” and, therefore, may be “subject to certain restrictions”. The demand for “respect of the rights or reputations of others” is noted as one of the conditions, among others, that justify the restriction of freedom of speech. These restrictions may arise from “legal sanctions or social disapprovals”. Such restrictions are considered as new definitions assuring freedom of speech as it is incompatible with the core values of democracy. In the intervening time, hate speech will invade others' reputations and rights (Article 19, 2015).

Hate speech is an attack against a person or a group on the basis of protected attributes such as race, religion, ethnicity, national origin, sex, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity. As (Gelber, K, and McNamara, 2015) research, hate speech is directed at historically identifiable minorities and they will be targeted with a speech that is harmful to their involvement in processes of democratic legitimation. Hate speech is factually known as discrimination and maltreatment for the others. Gelber said that it would jeopardize others' ability to partake in the political decision making that affects them.

Hate crime reports Edinburgh cited in (Hamad R., 2017), has seen an increase of all reported hate crimes over the last five years. National and international events, as well as political climates and media rhetoric, can influence rates of hate crime, with a reported spike in hate crime following the European Union Referendum vote.

In human natural process speech is the one express the feeling, thought, and any internal activity. According to (Sikorskaya, 2014), expressions in any form deemed humiliating to any race, religious, ethnic, or national group. This phenomenon can be expressed in a form of racism, xenophobia, interethnic hostility, or intolerance, instigating violence, hatred, or discrimination.

Discriminatory hate speech may offend someone, hurt their feelings, be vituperative, or contain epithets, some of which may be capable of the discriminatory harms of hate speech, but none of which is definitively capable of doing so unless other factors are in place (Gelber, and McNamara, 2015).

The argument about the ban on hate speech varies from the right to the freedom of expression. On (Sikorskaya, 2014) report, the mandatory regulation of speech depending on its content can undermine the fundamental right to freedom of speech. On the other hand, supporters of hate speech regulation in the media claim that the right to freedom of speech is not absolute. A few international initiatives have been created to solve the issues of qualification of expressions used in the media as “inciting hatred”. However, regulation standards differ much in the laws of various countries concerning the types of expressions, prohibition, and sanctions.

The effects of hate-based violence on individuals, families, and communities are considered especially harmful because they are typically experienced not only as an attack on one’s physical self but also as an attack on one’s identity (Levin & McDevitt, 1993). Although the negative consequences of hate-based violence for the actual survivor, the survivor’s community, and society at large have been well established in the literature, direct and systematic research on the subject is still very limited (Dzelme, 2008) but in Edinburgh cited in (Hamad, 2017), harms of hate crime research indicate that the trauma experienced by victims of hate crime can be more enduring and harmful than non-hate related offending, and hate crime also has detrimental effects on communities as well as individuals.

Prejudice and hate speech have been observed throughout history and their dynamics and consequences have been scientifically researched, described, and explained for decades before the digital era (Maas, 2015). According to Maas, explanation hostile portrayals and stereotyping of groups and minorities as other different or dangerous can lead to dehumanization. (In another way of explanation, we can also dehumanize ourselves, setting into motion a cyclical process through which performing antisocial behavior causes us to view ourselves as less human, leading in turn to further antisocial action). This effect can escalate rapidly when hostile rhetoric reaches a large audience by means of broadcast, print, or digital media and lead to real-life violent hate crimes, including genocide.

Hate speech should be opposed by speech intended to educate the audience and root out delusion and bias, overcome the enemy image, and destroy stereotypes, thus changing public opinion voluntarily. The Ethiopian parliament in the second month of 2020 passed legislation that criminalizes hate speech and fake news. Ethiopia has experienced serious communal and ethnic

violence. The hate-based speech and reports turn out to be strong in Ethiopia and since of that, the government tries to grip the problem via proclamation.

Background about the selected television stations

The Ethiopian Broadcasting Corporation (EBC) (EBC includes both the ETV and Radio Ethiopia, thus better to refer to ETV) is an Ethiopian public service broadcaster. It is headquartered in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and it is the country's oldest and largest broadcaster. EBC was established by the order of Emperor Haile Selassie and initially operated by a British firm, Thomson. It's 100% owned by the Ethiopian government. Its programming includes news, sport, music, and other entertainment. A majority of the programming is broadcast in Amharic, the official federal language of the government of Ethiopia. In addition, some news segments are broadcast in other languages such as Afaan Oromi, Somali, Tigrinya, Harari, as well as English.

ETV News is the main news channel with 24 hours coverage, with the content on culture, politics, documentaries, and economy. Broadcast mostly in Amharic with the exception of some news segments which are broadcast in other languages.

The Oromia Media Network (OMN) is and nonprofit news enterprise whose mission is to produce original and citizen-driven reporting on Oromia, the largest and most populous state in Ethiopia. OMN seeks to offer thought-provoking, contextual, and nuanced coverage of critical public interest issues thereby bringing much-needed attention to under-reported stories in the region. The goal is to create a strong and sustainable multilingual newsroom that will serve as a reliable source of information about the Oromo people, the Ethiopian state, and the greater Horn of Africa region.

They hold themselves to the highest journalistic standards but unabashedly and proudly offer a uniquely Oromo perspective. It also aims to connect the growing Oromo diaspora to its homeland using innovative digital tools and people-centered storytelling techniques. OMN through voluntary donations, targeted advertising, and external grants.

LTV means life or leading television. LTV Ethiopia is an Ethiopian satellite TV channel owned and started by Gemechis Buba. LTV news is daily one-hour news coverage, five days from the week with the content on culture, politics, documentaries, and economy. Broadcast in Amharic

and it's now broadcasting on Ethiosat and Nilesat. High quality, high-impact multimedia content will be available in easily accessible formats including on the web, mobile devices, social media, satellite television, and radio.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Media has experienced rapid growth in Ethiopia and hate broadcasting on television sensational apparently. Nevertheless, hate speech is not an imaginative matter in Ethiopia, as a nation it is everyone's issues, from very commencement in a different way of saying peoples used to say it. From the aspect of culture, gender, economic status, religion, political aspect, family status, race, ethnic origin, national origin, disability, and sexual orientation.

There was no strong rejection of it and the people who receive hate speech are victims. They should accept the bad words, saying, insult, etc. and live with it. Sometimes, they take it as punishment or order. These people believed that they are here on this earth with potential hate speech and bad words. The system gave them no option, no way out even in the front of justice and this people accept who they become. But nowadays hate speech has become noticeable ever since the last few years. The private media house platforms have been hit by hate speech and the society has engaged in intense public discussions on hate speech. The media still seem polarized, to some extent, along with ethnicity, racial, and religious ideology. This problem has the power to change the societal thinking pattern and it could be supported by social theory.

This might even well extend to an individual feeling for any trials, tribulations which he or she perceives as being experienced by any group he or she might feel that they belonged to. Thus Tajfel and Turner strongly believed that by stating the case of Germany (Tajfel, & Turner, 1979, p. 282) and Rwanda, hate speech produces prejudice in those countries and the prejudiced views creates between cultures may result in racism; in its extreme forms, racism may result in genocide or hate crime.

According to (Müller, & Schwarz, 2018), research hate speech can be considered dangerous at numerous altitudes. It has the potential of disturbing social peace in that exposure to hate speech affects human psychology, shapes attitudes, and influences actual behaviors, including serious hate crimes such as genocide (Fyfe, 2017, pp. 523-548). This paper explains the psychological

impact of hate speech on audience: The case of political television talk shows on ETV, LTV and OMN.

Hate and dangerous speech is a serious and growing problem in Ethiopia (Abrha, 2019, p. 5) cited (Horne, 2018), both new media and main stream media. It has contributed to the growing ethnic tensions and conflicts across the country that has created more than 1.4 million new internally displaced people in the first half of 2018 alone (Abrha, 2019, p. 5) cited (Horne, 2018).

Thus, in Ethiopia increased hate speech and hate-based act. The Ethiopian parliament passed legislation that criminalizes hate speech and fake news. It is to control the activity of hate speech in the country. The Ethiopian government worried to protect the citizen from hate speech and fake news. There are some human rights watch activists and some journalists criticized the law as a threat to freedom of expression. There was a wave of protests in 2019 in Ethiopia's capital, Addis Ababa, and in the Oromia region that led to communal violence in a number of locations and the deaths of 86 people (Haileselassie, 2019), the government promptly approved the proclamation. Most mainstream media and social media promote hate speech on some race, religion, and especially ethnic origin. Because of this, so many peoples die, kids, youth, elites, families, and peoples who are vulnerable. So this study will research the psychological impact of hate speech on audiences: The case of political television talk shows of ETV, LTV and OMN and Posted on YouTube and Audience Reaction Evaluated.

Objective

1.3 General objective

This paper aims the psychological impact of hate speech on audiences: The case of political television talk shows of ETV, LTV and OMN and Posted on YouTube and Audience Reaction Evaluated.

1.3.1 Specific objectives

- To describe what factors of hate speech and the impact on society
- To explain the difference between hate speech and freedom of speech
- To analysis the impact of hate-based television programs on audience psychology
- To identify the factors that motivate hate speech among Ethiopians as well as the selected media houses.

- To identify the media house programs content on the aspect of the hate speech element.

1.4 Research questions

- What is hate speech in the context of free speech?
- How does hate speech affect audiences' psychology?
- What are the factors that motivate hate speech in television talk shows and among commenting audiences?
- How do television talk shows use hate speech in words, images, and videos?

1.5 Significance of the study

Freedom of speech is like any right it is a right to be guarded, and simply hate speech is the opposite of this right. Negative thoughts are very corrupted and can poison human life. It will be caused by hate speech after processed in mind. Mostly 'Hate speech' targets people, as individuals or groups, because of who they are (Article 19, 2015).

Certainly, the researcher believes that this study would have several contributions to prospect activities to fight hate speech after locating the impact of hate speech. And actually, it may feed for the broadcasters and producers.

The political system creates several groups based on their ethnicity, religion, origin, etc. based on such a group the elite and media persons tend to magnify and belong to their favorite and defame the others. In this process knowingly or not they exercise hate speech so, this research is about creating awareness, teaching the media person what they have to do instead of committed hate-based speech. The significance of this research is very important for the current media industry.

1.6 Scope of the study

The study was mainly concentrated on how the media houses covered hate speech among their programs using words, images, and videos. What will be the psychological impact of hate speech in the society and the root causes among Ethiopian mainstream media. And due to the huge categories of mainstream media, this study is enclosed to selected types of TV channel EBC, OMN, and LTV and Posted on YouTube and Audience Reaction Evaluated.

Hate speech is a provocation of about to happen violence, for the worst case, it will be Cause for the death of many and eradicate human life. The paper focuses on the station of LTV, OMN, and EBC political talk show. Nowadays in Ethiopia, the industry of broadcasts becomes lenient for

their reports and unsafe reporting style. This directly affects the life of society in a bad way. In the end, the paper will help other researchers as a baseline document.

1.7 Organization of the research

The paper will have five chapters, the first chapter will introduce the entire frame of the research what about. It focuses on the background information on the issue. The specific issues covered under the statement of the problem and the objective of the paper in detail. The research question and scope of the study. In chapter two a review of existing literature should be done to find out the past research done on the subject. It will help identify what was done in the past and the knowledge gap on a particular subject.

In chapter three the research method will be focused, how and what methods will be used, and which techniques are most important. In chapter four the findings and analysis will be writing in-depth. The final chapter is the conclusion and recommendation. In this unite the researcher recommend for Ethiopian broadcast media to have a strong plan of action on hate speech regulated the corrupted reports and programs. Finally, the reference part will present.

1.8 Limitations

Throughout retrieving pieces of literature slight previous research studies done in Ethiopian circumstance on the area make the possibility of the literature restrained though further out of perspective but interrelated literature were used to assess for review of the issue area.

Through some individuals were not willing for an interview because of COVID 19 viruses fear but, it doesn't impact on the searching of information since alternative individuals were used for access.

The other limitation was could not make further study towards human behavior and thinking pattern affected by hate based speech.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

The meaning of this study is to provide a better understanding of hate speech on television programs. Particularly, hate speech and its impact on audience psychological parameters. This literature review is to provide a general overview and foundation of the thesis subject-hate speech. More specifically, how hate speech affect human mind and how the media role will be.

More specifically, in this chapter a collection of the most significant previously published research and interpretations on the topic are discussed. Here in this chapter the theoretical framework which helps to understand what is hate speech? And theoretical framework is discussed. The general and conceptual understanding and explanations of hate speech are conferred.

2.2. Theory to understand hate speech

2.2.1. Social theory

Social identity theory suggested that people have an inbuilt tendency to categorize themselves into one or more in-groups, building a part of their identity on the basis of membership of that group and enforcing boundaries with other groups (out-groups) (Tajfel, & Turner, 1979, p. 282). According to Tajfel & Turner, social theory focus on the social comparison. Social comparison within the out-group is a decisive element in the process by which social categorization can turn into the creation of positive in group distinctiveness.

In this social identity theory offers an explanation for the so-called “mere categorization effect” to Tajfel & Turner by postulating a need for positive social identity. By treating or evaluating in-group members more favorably than out-group members, social identity can be ensured or enhanced.

A person may be held to inter-act with wider society simultaneously as an individual and as a member of any groups he or she might feel that they belonged to. The author believed that this might even well extend to an individual feeling for any trials or tribulations which he or she perceives as being experienced by any groups he or she might feel that they belonged to. Such assumptions allow social identity theory to be extended in to an area known as conflict theory and hence into the realms of politics and statesmanship (Tajfel, & Turner, 1979, p 282).

Tajfel accepted that we live in a world alive with the possibility of prejudice or discrimination aligned with groups and group perceptions, nevertheless Tajfel saw groups as being positive, they could give subject to means, in co-operation with fellow group members, of seeking to improve their position as individuals and as a group.

Positive in-group bias can be explained because the in-group comes to take on a self-relevant role, where the person defines him or herself through the group. As (Tajfel, H., & Turner, 1979: 282), the treatment of out-group members is directly related to the motive to protect or enhance the self. Social identity effects are based on protection and enhancement of self-concepts, threat to the self-concept would intuitively be related to the strongest identity effects. Several laboratory and field studies have empirically confirmed that when groups pose a threat to one another, the effects of identification increase. This social identity bases of discrimination, prejudice, and intergroup conflict, by locating these phenomena as resulting from group-based categorization and self-enhancement motives. However, the historical evolution of the theory itself also offers an interesting case in which intergroup conflicts become redefined as aspects of individual identity.

Social theorist (Tajfel, & Turner, 1979, p. 282) proposed that the groups, social class, family, football team. Everyone belonged to were an important source of pride and self-esteem. Groups give us a sense of social identity: a sense of belonging to the social world. Which means they are based on their membership. The theory divided the world into “them” and “us” based through a process of social categorization i.e. they put people into social groups.

Prejudiced views between cultures may result in racism; in its extreme forms, racism may result in genocide, such as occurred in Germany with the Jews, in Rwanda between the Hutus and Tutsis and, more recently, in the former Yugoslavia between the Bosnians and Serbs. Social categorization is one explanation for prejudice attitudes “them” and “us” mentality which leads to in-groups and out-groups.

2.2.2. Social Identity Theory Stages

There are three mental processes involved in evaluating others as “us” or “them” (Tajfel, & Turner, 1979, p. 282).

2.2.2.1. Categorization

We categorize objects in order to understand them and identify them. In a very similar way we categorize people (including ourselves) in order to understand the social environment. We use social categories like black, white, Australian, Christian, Muslim, student, and bus driver because they are useful (Tajfel, H., & Turner, 1979: 282). Similarly, we find out things about ourselves by knowing what categories we belong to. Tajfel and Turner said that, we define appropriate behavior by reference to the norms of groups we belong to, but you can only do this if you can tell who belongs to your group. An individual can belong to many different groups.

2.2.2.2. Social Identification

In the second stage, social identification, people adopt the identity of the group we have categorized themselves as belonging to as Tajfel and Turner explanation.

If for example people categorized themselves as a student, the chances are they will adopt the identity of a student and begin to act in the ways they believe students act and conform to the norms of the group.

There will be an emotional significance to identification with a group, and their self-esteem will become bound up with group membership (Tajfel, H., & Turner, 1979: 282).

2.2.2.3. Social Comparison

Once people will categorize themselves as part of a group and have identified with that group we then tend to compare that group with other groups. If their self-esteem is to be maintained their group needs to compare favorably with other groups.

This is critical to understanding prejudice, because once two groups identify themselves as rivals, they are forced to compete in order for the members to maintain their self-esteem (Tajfel, H., & Turner, 1979: 282).

2.2.2.4 Evolutionary psychology theory

Evolutionary psychology (Schaller, 2011) can contribute explanations for why insults towards social and sexual minority groups often co-occur concerning body parts and sexual practices that both derogate the target and express disgust towards him/her. One theory is that disgust has developed from its origin as a disease avoidance mechanism into a putative behavioral immune

system comprised of cognitive, affective, and behavioral tendencies to avoid sources of disease. Because the biological costs of infection are high, this behavioral immune system makes us hyper-vigilant and reactive to ‘false positive’ threats. For example, the system may be triggered by people who appear ‘strange’ to the majority because they do not conform to societal and/or sexual norms (Nussbaum, 2010).

2.3. Television and its impact on audience

Television presents information in very effective way. This makes things memorable easily. It is one of the great tool for entertainment as it relays movies, reality shows, serials etc. It also helps alleviate depression of mentally suffering patients. Watching television has many positive and negative effects on the behavior among children. Positive effects include, while negative effects includes violence, behave aggressively and their emotional aspects affected. Technology makes our life easy and it becomes a part of our lives everywhere, anywhere (Gerbner, 1998: 175-195)

Television can be a very powerful and effective learning tool for children if used wisely. Television can help young people discover where they fit into society, develop closer relationships with peers and family, and teach them to understand complex social aspects of communication (Shulman, 1973). Meanwhile, Television has also been credited with changing the norms of social propriety, although the direction and value of this change are disputed. It influencing its viewers, evoked an imitative response from other competing media as they struggle to keep pace and retain viewer- or readership.

As Shulman, analysis there are so many psychological negative effect in the audience. The basal ganglia portion of the brain become very active when a person plays video games and watching TV. And the body releases a chemical called dopamine. Ritalin (and cocaine) also works on the basal ganglia of the brain and increase dopamine. More dopamine is released; the less neurotransmitter is available to do anything else. For that reason persons with illnesses related to dopamine unbalance like ADHD should limit the spent on watching TV to a half –hour a day.

Cultivation of ‘fear of crime’ among television viewers has captivated by the program content type which has relationship between coverage of crime and its perceiving. The ‘crime’ and its ‘fear’ have an interesting impact on people and when it is measured against the television

coverage, the examination became more attractive with outstanding media dynamics as (Gerbner, 1998: 175-195)

The electronic media has more effect than print and other form of media. The coverage of crimes and negative report on media not only effects audience' perception about crime following their consumption but also creates differing mediated and real worlds. The negative effects of television are countless. As Gerbner explanation the major negative effect is, isolation, aggressiveness and negative social development. Many children sit around watching television and rarely play with other kids. This leads to stunted social development.

Heavy television viewers were more likely than comparable light viewers to overestimate crime rates and risk of personal exposure to crime and underestimate the safety of their neighborhoods. The cultivation theory has been widely used in the study of violence in television. The theory has been used to explain how children who watch violent cartoons become violent themselves. Repeated exposure to violence on television reinforces existing beliefs that the world is a dangerous and unsafe place (Gerbner, 1998: 175-195).

According to both author television has immense power to change people's way of thinking and how they behave. If the media houses transmit hate based reports and programs, the contents of the program can affect and can create negative consequences.

2.4. What is freedom of expression?

Freedom of expression relates to the liberty to be able to hold opinions and to impart and/or receive these as well as ideas and information to others in any form. According to International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of (Article 4, 1965), freedom of Expression is the best way of attaining the truth. It advances the ability to criticize or converse one another without fear and allows us to get to the truth. Also the research strongly believed that freedom of expression is a vital part of the democratic process as free debate about public issues facilitates the strengthening of a democracy.

In similar expression on freedom of opinion and expression is a fundamental human right, protected in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and given legal force through all major international and regional human rights treaties. In this paper freedom of

speech explained widely and it about that individuals and community use to articulate their opinions and ideas without fear of retaliation, censorship, or legal sanction.

There are differences between on freedom of speech and hate speech. Both ideas focus on speeches, seeming with speech act that deliberately focus on violate or defame individuals, groups, demographic or political groups (Barendt, 2005). This research explain that, navigating through these tensions invites a consideration of the repercussions of limiting or encouraging freedom of expression, including the defense of hate speech, and whether or not this significantly affects a person or group's right to human dignity.

The universal right to "human dignity" is therefore intrinsically connected to the protection of fundamental political rights and freedoms. Freedom of speech and hate speech then becomes a point of contention when the balance between opinion and violations of human dignity are shifted, raising the issue of hate speech and international legislation.

2.5. Importance of freedom of expression

As the "ICERD" (1965) in which Article 4 explanation, freedom of expression give self-determination as well to others view and it protects the right of the dissenters. It is for these reasons that the right of Freedom of expression is regarded as an imperial right which is worthy of observance and protection in any free society.

The importance of free expression as (Barendt, 2005), is to a democratic society cannot be overstated and continues to be a point of advocacy for the maintenance of a healthy democracy. Freedom of expression is the most important thing in the citizen's day to day life and their relationship with government.

Freedom of expression has been established as a key freedom required for sustaining a democracy. However with every right comes responsibility and therein is the need for a limitation on the right to freedom of expression so as to prevent the destructive and regressive effect it could have said International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of 1965 ("ICERD") in which Article 4, The concept of hate speech makes reference to speech that attacks the person or group to whom it is targeted on the basis of hatred or incitement of harm.

Freedom of expression is recognized as the will of the people over which government to account, through discourse it influence the manner of government supposed to govern. When this freedom of expression appear peoples can protest on what they didn't like as the paper of "ICERD" (1965) in which Article 4. Groups are then able to make their grievances and concerns know to the government who it is hoped would listen to the voices of the people and take remedial action thereafter as "ICERD" (1965).

2.6. Can and should freedom of expression be limited?

Determining the protected characteristics also requires an understanding of the history of oppression and discrimination in a particular state, as well as its current social problems. Hence, (OSCE, 2009: 38-39) mentioned, protected characteristics should also include the characteristics that have been the basis for past discrimination or oppression, as well as the ones that are the basis for the present or contemporary incidents of discrimination or oppression. When the freedom expression were not be limited, the discrimination and hateful speeches will be dominant. For example, blue-eyed people have not experienced history of oppression, nor they experience oppression or discrimination at the moment, hence the expression targeting this characteristic will not or cannot be treated as a hate speech (Lawrence, 1999).

According to the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 106 of (Africa, 1996), the right to freedom of expression requires that it be exercised with the responsibility not to infringe on other rights. In South Africa, this prerequisite that every rights remain trained within this limitation of responsibility to others. Most legislation relating to freedom of expression has an express limitation inserted that makes it clear what free expression cannot extend to. The internal limitation within the South African Constitution is unique in that it is the only right within the Bill of Rights that contains an internal limitation clause. This is indeed attributed to the South African history of apartheid which seemed to thrive on discrimination, hate speech and harassment. The writers of the Constitution were cognizant of that history and the need to takes steps to highlight the responsibility that lies with the ever so important right to freedom of expression.

The South African Constitution states that Freedom of Expression cannot extend to expression that enlists:

- a. Propaganda for war;
- b. Incitement of imminent violence; or
- c. Advocacy of hatred that is based on race, ethnicity gender or religion and that constitutes incitement to cause harm.

This is to say that responsible exercise of free expression is such that it is within the confines of expression that does fall within section 16(2) of the Constitution.

The need to limit certain rights is due to the fact that careless exercise of the right may infringe on the rights of others and thereby become destructive as evidenced from the apartheid history of South Africa. It is prudent therefore that the right be limited.

Also in Article 20(2) of the ICCPR obliges States to prohibit by law “any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence”. The HR Committee stressed that while States are required to prohibit such expression, these limitations must nevertheless meet the strict conditions set out in Article 19(3).

2.7. What does hate speech mean?

‘Hate speech’ is a term widely used, but lacking a single meaning. In this article we follow (Parekh, 2012: 37-56) in emphasizing three defining characteristics. First, it is ‘directed against a specified or easily identifiable individual or a group of individuals based on an arbitrary and normatively irrelevant feature’. Second, ‘hate speech stigmatizes the target group by implicitly or explicitly ascribing to it qualities widely regarded as highly undesirable’. Third, ‘the target group is viewed as an undesirable presence and a legitimate object of hostility’

an offence punishable by law all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred, incitement to racial discrimination, as well as all acts of violence or incitement to such acts against any race or group of persons of another color or ethnic origin, and also the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof (ICERD, 1965).

A conception of hate speech as speech that is directed at historically identifiable minorities; that targets them with speech that is harmful to their involvement in processes of democratic

legitimation (Gelber, K and McNamara, 2015). Hate speech is historically know discrimination and maltreatment for the others as Gelber explanation, that it would imperil a target's ability to participate in the political decision making that affects them. This discriminatory hate speech from speech that may offend someone, hurt their feelings, be vituperative, or contain epithets, some of which may be capable of the discriminatory harms of hate speech, but none of which is definitively capable of doing so unless other factors are in place.

In recent years, Europe has witnessed a significant increase of xenophobic, nationalist, Islam phobic, racist and anti-Semitic attitudes. Their effects are not solely restricted to hostile rhetoric, instead, they turn into actual crimes against groups and individuals. As Heiko Maas, the German Minister of Justice puts it: Hate speech is often not restricted to mere act of hateful speech. It often moves from words to deeds. The fact that "mental incitement" too often turns into violence can be seen in the surge in attacks on refugee shelters: in 2014, the number of acts tripled in comparison with the previous year (Maas, 2015).

2.8. Legislation around hate speech

The European Convention of Human Rights (E. convention on H. Rights, 2014), in Recommendation CM/ Rec (2010)5 “on measures to combat discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation or gender identity,” the Committee of Ministers has since recommended the following definition for homophobic and transphobic “hate speech”: “all forms of expression, including in the media and on the Internet, which may be reasonably understood as likely to produce the effect of inciting, spreading or promoting hatred or other forms of discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons.”

Hate speech' targets people, as individuals or groups, because of who they are.

“Direct and public incitement to genocide” - prohibited in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), (Genocide Convention) and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998) (Rome Statute), ICC). Prohibition of incitement to other discriminatory violations of international criminal law, such as the war crime of persecution, is not required by either the Genocide Convention or the Rome Statute, but should be considered within this category.

Fair and accurate reporting or commentary in the public interest or in the publication of any information, commentary, advertisement or notice, in accordance with section 16(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. The State, the South African Human Rights Commission and the Commission for Gender Equality have a duty to promote awareness of the prohibition against hate crimes and hate speech, aimed at the prevention and combating of these offences. Without derogating from the general nature of the duty referred to in subsection, one or more Cabinet members, designated by the President, must cause programs to be developed (South Africa ministry of justice and correctional Services., 2018)

The terms ‘hatred’ and ‘hostility’, (Mendel, 2010) speaks of a “distinct paucity of material in official documents and court decisions on what constitutes ‘hatred’”. Both terms are often used and defined as equivalents, but the inevitable question then becomes whether there actually is any difference.

Hatred and hostility would appear to refer to very similar notions. Significantly, both the HRC [human Rights Committee] and the Committee on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD Committee) have understood their respective terms to include a passive state of mind rather than a specific act. In other words, the proscribed result is simply a state of mind in which hostility towards a target group is harbored, even though this is not accompanied by any urge to take action to manifest itself.

This finding leads invariably to a contradiction within international law: “hatred, as such, is simply an opinion and is thus absolutely protected under international law” (Mendel, 2010).

In Egypt hate speech divided into xenophobic, political, religious and cultural forms. Politically induced hate speech contains hate speech against political groups for their political opinions (Zaharaa, 2014): 162-174). It also includes hate speech based on nationalist discourses against some Arab nationals. Xenophobic hate speech is hate speech that incites the hatred or rejection of foreigners, particularly Westerners. Cultural forms of hate speech include forms of hate speech against religious groups, particularly religious minority groups and ethnic group (Allam, 2014).

2.9. Deeply offensive expressions

Hate can be disseminated by both individuals and groups. Online hate speech authors do not have specific victims. Experience shows that the most common groups against whom such speech is directed are refugees and immigrants, as well as religious, ethnic minorities (Klein, 2012: 429). Such groups are marginalized and terrorist attacks and misconducts of individuals belonging to certain minority groups are frequently instrument to undermine the public image of vulnerable people. This section will demonstrate different forms of online hate speech that exemplify the new methods of hate speech generally. The first one is a more traditional expression of intolerance towards different groups, while others are more recent, transformative measures that aim to change the perception of hate speech (Perry, B., & Alvi, 2012:57-71).

International freedom of expression standards protect expression that is offensive, disturbing or shocking, and do not permit limitations premised solely on the basis of “offence” caused to an individual or group. International human rights law provides no right to individuals to be free from offence, but it does unequivocally protect their right to counter such offence and speak out against proponents of that speech (Klein, 2012:427-448).

However, states often sanction expression labelled as “offensive,” sometimes even distinguishing degrees of offence as a basis for imposing sanctions. The nature of “offense” is inherently subjective, allowing the State to arbitrarily restrict certain views. Too often, prohibitions on “offensive” speech also lack the precision and clarity necessary to enable the public to regulate their conduct in accordance with the law. ARTICLE 19 therefore believes offence should never be a basis for restricting expression, even if it is discriminatory, without proof of that expression falling within the categories identified in Part III.

Hatred will caused serious damage and it have to be banned in any case. There are hatred in every activities, but the hatred of journalist and media is the most influential and make serious harm in the receiver of the hate speech (Perry, B., & Alvi, 2012:57-71). One person’s abuse or insults, observed by others, may be understood as “advocacy of hatred” inciting a prohibited conduct. This may be the case where there is an influential “ringleader” in a situation analogous to a “mob”; one person leading discriminatory insults causes others to join with a view to inciting others to a prohibited conduct (Article 19, 2015).

Hatred should be understood, as above, to be a state of mind, characterized by the “intense and irrational emotions of opprobrium, enmity and detestation” towards a target group on the basis of a protected characteristic as Article 19 explanation.

In this Article included the idea for the purpose of the prohibitions under Article 20(2), “hatred” relates to the state of mind of the speaker vis-à-vis the target group, and to the state of mind of the audience who s/he ultimately seeks to incite to the proscribed conducts. This is distinct from the feelings of insult or indignity that the target group may feel when confronted by ‘hate speech’, which is not the object of the Article 20(2).

2.10. Prohibited speech

The type of hatred is also relevant. Article 20(2) of the ICCPR only lists the “advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred” but, as noted above, we recommend that this list be interpreted expansively as “advocacy of any discriminatory hatred” against a person or group of persons. This would encompass all of the protected characteristics recognized under international human rights law, reading Article 20(2) of the ICCPR (C. and political Rights, 2014) in light of the broader nondiscrimination provisions in Article 2(1) and Article 26 of the ICCPR, and other international legal instruments addressing discrimination.

According to Article 19, Hate speech’ that must be prohibited and showed that the speech is very dangerous for the society. The Article elucidate the international law, States are required to prohibit the most severe forms of ‘hate speech’. The prohibitions are tailored to preventing the exceptional and irreversible harms the speaker intends and is able to incite.

“Direct and public incitement to genocide” prohibited in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948)²³ (Genocide Convention) and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998) (Rome Statute), ICC).

Prohibition of incitement to other discriminatory violations of international criminal law, such as the war crime of persecution, is not required by either the Genocide Convention or the Rome Statute, but should be considered within this category. Any advocacy of discriminatory hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence, as analogous to Article 20(2) of the ICCPR, but must additionally satisfy the requirements of Article 19(3) of the ICCPR

ARTICLE 19 therefore generally finds laws that allow “groups” to file defamation cases problematic, and recommends their repeal. Instead, harm to a group of persons as a consequence of ‘hate speech’ should be litigated or prosecuted under legitimate ‘hate speech’ provisions.

Hatred should be understood, as above, to be a state of mind, characterized by the “intense and irrational emotions of opprobrium, enmity and detestation” towards a target group on the basis of a protected characteristic.

Negotiating hate speech is a delicate matter because, “from a human rights perspective, the right to life and the prohibition of discrimination are to be balanced against the freedom of expression” (Buyse, 2014: 796), and the sometimes consequential need for tolerance of these multiple expressions. In this way, a controversial case could be made for the protection of speech acts that are often divisive. Protecting hate speech, however, presents the risk of prejudices becoming entrenched in pluralistic societies (Hirvonen, 2013: 78-86), which then compromise concepts of human dignity, defamation and human rights (Leo, L.A., Gaer, F.D. and Cassidy, 2011: 769-784). Still, protecting hate speech does not only protect the speaker’s rights but also allows the target of these speech acts to “speak back” (Mårtensson, 2013: 230-248). Freedom of speech principles then need to be balanced by considering whether or not these speech acts are offensive or incite violence (Tsesis, 2013: 497-532), and so the question of legalization comes into play.

When we think about legislation, established laws and judicial systems are heavily reliant on Western paradigms, frameworks and institutions. American courts have been contending with issues on free speech for a few hundred years, whereas the European courts have been dealing with them within the last seven decades (Barendt, 2005:55). When considering hate speech, there is a need to remember that human rights law does not dictate that freedom of expression is an unconditional right.

Freedom of expression can be limited by protocols determined by documents like the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICPPR), the American Convention on Human Rights (ACHR), and the European Convention for Human Rights (ECHR) (Buyse, 2014: 791). With regards to discrimination, Article 20(2) of the ICPPR states: “Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law” (OHCHR, 1976). Further clauses on racial discrimination

are also found in the International Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination OHCHR, (1969). It is also evident that much has been written in the American and European contexts (Bleich, 2011: 917-934), resulting in a need for more discussion in the non-Western contexts.

2.11. Xenophobic hate speech

When we see out boxes on non-Western contexts is completely different. There are cultural and aspect differences. In the case of xenophobia, it appear in Africa more than western situation.

Research hate speech has increased since the January 25th Uprising. In the post-January 25th Uprising (Yosra El Gendi) Since the January 25th Uprising in 2011, various forms of hate speech have been on the rise in Egyptian media. These can be divided into xenophobic, political, religious and cultural forms. Politically-induced hate speech contains hate speech against political groups for their political opinions (Zaharaa, 2014: 162-174). It also includes hate speech based on nationalist discourses against some Arab nationals. Xenophobic hate speech is hate speech that incites the hatred or rejection of foreigners, particularly Westerners. Cultural forms of hate speech include forms of hate speech against religious groups, particularly religious minority groups (Allam, 2014).

While xenophobic hate speech may emerge in periods of national crisis, different levels of xenophobia are rooted in an anti-colonial discourse that aims at liberating the Egyptian nation from the trends of Westerners and to maintaining local customs and traditions. After the January 25th Uprising, the rise in this discourse was partially a result of attempts to discredit democratic ideas and supporters of the uprising as being Westernized and thus inauthentic. This was also manifested in advertisements on TV that warned of the dangers of giving information to foreigners, perceived as potential spies (Uthman, 2014). In the case of a crackdown on civil society in 2011, a number of international NGOs (including the National Democratic Institute, International Republican Institute, Freedom House, Konrad Adenauer Foundation and others) were accused of operating illegally in Egypt (El Taraboulsi, S., Khallaf, M. and Farouky, 2013), was an extension to this discourse. Thus, the increase of xenophobic sentiments after the January 25th Uprising in 2011 was conducive to the increase of xenophobic hate speech.

The aftermath of the January 25th Uprising in 2011 has witnessed a period of a chaotic state of media freedom, which in some cases has led to politicized discourses and low professional standards and professional ethics. This politicized discourse was polarized further by the political events leading to the June 30th 2013 incidents in Tahrir Square. Nationalist and xenophobic discourses have also been used as hate speech against foreigners. Furthermore, there is evidence that hate speech against religious groups has resulted in much popular upheaval since 2011 (Charlotte Elliott, 2016).

2.12. Does hate speech harm?

2.12.1. Psychological and social effects of hate-based violence's

The effects of hate-based violence on individuals, families, and communities are considered especially harmful because they are typically experienced not only as an attack on one's physical self but also as an attack on one's identity (Levin & McDevitt, 1993). Although the negative consequences of hate-based violence for the actual survivor, the survivor's community, and society at large have been well established in the literature, direct and systematic research on the subject is still very limited (Dzelme, 2008). Behaviors experienced at every level of the hate-based violence continuum can pose a threat to mental and physical health even though only some events constitute a psychological trauma according to the Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5) post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) criteria.

At the individual level, exposure to the foundational conditions of prejudice and discrimination may constitute an indirect form of violence. Exposure to prejudice and discrimination has been linked to severe psychosocial impairment, which may increase the risk of and exacerbate the additional traumatic effects of direct forms of hate-based violence (Waelde, 2010). Exposure to different forms of hate-based violence has been associated with a variety of physical and mental health problems, including symptoms associated with PTSD, depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and somatization (Kilpatrick, & Acierno, 2003). Survivors of hate-based violence also experience feelings of powerlessness, isolation, guilt, shame, anger, and loss of faith in law enforcement (Committee., 2006). One of the most prominent consequences of hate-based violence is persistent fear for one's own safety and that of their family. This fear may lead to physical and psychological constraints, such as changes in appearance and behaviors, attempts to

construct personal safety measures, damage to self-confidence, strain on personal relationships, or mental health conditions such as PTSD and depression (Dzelme, 2008).

The impact of prejudice and discrimination may extend beyond the trauma routinely associated with criminal victimization, challenging the survivor's sense of self. For individuals who are struggling with issues of identity formation or cohesion (e.g., sexual identity diffusion), hate-based prejudice and discrimination experiences may prove particularly destabilizing. For example, (McCoy & Major, 2003) found that Latinos who were initially low in ethnic identification even more strongly with their ethnic group if they read about pervasive prejudice against their group.

Prejudice and discrimination may have adverse and disruptive consequences for family relationships. The burden of fear and personal pain, coupled with the inability to share it, results in impairment in marital and family relations, reduced family cohesion, social dysfunction, and heightened family conflict (Goff, Crow, Reisbig, & Hamilton, 2007, p. 344-353). For parents, constant anxiety relating to the safety of their children and a perceived inability to protect them are associated with a sense of powerlessness, anger, shame, and frustration (Dzelme, 2008).

In addition to the individual and interpersonal effects of prejudice and discrimination, the heightened psychological distress produced by such events may affect the entire community. Acts of prejudice and discrimination are messages to members of the survivor's group that they are unwelcome and unsafe in the community, decreasing feelings of safety and security (Noelle, 2002). Furthermore, witnessing discrimination against one's own group can lead to psychological distress and lower self-esteem (McCoy & Major, 2003).

Of all crimes, hate crimes are most likely to create or exacerbate tensions between groups, communities, or entire nations and cultures, which can trigger larger community-wide or nation-wide and international racial conflict, civil disturbances, and even riots, thus putting communities at risk of serious social and economic consequences (Benier, 2017, p.179-201).

Although all marginalized groups, such as females, individuals with disabilities, or those belonging to religious minorities, may be at risk for hate-based violence and cumulative post-traumatic difficulties, the authors of this paper will provide two specific examples: racial and ethnic minority. These groups have historically and are currently subject to prejudice and

discrimination, and are therefore at high risk for hate-based violence and for cumulative negative mental health effects (Somerville, 2011,p. 82-101).

The literature distinguishes between constitutive and consequential harms (Somerville, 2011p. 82-101) namely, between harms that are occasioned in the saying of a hate speech act, and harms that occur as a result of it. Matsuda has written persuasively of individual harms including psychological distress and risk of destruction to one's self-esteem, and social harms such as restrictions on freedom of movement and association.

2.12.2. Manifestation of violence based on hatred

Hate speech like prejudice and discrimination are the foundation of hate-based violence. Hate based violence can take the form of verbal violence, which may include degradation, harassment, humiliation, and threats (Klonoff, Landrine, & Ullman, 1999,p.329). Hate-based violence may also take the form of physical violence, such as bullying, sexual violence, and maiming, and can go as far as murder and genocide. It is important to note the distinction between the foundation for hate-based violence and the actual acts of hate-based violence since prevention requires starting with the foundation of hate-based violence, and when prevention is not successful, interventions may be necessary to assist survivors in regaining safety and recovering from the traumatic effects of hate-based violence (Somerville, 2011,p. 82-101).

Hate-based crimes are often preceded or accompanied by prejudice, including negative stereotypes and distortions, and discrimination, including acts such as exclusion and disqualification. Hate speech, a form of violence which refers to actions or statements.

2.13. Hate speech in Ethiopia and the new proclamation

2.13.1. The content of the Ethiopian hate speech law

Is hate speech a limitation on freedom of speech?

Some Make argument on the idea of hate speech compared to freedom of speech. Recently, in the second month of 2020 GC the Ethiopian parliament passed a legislation that criminalizes hate speech and fake news. The law criticized by many journalist, politician and human rights groups as a threat to freedom of expression.

The Hate Speech and Disinformation Prevention and Suppression Proclamation law bans the production and dissemination of hate speech and fake news. The law mentions that, if the act of creating or sharing social media posts that could result in violence or disturbance of public order, was passed into law by the House of People's Representatives with a majority vote in the 547-seat parliament. Some 23 lawmakers voted against it while there were two abstentions.

Violators could be fined as high as 100,000 Ethiopian birr (\$3,115) and imprisoned for up to five years. Since the mid-2018, Ethiopia has experienced serious communal and ethnic violence. According to the authorities, some of that may have been provoked by hate speech and fake news that fomented ethnic tension and violence. Violence has increased since Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed, winner of the 2019 Nobel Peace Prize, came into power. This is because the reformist leader ensured the right to free speech and assembly for all.

2.13.2. Debate Regarding the hate speech Law

Rights groups criticized the new law, questioning the motives behind passing such a legislation. Many refused the law and take it like hindrance for freedom of speech and the Human Rights Watch warned that the bill could significantly curtail freedom of expression if approved. It urged the government to instead adopt a comprehensive strategy to address hate speech. Many journalists and human rights watch believed that the government has other options to target hate speech and fake news.

The bill threatens free expression as Reuters report (Haileselassie, 2019), Ethiopian lawmakers should significantly revise the draft law on hate speech and disinformation. Ethiopia has experienced serious communal violence that may have been provoked or exacerbated by online speech that fomented ethnic tension and violence. In late 2018, the government announced it was preparing a bill to tackle hate speech. On November 9, 2019, following a wave of protests in Ethiopia's capital, Addis Ababa, and in the Oromia region, that led to communal violence in a number of locations and the deaths of 86 people, the government promptly approved the proclamation.

"The Ethiopian government is under increasing pressure to respond to rising communal violence that has at times been exacerbated by speeches and statements shared online," said Laetitia Bader,

senior Africa researcher at Human Rights Watch. “But an ill-construed law that opens the door for law enforcement officials to violate rights to free expression is no solution.”

The government should instead adopt a comprehensive strategy to address incitement to violence, discrimination and hostility, and invoke non-punitive measures to address hate speech, Human Rights Watch said. This should include regular public messaging from the prime minister and other public figures about the dangers of hate speech, programs to improve digital literacy, and efforts to encourage self-regulation within and between communities.

The draft proclamation’s definition of hate speech is not narrowly restricted to speech that is likely to incite imminent violence, discrimination or hostility, as is required under international law. Instead it broadly allows punishment for “speech that promotes hatred, discrimination or attack against a person or an identifiable group, based on ethnicity, religion, race, gender or disability.” Nor does the draft law set out an objective process to make this determination.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explain in detail the research methods implemented for this study. The chapter will explain the choice of research approach, then the research design as well as the advantages and disadvantages of the research tools chosen. This paper includes the view of practitioners currently working with media expertise. It will address the problem caused by hate-based information and possible impact on society. Because of hate-based programs and speeches, peoples categorize themselves. The concern of research design, area of study, population, and samples of the population, sampling technique, and instruments for data collection and methods of data analysis are presented.

3.2. Research design

This research aims to show how the psychological impact of hate speech on audiences towards the selected three media houses how transmitted hate speech among their programs using words, images, and videos. These approaches will affect several things in the human day to day activity and communication. It could cause conflict between two ethnic groups, religion, race, national origin, sex, disability, sexual orientation, or gender identity. And also this can be caused by trauma in audience. This research will focus on the consequence of hate speech in the social-psychological makeup.

The research design is a plan, structure, and strategy of the investigation so conceived as to obtain answers to research questions or problems (Kumar, 1999). It is a blueprint or detailed plan of how a research study is to be completed operationalizing variables so that it can be measured, selecting a sample of interest to study, collecting data to be used as a basis for testing hypotheses, and analyzing the results.

In this research, a qualitative research method held and the type of data is reviewing the television program content. The location is in Addis Ababa and the media expertise participate on interviews. The research tries to see how hate speech entertains in the selected media house and the difference between hate speech and freedom of speech. In other words, the research design articulates what data is required, what methods are going to be used to collect and analyze data, and how all of this is going to answer the research question.

The function of the research design is to provide for the collection of relevant evidence with minimal expenditure of effort, time, and money. A flexible research design that provides an opportunity for considering many different aspects of a problem is considered appropriate if the purpose of the research study is that of exploration. But when the purpose happens to be an accurate description of a situation or an association between variables, the suitable design will be one that minimizes bias and maximizes the reliability of the data collected and analyzed (Kotheri, 2004).

3.3. Research approach

There are three approaches or methods for conducting research: qualitative methods, quantitative methods, and mixed methods (Kotheri, 2004). Seeing that this research study involves collecting and analyzing qualitative data. The justification for this research selected qualitative research methods to collect and analyze independent strands of qualitative data.

Though data sources, samples, and sample sizes are different, the methods are prioritizing equally since they are designed parallel to answer the same research questions together. Since the researcher believes that the qualitative method, provides a better understanding of a research problem or issue than either the research approach alone.

Qualitative method is employed since the researcher proposed to collect data through in-depth interviews and qualitative content analysis. And the interpretative and qualitative content analysis, a method of analysis also choose a qualitative method.

The qualitative research approach is used because, this method attempt to gain an understanding of underlying reasons and enthusiasm for actions and establish a better solution. Qualitative methods provide insights into the setting of a problem, generating ideas and/or hypotheses. The data type and data Source primary and secondary data type (Kotheri, 2004).

The strength of qualitative research is its ability to provide complex textual descriptions of how people experience a given research issue like hate speech on media. According to (Denzin, 2000), It provides information about the “human” side of an issue that is, the often contradictory behaviors, beliefs, opinions, emotions, and relationships of individuals. Qualitative methods are also effective in identifying intangible factors, such as social norms, socioeconomic status, gender roles, ethnicity, and religion, whose role in the research issue may not be readily apparent. Qualitative research can help us to interpret and better understand the complex reality of a given situation and the implications of quantitative data.

3.4. Sampling Techniques

Sampling is the process of selecting a portion of a population or universe. Sampling is the process of selecting units from a population of interest so that by studying the sample may fairly generalize our results back to the population from which they were chosen.

The data collection method and data collection tools are interview, review document, and program content review. Why preferred these methods are, to show the problem deeply from the expert view in both way to show the real happening (Denzin, 2000).

And probability and non-probability sampling are the two measure categories of sampling methods that help to select a representative of the population. Indeed, one between non-probability sampling method called purposive sampling technique, also called judgment sampling, is the overall technique (used for the selection of mainstream media and the Medias program contents, the professional and the program type) selected for this study wherein having a prior purpose in mind. In purposive sampling, the criteria of the elements that are to include in the study are predefined. Also, purposive sampling is very useful in the early stages of an exploratory study. And which help to gain detailed knowledge about a specific phenomenon rather than make statistical inferences. An effective purposive sample must have clear criteria and rationale for inclusion.

3.4.1. Selection of mainstream media platforms and their contents

EBC (Ethiopian Broadcast Corporation), OMN (Oromia media network), and LTV (leading or life television) are one of the biggest television stations in Ethiopia. EBC, OMN, and LTV are selected purposively from the mainstream media platform because they are one of a heavy viewer from both the government and private television station. There are different types of television stations in Ethiopia; focused on entertainment, information, and education. The selected television station for this paper is mixed type platform, they used to entertain somehow, teach their audience, and well informed. The selected media influence many people and both reflect and shape prevailing currents of thought. The selected media audiences are different and their selection of events is quite unlike. The stories are reported and how they are covered is dissimilar.

Purposive sampling is at this stage used to sample from EBC, OMN, and LTV political talk show, the content entertained and posts on YouTube which are reachable for everyone who

needed it. The ethnic and religious issues present unlikely and even the government policies and other issues are quite altered.

According to the season, most political issues are hot, open for further definition and meanings. Peoples will be led by the media, the information gathers from the media are reliable for society most of the time.

3.4.2. Selection of new media users and professionals

For this research, the researcher used the YouTube viewer to extract and know the audience's way of thinking and responses. To know people's way of thinking need further experimental studies but instead of their expression, it will be fair to say something depend on their comments. The viewer of selected media followers is probably actively engaged in the mainstream media and YouTube channel. So their comment will be included in this paper; media professionals and psychologists specifically selected for the sake of clear pinpoint. The researcher believed that they are informant of the topic.

3.5. Sample size

The selection made by the government and private-owned media. This media organization purposely selected mainstream media platforms as they are the most viewed media in Ethiopia. From these two stations, political programs are selected purposively because there are intense situations in the political movement and for this reason, the political programs are become sided for one party. When they support one of their group the other will claim thereby they used to entertain hate speech to demolish the value of the society.

Sample size determination is the act of choosing the number of observations or replicates to include in a statistical sample. The sample size is an important feature of any empirical study in which the goal is to make inferences about a population from a sample. In practice, the sample size used in a study is usually determined based on the cost, time, or convenience of collecting the data, and the need for it to offer sufficient statistical power.

For this research, the year 2012 EC selected purposely and the program uploaded day written in Gregorian calendar for the sake of finding on you tube, from this year the selected television stations gave the selected chance only one month program for each of them. Due to this, four programs from each station and a total of 12 programs will be evaluated in the aspect of hate speech existence. The program aired season will depend on the country's political situation, four programs from the political hot season and the rest will be from the calm season. The reason we

selected this way is it helpful to compare and contrast the situation versus the program, the journalist discipline versus the media ethics and professionalism, comment of the audience versus the real situation, and aired program content.

The total sample sizes are determined by the operational definition, comments and posts that are video that is insulting, intimidating, humiliating, or projected to incite violence or prejudice against a person or group of people grounded on and stating a certain group of ethnicity and religion among the total sample size. The intention of data collection for qualitative data is to establish and gain information from a small sample however to collect in-depth information from this sample; but, in quantitative research, a large sample is needed to conduct important statistical tests.

Regarding the professionals, they selected from the three professions thirteen person, six from media professional, six from psychology professionals and one from lawyer. They will go to explain how the human mind works regarding speech and hate speech. How hate speech influences the human mind and ultimately the consequence of hate speech at all.

3.6. Data collection tools

3.6.1. Data source

Primary data is collected with an aim for getting a solution to the problem at hand and its factual as well original. Primary data is data that is collected by a researcher from first-hand sources, using methods like surveys, interviews, or experiments (Kotheri, 2004). Secondary data is data gathered from studies, surveys, or experiments that have been run by other people or for other research.

Primary data is information collected through original or first-hand research. On the other hand, secondary data is information that has been collected in the past by someone else. The objective of any study defines whether primary or secondary data is to be collected.

At this point, Primary data are collected using content analysis of mainstream media talk shows, and in-depth interviews. The secondary data are dissimilar books and articles that the researcher used to cultivate the literature of the topic and the argument of the study.

3.6.2. Content analysis

Journalistic ethics and standards comprise principles of ethics and good practice applicable to journalists. This subset of media ethics is known as journalism's professional "code of ethics" and the "canons of journalism". While various codes may have some differences, most share common elements including the principles of truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, impartiality, fairness, and public accountability, as these apply to the acquisition of newsworthy information and its subsequent dissemination to the public.

Like many broader ethical systems, the ethics of journalism include the principle of "limitation of harm." This may involve the withholding of certain details from reports, such as the names of minor children, crime victims' names, or information not materially related to the news report where the release of such information might.

Some journalistic codes of ethics, notably some European codes, also include a concern with discriminatory references in news based on race, religion, sexual orientation, and physical or mental disabilities. The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe approved (in 1993) Resolution 1003 on the Ethics of Journalism, which recommends that journalists respect the presumption of innocence, in particular in cases that are still sub judice.

Qualitative Content Analysis, as a data collection method, used to collect data from mainstream media and YouTube posts that mentioned political ideology, ethnicity, and religion in Ethiopia.

3.6.3. In-depth Interviews

In-depth interviews contain direct assignment with individual participants. It is a qualitative data collection method where the interviewer can ask the participants altered questions based on their responses. In-depth interviews need the interviewer to be highly skilled at such data collection methods to ensure that the participants feel comfortable in sharing information authentically, that there is no data lost in the process and the quality of information collected is in-depth and thorough (Kothari, 2004). Consuming all rewards of an in-depth interview, the researcher used semi-structured with 6 individual interviewees to attain qualitative data as well.

The interviewer is also required to be fairly empathetic to individual participants during the one-to-one engagement. Again, the choice of location is important in the level of comfort the participants may experience. As Kotheri explanation, in-depth interviews are normally carried out face to face so that a rapport can be created with respondents. Body language is also used to

add a high level of understanding of the answers. Telephones can also be used by a skilled researcher with little loss of data and at a tenth of the cost.

The researcher prefers semi-structured interviews on open-ended questions. This way the researcher can get detailed information and can ask a follow-up question regarding the topic. The hours will be used from 20 – 60 minutes. The interview remains recorded and then transcribe from Amharic to English.

The style of the interview depends on the interviewer. Successful in-depth interviewers listen rather than talk. It will hold a clear line of questioning and use body language to build rapport. The interview is more of a guided conversation than a clipped question and answer session. The interview is conducted using a discussion guide which facilitates the flushing out of the respondent's views through open-ended questioning.

3.7. Data presentation and analysis techniques

Data analysis has two prominent methods: qualitative research and quantitative research. Each method has its techniques. Interviews and observations are forms of qualitative research, while experiments and surveys are quantitative research. For this paper choose qualitative research data analysis.

Data presentation plays a crucial role in communication research, as the objectives are made clear with relevant pieces of evidence. The researchers can convince their research to the reader by the effective data presentation. Reaching on this part is a sign of gain the confidence of the reader of the research document.

Interview and text analysis are hired for this part of the research paper. The qualitative data, findings are presented and analyzed. The research question addressed and interpreted.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETION

4.1. Introduction

The main objective of this study was research the psychological impact of hate speech on audiences towards political television talk shows. Four main research questions were articulated and qualitative research method were selected to comprehend the stated objective. Formerly in this chapter all primarily collected data are presented, analyzed and discussed to ample the core objectives of the study and to response the stood research questions.

4.2. How the chapter presented

This chapter presented the user comments beneath videos tagged with what is, which have been released on YouTube but try to minimize the hateful expression for the sake of insurable of readers.

Based on a qualitative content analysis of a random sample of user comments related to the videos that are tagged with what is, basically aim to review the potentials of counter messages to foster a critical awareness or reflection, inquire which themes and topics are brought up in comments posted below counter speech videos. To relate these topics to the content of counter speech videos and further investigate to which aspects of the videos the comments refer to. To focus on a specific aspect of hate speech in comments below the counter-message videos, we question which topics serve as the indicators of hate speech.

For all twelve videos, randomly selected the user comments. The sampling procedure is based on the profile-sampling method developed by (Reinders, 2012), for qualitative research designs. Reinders' approach allows qualitatively to inquire about a huge corpus of data material and at the same time considering its diversity and complexity. The basic idea of this method is to reduce the material by organizing the data in specific formal clusters (in the present study relied on the comment count per user as a formal criterion) so-called profiles (Reinders, 2012) and to randomly select the final material or the analysis based on these clusters. To apply this technique to the material user comments related to the videos and quantitative information regarding the material are necessary (Reinders, 2012). In the present study, used qualitative data about the number of comments by each user that have been generated with YouTube.

For content review, 12 episodes of a television program were selected from three different television stations. The type of selected programs is hard talk on Ethiopian politics. From each television selected purposively four interviews and randomly the comment below on the posted programs. After aired programs immediately uploaded on YouTube and viewers can express their comments and ideas write below. This paper aims to research the psychological impact of hate speech on audiences towards to address selected political programs in Ethiopia media houses. To address the root causes of hate speech and how much they use hate speech on the television. The programs review below and transcribe to English. All programs produced in Amharic language and most comments are in the same language. Some of the comments given in English, the rest is in Amharic and I translate all to English.

4.3. Demographic status of the interviewee

The interview helps to explain what is the issues are and gives a better understanding of the research. It is open-ended questions and in-depth information collected. The studying is complex, because of that it required lengthy explanation, dialogue with respondents to work through their responses.

Purposive Sampling method selected for the interview part and the researcher chooses the participants. It uses the judgment of an expert in selecting issues more convenient and select only individuals that are relevant to research design. Besides this, there is no way to ensure that the sample is truly representative of the population, and more emphasis is placed on the ability of the researcher to assess the elements of the population.

The participant for an interview is 13 professionals, six from media practitioner and experts, six from psychology and one is a lawyer. From the whole participant six are women's and seven are men's, all are first and second-degree holders in their profession.

4.5. List of the titles of the twelve interviews

4.5.1. ETV

(□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□) The EPRDF unification meeting in Nov 21/2019.

(□□□□ □□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□) The discussion between political parties on the national 2020 election and COVID 19 pandemic May 19/2020.

Video	Transition date	Dislikes	Likes	Number of views	Total number of comments
We are not nationalist like others	Jan 22/2020	1918	2800	365,165	6,227
Unitary is emerging	Sep 25/2019	522	861	105,178	1,131
The rhetoric which say Woyane divided us is a fable	Oct 2/2019	1883	1500	412785	3231
What has been done to make the country stable	Dec 25, 2019	412	2056	240353	1496
Total (N)		4,735	7,217	1123481	12,085

Table 2

4.6.2. Selected program from OMN

Video	Transition date	Dislikes	Likes	Number of views	Total number of sample comments
The relationship between flag and religion	Jan 17/2020	19	209	7847	64
Bekele Gerba interview with OMN and his response to the Mekelle journey	Aug8/2019	5	49	4325	17
Current affairs with Girma Gutema	Oct 26/2019	173	717	35,430	354
Jawar Mohamed and Lidetu Ayalewu; Corona Virus, national election, crisis on the constitution and solution-	May 02/2020	355	2100	113,641	749

based answers					
Total (N)		552	3,068	161,243	1,184

Table 3

4.6.3. Selected program from EBC

Video	Transition date	Dislikes	Likes	Number of views	Total number of sample comments
The discussion between political parties on the national 2020 election and COVID 19 pandemic	May 19/2020	5	36	2498	Comments are turned off
About the next national election	Feb 2/2020	1	13	1933	11
The human rights in Ethiopia	Dec 6/2019	0	0	196	0
The EPRDF unification meeting	Nov 21/2019	5	6	721	2
Total (N)		11	55	5,348	13

4.7. Blaming on history

“LTV show” is one of the LTV political programs and it is a weekly Amharic show. The show produced an interview with Asefa Wedajo, a lecturer at Dilla University.

The selected interview questions focused on the meeting held in Mekelle and the interviewee's role in the assembly. The person attended the meeting by invitation and present himself as a politician and human rights watch.

The interview uses images well and the camera shot was held by three cameras with good video editing. The camera angles are good. In this show, the interview questions well-structured but the presentation was rough.

In this episode, the journalist raised a question for the guest claiming what he has been present in the assembly. He claimed that the guest devoted to raised hate speech towards a certain tribe and he remain judged.

The guest tries to elucidate his opinion and accusation,

People denying a very true history in Ethiopia and those people should stop doing the history misleading act. The people who been aggressive on me, are completely not related to my above truthful and moral statement, they were mad at Emperor Minilik issues, not anything else. The Emperor Minilik issue about how he ruled Ethiopia by the time being and he ruled in an autocratic way. And also this must tell and have to be admitted by Amharas. I was reminding this truth and I didn't do wrong but peoples were shouted on me.

□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□
□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□
□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□□□

The guest speak this but no follow up question about the raised idea to clarify for the audience, just left out the question.

The speaker mentioned the phrase to explain his idea about one of his against person “□□□□□ □□” “just like a mentally ill person” this phrase is the categorization and he used to isolation. It means the person who has a mental problem has to be isolated from society. From the journalist's side, there were no defense questions and corrections about it.

In media hate-related speech mirrored by the rise of democracy in the country and the change of the EPRDF to the “changer team” or Prosperity Party (by the current name). The political movement changes the media culture and gives more freedom to produce any kind of program. Some of the media houses and the Journalists used to hate speech, harassment, bullying, and

discrimination, targeted directly and indirectly through forums, several programs, and as well on YouTube media.

This rise in hate speech YouTube is compounded by difficulties in policing such activities which see the Internet remain largely unregulated.

Although no statistics offer a current global overview of hate speech online, both social networking platforms and organizations that combat hate speech have recognized that the online dissemination of hateful messages is increasing and that greater attention should be paid to this phenomenon, for adequate responses to be developed. According to (Base, 2017), a web-based application that collects global instances of hate speech online, most cases target individuals based on ethnicity and nationality; however, incitements to hatred based on religion, class, gender, and sexual orientation are increasing.

Emperor Minik destroys the wolayta society's personality but now the new powered groups coming to destroy that kind of ruling system. Emperor Minilik is now symbolic and metaphor, this ruling system was imperialist, not federalist. Now I stand for federalism on those the so-called ruling power it will be messages. Said the guest speaker.

□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□
□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□
□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□□□
□□□ □□ □□□□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□□□□□

“If anyone appreciates Emperor Minilik, it means that trying to kill our society and disrespect them. It is not fair to put the sign of the emperor in the palace because he was feudal.”

“□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□

“I am a pragmatist and hard to believe without seeing. In Ethiopia, there has partnership and federalism. So for the feature, the new powered group coming and I believed the coming ideology.”

“□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□ □□ □□ □□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□

The discussion between in this episode is not balanced, the journalist asked the question but not fairly from journalistic discipline. The constructed questions are designed to tell the one-sided story and the guest was lined his side and give a message for his followers to not accept even the history of Ethiopia, especially the positive part of the history.

Ethnicity based argument and fight showed in the program. It was cultural misunderstanding, regional culture, ancestry, and language. They fight also focus on language and shared culture caused mainly by social and political systems that lead to inequality and grievances and do not offer options for the peaceful expression of differences. The used words and expressions were very rough and even the comments also reflect that. People were very aggressive and used very offensive words toward one another ethnicity. Refer Jan 22, 2020, LTV world; LTV show program with Esikindir Nega. Discriminatory hate speech from speech that may offend someone, hurt their feelings, be vituperative, or contain epithets, some of which may be capable of the discriminatory harms of hate speech, but none of which is definitively capable of doing so unless other factors are in place (Gelber, K and McNamara, 2015).

While the source of the conflict comes from political, social, economic, and religious issues, the individuals in comment initiate conflict in a discussion box and it shows expressly fight for their ethnic group's position within society. Hate speech is often not restricted to the mere act of hateful speech. It often moves from words to deeds. The fact that "mental incitement" too often turns into violence can be seen in the surge in attacks on refugee shelters (Maas, 2015). The bigger picture for the country in the aspect of each and one of the program set goals. Dr. Gemechu Megersa Anthropologist, present their idea for the audience and brief what they believed on behalf of Oromo. This episode focus on Oromos's culture. The guests are researching the world view of Oromo's peoples and present himself as a representative of Oromo culture wisdom.

Christianity is directly mean that Amhara. The question is where can I be an Ethiopian being Oromo? The majority believed that, if someone is a Christian automatically he is an Amhara nor Oromo. So, to be clean from Oromo you have to baptize in the Christian church and you will be Christian or Amhara. This is

cultivating the native mind to change those peoples. Which is not fair for Oromo's and deliberate action to illuminate the culture.

□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□ □□
□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□? □□□ □□
□□□□□□ □□□ □ □□ □□□ □□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□
□□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□
□□□□□ □□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□
□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□□ □□ □□□□ □□□□□
□□□□ □□□□□□□□ □□ □□□□□□ □□ □□□□□

Said the guests. These beliefs are live in society for so many years and society presents itself as it is. *“Occupation of the physical space, domestication of the native mind, it means changing the mind. (This quote refer by the guest directly in English) “I believed that the Amhara’s ruled Oromo’s peoples in the feudal system and that time being Amahara is the best version of existence.”* “□□ □□□□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□” as Dr. Gemechu explanation and he believed that kind of thought still exists.

In Europe has witnessed a significant increase in xenophobic, nationalist, Islam phobic, racist, and anti-Semitic attitudes. Their effects are not solely restricted to hostile rhetoric, instead, they turn into actual crimes against groups and individuals (Maas, 2015). German ban such kind of expression after bereaved so many Jew's life caused by hate speech.

There is ‘arada’, not Amhara! (Translate the “Arada” word equivalent to a city boy, so we use this word in the below explanation) “Arada” means the one who lived in city, slick, knave, gangster, ruffian, and vagabond. This kind of person is not wise and layman for what he speaks for. This representation is not related to Amhara but by that time Amhara lead the country and they were abused the other group of Ethiopian especially Oromo’s people. Those rulers were a city boy and they know nothing instead. This day the meaning of Arada changed and peoples used to say someone is smart, who know many things etc.

□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□□ □□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□ □□□ □□□□□
□□□ □□□ □□□□ □□□□□ □□□□□□ □□□ □□□□□□□ □□ □□□ □□□□

The viewer comments on the guest's ideology and what he says in the interview. The viewer tries to express their feeling and thought in a different way of expression, we try to select the comment randomly because the given comments are so many and hard to manage all. There are two types of comments we observed, the majority were very offended and gave negative comments, the others tried to comment genuinely more or less positively and tried to correct the idea raised in the wrong way.

Many feel the country is in a bad condition and express this dread like this *“Ethiopia has a big problem; the problem for Ethiopia is Oromo and Oromo has a big problem; the problem for Oromo is Ethiopia”*

“Great chimpanzee's cheating, Betty is interviewed with the Great monkey, and He denied his Lord savior Christ our God & his national too. Oh! Great monkey, please turn to a human being” said one of the comment givers, and we quote directly.

“The Oromo believe in eighty-eight Ayana or evil spirits which require sacrifices if a disaster is to be avoided and protection is to be gained. The surest way to salvation” is to drink the blood of the sacrificial victims offered to them. These pagan sacrifices are still carried out today along the shores of the Rift Valley lakes in Ethiopia and among them.

“Stupid and useless, by the name of religion you guys doing a bad activity for your own sake. May lord kills you and the fire fall in you” people are using imprecation to vent their emotion towards.

From the selected comment we observed insulation and categorization put in a very hard way even to say it again. Invading people's privacy and dehumanization was entertained here.

According to Evolutionary psychology (Schaller, 2011) theory, fear is transformed into hate speech towards those perceived as different. It follows that media and online communication has the advantage of enabling people to express intolerance towards a disgusted/feared subject from a protected position, with no direct exposure to the target.

“The massive people have spent thousands of years living with each other, the new political and economic approaching institutions should learn from the people to modernize the country. Completely imposing new ideas will only drag down the country into an overall crisis” said Dr Gemechu.

4.9. Religion-based hate

The paper observed religious hate speech herewith and the potential awakening of religious conflict. Ideal wars have been fought in the name of different historical saying, gods, and goddesses. Still, today most violent conflicts contain religious elements linked up with ethno-national, inter-state, economic, territorial, and cultural and other issues.

Religion in many parts of the world is contributing to violence, although exaggerated in many cases. This is well documented and broadly accepted. Usually disregarded, however, are opportunities to employ the assets of religious leaders and religious institutions to promote peace? All religions have their accepted dogma, or articles of belief, that followers must accept without question. This can lead to inflexibility and intolerance in the face of other beliefs. In this shows the guest Dr Gemechu present himself-extremists or guardians for the mentioned religion and take himself as escalation. In this show so many insulting words, intentional and intense expressions, claiming agenda and showing superiority.

The selected interviewees have different views and with a different guest, this might help to entertain many ideas and perspectives. Esikindir Nega journalist and human rights watch. The discussion between the journalist and the guest is very rough. Has mentioned Amhara and other ethnic groups in the aspect of comparison. The journalist said that *“Amhara is racist, rigid, arrogant, and there was gig discrimination between peoples.”* For this sided information and saying they trying to answer but he does not have proper time. She insisted him to confess and he was doing wrong. At this point, she lost her journalistic position and speak to offend Esikindir to not favor Amhara by his speech. She literary concludes Amhara was ruled by force and impose their language unwillingly.

In the Ethiopian constitution, students learn in their mother tongue. The curriculum aims for the students to achieve easily. It helps the students all begin with pure sounds, phonetics. Children are born with the ability to absorb, use, and recognize any sound. Starting at age 4 months, they can narrow the sounds down to those of their mother tongue, and then it becomes phonology, the patterns of sounds and how sounds are organized into systems. This idea entertains in the show in the wrong way. The journalist asks her guest “why the leaders who govern Ethiopia in the past decade decided (believed as if they are Amhara and they usually take side for their language; as her explanation) all students must learn in Amarigna language and the language is the national

language?” The journalist stands here is the Amharic language that must stop to be used as a national language for so many years and it is time for the other language especially Oromia. This seems to motivate peoples to stand to violet regarding the issues.

As the journalist believes the governor's rulers purposely inject Amhara’s culture and their language; this was very iniquity. The question raised from the journalist was inappropriate and not ethical at all. She label the Amhara leaders was domineered which is assert one's will over another in an arrogant way but the guest refused to accept her premises.

The claim raised on NAMA (National Movement of Amhara) is a political party aimed to resume the superiority of Amhara and wants to govern again in arrogance way as the journalist question. So, you lead this movement with the group and you are working to suppress the other ethnicity who existed in Ethiopia.

4.10. Political view based

Ethnic conflicts in states in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean that became independent after World War II. Here the focus of analysis shifts away from the assumed nature of an ethnic group to ethnic relations. Horowitz shows how the social form of ethnic conflict gets its own, often violent dynamic when a conflict system is ethicized (Bös, 2015).

The people suffering from ethnic conflict and suppressed as the rest of Ethiopians. The conflict between two or more contending ethnic groups. While the source of the conflict is political, social, economic, and religious, the individuals and groups in conflict must expressly fight for their ethnic group's position within society.

This final criterion differentiates ethnic conflict from other forms of struggle and we care about that because the psychological damage is very hard and we Amhara’s suffering by that till now. The past government was ruled arrogantly and they gave a bad name for the Amhara, so we are no more silent and stand to fight that kind wording and exclusion. The negative words and expressions are bad and “NAMA” political party fighting for it said Eskindir Nega.

Between the discussions of the two ethnic groups mentioned frequently for good and bad. The guest said that “*Querro is terrorist and this group represents the Oromo people. This group kills*

Hate speech is more destructive and dangerous when it targets traditional symbols, events, or activity. The messages exchanged on individuals related to nation, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, occupation, gender, or disability have a more impact than the individual's personal information. (Almagor, 2011) has defined hate speech “as bias-motivated, hostile, malicious speech aimed at a person or a group of people because of some of their actual or perceived innate characteristics”.

This interview was awesome. I don't understand why there is so much hate for the interviewer. She challenged him with all the information she had in her arsenal, either from her bias/belief or not. Eskinder stood up to her toe to toe and responded with dignity and truth though. Kudos to him. Well done Eskinder! Let's appreciate challenges like this. They help in enlightening the public.”

“Thank you so much for delicate and concrete answers, the girl sounds out of control, very disrespectful and disturbed. She sounds very much Menga supporter or she's Menga!

There are so many awful words here in this episode, the tenacity was harmful and causes someone to feel resentful, upset, or annoyed; someone to feel hurt, angry, or upset, rude, and insulting.

Ethnic groups compete for the same goal notably power, access to resources, or territory. Violent conflict is caused mainly by social and political systems that lead to inequality and grievances and do not offer options for the peaceful expression of differences. As “Baytona” party leader utters Ethnic conflict arises. Ato Kibrom Berhe from Baytona party presents himself as the guardian of Tigray people.

When the new group comes on the front to lead Ethiopia tried to stabilize the unstable of the internal uprising and the conflict between different groups of peoples in Ethiopia. “Oromara” is a group of people and they are good for nothing.” He explains his opinion and strongly disagrees with what the group stands for. “Oromara” is a group of people from Amhara and Oromia. They used to work the two people be together, and minimize their conflict between, and work together in the spirit of brotherhood. Whatever they commit to working with the guest denial what they about and he dispirits their target aim in the two groups of people.

The guest strongly disagrees with the “Oromara team” and what they did.

If the past ruling part was to act injustice, it could have been for all the ruled people by that time, and the group must include all part of Ethiopians and every race. But

this group did not include the others and only the Amhara and Oromo peoples joined. The group system is not a democrat and praised only two big races.

“Oromara was aimed to destroy Tigray peoples,” said the guest and it has strong hate speech towards the group and the two ethnic groups. Some comments are tried to express empathy for the guest and the others will support the journalist as well. *“What a great interview answers Kibrom! She tried to put her words in your mouth but you are smart enough to know the tricks.”* Some are asking the Journalist is neutral or activist? By pointing out several questions and the belongings will pass for what are they support groups; and it shows that “OROMARA “Duriye” is worse than TPLF”.

“The political movement is now converging into one and the political elites try to merge the culture, the language, the history, etc. this should not be implemented in this country and we need federalism to solve our problem” Bekele Gerba opposition party leader. In Ethiopian history, the peoples used to live together and got married to any tribe. This is what the society believed but not the political parties. These groups use the societies diversity in a bad way and insist the political system is about to fragile.

The guest used to speak to not merry Oromo people with Amhara or any others. *“We should protect our ethnic group by not live together and let’s stand by ourselves even by divorce the other. We should speak only our language and not socialize with others.”*

The guest tries to protect his tribe or manipulate society by creating a victim mentality. The direct quote shows how much these people won’t live from the rest of Ethiopians or they deliberately use the sensitive part of the issues to get many mad followers. Because of this speech, the viewer becomes very emotional and insult him in different media as well in a comment box. For example, we write some of the comments here.

It’s a shame to hear such things from you Bekele such greediness to get power and money I regret” this is the viewer's comment and others also blame him. *“Real man what a solid and real interview! Ato Bekele, you are a hero and your idea is so smart. It seems to me Bekele Gerba man on fire. How strong you are for what you believe!”*

There are not hate-based speeches which seem to support the hate like wordings and statements. Grounds of the hate speech post have two dimensions, from the guest and the viewer. Both could entertain the hate speech in one or different explanations.

Jawar Mohamed was Assassin and it is very problematic said Girma and request the government to take action on. In this happening so many peoples died and many injured but Jawar and the OMN journalist claim Ethiopian Citizens for Social Justice “Ezema” political party.

“The media diversity is hostile and against diversity. They the used same words and all media in Ethiopia works to demolish the Oromo people.” said the guest. This expression is encouraged the Oromo’s people to stand against the others. The speech refers, there is a negative connotation, and the media landscape stance on sediments prejudice.

The guest Girma Gutema mentioned that, several media in Ethiopia are rude, especially ESAT is ill manners, immoral, moroseness, solicitous, and profanity. “OPDO is against “Neftegna” (In history the word Nefitegna refer with Amhara and the guest explained that the current Oromia state governor and the leading system is against the Neftegna.

“Menga” is purposely present and it is planned to discourage language. Menga is to make the people depress and to categorized in one box. Racism was entertaining.

According to Article 19 from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states that “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any networks and regardless of frontiers”. The legal evidence on hate speech can be initiate by accessing international human rights law with internationally acknowledged announcements and conventions supporting fundamental rights to every human being. The whole universe is agreed upon the freedom of expression. To make effective and appropriate use of freedom of speech, article 29(2) of the UDHR states that, “In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely to secure due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.” It opposes the use of text, content, theory, and practice of free speech as the liberty of an individual in modern societies. Similarly, other international bodies stated their views on free speech rights and/ or hate speech restrictions in the form of articles. A summary of articles from international bodies for free speech rights and/or hate speech restrictions is outlined in (ECHR, 1950; ICCPR, 1976; ICERD, 1969; UDHR, 1948).

OMN television produced this show as current affairs on Jawar Mohamod assassin. People comment on the episodes and most comments are *negative*.

Stupid journalist, you don't represent us, caused you didn't know about us, so stop telling a bad thing.” “*We need to duplicate Jawar practically somebody has to come and do something from outside just like Jawar Abiye is not good for us. Abiy had never Oromos interest in his heart. Increasingly this became clear. We didn't believe that Dr. Abiy answers Oromo's people's questions. He should show us he ODP stand with Oromo's otherwise the coming season will be hard for him.*” “*The Amhara elites stop releasing hate speech towards Oromo and don't mention about TPLF and Oromo. Your time is over* said different viewer.

“*Everyone has to protect himself from Qerro by having weapons.*” comment one of the viewers under the program. Some people say OMN and the journalist are the one who cost 78 people's life to death, but still they didn't say about those who lost their life for the sake of Jawar. Media should be plausible but the journalist discussed only Jawar, this is not right and we fight for it. “*We should kill him and the time will come soon*” very emotional word with hateful expression entertained. Put the texts to show the intensity of the people's expression and agitated sentiment.

“*God sees everything that you guys doing. You will get your punishment. Who the hell you guys think you are?*”

“*If the guard was Amhara he will slaughter him like “Seare Mekonen”, his death was happened by Amhara's people*”

The reference to F. Ferdinand in connection with the assassination attempt on Jawar Mohammed is relevant. As OLF chairman, Dawud Ibsaa rightly said, on this day in 1914 (ie. 28 June 1914) Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria and his wife Sophie are shot to death by a Bosnian Serb nationalist during an official visit to the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo. The killings sparked a chain of events that led to the outbreak of World War I. The assassination of the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand came as tensions between European powers were reaching boiling point over their empires, military superiority and the struggle for home rule by smaller nations in the Balkans. Additionally, don't forget the terror attack in Bahir Dar and Finfinne on 22 June 2019 by the Amara paramilitary bandits. The terror campaign

has now reached many cities in Oromia, including Adama, Bishoftu, Assela, etc; The Naftegna terrorists have now started using Kalashnikov and revolvers to attack civilian Oromo's and destroying Oromo business centers.

“Please show first some sympathy for those loved ones lost their life & victims. Please first stand with the victims! Next who is responsible for those lost poor human lives, & victims should be served, otherwise, PEACE can't be achieved sustainably.” The above comments appointed on peoples and try to manipulate by picking their Ethnicity. The speech goes to the mentioned ethnics and the interviewed guests.

Brother Girma what do you expect from resist mentality. They have been trained for the last 100 years they are the supreme but nobody else. All Ethiopian people should unite for their rights. If Ethiopian people let the chauvinists expand their agenda, Ethiopia is gone. Abiy is dancing with the wolfs. If they get the chance tomorrow they will eat him alive. Keep the good work and work on uniting the Federalists”

The chosen comments based on the references to an expression that is abusive, insulting, intimidating, harassing, and or incites to violence, hatred, or discrimination. This pillar words included here and the comment.

Sample of analyzed texts, we focus on the macro characteristics and strategies intentional plans of comments that are adopted to achieve a particular aim of hate speech discourse produced in comments on program items

“OMN is warmongering fascist media which lacks fairness! It repeatedly aggravates Kimant/Agawu/ Oromo issue to destabilize Amhara and deliberately ignores the same issue of, Gurage, Gamo, Amharas in Oromia region”

“Jawar's ideology is hate of Amhara and Christian. We can't take any more conspiracy Abey is no better than stopped H/ Selase next election Abey has to be removed from the power.”

Oromo, as an ethnic group, can't lead a country. Look at you. You have historically and openly Oromo leaders in every important executive administrative hierarchy. Yet, you're working day and night to overthrow this regime. You are upholding Jawar over Lemma and Abey. What kind of wisdom is that? Jawar has to be prosecuted in the front of justice.

“The government now doesn't care about people's safety when something happens blame goes maybe on Jawar.”

“Thank you after they lost the war they start by media their hate. Thank you so much for the clear presentation. We know the crisis that the Oromo people are fighting and the consequences it will bring on the country.” The politics and expression are here “us and they” blame game. The spread of hate speech seems normal and anyone can comment easily to deteriorate the other's views.

Separately in OMN media station Jawar Mohamed and Lidetu Ayalewu discuss Corona and the coming election. The virus is new and very hard to tolerate. We don't know how to handle and live with it. Public health crisis happens in the world said Lidetu Ayalewu while in the interview. The state of emergency is not done well and the society is not willing to do well. The public and government are not engaged with the severity of the crisis. Our political and economic life is much shared.

A coming constitutional crisis, the ruling government's ability is below the average and they cannot lead the country more than this.

As Lidetu Ayalewu comments *“We are facing a constitutional crisis and the government couldn't control alone, so we have another option to govern this country.”*

“After a month we will be equal and right after we opposition's also claimed equally”. These quotes are out of public interest or not included, the guest expresses his will for the public and the idea able to expose the public for upraising. *“All opposition parties agree to push the election but how the government handles the coming crisis?”* In the worst scenario, we will go to face the challenge after September 30, by the time no one has the power to lead alone, and even the ruling party could not stay in the position. Society should say no to the government and create anything to take the power from the hand of the ruling one. *“Unilateral may make serious problems. And the government wants to be autonomous and work by alone, in this scenario we are not going to accept It.”* said the guest.

As the guest's explanation, after October 10/2012 no one will have power, the government and opposing parties will be on the same page. The gusts proposing to create a crisis on the society and it seems deliberately

*What is the point of this discussion if you don't say your final solution for the crisis?
You have said enough confusion strategy but not clear, I think people should involve
in decision making beyond political party, ask people to give their own opinions*

through media. Do we need 107 party agreements for this poor country? Said one of the viewers for the gust as a reply.

After the show been uploaded peoples comment on what they believe and think. They directly ask the guest via their expressions. Meanwhile, they were not got any proper response, or no one clear the idea but majorities made the fight and spread hated comment. For example, we can see some of the comments below.

“Mr. Lidetu, you made a terrible mistake in 1997 and the society forgives you after all. Even though you are still committed to making a terrible mistake with the terrorist media and you present your idea via, this shows as you undermine the Ethiopian people.”

To be honest I appreciate the moderator. He seems knowledgeable with confidence. I didn't notice partisanship like questions. In my view mistakes are always forgivable if one dares to admit them. However, what I didn't notice from the guests was an apology. It's nearly understandable both gusts have blood on their hands and yet both are aspiring the highest office of the nation. Let's learn from the “daylight - Hyenas” and get out of self-inflicted vulnerability.

There is a very hateful speech in the program and especially in the comment. Some of the comments polished somehow to make a proper expression hate speech are not proper expression but even for the sake of this paper reader the comments are dangerous to read directly or as it is. Most of them are traumatized and below standard or deviate from the manner and ethics. *“What I advise to the double dealer Lidetu is just to move to his second home Mekelle and join his fellows “YeQen Jiboch” before Meskerm 30. The five stars “Lalibela Hotels” belong to the rightful Lalibela people.”*

“Don't speak loud the Amhara's and Oromo's” seems direct order and not show respect. *“A conversation among psychopaths”* this are very hatefully negative words and the aggression released in a different expression. *“These fear-mongering politicians trying to take advantage of this crisis. I think they deserve to be infected by Corona.”*

First thing Politics in Ethiopia since ancient times has not brought anything better instead it has been a chaotic and catastrophic image of Ethiopia. *“Jawar, you are sitting in Ethiopia and how many times do you have to terrorize the Ethiopian people?”*

“You are the one who is talking about destruction. You are out of your mind. Crazy you are out of line. You need to stop!!! Yes, you are undermining the government.”

Naftagna will never build up in our states again. Oromo we must secure our states and build Oromia. These need a lot of fighting and determinations we are fooled around and fell in hell, bulled and killed by team Ethiopia. From now on Oromia live free or die no negotiations!!

“Lidetu is preaching & inciting violence. This is illegal & crime. The government should do something before the situation is out of hand & spread to others. Lidetu needs to be silenced.”

The government has no constitutional legitimacy, but it has political legitimacy. That means the people want it to continue governing to keep the peace. Elections can be held within a year. In the meantime, it should govern according to the constitution except for the postponing of the election. It will be good if it can upgrade the current forum of political parties to a consultative body. At the same time, the parliament should continue fun Hate speech may occur hate crime, this hate-based violence is intended to instill fear and anxiety, impose psychological damage, reduce a sense of belonging, and to exclude a group identified as “other” (Craig, K. M., and Waldo, 1996).

4.12. Incites to violence

Hate-based violence may also aim to expunge a group from the community such as forced moves from the community, forced migrations, displacement, or to destroy the groups’ cultural norms, values, and rituals. Hate-based violence can be carried out by organized hate groups like Neo-Nazis, Skinheads, Ku-Klux-Klan, by socio-political organizations, and by individuals without any specified ideology. Moreover, hate-based violence can be carried out for individual motivations and gains and/or for the perceived service and benefit of the “in-group.”

The comment extremity is very bad and even not about for correction. The audience cannot hold their emotions when they watch unfair expressions on their religion, believes, political views, race, etc. here using direct quote their comment in Amharic to show how hard the hate created. Many have the potential to commit a hate crime and easy to raise hate speech. Some of the audience reply and ask the guest so many questions and released their congested emotion and anger.

We Ethiopian People already gave the privilege to lead Ethiopia until the next election to Prosperity Party. To which Ethiopian people are you talking Mr. Lidetu? Right now we don't need BANDA like Lidetu and Jawar. We have a lot of

external enemies including COVID 19. I do respect, support, and admire the political analysis of Lidetu. However, he lost the point today. I started considering all opposition parties in Ethiopia as garbages who want only to gain power. Lots of trash!!!”

Girma, both of your guests think they have a silver bullet for every single problem. They are full egos. Slippery Ledetu is a Banda and everyone knows him because of what he did after KINEJIT won the election in a landslide in 1997 E.C. Shertetew Lidetu has ZERO integrity, just power-hungry mother F” “Waizero Buda. The descendant of that Komata society. Where are your fingers?” We observed the majority of comments are negative and bad expressions.

The selected program from ETV is more or less different from the others. The programs focus on human rights and how they protect in Ethiopia? The professionals are recommending a lot of ideas and they teach how the right implement. The issue is very important and everyone has to know the law and also the right. For this show, the YouTube viewer is less and no one comments on it. Why the viewer not watch such a program and not comment on it? Why educations shows beloved by many? The issues are very important, it just the right to get food and the right to live. Peoples invaded their privacy and between ethnic groups, the conflict becomes worse. The gusts raised ideas on how to keep individual right

The transition on the EPRDF party to new change maker groups. All over in Ethiopia, the movement was very hard and the uprising was killed many. A lot of youngsters sacrifice their life and peoples displaced from their living village. In this topic journalists and bloggers had debate and discussion, they raised their points of view.

The collision of the EPRDF party, 1161 audience views the program 12 like and 2 people dislike it. The program focus on the past and current ruling parties' domination. How the past 28 years of the political culture in Ethiopia and how the government handles the societal issues. This episode asks questions for the public and government. The weakness and strength of the government management style.

The program used different camera angle, the video editing was good, and the interview questions are well organized and structured. The image presentation, the gesture of the journalist

was good, the ultimate goal, and questions presentation is good. The message transmitted in a professional presentation.

The comment below the program is not hated base expression and it is an appreciation for the media house as well for the journalist. For that reason, the review of ETV programs is a bit different, the programs are much ethical and well structured.

User comments may be considered as a standard feature of the web. Comments made mainly by unknown users appear below the various kind of online content (e.g., news articles, posts on social networking sites, videos). Motivation to start commenting on a media content stem from expressing an emotion or an opinion, adding information, correcting inaccuracies or misinformation as well as giving a personal perspective (Stroud, van Duyn, & Peacock, 2016). Numerous studies are dealing with user comments as a form of political online participation (Weber, 2014) its potential concerning the political deliberation as well as an important indicator for the different forms of offline political participation. Media content either online or face-to-face may foster media effects. Therefore, it seems important to take these discussions, for example, in forms of comments happening below certain media content into account to get a more complete picture of these potential effects.

4.13. Interview

4.13.1. Understand by the term Freedom of Expression

The interview ten experts for hate speech topics and we had detailed questions and answer with them. For the question of what is hate speech, the experts answer differently from their professional backgrounds. As a psychologist explanation hate speech is a speech made by individuals or groups to disseminate hate towards a specific group or person based on race, sex, religion, or other defining characteristics of that specific group or person. All interviewed experts believed that hate speech is a form of speech directed towards a certain individual or group which is popularly based on race, color, gender, ethnicity, and disability.

4.13.2. Understanding how to minimizing hate speech

A hate speech leads to discrimination against and or violence against the targeted individual or groups. They also try to see what hate speech mean in the media aspect. Some of them say that

its making speech to the public in various forms of media where one group is defaming the other one or one group is spreading negative prejudice over the other based on certain identities like ethnicity, religion, culture, skin color, etc hate speech is something that promotes hatred towards human identity.

According to media experts, in our few medias political extremism intertwined with ethnicity, one might say “I am the one who saves this country, taught others, pride, etc.” to claim his outlooks, and in contrast to this others say some given ethnic group have no role in forming the country and claim they are manifesting victims mentality, even they used to support their claims by elites explanation. Both media type move is against the togetherness of the people in the country having no benefit.

Related to this, without proofing the source of news and without any evidence they claim something bad happened to some ethnic group. This ignites a question to the relation of peoples. Understanding how hate speech cause violence can lead to serious and potentially chronic traumatic stress reactions. The traumatic stress reaction, psychological problems, and other mental problems can be caused by hate speech. The traumatic stress reaction and related symptom may result from experiences of hate-based violence that have been proposed by many scholars (Dzelme, 2008). Any hate created violence may occur in hate tended speech television programs regarding race, ethnicity, religion, status, culture, beliefs, gender, and on so many television program productions repeated and prolonged. After the hatred programs impact the survivor community and the society will be part of it, this will make the issue worse.

According to the Ethiopians, low hate speech is illegal or not freedom of expression. One of the respondents explain what hate speech is a kind of speech which can be manifested in any form of discrimination or segregation which can focus on both individual and group of people by one of the following and other identities: race, nationalities, people, gender, creed, disability, etc. and it can also be expressed by the conflict which is followed by hate speech done on the above-mentioned grounds.

For the question of how harm hate speech? The respondent reply, “Yes, it does harm the target of the hate speech”. In most cases hate speech is directed towards a minority. These are people who have already been outlasted by the rest of the "normal" society and hate speech is a deliberate tool used to belittle, disapprove, and ban the views and existence of the minority. Hence, leading

to protests, physical violence, cyberbullying, depression, suicide, and downfall as a country at large.

The media expertise explains what hate speech is from their professional perspective, hate speech means a kind of negative speech that takes place between people and it has a negative symbol. Hate speech and its implications are existent for a long time ago. But our Ethiopian culture, norm, cohabitation, respecting one another was helping us not to practice hate speech. But now a day extreme hate speeches are becoming widely seen.

4.13.3. Consequence of hate speech in the society psychological makeup

The respondent agrees that hate speech can cause harm; it can also hurt people. When hate speech conducted emotions of people would be negatively intrigued and causes great harm. Hate speech initially hurt the speech owner himself/herself because it degrades the self-esteem of the speechmaker and devalue what he/she has to initiate him/her does bad things being in inferior emotions. The behavior of the hate speech maker can also be changed. So that attacks to happen in the shadow of hate speech may have no end.

The hate speech might start at an individual level may transmit to family, institution, country, etc. and can be out of control. As we can in our country, the hate speeches that have been transmitted in social media divided the community into two categories and created politics of 'ours and their' then it made people to make conflict stage by stage, to declare war on one another, to chase away each other, to kill each other and fight back.

The other respondent's reply to the question, from human psychology perspectives, hate speech is a form of verbal abuse and it can have a serious psychological effect on the target such as lowering self-esteem, and discrimination of the target by others.

Hence, media professions also understand how hate speech can cause psychological problems. Hate speech can cause a great psychological impact on people. As numerous media researchers say information and programs to be passed by social media can put a huge impact on audiences. He/she who spends several hours on given TV-series has a great tendency to believe all the information and change into action. Regarding hate, audiences when they listen to hate containing information they can experience loathsome emotion and even hate.

The issue of hate speech regulation is usually presented by academics, civil society, and international organizations as a balancing exercise between free speech and other freedoms and

values such as freedom of discrimination and human dignity. Concerning freedom of expression, it must be noted that this has been a key concern for many with hate speech regulation. Countries have incorporated reservations to Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination on grounds of free speech and both the Framework Decision on Racism and Xenophobia and the Additional Protocol to the Cybercrime Convention, discussed below, include a ‘safety net’ of free speech.

The Framework Decision holds that it ‘shall not have the effect of modifying the obligation to respect fundamental rights and fundamental legal principles, including freedom of expression.’ Article 7 explains that the Additional Protocol is ‘mindful of the need to ensure a proper balance between freedom of expression and an effective fight against acts of a racist and xenophobic nature.

The media houses and journalists need to balance free speech and hate speech before transmit. The balancing exercise needs to be determined. In doing this, the harm resulting from hate speech needs to be determined. A supporter of hate speech regulation, argues that ‘prejudicial speech initiates, perpetuates and aggravates socially accepted misrepresentation about out-groups.’ As well as harming the targets, it has been argued that hate speech can also affect the perpetrator who is ‘more likely to become entrenched in his or her hateful beliefs if given the legitimacy of a global audience.’ Victims may suffer emotions such as ‘sadness, pain, distress’³⁸ as well as, amongst others, ‘humiliation, isolation and dignitary affront.’ However, are these consequences sufficient to limit the fundamental right to free speech?

There are also times when hate speeches lead to violent attacks on the target which will have a traumatic effect as the psychologist believes. According to many scholars hate speech may cause conflict between individuals and groups. Hate speeches can cause harm, the reason is those speeches can cause ignorance/discrimination on individuals and conflicts when as a group while their bases are religion, races, etc. they can also cause conflicts and social extremism so that it has negative implications and harm.

4.13.4. Hate speech law in Ethiopia

For the question of Why do we (Ethiopian context) need 'hate speech law'? The media professionals, the psychologist, and the lawyers respond from their perspective but they all say that the law is very important for the current situation. To protect people and groups from hate speech and its damaging psychological effects on the target. Hate speech is also a matter of peace and security.

From the respondent one of the psychologists said most of our people are recipients of everything that is on the media, these will seriously disrupt the peace and security of the homeland especially by escalating the current inter-ethnic conflicts and could be a threat for state failure.

With the expansion of modern-day social media hate speech has a great platform to reach its targeted audience and fuel the silent war. Besides, taking the current situation as an example, a hate speech law is important in ensuring the sanity of the nation as a whole as so-called activists and politicians are also taking part.

As the lawyer explanation, the hate speech law will allow a group of people and individual to be free and adding on that it will minimize the discrimination happening to the people target to the hate speech.

Hate speech is more destructive and dangerous when it targets traditional symbols, events, or activity. The messages exchanged on individuals related to nation, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, occupation, gender, or disability have a more impact than the individual's personal information. (Almagor, 2011) has defined hate speech "as bias-motivated, hostile, malicious speech aimed at a person or a group of people because of some of their actual or perceived innate characteristics".

The psychology experts believed that it affects the self-esteem of individuals and groups, creates hatred, initiates various forms of revenge and violence, it divides people and considers one group as the enemy etc. In general, the respondent's reply and agree on hate speech can harm and it ultimately leads to the destruction of society. As it might lead to violence and a certain group or a person. The psychologist strongly agrees on hate speech can cause psychological damage. The target people or a person of hate speech will suffer from anxiety, low self-esteem, and all others related to dignity and confidence.

The lawyer strongly agree with the reason behind is, in hate speech, people can be indulged in extreme conflict with one another, and individuals might fail in psychological problems, for

example when they hear bad things about their disability, gender, and other forms of discriminations which can cause conflicts. Consequently, hate speeches can cause harm.

The ways through which hate speech can cause harm one which needs attention is those victims may involve in hate speech activities and they also affect others by planning to compensate and counter vial what happens in their life. This action pattern may participate many and the problem couldn't have ended.

4.13.5. Critical remarks of hate speech differentiated from other

For the question of how 'hate speech' be differentiated from other critical remarks? The psychologist replay that hates speech targets a person or a group on the grounds of ethnicity, sex, political affiliations, and other discriminatory attributes. It promotes violence and stereotype towards the target. The hate speech more focuses on a specific target group or individual and it might not base on facts and reason.

Hate speech is among difficult and negative events as media professionals. Negative speech is quite different from strong critics. Giving strong critics has no problem. A strong critic helps to improve limitations. But in hate speech, there will nothing to be improved.

As the media house professionals, freedom of speech won't be hindered by hate speech law. Some people thought they are exercising their freedom of speech while giving their hate speech without limitation and they also consider it as if they get freedom. Nonetheless, hate speech should stop especially in our country considering our culture and current situation. Our Media and where our people domiciled, lessons obtained, and values developed shall be free from hate speech in the name of freedom of speech.

These days information to be disseminated on social media is causing great problems. Especially, in politics, activists, political party leaders, and their followers are showing affiliation to pull and enforce people to move to different directions have been widely seen. And they are using social media information to assist people to make conflict and displace each other on an ethnic basis. The words they use can retain generations creating bad memories. For example, speech disfavoring interracial marriage and even speeches favoring interracial marriage dissolution are being transmitted without any censure. For example, even in a country's issue to bring down a ruling man clearly and understandably by saying rude government, neftegna (militant), and other hurly-burly communications.

To control hate speech laws should be enacted. When we see the trend in our country the discipline and good working habits of journalists and social media are at the lower side so that laws shall be needed to deal with these issues. Especially these days as the new government gave wide political space and freedom of speech it needs great attention before the community will be messed up. And to implement these laws is needed.

Regarding the tolerance of hate speech for the sake of freedom of expression is an attack on human dignity could not be tolerated for the sake of freedom of expression. As the experts believe the two speeches are different things. It is that people are confusing freedom of expression with hate speech. There could be grey areas where the two may overlap and requires serious consideration especially in a culture where critical thinking and communication have almost been far distant. It could affect but people's dignity, their psychological and physical safety is a priority than freedom of expression. Additionally, disseminating hate is not exercising freedom of expression; instead, it's a misuse of the rights of expression. A critical remark corrects the mistake that is polite and doesn't cross the line. While a hate speech includes offensive and demeaning words without regard to your being.

4.13.6. Types of 'hate speech' should be prohibited

As the lawyer explanation is also, hate speech is on individuals, discrimination might happen, if its bases are gender the harm is beyond discrimination as hate speech can cause sexual assault and discrimination, if its base is raced it can cause interracial conflict and genocide/ethnic cleansing if gender and disability are the targets of the hate speech as it was said before it will also arise extreme discrimination if religion it can cause harm on some followers of the respective religion and religious conflicts and extremism.

As stated above the base of hate speech is peoples, communities, individuals or some part of a community, some religion follower(s), skin color, etc. and it's about deliberately discriminating, attacking, inculcating hate, partiality, etc. the lawyers recommend, apart from hate speech when we come to criticism its base is an attitude not hurting individuals, for example, it may arise regarding the profession, political views, researches, and studies. So, opinions might be entertained, but their goal is to focus on the idea, not the individual, they target to present alternatives and criticize, uncover the limitations of the opinion, generally, it's directly related to the idea. It shouldn't have the aim to discriminate the owner of the idea and the individual.

To identify whether some speech is hate one or professional critics, looking forward to the content such as whether they are trying to insult or hurt the owner of the idea. Hence, the critics should professionally show strengths and limitations, to teach others, and to offer alternative ideas. Nonetheless, hate speech is not an alternative idea, couldn't show strength and limitation, has no professional outlook, awake malicious thoughts and its ultimate goal rising conflict as professional critics leave the judgments for the audiences, for example, if it's research and study leaving the issue for the scientific community if professionalism leaving the issue for people in the profession if politics to people in the arena, etc. So we can differentiate both by looking at their final potential consequences.

The respondent recommends the type of hate speech that should be prohibited by States, and under which circumstances. The psychologists said that speech intended to harm a specific person or group based on membership in that group. Hence, the speech's that because physical and psychological harm to the target must be prohibited. This should implement if the speech puts national peace and stability at risk. Though, psychologists recommend prohibited hate speech targeting ethnic identities; religion, gender, and culture in general. All types of hate speech are targeted purposefully to demean, belittle, and destruct.

Even the media professionals noticed that few Media claim that they have special people to serve so that they invite guest professionals and comment givers from the ethnic group they supposed to favor. This should be a band.

4.13.7. The bigger picture for the country

As the lawyer argument, it is controversial most of the time, even by politicians regarding freedom of speech is the two hypotheses any international conventions Ethiopia signed, human right treaties and when we analyze our laws which are constitution based, people have the right to express their ideas, to speak what they believe in, it gives the full right. This principle is inalienable at any cost. When we look at Geneva conventions which have been signed by Ethiopia it has been put down clearly; the big issue here is when any international conventions deeply have seen it is a right which they are sensitive to regarding expressing ideas freely.

They are indicated as basic rights for humankind, but it can be limited under few circumstances because if this principle not handled well it can cause negative consequences. If we think all principles regarding freedom of speech should be implemented as it has been written in constitutions and international conventions it yields deleterious impacts.

What is controversial most of the time is which should come first, even there in our constitution it mentioned about right of dignity, which allows people the right to manifest their dignity and somebody can claim it as a right, so when somebody claims I have a right to freedom of speech, at the same time he/she should think the other person has the right to be with his/her dignity or good name.

So, it's all about differentiating between the two extreme edges, freedom of speech and hate speech, to use balanced speech without touching the dignity of others. Implementing freedom of speech at its finest without any limitation may end up with negative consequences, for example, loss of dignity. Unlikely in the name of others dignity right to speech could be hindered, so that balancing between the two extremities is the best way to implement the principle.

Eventually, the implementation of international conventions should establish its ground on freedom of speech in order not to diminish the right to freely express ideas. Generally, it shouldn't favor one extremity as we can see this type of approach is not different from the car without brake so that one extreme shouldn't be compromised by the other.

According to the lawyer explanation, the hate speech law affects freedom of speech, as international treaties and enacted constitutions depicted that citizens have a right to express their ideas freely. And as it is clearly stated in our constitution the limitations have been mentioned if it can discriminate ethnicity, religion, gender, etc. and if it can compromise those values. Eventually, when it says citizens have a right to express their idea freely which will come true only if it couldn't push the rights of others and only if it is ensured that it has no negative impact on gender, religion, or body conformation. So that speech can be limited, meaning when we enact a law regarding hate speech it can also hinder the freedom to speak. Especially, this limitation can go beyond its goals so that it can make the right to speak stunted and hurts the right of citizens. Consequently, if the aim of the law has a political motive and when lawmakers have any relation with some other aim and if the executives couldn't implement it well, undoubtedly it can make the right to speak stagnantly. In African countries like ours, where institutions are very weak these types of phenomena can occur and the way out to express ideas may be compromised by misuse of the law itself. When we conclude, the hate speech law can compromise freedom of speech. If the lawmakers and the executives couldn't be non-partisan its potential to hurt the freedom of speech is reasonable. So, the making and implementation of the

hate speech law can be characterized as one that can hinder the right to speak freely if the law wouldn't be translated well; the impact can be extended up to confining people not to speak.

Meaning as we put in proclamation number 1185, some speeches if they are for purpose of research and studies they wouldn't criminalize the speech giver in hate speech law, which means if the speech targets to hurt gender, religion and other human values stated above purposively the hate speech law shall be served. Then below as the proclamation read, it says if it's related to history, research, lesson giver programs, etc. the law shall not be served as exceptions.

There are circumstances in which hate speech law can be served, both in our country and other countries, however, it's better to separately talk about our country's law; when the victim is individual it shall be served when it hurts the reputation of the individual, when it hurts good and fame of the person, if community, religious institutions if it's reported to diminish their values, identities and make them be hated, if it targets gender and body conformation if trying to discriminate, to be hated, etc. might be reported the hate speech law shall be served as stated in our law. Related to this, apart from the deliberate transmission of the speech, for example, if the suspected hate speech delivered is due to poor language of the speech giver (e.g., non-nativity to the respective language) there might be occasions this law shall not be served when we see against this law. So, it should be wisely checked whether speech is intentionally targeting some group to hurt, to defame, abolish their good names and other similar scenarios such as targeting gender, creed, disability, etc. in our countries context and when it's found to ignite conflict, when it's found to abolish their good names and fame and when it focuses on who is vulnerable to be harmed and discriminated; furthermore, when they are found to be a speech that can cause conflict, in order the hate speech law shall be served in our country.

As the above explanation, those speeches should be reported when they are designed to attack people, unless exaggeration may happen. The situation in which the speech is delivered or transmitted must be taken into account, for example, if it is on social media, broadcast, etc. and if the audiences tried to take action it shall criminalize or invite the law to be served. For example, the proclamation number 1185 regarding hate speech it stated the criminal punishment in sub-article 7 if somebody conducted the forbidden speech stated under sub-article 4 of this proclamation number it charges up to 2 years of imprisonment and shall be fined by money, not more than 100, 000 ETB. If an attack might take place due to the hate speech, it stated that the punishment shall be up to 1-5 years simple imprisonment, it gives strength stage by stage when

the proclamation is read. This will be served as the speech is passed to a third party, so that it needs other people (third parties) to hear and react, for the hate speech law to be served. The reaction wouldn't mandatorily conflict, but the potential to cause conflict shall be seen; generally, it should be seen that whether the information of hate speech reaches the third party by written form, by symbol, by social media or broadcast understandably as the proclamation depicted.

The respondent from the media evaluates the ground of current media activity. One of the respondents said that in our few medias political extremism intertwined with ethnicity, one might say "I am the one who saves this country, taught others, pride, etc." to claim his outlooks, and in contrast to this others say some given ethnic group have no role in forming the country and claim they are manifesting victims mentality, even they used to support their claims by elites explanation. Both media type move is against the togetherness of the people in the country having no benefit.

Related to this, without proofing the source of news and without any evidence they claim something bad happened to some ethnic group. This ignites a question to the relation of peoples. Comments that drive especially the youngsters have being transmitted as they were. The message could invite them to violent action than a peaceful struggle, which is not expected from media which ought to surmount its responsibilities. For instance, "who assigns him to act like Mose? So, why he didn't split the river and let us move on? Rather better to call the PM Judy, Judy with many shortcomings, since in the time of his premiership many churches burnt; So that, he is Judy and Jawar is Gragn Ahmed, if someone strikes me on one cheek I don't turn to him the other also. I don't let him if he does this to me, I will hit him at the spot. I don't tolerate more." The comment may be considered as he freely expresses his idea on narrow stages, but if it comes to media that have many audiences so that it could potentially cause conflict to happen he shall be made responsible.

There is something related to what mentioned above. Rather than preparing programs that make youths and especially children have a bright future, develop their skills when they transmit hate speeches they could develop a victim mentality.

The media experts also claim the language used, the intentions the journalist about and the media potential to act on everything by disseminating information. If there is a time when news begins with adjectives to end similarly it's our time, our Media did this and are doing it. They use words

that can cause fear to the public, for example, they start by saying “Ethiopia badly, despondently”. Using words that have a psychological effect on people are common in a few channels in our country without any solid pieces of evidence.

Regarding complaining, another example is complaining officials including prime ministers are not punishable. But it has been seen widely when journalists themselves in the introduction start a dialogue by taking aside, even in their programs. For instance, an interview started by one journalist is quoted as follows: “ When it comes to the intermittent speech of the PM and unfinished honeymoon period of the premiership, he said nothing at least on his social media pages as you know, how you judge this event?” ones said the journalist, which is against the ethics of the profession.

Between politicians in the Western world there is common to share strong arguments and even strong words, but when it’s seen against our culture and norms to directly transmit sayings like “rude government, rude leader” is bizarre.

The respondent mentions the current situation regarding hate speech in media and their political activity. The complaint might be characterized by a word full of bias. For example, calling the head of the election board as ‘the collector’, saying the so-called Balderas group instead of the original name, Balderas for true democracy, which has been transmitted on Medias; and speech plagiarism is very common.

The other thing is the media have no agendas, they need to catch the daily attention of audiences, however, they don’t research beforehand, and they are even oriented. As a result, they sit for transmission just depending on what they shallowly heard; they don’t come back to the issue as they won’t collect both human and document evidence and won’t prepare an additional report. The classic example for this is: “The authority said I’m taking measures on the illegal land scramble”. The media journalists won’t dig out more information on who the scramblers are and the stages of the measurement taken by the government or respective authority and to give answers to similar questions.

The Media are not widely seen when they surmount their responsibilities to dry the source of fear. For example regarding the project entitled “beautifying Addis Ababa,” the construction started around Meskel square cause controversial issues between some communities. If Medias reported what has been taking place from the fencing of the project area we can say respective Medias surmounted their responsibilities.

The other thing is undertaking a nonprofessional angle and side-taking when to report. Reporting similar news from different angles requires skills but, but when it takes a side it loses its discipline. For example, there was a wide notice given by the EZEMA party through its president last time. As one private media stated, by including the voice of the president “Prosperity party is asking the merchant community in written form to collect income, the merchants’ community were paying in the fear of future tax.” Said the president and presented what happened in Adama town as evidence. Not only is this, but also about the election campaign the prosperity party undertaking by using training as a cover was spoken. If the private media can also ask the prosperity party about the claim, the report would be complete enough. But government Media only transmits what is the only good part of the speech which is not a professional approach. Likewise, last time comments of the prosperity party, Gedio and Wolayita party leaders got media coverage in VoA. While VoA reported all the phenomenon, the regional media reported the idea of Wolayata party leaders as they said election and corona are the same to us so that the election time shouldn’t be rescheduled, but the report is not in its full version, why? May be need of the government, the fully reported Gedio, and the Prosperity party stand strongly arguing that the election should be rescheduled can be a possible answer.

As the growth of the media industry is so stagnant and there are scarcities of specialty areas professionals are not excelling in their field. But there is a trend to present one’s self as an analyst in almost everything; and the analysis is given depending on as their friends told them or as they heard from somewhere else, which have no professional ground at all.

The media professionals recommend about the hate speech activities, Hate speeches targeting identities, political views, outlook, skin color, religion, race, job, lifestyles, health-related (crazy, ill, handicapped) should stop. Hate speeches to be transmitted by any media should be stopped. In line with this, our office, the Broadcasting Authority is working on this issue. We working on a lot of training and capacity building. We are also physically visiting media when we detect that they are transmitting hate speech and we discuss the way forwards. Before going to implement the law, we believe that building their capacity and giving the training is necessary.

Hate speech at any cost couldn’t deny freedom to speech. Being a journalist is taking responsibility for information and is feeding the right thing at the right time to the respective community. News and programs should serve the community. Even when inviting interviewee journalists should take responsibility not to invite individuals who can cause conflict by their

speeches, unless it would be failed responsibility. The role of media is to entertain, teach, and give information; so that apart from these goals nothing should be exercised.

After hate-based information the society react towards, it may follow growth pattern from stereotyping, prejudice, discrimination, and violence genocide. Societal division, inter-ethnic conflicts, various forms of racial segregation, systemic attacks, corruption, destroys the rule of law and societal order, destroys resources, a dramatic increase in refugees, facilitates genocide, results in state failure, and destabilize the region.

Some psychologists say that humans are social beings. We care about what people say and think about us because we have to co-exist. And if you don't fit in among the powerful or majority you'll be facing personal struggles on a daily in all the 5 social institutions. In your family, Education, Religion, politics, and economy. Hence, leading to psychological distress.

To trace the thinking pattern shift caused by hate speech we should know how much the speech creates psychological impact. As the psychologists believe the thinking pattern of human beings form may intact by the hate speech and the pattern will change after. The hate speech changes human thinking patterns directly and it will make an influence by the pattern we are using.

After hate-based information, the society could act in two different ways as the target group and as the hate speech giver group, there could also be neutral groups in this process. For the target group, it is going to be a humiliation and dignity loss and as the hater's society, it going to give them power (at least that is what they assume) over the target groups. There could be a conflict between those two groups which could lead to war in the worst case.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. Conclusion and recommendations

The key objective of this study was the psychological impact of hate speech on audiences towards political television talk shows. To guide the process, four main research questions were constructed, qualitative research methods were selected to comprehend the stated objective. Content analysis and in-depth interviews were engaged below the view of the research methods approach to collecting the data and information under the mentioned research questions. When adequate data were developed, analysis and interpretation were held guided by the stated objectives.

5.1. Conclusion

The respondent mentions the current situation regarding hate speech in media and their political activity. The complaint might be characterized by a word full of bias.

The other thing is, according to the finding of this research the media have no agendas, they need to catch the daily attention of audiences, however, they don't research beforehand, and they are even oriented. As a result, they sit for transmission just depending on what they shallowly heard; they don't come back to the issue as they won't collect both human and document evidence and won't prepare an additional report.

To trace the thinking pattern shift caused by hate speech we should know how much the speech creates psychological impact. As the psychologists believe the thinking pattern of human beings form may intact by the hate speech and the pattern will change after. The hate speech changes human thinking patterns directly and it will make an influence by the pattern we are using.

After hate-based information, the society could act in two different ways as the target group and as the hate speech giver group, there could also be neutral groups in this process. For the target group, it is going to be a humiliation and dignity loss and as the hater's society, it going to give them power over the target groups. There could be a conflict between those two groups which could lead to war in the worst case.

Our past experiences clearly show how severe the consequences of hate speech can be and the necessity of education on the subject. Diverse groups are targeted by hate speech and individuals as well as groups suffer from hate speech based on one or more discrimination grounds.

Hate may affect those subject to it to a various degree, every word uttered carries responsibility and often a small seed sown may incite a person to commit atrocious deeds or to exercise injustice in some way or form. There are many examples of hate speech, by not being addressed, has led to certain groups of people being disrespected and discrimination against them considered to be legitimate.

The most serious instances have led to a deep divide in the social cohesion and even to conflict. This is not acceptable in a democratic society. Several international conventions include provisions on the protection of privacy and honor and the prohibition of discrimination. Not all of them have provisions against hate speech but restrictions to freedom of expression were discussed by member states under their drafting process.

It is necessary to establish what constitutes hate speech to find effective ways of countering it. That is only possible through awareness-raising and education on cause and effect. Hate speech is the extreme stereotyping of an individual or a group of individuals aimed at dehumanizing them. It is by far easier to attack someone who has been dehumanized.

It must not be forgotten that words are a powerful tool and while one individual does not react to hate speech and incitement to violence another one might. For intolerance to be accepted needs only the indifference of the general population. We should never lose sight of our ultimate goal which is a world of multiculturalism and tolerance. We must find effective measures to protect vulnerable groups and individuals against hate speech and violence. Hate speech is only a symptom, a manifestation of intolerance and narrow mindedness deeply rooted in society. Therefore, legal measures alone, such as restrictions to freedom of expression, are not enough. To address the problem comprehensively, we must enlighten people, change their way of thinking and broaden their perspectives, by using measures such as intercultural dialogue, education on tolerance, and diversity. Besides, the government must strengthen freedom of expression. The reaction to hate speech should be a comprehensive legal frame, including legislation on equality and anti-discrimination, as well as increased dialogue on diverse cultures, multicultural society, and diversity. Minority groups should also be given a voice, for example by more positive media coverage. Freedom of expression can be the best way to reach individuals in society and to change their mindset permanently.

5.2. Recommendations

- The recommendations state that equal dealing and non-discrimination are common minimum standards that must be respected by everyone under all circumstances.
- Each concerned Ethiopian citizen ought to acknowledge and concede to the reality of hate speech among Ethiopians. Principled government, media, legislators, activists, religious leaders, and educators ought to be watchful about hate speech among Ethiopians and meanwhile contribute their share towards the reduction of hate speeches and the development of civil, democratic dialogues among citizens.
- Political parties, politicians, and people who support them must refrain from using discriminatory language and hate speech in expressing their views.

- The same obligation relates to media who must be careful in their reporting on attitudes that contain hate speech with a critical reflection on the context.
- The latest examples are the insults of the prime minister and also of different ethnicity, journalists, religion, and politicians from the local community, as well as rude verbal incidents of public figures. So the media houses has to work on regarding this issues.
- The present government should have been alert on the media culture we have now. Many are involving the media industry who are professional and layman. There are criteria to work on media and strangers can call himself a journalist. This situation brought serious problems in the media industry; hate speech become one of the elements of journalism in some of the producers. Especially on political programs hate speech will appear easily, the media counsel and media houses should pay attention to the nature of the political culture.
- To invite guest journalists should take responsibility, not to invite individuals who can cause conflict by their speeches unless it would be failed responsibility.
- The other thing is the media have no agendas, they need to catch the daily attention of audiences, however, they don't research beforehand, and they are even oriented. So the media has to be changed on these issues.
- The type of hate speech that should be prohibited by States, and under which circumstances. The speech intended to harm a specific person or group based on membership in that group. Hence, the speech's that because physical and psychological harm to the target must be prohibited.

Reference

- Act, C. J. and P. O. (1994). https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/pdfs/ukpga_19940033_en.pdf, Accesseddate: 17 April 2018 (p. <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1994/33/pdfs>).
- Act, P. O. (1986). http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/64/pdfs/ukpga_19860064_en.pdf, Accessed date: 17 April 2018.
- Africa, C. of the R. of S. (1996). *Act 106*.
- Allam, H. (2014). Egyptian Copts under pressure. *Hate Speech International*. [Online]. Available from: <https://www.Hate-Speech.Org/Egyptian-Copts-under-Pressure/>.

- Almagor, R. C. (2011). *Fighting hate and bigotry on the internet. Policy & Internet*. 3(3)(<http://dx.doi.org/10.2202/1944-2866.1059>.), 1–28.
- Anti-discriminatory, U. (2015). *Law*. <http://www.emirates247.com/news/government/uae-antidiscriminatory-law-bans-hate-speech-promotion-of-violence-2015-07-22-1.597389> (on 04-03-2017 Accessed 09 February 2017).
- Article 19. (2015). ‘Hate speech’ Explained: A Toolkit. London: Article 19. In Available from: <https://article19.org/data/files/medialibrary/38231/'Hate-Speech'-Explained--A-Toolkit%282015-Edition%29.pdf>.
- Article 4. (1965). *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of (“ICERD”) in which*.
- Barendt, E. (2005). *Freedom of Speech. 2 Ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- Base, H. (2017). Most Common Hate Speech. <Http://Www.Hatebase.Org/Popular>, Accessed 2018 January.
- Ben-David, A., and Fernández, A. M. (2016). *Hate Speech and Covert Discrimination on Social Media: Monitoring the Facebook Pages of Extreme-Right Political Parties in Spain. International Journal of Communication, 10(0)*.
- Benier, K. (2017). The harms of hate: Comparing the neighboring practices and interactions of hate crime victims, non-hate crime victims and non-victims. *International Review of Victimology, 23(2)*, 179-201.
- Bleich, E. (2011). The Rise of Hate Speech and Hate Crime Laws in Liberal Democracies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.*, 37(6), 917–934.
- Bös, M. (2015). Ethnicity and Ethnic Groups: Historical Aspects. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition (Second Edi, Issue May)*. Elsevier., <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.62015>, 9.
- Buyse, A. (2014). *Words of Violence: “Fear Speech,” or How Violent Conflict Escalation Relates to the Freedom of Expression. Human Rights Quarterly. 36(4)*, 779–797.
- Chetty, N. S. A. (2018). Hate speech review in the context of online social networks. *National Institute of Technology Karnataka*.
- Committee., I.-A. S. (2006). IASC guidelines for gender based violence: Interventions in humanitarian settings. Nairobi, Kenya. [PDF Document]. Retrieved from Http://Www1.Paho.Org/Hq/Dmdocuments/2010/GBV_humanitarian_settings.Pdf.

- Craig, K. M., and Waldo, C. R. (1996). *So, what's a hate crime anyway? "young adults' perceptions of hate crimes, victims, and perpetrators.* 20(2)(Law and Human Behavior), 113–129.
- Denzin NK, L. Y. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* London: Sage Publications.
- Dzelme, I. (2008). Psychological effects of hate crime – Individual experience and impact on community. Attacking who I am. A qualitative study. *Latvian Centre for Human Rights. [PDF Document]., Retrieved from [http://cilvektiesibas.org.lv/site/ attachments/30/01/2012/Naida_noziegums_ENG_cietusajiem_Internetam.pdf](http://cilvektiesibas.org.lv/site/attachments/30/01/2012/Naida_noziegums_ENG_cietusajiem_Internetam.pdf).*
- El Taraboulsi, S., Khallaf, M. and Farouky, N. (2013). Giving in Transition and Transitions in Giving: Philanthropy in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia 2011-2013. *American University of Cairo: John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement.*
- Fyfe, S. (2017). Tracking Hate Speech Acts as Incitement to Genocide in International Criminal Law. *Leiden Journal of International Law,* 30(2)(<https://doi.org/10.1017/S092215651600075>), 523–548.
- Gelber, K and McNamara, L. (2015). 'Evidencing the harms of hate speech',. *Social Identities, DOI: 10.10.*
- Gerbner, G. (1998). *Cultivation analysis: An overview. Mass Communication & Society, I. (3/4),* 175–195.
- Goff, B. S. N., Crow, J. R., Reisbig, A. M., & Hamilton, S. (2007). The impact of individual trauma symptoms of deployed soldiers on relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21(3),* 344–353.
- Haileselassie, M. (2019). Ethiopia: Bill Threatens Free Expression. *Nairobi: REUTERS.*
- Hamad R. (2017). Causes, Motivations and Effective Interventions for Criminal Justice Social Work. *City of Edinburgh Council.*
- Hirvonen, K. (2013). *Sweden: when hate becomes the norm. Race & Class. 55(1),* 78-86.
- ICERD. (1965). International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination of. *Article 4.*
- Kilpatrick, D. G., & Acierno, R. (2003). Mental health needs of crime victims: Epidemiology and outcomes. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 119–132.*
- Klein, A. (2012). Slipping racism into the mainstream: A theory of information laundering. *Communication Theory, 22(4),* 427–448, 429.

- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Ullman, J. B. (1999). Racial discrimination and psychiatric symptoms among Blacks. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 5(4), 329.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). research methodology: methods and techniques. *2nd Edition, New Age International. New Delhi.*
- Kumar, R. (1999). research methodology; a step-by-step guide for beginners. *SAGE.*
- Lawrence, F. M. (1999). Punishing Hate: Bias Crimes under American Law,. *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts,.*
- Leo, L.A., Gaer, F.D. and Cassidy, E. K. (2011). Protecting Religions from Defamation: A Threat to Universal Human Rights Standards. *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy.*, 34, 769–784.
- Levin, J., & McDevitt, J. (1993). Hate crimes: The rising tide of bigotry and bloodshed. *New York, Plenum Press.*
- Maas, H. (2015). Geleitwort. In Amadeu Antonio Stiftung (Hrsg.). In „*Geh sterben!*“ *Umgang mit Hate Speech und Kommentaren im Internet* . Berlin: Amadeu Antonio Stiftung. (Issue <http://www.amadeuantonio-stiftung.de/w/files/pdfs>, p. 6).
- Mårtensson, U. (2013). Hate Speech and Dialogue in Norway: Muslims ‘Speak Back’. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.*, 40(2), 230–248.
- Mayring, P. (2010). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. [Qualitative content analysis: basics and techniques. (11th updated and revised ed.). Weinheim: Beltz. In *Retrieved from* http://www.contentselect.com/index.php?id=bib_view&ean=9783407291424.
- McCoy, S. K., & Major, B. (2003). Group identification moderates emotional responses to perceived prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10051017, 29(8).
- Mendel, T. (2010). hate Speech Rules under International Law. *Retrieved: Http://Www.Law-Democracy.Org/Wp-Content/Uploads/2010/07/10.02.Hatespeech.Macedonia-Book.Pdf [06.09.2013].*
- Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2018). *Fanning the Flames of Hate: Social Media and Hate Crime (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 3082972)*. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. *Retrieved https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3082972.*
- Mulugeta Abrha, (2019). Mapping Online Hate Speech among Ethiopians: The Case of Facebook, Twitter and YouTube. Addis Ababa University

- Noelle, M. (2002). The ripple effect of the Matthew Shepard murder: Impact on the assumptive worlds of members of the targeted group. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(1), 27-50.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *From Disgust to Humanity: Sexual Orientation and Constitutional Law*. Oxford University Press., New York, NY.
- OSCE. (2009). *Hate Crime Laws: A Practical Guide*,. Published by ODIHR, Warsaw, Poland, 38–39.
- Parekh, B. (2012). Is There a Case For Banning Hate Speech? In M. Herz & P. Molnar (Eds.) *The Content and Context of Hate Speech: Rethinking Regulation and Responses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 37–56.
- Perry, B., & Alvi, S. (2012). ‘We are all vulnerable’ The in terrorem effects of hate crimes. *International Review of Victimology*, 18(1), 57–71.
- Poland, P. C. of. (1997). https://www.unodc.org/res/cld/document/pol/1997/penal_code_html/Poland_Penal_Code_1997.pdf, Accessed date: 17 April 2018. *Indian Penal Code (1860)*. <http://www.vakilno1.com/bareacts/IndianPenalCode>, Accessed date: 17 April 2018.
- Reinders, H. (2012). Qualitative Interviews mit Jugendlichen führen: Ein Leitfaden. [*Qualitative Interviews with Youths: A Guideline*]. (2., Revised Edition). *Sozialwissenschaften 10-2012*. München: Oldenbourg. Retrieved from <Http://Www.Oldenbourg-Link.Com/Isbn/9783486715903>.
- Rights, C. and political. (2014). *International Covenant on accessible at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Covenant_on_Civil_and_Political_Rights accessed on 17/01/*
- Rights, E. convention on H. (2014). *accessible at file:///E:/hate%20speech/The-dynamics-of-hate-speech-and-counter-speech-in-the-social-media_English-1.pdf*.
- Schaller, M., and J. H. P. (2011). *The Behavioral Immune System (and Why it Matters)*. 20(*Current Directions in Psychological Science*), 99–103.
- Shulman, M. (1973). *The Ravenous Eye*, Cassell and Company.
- Sikorskaya, I. (2014). *Hate Speech in the Media and Internet*. *School of Peacemaking and Media Technology*.
- Somerville, K. (2011). Violence, hate speech and inflammatory broadcasting in Kenya: The problems of definition and identification. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies*, 32(1), 82–101.

- Stroud, N. J., van Duyn, E., & Peacock, C. (2016). News Commenters and Comment Readers. In *Retrieved December 1, 2016, from https://engagingnewsproject.org/enp_prod/wpcontent/uploads/2016/03/ENP-News-Commenters-and-Comment-Readers1.pdf*.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of inter-group conflict. *Monterey*, 281–28.
- Tsesis, A. (2013). Inflammatory Speech: Offense Versus Incitement. *Minnesota Law Review.*, 97(4), 497–532.
- Uthman, S. (2014). Racism, Incitement and Xenophobia in Egyptian Media [al- ‘unsuriyah wal Tahrid wa karahiyat al- ajanib fil I’lam al- Misry]. *Al-Arabi al-Dimocracy. [Online]*. Available from: <Http://Arabdemocrat.Com/Ar/?P=1975>.
- Waelde, L. C., P. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Race-Related Events Scale. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 2(1), 1.
- Weber, P. (2014). Discussions in the comments section: Factors influencing participation and interactivity in online newspapers’ reader comments. , , . doi: 10.1177/1461444813495165. *New Media & Society*, 16(6), 941–957.
- Zaharaa, W. H. (2014). I hate you: Hate Speech in the Media of the Arab Spring. [*Inni Akrahok: Khitab Al- Karahiya Fil I’lam Al- Rabi’ Al- Arabi*]. *Center For Defending Freedom of Journalists. [Online]*. Available from: Http://Www.Maktaba-Amma.Com/2014/09/Blogpost_60.Html.

Annex 1

Coding guide

The words, phrases, and expressions listed below in bold are taken from the coding sheets and assumed to have the meanings following them.

Blaming on history: when the hate speech post has statements regarding historical or current replica or whispered crimes or wrongs of one group or individual against the other and make guilt other groups

Blaming words: words that show historical or current replica or whispered crimes or wrongs of one group or individual against the other and make guilt other groups on it

Claiming agendas: when the hate speech post has statements which assert that one group has hidden plans towards other groups in the course of attaching fake or said historical or current actions

Contextual: when the hate speech post has statements of expression which goes within the political, economic, and social context in which it was communicated. The contextual understanding should take into account, extra with the existence of a conflict in society, for example, recent incidents of violence

Dehumanizing words: words used for making dehumanization and/or equate one group with animals

Dehumanizing: when the hate speech post has statements of dehumanization and equates one group with animals

Ethnic hate speech: when the post is insulting, intimidating, degrading or intended to incite violence or prejudice against a person or a group of individuals based on calling or mentioning ethnic identity (Amhara, Tigray, Oromo or Ethiopia-Somalia)

Hate speech: when the post is insulting, intimidating, degrading,, or intended to incite violence or prejudice against a person or group of people based on their race, gender, age, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, language, moral or political views, socioeconomic class, occupation or appearance (based on calling or mentioning their specific names such as Amhara or Orthodox), mental capacity and any other similar distinction.

Imposing the whole: when the hate speech post has statements which attribute and imposes negative qualities (faults, frauds, or corruption) of certain individuals to the whole, and or projecting one group's or individual problems onto others

Incitement words: words used to direct or indirect calls for discrimination, hostility or violence

Incitement: when the hate speech post statements whether contained direct or indirect calls for discrimination, hostility or violence,

Intense: when the hate speech post statements are clear with the public nature of the expression, the means of the expression and the intensity or magnitude of the expression in terms of its frequency or volume

Intentional: when the hate speech post has statements which indicate an intention to take on in advocacy to hatred; purpose to target a group based on a protected characteristic

Picturing negative: when the hate speech post has statements which are creating a negative image of other group or individual through the expression of downbeat words (excluding of dehumanizing)

Prominent: when the hate speech post is posted by a politician or a prominent member of a political party and public officials or persons of similar status (e.g. teachers or religious leaders)

Religious hate: when the post is insulting, intimidating, degrading or intended to incite violence or prejudice against a person or a group of individuals based on calling or mentioning their religion (Orthodox, Catholic, or protestant)

Searching enemies: when the hate speech post has statements searching for enemies or set as enemies among others

Showing superiority: when the hate speech post have expressions of the superiority of other groups through praising one group over others and or crating us and them regarding social, political, economic or cultural worth's

Words of negative expression: words used for creating a negative image of other group or individual through the expression of downbeat words (excluding of dehumanizing)

YouTube: allows commenting and subscribing videos

Anex 1

Questioner

This questionnaire is meant to collect information on the implication of hate speech on Ethiopian mainstream media houses. This information is being sought solely for academic purpose and will be treated with strict confidence. Kindly answer the questions by writing a brief statement or record a voice answer.

Interview Questioner for media professionals

1. What is hate speech?
2. Does hate speech harm?
3. How does hate speech harm?
4. Can 'hate speech' have psychological impact on its target?
5. Why do we (Ethiopian context) need 'hate speech law'?
6. How can 'hate speech' be differentiated from other critical remarks?
7. Could hate speech be tolerated for the sake of freedom of expression?
8. Could the 'hate speech law' affect freedom of expression?
9. Which types of 'hate speech' should be prohibited by States, and under which circumstances?

Interview Questioner for psychology professionals

1. What is hate speech?
2. Does hate speech harm?
3. How does hate speech harm?
4. Why do we (Ethiopian context) need 'hate speech law'?
5. How can 'hate speech' be differentiated from other critical remarks?
6. Could hate speech be tolerated for the sake of freedom of expression?

7. Could the 'hate speech law' affect freedom of expression?
8. Which types of 'hate speech' should be prohibited by States, and under which circumstances?
9. Can 'hate speech' have psychological impact on its target?
 - ✚ explain the thinking patten of human being form,
 - ✚ how this pattern will change,
 - ✚ Which reason will make influence?
 - ✚ Is hate speech change human thinking pattern directly?
 - ✚ After hate based information how the society react towards?
 - ✚ What will be the consequence of hate speech on the society and possible damage?

Anex 2

Check list for you tube

1. source of the post

YouTube

2. Nature of the post (A post may have a mix of 'hate speech' may not be categorical.)

A: hate speech

B: not hate speech

3. grounds of the hate speech post

- a. ethnicity based
- b. religion based
- c. race based
- d. culture based
- e. believes based
- f. political view based
- g. gender based
- h. age based
- i. occupation based

Other: specify_____

4. Form of the hate speech post

- a. blaming on history
- b. abusive,
- c. insulting,
- d. intimidating,
- e. harassing,
- f. incites to violence,

g. hatred,

h. discrimination.

5. Blaming words: _____

A: picturing negative

1. Words of negative expression: : _____

B. searching enemies

C. showing superiority

D. imposing the whole

E. claiming agendas

F. dehumanization

1. Dehumanizing words: _____

Others (specify): _____

6. Severity of the hate speech post

A. Intentional

B. Contextual

C. Prominent

D. Intense

E. Incitement

* Incitement words: _____

- Other (specify):

7. The content and comment for the selected programs

Anex 3

Check list for the programs to review

How is the image presented?

How is the video presented?

How are the interview questions structured?

How are the questions presented and asked?

The motive of the questions?

The term used by the journalist?

The gesture of the journalist?

The camera shoot, angle?

The message would be transmitted and supposed to be?

The ultimate goal would be?