

Eszter Galgóczi

Does Hate Speech Influence People's Attitude?

A Hungarian Case Study

ABSTRACT

The 2015-2016 migration crisis has caused a lot of turbulence in most European countries. Hungary and its prime minister, Viktor Orbán, has struck a particularly critical tone toward non-European asylum seekers. The government initiated a massive billboard campaign throughout the country primarily targeting refugees, while appealing to the people's most basic fears. Most opposition parties and the left-leaning media have criticized this billboard campaign and classified it as a form of hate speech. The aim of my paper is to identify the effects of hate speech on people's attitudes toward ethnic and religious minorities. To understand the effects of hate speech I designed a survey-experiment model. Among the experimental subjects who received stimuli (hate speech panels), significant changes have been observed suggesting that regardless of any demographical data intermediate information (information received between the original state and the output point) has changed their attitudes.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research is to find a definition for hate speech, which political scientists can refer to in the future when discussing the interdependence of hate campaigns and political nudging, and to develop an academically acclaimed method which could determine when and how hate speech influencing voters is purposefully applied. The main focus of this paper stems from the 2015-2016 migration crisis. Undeniably, it caused a lot of turbulence in most European countries, most importantly in the member states of the European Union. However, Hungary and its prime minister, Viktor Orbán, has struck a particularly critical tone when addressing non-European migrants. A nation-wide campaign has included a massive billboard initiative around the country targeting migrants, willing to set foot on European soil. Most opposition parties and the left-leaning media have criticized this billboard campaign, spreading the entire country exhausting the previously known limits of “hate speech”.

This research seeks the answer to the question whether using the word “hate speech” in the aforementioned context is more than a simple label that most liberal parties can fend for their own benefit in political battles or something that holds a real academic and scientific value. The first difficulty that one has to overcome when discussing hate speech is that a unified idea of hate speech in academic literature is still virtually non-existent. Following the previous step, one could rely on surveys that have proven that in the past few years an increasing majority of Hungarians had come to reject foreigners, giving the researcher a cause for further investigation.

This research is extremely important since in the struggle of winning the favour of voters politicians tend to generate changes in the society more than often, which may last a lot longer than their own time in office, overwhelming oncoming generations.

THE HUNGARIAN CASE

The refugee crisis started in 2015 and became the most recent political agenda in Hungary, which persisted till the elections held in 2018. This political affair has reached the majority of voters and a major part of the country formed an opinion about refugees; most of them reflected the government’s side. The reason for that is that not only politicians and politics have dealt with such a policy but having seen the billboard campaign already mentioned the vast media have also started dealing with it a lot. The next paragraph deals with the question of what exactly hate speech is and whether this billboard campaign can be described as such?

The results of the polls have shown that the Hungarian population rejected refugees, mostly after the campaign. Hungarian Social Research Institute, Tárki has been making one of the most reliable studies of the Hungarian society, while carrying out the same research with the same methodology every year since 1992. They state that “friendly attitude toward foreigners” is slowly disappearing from the Hungarian society. Hatred against strangers has been increasing during the operation of the billboard campaigns (TÁRKI, 2015). The author thinks that the prominent xenophobia measured in April has risen because of the “manipulation by the government (Sik, 2016). Another poll from 2015 showed that 66% of the total population considers the refugees to be dangerous while 19% said that Hungary was forced to accommodate them (Republikon Intézet, 2015). In 2016 eight out of ten people thought that there may be terrorists among “illegal

immigrants” (Nézőpot Intézet, 2016). But none of the polls ever studied the link between government campaign and opinions.

In the light of all this, it is clear that the Hungarian case can only be interpreted in itself, and the results are only applicable for other countries’ populations.

DEFINING HATE SPEECH

Defining hate speech is important in two different aspects. First of all, for measuring its effects the study needs to define what exactly we are measuring. The second step is to identify whether billboard campaigns are meeting the criteria of hate speech.

Many of the researchers in international academic life deal with different aspects of hate speech. Most of the writings are questioning or supporting criminality: – they are predominant but also many of them are dealing with the linguistic aspects of hate speech. There is no consistent or united definition that every researcher can accept, even though the different wordings usually only complements each other, but they do not contain any contradictions. The following definitions demonstrate two things: hate speech as a concept is generally the same, different researchers only supplement the definition or rephrase it, but basically do not change it. Secondly, the political science literature and law are so intertwined in this special case that it is difficult to separate the two from each other. Researchers often examine and compile different legislative texts so they can draw general conclusions. In addition, the world of law is more pragmatic than that of political science, therefore this short chapter presents some definitions on hate speech, including those in political science and in law, for greater interpretation, and then decides on the one this paper uses.

There are shorter concentrated ones, as “*words that wound*” (Britt, 2010), but as powerful three words can be as such broad concept this seems to be. In general, it grabs the essence of hate speech, and the harm it may cause but when it comes to investigating real cases it is not sufficient. The definition of the authors cited below are way more precise:

“Hate speech” is the generic term that has come to embrace the use of speech attacks based on race, ethnicity, religion, and sexual orientation or preference (Smolla, 1990).

“Hate speech” as a type of group libel: speech (oral or written) that argues for the mental, physical, and/or ethical inferiority of members of particular historically-oppressed groups (e.g., blacks, women, Jews, and homosexuals)(Taylor, 2011).

These definitions are much more circumspect and are largely similar, with some supplementation. The first one refers to hate speech as a way of using speech while the second one argues that it is speech, which may appear in oral or written form. Some argue that extending speech is inevitable and instead recommend the use of “expression” or “expressive content” phrases (Marais & Pretorius 2015). Hate speech targets with regard to social inequality (Hull, 2003, 532), which means that hate speech has well-defined frameworks and recipients. Personal insults and attacks cannot be defined as hate speech, since it should always include social exclusion, presumably targeting a minority. In that sense, Smolla and Taylor do agree in their definitions.

When defining hate speech researchers more than often use the words of law for multiple reasons. Interestingly it is still a trending topic, if hate speech must be regulated

or protected by free speech, while the accuracy and precision of the laws also play a role in this complex situation.

Of the international conventions, perhaps the most important is the second paragraph of Article 20 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. It was born before the revival of the debate in 1966, yet meets the criteria of hate speech regulations, while it regulates hatred against individuals or groups for national, ethnic or religious affiliation (C. Knechtle, 2006).

Any advocacy of national, racial or religious hatred that constitutes incitement to discrimination, hostility or violence shall be prohibited by law, which is supplemented by paragraph 19 (3): (a) For respect of the rights or reputations of others; (b) For the protection of national security or of public order (order public), or of public health or morals.

Compared to that, the Council of Europe has much more detailed regulation on hate speech, which expires the definition of “speech”, defines the cause of it, and also explicates the targeted groups.

All forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin (Council of Europe)

After a thorough research of the prominent academic literature, this paper will work with the following definition of hate speech, targeting groups rather than individuals:

Any expression and or symbol (oral or written form) that is conveyed to a larger group of people, with an intention to incite hatred, based on determination on the basis of various social inequalities and / or social stigma, is hate speech.

THE “DID YOU KNOW?” BILLBOARD CAMPAIGN

This research operates with the “Tudta?” (Did you know?) series of informative billboard campaign targeting migrants. Usually these kind of signs, billboards, or messages are targeting two different groups, first of all, the members of majority ensuring them, that the intuitions about the target groups are well-founded. Secondly, it also carries a message for the targeted group, makes them feel ashamed, and excluded (Waldron, 2012). In this case, the billboards are written in Hungarian, meaning the only receiver is the Hungarian population, in that case: the majority.

The concept of the poster is: they include no picture, nothing else, only the white signs, in front of blue background, at the top the question pops up: did you know? The wording is the following:

- Did you know? Brussels plans to settle a whole town's worth of illegal immigrants in Hungary
- Did you know that since the start of the immigration crisis, harassment of women has increased in Europe?
- Did you know that since the beginning of the migrant crisis, more than 300 people have died in Europe in terror attacks? (BBJ,2018)

Posters do not contain direct messages. They do not claim that every immigrant is a terrorist, only since immigrants have arrived, many have lost their lives in terror attacks.

In fact ever since the beginning of the refugee crisis, several terrorist acts have occurred, but there is no evidence that there is a link between the two. The wording of the poster nevertheless suggests this. Immigration also increased the number of violent acts against women. In this case we can also read a true statement, and the posters do not even mention that they were committed by immigrants. But it appeals to the fears of the population, readers decide what he or she believes. The third poster is out of line. It is not clear here whether Brussels or illegal immigrants are the targets. The wording of the poster cannot be interpreted in itself, but considering the other two, it says that Brussels forces the population of Hungary to live together with *that type of people*.

Posters are able to generate negative feelings, such as hatred, fear and rejecting. The wording itself is incapable of doing so, but the underlying content or interpretation meets the criteria of hate speech. It also reached millions of people, a larger group of people, and the target is a social minority: *illegal* immigrants. The paper interprets them as indirect hate speech.

WHY IS IT WORTH USING HATE SPEECH? THE ART OF ENEMY MAKING

Using hate speech makes it possible for a group to become an enemy of citizens. The creation of enemy is not novelty even not in political science. One of the greatest political theorists Carl Schmitt (1932) made a distinction between political friends and political enemies. He argues that political enemies are the ones disinherited by the community of the whole. There are no special characteristics of an enemy, the only thing needed is the clear distinction between the group and the enemy. In general, however, mostly vulnerable groups are the ideal subject of becoming an enemy (Murray, 1998). Even for the primitive man it was crucial to become the part of a community. Being the part of a certain group also meant that they were determined against other groups (Erikson, 1966). According to the biological sense - discrimination and paranoia are universally observable phenomena. In essence, every small group identifies different groups as enemy, based on not only economic, or social differences, but also racial, cultural or religious ones. Larger groups, such as the nation, are willing to unite against other nations who are considered as common enemies. Although committing an ideological community is an important constituent force, but clinging to people is a much stronger feeling. (Pinderhughes; 1982)

Ultimately, the common enemy mobilizes society, directs it, and the common enemy image shuffles people and ultimately increases people's confidence in the state (Peek, 2004). And by conclusion the organized group is assured that no harm can come from the "dangerous" environment. Members of different groups are usually motivated by the same norms, and though their habits, such as members and individuals, are easily identifiable with members of their community.

But in peaceful historical periods where there are no natural enemies and states more than often creating one for themselves. For that there are identifiable methods, which are commonly used in hate speech, and also, hate speech is also a tool for creating an enemy.

One of the most effective methods is if we claim that individuals or particular groups reject or disregard the universal values, that are shared by all of the society. (Eckhardt, 1991) Dehumanization is also sufficient when it comes to enemy creating (Steuter, Wills, 2009). Systematic dehumanization is a perfect tool to distance people from their peers, this allows them not to ponder on other people's human qualities and features. This makes it much simpler to distinguish themselves. But the best way to increase peoples's confidence in state is to claim that the country is in danger and the only chance to be saved

to maintain the current power, otherwise the external influences destabilize the system. If someone disagrees than he is a traitor who rebelled against his country. (Peek, 2004)

METHODOLOGY

To answer the following question: Does hate speech influence people's attitude? Or in other words: Are hate speech contents able to affect people's judgement, theoretical methodology and self-assessment tests are not adequate. To understand the mind of the voters we have to ask the voters themselves, but if we do that in a direct way, by using a self-assessment test, there is a great chance that individual are not replying honestly, not only because of their compliance constraint to the perceived or real opinion of the majority, but also sometimes they cannot figure out what changes are going on in themselves.

The experimental method is able to deduct casual inferences, since settings are able to control all aspects of the environment, when only the independent variable differs, then researchers may confidently say that any difference in the dependent variable is due to the effect of the independent variable. (McDermott, 2002) By designing an experiment, self-assessment problems are also avoidable, as the participants are not aware of the real measurement, and cannot figure out what the "optimal answer" would be.

According to Kittel, Luhai and Morton (2012), there are three kinds of experiments: laboratory, field and survey experiments. Of course, there are no strict borders, and the only restraining force of mixing these three is the creativity of the researcher.

This paper operates with a survey experiment, while it is the most valuable tool for examining the background processes (Lavine 2002, Mutz, 2011).

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SIMULATED EXPERIMENT

Most of the time experiment is operating with groups of students, and representability is a question here. By this mean the reason for this is that the goal of the inquiry is not to generalize the outcome to a certain population, instead to challenge a theory, which applies to causal relations between abstract constructs in order to underpin the preliminary assumption (Smith and Mackie, 2004). This exact experiment combines the experimental measurement and the benefits of online surveys – reach hundreds of fillers, and recipients. This advantage has made it possible that the experiment reached more than three hundred people - yet the research not to be considered representative but it can provide a good starting point for future research.

The first and most important criteria of the experimental method is formulating two groups, one who gets the "treatment" and a control group. It is important to compare the result of the two groups, and make sure, that the *treatment*, also called the *independent variable* triggers the changing of attitudes. So the research works with two different groups, an experimental one, and a control group. To make sure, the criteria of *randomization* is satisfied, the two different online surveys had one link, which contained a built-in script, which divided fillers into two groups. The first click in the online survey led to the experimental group, the second one to the control group and so on.¹

¹ This caused some problems also, while the script only measures click, however not tracking down if the recipients are finishing the questionnaire. The number of the two groups did not match at the end. we can accept 156 responses in the control group. In contrast, the experimental group received 168 responses, which means that 12 responses had to be excluded before the analysis was started to have the same number of elements in the two groups. By random selection 12 respondents were excluded from the sample.

The experiment contains two groups, one control group or one experimental group, and the test consists of three main parts for both groups: (1) demographic questions; (2) different general information is received from individuals in the control group, the experimental group receives additional stimuli; (3) an overriding question in which respondents are interested in their opinion of a hatred campaign.

After filling in demographic information of themselves in both of the groups, they had to decide from eight fictional characters, whether they are likeable or not.² Both group had the same eight characters the first four came up without a picture, only with an empty profile picture, the second four contained some random pictures.

The information came up with a picture (or without a picture), telling the respondent the fictive name and age for the character, and they had to decide, on a scale from one to five³, how likeable they found the character. For the control group, they only had to tell us from these 8 characters, by the same way, the same information. For the experimental group, they had more and more information about the characters. The second one contained information about which minority the character is a member of⁴. For example: *He/she has allegedly Roma origin. or Allegedly he/she is a member of a lesser known sect.* Then they got a negative message, which counts not as hate speech in itself, subjects had to decide again. Messages like: *Allegedly his/her only income is from aid or According to his neighbours he is more than often violent with his wife.* The fourth piece information was the mixture of the above mentioned two, which now meets the criteria of hate speech. They also had to signify on the same scale how likeable the characters are after these pieces of information.

The message which they got as hate speech content, was allocated in three different groups. Most of them were former hate speech court cases, with tiny changes. For example: *Allegedly he rejects democracy, does not respect the laws*⁵ The second one reinforces existing prejudices like *several people have seen her behaving inappropriately on the Pride March*, and lastly according to the focus of the research, the third group of messages implicitly referred to the posters: *His brother allegedly wants to set up a body like an Islamic State.*

The effect of hate speech in the experimental group can be detected as the difference between the answer to the first question and the answer to the last question. The first question does not contain actual information about fictitious characters, but the last one contains implicit or explicit hate speech against fictitious people. Intermediate information is virtually reinforcing this effect.

The third part of the questionnaires is the same for the two groups. Open question, where recipients may express their opinions. The question is: Have you ever encountered a hatred campaign? What do you think of it? All other questions are obligatory to fulfil, this one is optional.

RESULTS

Both groups consist of 156 recipients each which means in this case we are testing 312 people.

² The question was: How willing would you be to accept this person in your friend group?

³ where 1=not at all, 5=very much

⁴ None of the information contained a statement, each came up with the „supposed” modifier

⁵ In a case of a 2003 European Court of Human Rights, one person was sentenced for hate speech because he criticized the institutions of democracy on a television show. (Hate Speech, 2017)

COMPARING GROUPS

Randomization is a perfect method for the two groups to have the same probability for the subjects, but it cannot guarantee that these subjects also have the same demographic composition. Table 1 and 2 show the results of the statistical comparison of the demographic composition of experimental and control groups.

Table 1. Composition of experimental and control groups demographic (low level variable variables)

	Cramer V	p value
Sex	0,058	0,308
Address	0,122	0,324
Education	0,910	0,632
Religion	0,130	0,022

Table 2. Distribution of the experiment or control group in terms of age, left or right affiliation, and liberal-conservative scale.

	F statistics	p value
Age	2,33	0,128
Left- Right Scale	6,992	0,009
Liberal- Conservative Scale	0,884	0,348

Based on the data, the following conclusion can be made although randomization does not guarantee that the demographic data of the groups are the same, the comparison of the two groups is almost the same. Using association assessment by low-level variables, and variance analysis for high-level ones Table 1 and Table 2 show that p is almost always above 0.05, so the hypothesis is accepted at a 5% significance level, meaning that the two groups are the same, the only exception is *Religion and Left-Right Scale*.

ANSWERS BY STARTING POINT

Comparing the two groups, hypothetically, by the first questions should be the same in both groups. The experimental group receives a hate speech content later. Table 3 shows, if the two groups had the same exact impressions at the starting point⁶. The null hypothesis in this case is that the answers of the two groups do not differ. As in the previous subchapter, if p is more than 0.05, null hypothesis is accepted, the answers do not differ statistically from each other. As in the previous subsection, for high-level variable variables, ANOVA has been used.

This condition was constant, Wahiba, and not in Kutaiba. For the former, p is 0.036 and the latter is smaller than 0.020. This means that in six of the eight cases examined, the responses of the control and experimental groups can be considered roughly the same.

⁶ Refers here as the control groups answers and the experimental groups first answers.

Table 3. Comparison of the control group responses and the response of the experimental group to the initial state

Name of the characters	F statistics	p value
Hakeem (38)	2,797	0,085
Aïcha (35)	0,140	0,708
Sándor (38)	3,778	0,530
Katalin (35)	0,871	0,350
Tibor (38)	2,075	0,151
Wahiba (35)	4,456	0,360
Kutaiba (38)	5,444	0,200
Edina (35)	0,598	0,440

PRELIMINARY RESULTS COMPARED TO RESULTS

Table 4. shows us whether the independent variable changed the dependent one, whether hate speech content changed the attitude of voters. Comparing preliminary results two-paired t-test were used, testing the data from the experimental group. Only one in eight cases showed that the hate speech content did not change the filler's opinion. Katalin was the only person with a p value of 0.64, so we kept the null hypothesis. Thus, in this case, the intermediate information did not affect the developed opinion. In all other cases, the results show a significant difference.

Table 4: Difference between initial and output values of the experimental group

Name of the characters	T statistics	P value
Hakeem (38)	10,133	0,000
Aïcha (35)	14,668	0,000
Sándor (38)	10,799	0,000
Katalin (35)	1,874	0,630
Tibor (38)	22,243	0,000
Wahiba (35)	12,549	0,000
Kutaiba (38)	13,523	0,000
Edina (35)	2,920	0,004

The answers of the control group have also been compared to the experimental groups results, by variance analysis. The question is: are there statistically significant differences between the averages of the two control and experimental groups? As a null hypothesis, we assume that there is no difference between the groups (in this case the control and the experiment), that is, the initial point is the same as the output point, so the information does not count. To achieve this, p must be more than 0.05. For Wahiba and Kutaiba calculations are not made, because in the previous subchapter it was found that when comparing the control and experimental group, the two groups differ in their case, so the comparison between the control and the experimental groups would be unfounded.

Based on the results of the experimental group, and based on the fact that the response of the control group did not deviate from the experimental group, I expected that in this case almost all the null hypotheses could be rejected. On the other hand, the value of p for each person is greater than 0.05, so in this case we can say that there is no statistically significant difference between the initial values of the control group and the output values of the experimental group.

There was a significant change in the experimental group, so the intermediate information influenced the evaluative judgement of the test subjects, but we cannot confirm this with the results of the control group. Although the two groups were statistically the same by the preliminary results, the results of the control group did not prove that the intermediate information can affect the value judgment.

DEMOGRAPHIC VALUES IN JUDGEMENT

Based on the data above, hate speech affects evaluative judgement in a negative direction. But does hate speech equally apply to everyone? Does it matter in this context, where does he/she live, or what political side is he/she chooses.

For the analysis of the data, linear regression has been used. Dependent variables in that case are the preliminary results minus results and independent variables are demographic data.

In most cases no demographical data affected the evaluative judgement, although there are some exceptions. In the case of *Sándor*⁷ only the position on left-right scale makes an impact, the more right-winged the recipients are the more likely to be negatively evaluated.

Table 5. The effects of demographic data to evaluative judgement in the case of *Sándor*

	B	Standard error	P value
Sex	0,249	0,189	0,19
Address	-0,049	0,349	0,232
Education	-0,202	0,204	0,323
Religion	0,005	0,256	0,985
Left- Right Scale	0,225	0,113	0,049**
Liberal- Conservative Scale	0,092	0,108	0,399

⁷ He had no picture, and he is roma and the only income he gets is from aids.

In the case of Katalin the participant's position on liberal-conservative scale explains the respondents attitude towards her character significantly. According to the data, however, the more conservative the person is, the more negative the direction of his/her evaluation. In her case the hate speech content was, that she's a lesbian who behaves indecently in the Pride. Acceptance of homosexuality is typically a conservative-liberal fragmentation in societies, in that case that is the most obvious reason for the results.

Table 6. The effects of demographic data to evaluative judgement in the case of Katalin

	B	Standard error	p Value
Sex	0,171	0,169	0,313
Address	-0,405	0,313	0,197
Education	0,002	0,182	0,991
Religion	0,210	0,229	0,363
Left- Right Scale	0,180	0,101	0,077
Liberal-Conservative Scale	0,309	0,097	0,002**

Edina is a *feminist, who has been repeatedly denounced*. In her case men were basically more condemned, and also, the more the respondents were on the conservative side on liberal-conservative scale, the more they had a negative opinion about her.

Table 7. The effects of demographic data to evaluative judgement in the case of Edina

	B	Standard error	p Value
Sex	0,420	0,166	0,013**
Address	0,247	0,308	0,423
Education	-0,203	0,180	0,259
Religion	-0,112	0,226	0,620
Left- Right Scale	0,034	0,337	0,737
Liberal-Conservative Scale	0,263	0,095	0,007**

CONCLUSION

To understand the effect of hate speech, the first and most important question to answer is, what hate speech is exactly. Defining it is still difficult. Summoning authors and descriptions from the field of political science and also the field of law, this paper led to the conclusion that a prudent definition should cover the following: what do we exactly mean by “speech”, who is the audience and the targeted group, and what exactly may it exactly cause. By that sense this paper works with the following definition: *Any expression and / or symbol (oral or written form) that is conveyed to a larger group of people, with an intention to incite hatred, based on determination on the basis of various social inequalities and / or social stigma, is hate speech.*

Defining hate speech led to the conclusion that the billboard campaign meets the criteria of hate speech, while they are able to generate negative feelings, such as hatred, fear and rejecting. The wording itself is incapable of doing so, but the underlying content or interpret meets the criteria of hate speech. It also reached millions of people, a larger group of people, and the target is a social minority: *illegal* immigrants.

Experiments led to more conclusions. Despite the fact that randomization does not guarantee that same demographical distribution in the two different groups, only the fact that respondents are likely to have the same chances to be the part of one or the other group, the results show that the demographic composition of the two groups are broadly the same. However, in the question of religion and the right-wingness, they differ statistically.

Experimental and control groups response did not differ statistically in six out of eight, by preliminary results (before any stimuli). So it seemed clear that the response of the control group and the response of the experimental group to the stimuli would roughly match the data obtained from the starting state of the experimental group or post-stimulus responses. Despite expectations we could not duplicate the results of the experiment group for the control group, so the data are not perfectly convincing.

However, we can observe a significant change in the results of the experimental group, which means that the stimulus I give, that is, the hate speech can affect the value judgment of the test subjects. To declare it was not the general anti-xenophobic or antipathy attitude against the minorities, I showed that the value judgment was only slightly changed after information after the second information, that is, on the belonging to the minority, while the negative information was noticeable, statistically it turned out that in some cases, reference to belonging to a minority also influenced the value judgment of the fillers. I think that based on the data it can be said that negative information and hate speech were more likely to affect the value judgment of the fillers.

Most polls made in the refugee crisis concluded that demographical data do not explain the opinion about the refugee crisis. It does no matter whether someone has better education, or lives in the capital city, most of the Hungarian population is against refugees. This experiment also concludes that hate speech targets every people not caring about ideology or whether recipients are religious or not.

This experiment concludes, that hate speech affects people’s attitude toward individuals, although this paper has many limitations. First of all, online experiments hardly meet the criteria of representativeness, which in this case is exaggerated as it was posted mainly on a social media site. Second of all, experiments must be repeated several times, to verify results. In this case the goal was to develop a possible method to measure the effect of hate speech.

REFERENCES

- Bleich, E. (2013). Freedom of Expression versus Racist Hate Speech: Explaining Differences Between High Court Regulations in the USA and Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(2)
- Britt, B. (2010). Curses Left and Right: Hate Speech and Biblical Tradition. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 78(3), p.633.
- C. Knechtle, J. (2006). When to Regulate Hate Speech. *Penn State Law Review*.
- Eckhardt, W. "Making And Breaking Enemy Images". *Security Dialogue* 22.1 (1991): 88-91. Web. 12 Feb. 2017.
- Edelman, Murray (1998 [1988]): Politikai ellenségek konstruálása. Fordította Erdei Pálma. In Szabó Márton (szerk.): *Az ellenség neve*. Budapest, Józsefvárosi Műhely Kiadó. 88-123.
- Erikson, E. H. (1966). *Ontogeny of ritualization*. In Lowenstein, K. M., Newman, L. M., Schur, M., and Solnit, A. J. (eds.), *Psychoanalysis- A General Psychology*, International Universities Press, New York.
- Hull, C. (2003). Poststructuralism, Behaviorism and the Problem of Hate Speech. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 29(5), p.532.
- Kittel, B., Luhan, W. and Morton, R. (2012). *Experimental Political Science: Principles and Practices*. 1st ed. Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp.3-12.
- Lavine, Howard. 2002. "On-line versus Memory Based Process Models of Political Evaluation." In *Political Psychology*, ed. Kristen Monroe. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 242.
- Marais ; Pretorius, M. (2015). A CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE HATE SPEECH PROVISIONS OF THE EQUALITY ACT. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, 18(4), p.907-909.].
- McDermott, R. (2002). EXPERIMENTAL METHODS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE. *Annual Review of Political Science*, [online] 5(1), pp.31-61. Available at: <http://www.uky.edu/AS/PoliSci/Peffley/pdf/McDermott%202002%20EXPERIMENTAL%20METHODS%20IN%20POLITICAL%20SCIENCE.pdf> [2 Apr. 2017].
- Mutz, D. (2011). *Population-based survey experiments*. 1st ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.1-22.
- Neier, A. (2014). The Content and Context of Hate Speech: Rethinking Regulation and Responses. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 12(3), pp.816-820.
- Peek, Lori (2004) „Constructing the Enemy during Times of Crisis: America after 9/11”. *Divide: Journal of Writing and Ideas* 1(2): p.29
- Pinderhughes, C. A. (1982). Paired differential bonding in biological, psychological, and social systems. *Am. J. Social Psychiat.* 2: 5-14.
- Schmitt, C. (1932), *The Concept of the Political. Expanded Edition* 25-38 trans. by G. Schwab, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Smith, E. and Mackie, D. (2004). *Szociálpszichológia*. 1st ed. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó, pp.85-129.

- Smolla, R. (1990). Academic Freedom, Hate Speech, and the Idea of a University. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, [online] 53(3) Available at: <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2024&context=facpu>
- Smolla, R. (1990). Academic Freedom, Hate Speech, and the Idea of a University. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, [online] 53(3) Available at: <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2024&context=facpu>
- Steuter, Wills, E. (2009). Discourses of Dehumanization: Enemy Construction and Canadian Media Complicity in the Framing of the War on Terror. *Global Media Journal -- Canadian Edition*, [online] 2(2), p.11-12. Available at: http://www.gmj.uottawa.ca/0902/v2i2_steuter%20and%20wills.pdf [Accessed 19 Feb. 2017].
- Taylor, R. (2011). Hate Speech, the Priority of Liberty, and the Temptations of Nonideal Theory. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 15(3),
- Waldron, J. (2012). *The harm in hate speech*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

DOCUMENTS

- AZ ELLENZÉKI SZIMPATIZÁNSOK TÖBB MINT FELE IS ELÉGEDETT A KORMÁNNYAL BEVÁNDORLÁSÜGYBEN (2016) <http://nezopontintezet.hu/analysis/az-ellenzeki-szimpatizansok-tobb-mint-feleelegedett-kormannyal-bevandorlas-ugyben/> Accessed: 2017.04.27
- BBJ. (2018). Hungarian gov't attacks 'migrants' in new campaign. [online] Available at: https://bbj.hu/politics/hungarian-govt-attacks-migrants-in-new-campaign_119453 Accessed 13 Apr. 2018
- Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (97) 20, of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on „Hate Speech”.
- Hate speech 2017 http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/FS_Hate_speech_ENG.pdf (Gündüz v. Turkey) (Pavel Ivanov v. Russia) Accessed: 2017.04.27
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 19 December 1966
Available: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/unts/volume%20999/volume-999-i-14668-english.pdf>
- Republikon intézet felmérése: A PÁRTOK HELYZETE 2015 KÖZEPÉN (2015) http://republikon.hu/media/20993/partok2015_v4.pdf Accessed: 2017.04.27
- Sik Endre Csúcsot döntött az idegenellenesség, és elfogyott az idegenbarátság (2016) http://www.tarki.hu/hu/news/2016/kitekint/20160404_idegen.html Accessed: 2017.04.27
- TÁRKI; THE ANTI-IMMIGRATION PROPAGANDA HAS ITS LIMITS: THE LATEST TÁRKI POLL <http://hungarianspectrum.org/tag/tarki/> Accessed: 2017.04.27