

Conference Paper

Collective Aggressivity in Numerical cales

Imam Suyitno

Universitas Negeri Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Abstract.

The social reality of conflict (group violence) is now occurring in many spheres of our society, including students who are synonymous with educated groups and prioritize rationality in making decisions. There are several reasons why conflicts between student groups occur. Firstly, the social reality triggers the tendency for students to behave aggressively and individual conflict occurs between students, which then shifts or switches to inter-group conflicts. This is deliberately created so that actors gain sympathy, support, even assistance from members of their group. Secondly, clashes between student groups tend to increase. This is because each conflicting group has seeds of conflict symptoms which at any time give a strong contribution to student's aggressive behavior, in the form of group prejudice, ethnocentrism, and discrimination. Lastly, when compared with the existing conflict symptoms, group prejudice ranks first in contributing to the emergence of student aggressive behavior tendencies ($r^2 = 0.98$ or 98%), followed by discrimination (0.96 or 96%), and ethnocentrism (0.94 or 94%).

Keywords: collective aggressivity, Universitas Negeri Makassar

Corresponding Author: Imam
Suyitno; email:
imamsuyitno@unm.ac.id

Published 3 January 2024

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Imam Suyitno. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the ICHELSS Conference Committee.

1. Introduction

Conflict and integration are innate human traits from childhood to adulthood (now) that are experienced by every human being in their civilization wherever and whenever [1,2]. It is undeniable that human aggressiveness cannot be removed from the face of this earth, because aggressiveness is part of the nature of human nature itself. When a child cannot speak, he can already scream at the top of his lungs to express his anger when his toys disturb him. When he was a child he fought with his friends just because of fighting over kites, and even when he became the leader of an organization sometimes he still scolded his subordinates.

Likewise as a group, ethnicity and even a nation, humans still continue to behave aggressively towards each other. Starting from small groups, for example fights between schools, between groups within campuses to wars between countries and even between groups of countries, which are still going on to this day, proving that humans never stop attacking each other. Even now the target of aggression has expanded so

OPEN ACCESS

much to helpless and innocent people, for example children, women, the elderly, and people who are not armed [3–6].

The search results showed that from 1820 to 1945 it was estimated that no less than 59 million human lives were lost as a result of aggressive human actions, and more than half of them were victims who fell in war, while the rest were victims of fights, abuse, deprivation, sexual aggression, and various other forms [7] Of that number, not including those who suffer physically or psychologically, and even countless material things caused by forms of aggression.

The condition that is concerning now is that aggression is increasingly indiscriminate and does not choose a place and time, which can happen anywhere and at any time. As shown by the mass killings of children, women and unarmed men in the Palestinian and Sabra refugee camps many years ago, the massacre of civilians in Bosnia (the inter-ethnic war when Yugoslavia was torn into small states) .

In Indonesia, the case was no exception on July 27, 1996 due to the attack on the PDI DPP office resulting in 4 people died, 149 were injured, 23 people were missing, and material losses were estimated at no less than 100 billion rupiah. October 10, 1996 the Situbondo incident which left 5 people dead and 56 buildings destroyed. The Tasikmalaya incident on 26 – 27 December 1996 recorded 4 deaths, 76 buildings were heavily damaged and no less than 107 cars were burned. Likewise in West Kalimantan (Sampit) 19 December 1996 – February 1997 there were tens to hundreds of people who died as a result of fighting between tribes. The climax of aggressiveness rocked Indonesia was the events of 13-14 May 1998 in Jakarta which was the biggest damage with 1217 people declared dead, 122 people injured and 152 victims of rape [8,9]

Such conditions seem to imply that now aggression is an instrument for achieving certain goals, the result is an accumulation of sophisticated weapons that enable institutionalized aggression to be carried out very effectively and efficiently. Especially in today's era of technology and modern war strategy, it is not too difficult to imagine humans being able to kill millions of their fellow humans in an instant. Whereas on the other hand, no less than apostles, prophets, philosophers, scholars were present to bring and voice love for fellow human beings. Modern society which is very complex as a result of technological advances, mechanization of industrialization and urbanization raises many social problems [10,11]. So the effort of adaptation or adjustment to modern society which is very complex makes it difficult to multiply adaptation and adjustment, causing a lot of doubts, confusion, anxiety and conflicts. Both open external conflicts, as well as internal conflicts within oneself that are hidden and closed in nature. As

a result, people then develop behavior patterns that deviate from general norms, by doing whatever they want for their own benefit.

Campus as an educational institution in which there are groups of educated people (students) which, although they are more predicated as scientific communities, does not mean that these groups are not contaminated or influenced by aggressive behavior [12–14]. Nowadays collective aggressiveness has also penetrated the campus environment, in every event involving student groups both at the local and national levels, for example demonstrations, aggressive behavior always appears. This shows that aggressive behavior can appear anywhere and by any group and within a certain time. anytime.

The social reality of fights between students has been rife, which of course has caused both material and non- material losses in addition to damaging the image of a university, it has also exacerbated the daily activities of the campus, especially those affected by disasters, cases of fights between students that often occur can also invite public antipathy towards the alma mater [15]. Thus policy makers must be very observant in seeing a firm and wise atmosphere here. Leaders really need an active role in managing a tertiary institution, in the sense of university leadership, to be more alert and make anticipatory efforts in dealing with every crime on campus which rarely involves students. and the college itself.

This problem has surfaced several times, and will become a culture if there is no seriousness from all tertiary institutions to resolve it thoroughly to the root of the problem. This is because cases of student group fights that have occurred on several large campuses, both public and private, have graced local and national media coverage, especially during the admission period for new students.

The collective aggressiveness that arose as a result of fights between student groups on several major campuses in the city of Makassar, including Makassar State University (former IKIP campus) has been going on for quite a long time. At least this can be seen from the data collected from the UNM student tabloid. March 1998, between technique and language/literature, August 2000, Technique attacks art, 17 May 2001, between technique and language/literature, 10 October 2002 technique attacks geography, 26 February 2003 between technique and language, 24 to 26 March 2003 , the technique of attacking language/literature. (Profession UNM student tabloid, Edition 065 Year XXI April 2003) and the most recent one occurred on 30 August 2004 at dawn around 01.00 which involved a group of students from the engineering faculty and the language/arts faculty on the sidelines of welcoming activities for the 2004/2005 new students.

The consideration for choosing Makassar State University (UNM) as the location (setting) of the research at that time, was considering that this university was one of

the universities that noted that the intensity of collective aggressiveness was quite high. Besides that, the amount of losses and even fatalities is inevitable as a result of collective aggressiveness. These factors prompted the selection of this university as a research locus.

To be able to understand the phenomenon of collective aggressiveness that has occurred at Makassar State University, the following are a number of issues that will be verified, namely: 1) What is the description of the aggressive behavior of UNM students that has occurred; 2) driving factors so that students behave aggressively; 3) whether there is a significant relationship between group prejudice, ethnocentrism, and discrimination together with tendencies of aggressive behavior; and 4) which of the variables group prejudice, ethnocentrism, and discrimination has the strongest relationship to student aggressive behavior variables.

2. Method

This research was conducted at Makassar State University for 3 (three) months after the approval of the research proposal and during this time maximum effort has been made to collect the required data. This type of research is explanatory in nature to reveal the tendency for aggressive behavior to emerge in existing student groups. This research belongs to the survey category where the conclusions obtained are expected to describe the state of the population. In this study using 2 (two) stages. First, it is done quantitatively to test the proposed research hypotheses. Second, it is carried out qualitatively to explore and study in more depth the sociological dynamics of the quality of these aggressive behavior tendencies.

The focus of the research is individuals who are in the collectivity of the faculties at Makassar State University (UNM). The faculties at UNM include: FIP, FEIS, FBS, FMIPA, FT and FIK. In this study the data collected includes: 1) Primary data, namely data obtained directly from respondents using a questionnaire instrument and in-depth interviews with several informants namely actors and faculty leaders, and 2) Secondary data, namely data obtained from documents either through BAAKPSI UNM able to go through tabloid investigations of Profession UNM students.

Data collection techniques used in this study include:

1. a))Questionnaire techniques, to obtain good data on the aggressive behavior tendency variable. Before the questionnaires were distributed to respondents, trials were first carried out on a number of students, namely 20 people (18.2%).

This is done to determine the validity and reliability of the questionnaire instrument as a test tool. Test the validity and reliability of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix 2

2. b))In-depth interview technique, to examine more deeply the sociological dynamics of the quality of aggressive behavior tendencies.
3. c))Documentation techniques, to record and investigate data both in the BAAKPSI UNM and in the editorial staff of UNM Profession student tabloids.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. The relationship between: group prejudice, ethnocentrism, and discrimination simultaneously with aggressive behavior tendencies.

The results of statistical calculations show that there is a positive relationship between group prejudice (x1), ethnocentric (x2) and discrimination variables (x3) with students' aggressive behavior tendencies (Y). Linear multiple regression analysis between these variables produces a "b" coefficient of 0.224 for x1; 0.109 for x2 and 0.954 for x3 and a constant of 0.335, so that the form of the relationship between the variables can be described by the regression equation $Y = 0.335 + 0.224x_1 + 1.109x_2 + 1.954x_3$. In order to find out the significance of the multiple regression equation and this linearity, the F test was carried out

TABLE 1: Multiple Regression Linearity Significance Test.

Value (x1x2x3)	Ry	Value		Results
		F Results	F Table	
			0, 05	
			0, 01	
0, 662		27, 160	3,94	6, 90
				Very Significant

Information: db (110-3-1) = 106 (Denominator) = (Numerator)

The contribution (strength) of the relationship between group prejudice, ethnocentricity, discrimination and student aggressive behavior tendencies is $ry_{x_1x_2x_3} = 0.662$ and the coefficient of determination is $ry^2_{x_1x_2x_3} = 0.438$ or 44 percent, meaning that variations in student aggressive behavior tendencies can be explained by group prejudice, ethnocentric and discrimination variables.

3.2. Analysis of the relationship between: group prejudice with aggressive behavior tendencies

The calculation results show that there is a positive relationship between the group prejudice variable (x1) and the aggressive behavior tendency variable (Y). A simple linear regression analysis between these two variables produces a “b” coefficient of 1.050 and a constant a of 19.693, so that the form of the relationship between the group prejudice variable and the tendency to behave aggressively can be described by the regression equation, namely:

$$Y = 19.693 + 1.050x$$

In order to find out the significance of the simple regression equation and this linearity, a t-test was performed.

TABLE 2: Regression Linearity Significance Test (Y) on Group Prejudice.

Value rxy	Value		Results
	t. results	t. results	
0,999	230,74	1,980	Significant

Information: *) trust level 5% db (110-2) = 108

On the basis of the regression significance test and the linearity test, it can be concluded that the equation $Y = 19.693 + 1.050 x_1$ shows very significant and linear. The contribution of the strength of the relationship between group prejudice and student aggressive behavior tendencies (Y) obtained a correlation coefficient $r_{y1} = 0.999$ as clearly stated in the following table

TABLE 3:

Number Samples	of correlation coefficient (ry1)	T count	T table		Results
			0,05	0,01	
110	0,999	230,711	1,980	2,617	Very Significant

Information: dk (110-2) = 108

Thus the working hypothesis can be accepted, this means that the higher the group prejudice score, the higher the aggressive behavior tendency score in students. The magnitude of the coefficient of determination is $r_{y1}^2 = 0.98$ or 98 percent, meaning that 98 percent of variations in student aggressive behavior tendencies can be explained by group prejudice conditions (x1).

3.3. Analysis of the relationship between ethnocentrism and the tendency of aggressive behavior

The working hypothesis proposed is that there is a positive relationship between the ethnocentric variable (x2) and the student’s aggressive behavior tendency variable (Y). A simple linear regression analysis between these two variables produces a “b” coefficient of 0.399 and a constant a of 11.594, so that the relationship between ethnocentric variables and the tendency to behave aggressively can be described by the regression equation:

$$Y = 11.594 + 0.399x$$

In order to find out the significance of the simple regression equation and this linearity, a t-test was performed.

TABLE 4: Uji Signifikansi Linearitas Regresi (Y) terhadap Etnosentris.

Value rxy	Value		Results
	t. results	t. results	
0,969	41,465	1,980	Very Significant

Based on the regression significance test and the linearity test, it can be concluded that the equation $Y = 11.594 + 0.399 x_2$ is very significant and linear. This means that every increase of 1 score on ethnocentric (x2) will be able to increase by 0.399 the score of student aggressive behavior tendencies (Y) at a constant of 11.594. The contribution to the strength of the relationship between ethnocentricity and student aggressive behavior tendencies (Y) was obtained with a correlation coefficient $r_{y2} = 0.969$ as shown in the following table.

TABLE 5: Correlation Significance Test Between Group Prejudice and Students’ Aggressive Behavior Tendency.

Number of Samples	correlation coefficient (ry1)	T count	T table		Results
			0,05	0,01	
110	0,969	41,465	1,980	2,617	Very Significant

Information: dk (110-2) = 108

Thus the working hypothesis can be accepted, this means that the higher the ethnocentric score, the higher the aggressive behavior tendency score in students. The magnitude of the coefficient of determination is $r_{y2}^2 = 0.94$ or 94 percent, meaning that 94 percent of variations in student aggressive behavior tendencies can be explained by ethnocentricity (x2).

The relationship between ethnocentric and aggressive behavior tendencies, if the effect of discrimination (x3) is obtained $r_{y \ x2 \ x3} = 0.105$. If group prejudice (x1) is controlled, then the partial correlation coefficient between ethnocentric (x2) $r_{y \ x2 \ x1} = 0.151$ is obtained and if the effect of discrimination (x3) and group prejudice (x1) is controlled, it is obtained $r_{yx2.x3.x1} = 0.762$. For more details can be seen in the following table

TABLE 6: Test of Significance of the Persian Correlation Coefficient between, Ethnocentrism (x2), Discrimination (x3) and group prejudice (x1) with tendencies of aggressive student behavior (y) if x3, x1, and x3 x1 are controlled.

Partial Correlation Coefficient	Observation	t Table		Results
		0, 05	0, 01	
$R_{y \ x2 \ x3}$	5, 097			
$R_{y \ x2 \ x1}$	4, 588	1, 980	2, 617	Very Significant
$R_{y \ x2 \ x3 \ x1}$	12, 239			

3.4. The relationship between discrimination and the tendency of student aggressive behavior

The proposed working hypothesis is the Relationship between Discrimination and the Tendency of Student Aggressive Behavior. Working hypothesis, there is a positive relationship between the discrimination variable (x3) and the aggressive behavior of students (Y). A simple linear regression analysis between these two variables produces a coefficient “b” of 0.664 and a constant a of 1.829, so that the form of the relationship between the variable discrimination and the tendency to behave aggressively can be described by the regression equation, namely:

$$Y = 1.829 + 0.664 \ x3$$

In order to find out the significance of the simple regression equation and this linearity, a t-test was performed.

TABLE 7: Regression Linearity Significance Test (Y) on Discrimination.

Value rxy	Value		Results
	t. results	t. results	
0, 983	55, 516	1, 980	Very Significant

Information: on degrees 0, 05 with db (110-) = 108

On the basis of the significant regression test and the linearity test, it can be concluded that the equation $Y = 1.829 + 0.664 \ x3$ shows very significant and linear. This

means that every increase of 1 score on discrimination (x3) will be able to increase the score of 0.664 student aggressive behavior tendencies (Y) at a constant of 1.829. The strength contribution of the relationship between discrimination and student aggressive behavior tendencies (Y) obtained a correlation coefficient of $r_{y3} = 0.983$ as shown in the following table.

TABLE 8: Correlation Significance Test Between Group Prejudice and Students' Aggressive Behavior Tendency.

Number of Samples	correlation coefficient (ry2)	T count	T table		Results
			0,05	0,01	
110	0,983	55,516	1,980	2,617	Very Significant

Information: dk (110-2) = 108

Thus the working hypothesis can be accepted, this means that the higher the score of discrimination, the higher the score of students' aggressive behavior tendencies. The magnitude of the coefficient of determination is $r_{y32} = 0.966$ or 96 percent, meaning that 96 percent of variations in student aggressive behavior tendencies can be explained by discrimination (x3).

3.5. Tracing cases of brawls

It cannot be denied that Makassar State University is a state university that has recorded the most cases of student fights among universities in this city, especially in recent years. This can be traced from various existing sources, at least from 1998 to 2004 there were dozens of cases of brawls which always involved students from the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Languages/Arts. The following data describes various cases of brawls that have occurred.

Cases of brawls between students would have been longer if a series of cases of brawls that were not open in nature were also revealed, small and sporadic brawls could still be felt at least until the October-November 2004 period. This shows how vulnerable Makassar State University is to the emergence of aggressive behavior students which later gave rise to cases of brawls between students from the two faculties.

It should be noted that from a series of brawl cases like those mentioned above, the one that left the most deep impression was the May 17, 2001 tragedy, how it didn't take billions of rupiahs of physical losses and caused serious and minor injuries to the victims. This is the case of brawls that claimed the most victims and losses, so that

TABLE 9: Various Cases Of Fights That Have Occurred.

Number	Year	Case Subject	Victims incurred
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	3 Mei 1995	Faculty of EEngineering with a faculty of languages	Involving approximately 300 students, a number of students were seriously injured
2	Mar 1998	Faculty of Engineering with faculties of language and arts	A number of students were injured, the windows of the building were shattered
3	Aug 2000	Faculty of engineering with HMJ Fine Arts	Radio, TV, motorcycle and paintings were damaged, the loss was approximately Rp. 60,000,000.00
4	17 Mei 2001	Faculty of Engineering with faculties of language and arts	The technology building at the Faculty of Engineering caught fire, causing billions of rupiah in losses
5	10 Okt 2002	Unscrupulous Engineering Student with BEM Geography	Computer, radio, and 1 geography student injured
6	26 Feb 2003	Faculty of Engineering with faculties of language and arts	The secretariat of the language faculty's clothing was damaged by a loss of Rp. 30,000,000.00
7	24 Mar 2003	Faculty of Engineering with faculties of language and arts	Several students were injured
8	26 Mar 2003	Faculty of Engineering with faculties of language and arts	Cars caught fire, 2 damaged, 2 motorbikes burned, secretariat maestro damaged, 12 seriously injured

Source: Data from the results of an investigation into the UNM Profession LPPM Research and Development

some people know it as the tragedy of 17 May 2001. So sad was this tragedy that a small number of students used it as a moment to inflame feelings of not being able to accept the reality that happened, this can be seen by the activities to commemorate this event every year which in his language is “Dentum” (Revenge of the Seventeen May).

3.6. Conflict triggers

The aggressive behavior shown by students in cases of brawls between students now seems to be a social academic reality that continues to be symptomatic. Student brawls that rely on acts of violence (violence actions) are actually manifestations of an individual conflict to an entrenched collective conflict.

From tracing cases of brawls between students, sometimes the triggers for events are very simple, for example the August 2000 incident was started by the unclear news

that an engineering student was beaten by a Fine Arts student, and of course this was immediately denied by the Fine Arts student, in fact it was the Engineering student who started it. Accusing each other of triggers every time a brawl occurs seems to be the justification for brawling. From interviews with several informants showed this.

According to Hizbul (the initials of FT students), the Faculty of Engineering version said that it was the Fine Arts students who started to sow the seeds of fighting. "Art students beat the Head of HIMA Electronics for no apparent reason. They even boasted and issued threats. This incident eventually spread to some of the Engineering Faculty students, and the next day, with no one's command, they then attacked and damaged the secretariat and inventory items HIMA Fine Arts." (Interview, October 2004).

The version of the Faculty of Languages and Arts, Meisar (FBS student) explained: "actually this is just a mere misunderstanding and the case has been resolved academically, but there are several people who are also fishing in murky waters, there are people who deliberately provoke the situation so that the fight continues for the sake of their name."

That's how even though the way of peace has been agreed upon by both parties, there are still many who claim to be dissatisfied. Accusing each other is not only at the student level but also at the faculty leadership level as in an interview with one of the faculty leaders.

Amin Rasyid in an interview with the Profession tabloid stated "Art reacted because there was a reactant, namely from Engineering, the matter of homemade weapons being the perpetrator's weapons which are stored in campuses and even assembling weapons, there is Engineering, because in Engineering the materials are in the laboratory, he said."

Likewise with the October 10, 2002 case where the collectivity (group) of Geography students (FMIPA) was involved in a brawl with Engineering students, the alleged trigger of which was simply bullying by Engineering students against Geography students.

To find out in more detail the triggers for fights between students in several incidents of brawls, it can be explained as follows:

3.7. Source of conflict

Social conflicts that lead to acts of violence accompanied by collective aggressiveness can be caused by many things. From the findings in the field, sources of conflict can be grouped into 2 (two): First: more psychological and sociological in nature, this group includes:

TABLE 10: Chronology of the Brawl.

Chronology of the Brawl	
Wednesday, 26 Feb 2003 02:30 Wita	A number of students attacked the secretariat of the engineering faculty's student association
10:30 Wita	Engineering faculty students were involved in brawls with language and literature faculty students
11:30 Wita	police enter campus
12:00 Wita	The Chancellor issued a policy on dismissing FBS students
Monday, 26 Mar 2023 11:10 Wita	Students from the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Languages and Letters attacked each other
12:00 Wita	police enter campus
Wednesday, 24 Mar 2023 10:45 Wita	A group of students wearing masks stormed into the area of the engineering faculty with homemade weapons and was fired once at the engineering faculty while storming into the lecture hall.
10:50 Wita	Hundreds of engineering faculty students attacked the language and literature faculties
11:00 Wita	The Faculty of Languages and Letters is occupied by the Faculty of Engineering
11:05 Wita	The occupation resulted in the burning of 1 car and 2 motorbikes, in addition to that 2 cars were damaged, the windows of the head office of the Faculty of Language and Literature and the building were destroyed, the secretariat of the maestro of the Faculty of Language and Literature was burnt
11:30 Wita	The police entered the campus, arresting a number of students in the two warring faculties
11:50 Wita	The Chancellor announced to take the students off for 3 days forbidding students from spending the night on campus and declared martial law
12:10 Wita	The police carried out a search of the two faculties and found a number of papporo, home-made firearms and machetes

3.7.1. Differences in views and ideology

It is very possible that differences of opinion between individuals in viewing every social phenomenon sometimes trigger acts of violence, and if this violence has started to appear on the surface it will usually be continued with wider acts of violence by involving the collectivity with the aim of gaining sympathy, assistance and participation as an example:

“When there are unscrupulous students who ask money from other students who are more junior just to buy cigarettes, or eat/drink soft drinks that occur within their collectivity is considered as something normal as a form of intimacy. And when this custom is carried out against students from different collectivities and then there is rejection and coercion, then this is the beginning of a commotion, moreover when this

event gains support from the collectivity, it becomes an act of violence accompanied by aggressive behavior.

3.7.2. Cultural differences

If observed closely, these two groups of students who are often in conflict actually have their own collectivity and occupy different habitats with different cultures. The Faculty of Languages and Arts deals with matters related to art, including literature, ballet and music, painting, Indonesian, English and German.

It is this factor that colors or shapes the behavior of its members which seems arbitrary and sober (free) when compared to students of other faculties. This can be seen in the way they dress, as illustrated by the results of field observations: "In college, you only need to wear a T-shirt wrapped in jea pants, some accessories wrapped around the waist, pieces of accessories wrapped around the waist, hair that is deliberately elongated and simply tied with rubber, and sometimes footwear is enough with flip flops' , Most of them define academic rules according to their point of view, what is done including what is imposed is none other than part of the art itself.

Sociologically, this is a symptom of anomie which is characterized by the existence of norms that cannot be used as a common reference, and there are norms but there is no implementation (perhaps there is less or no socialization). The author agrees with Coleman (1998) that this group of students makes their own benchmarks that are different from those of other groups. They create their own culture that is different from the culture of society in general, this deviant culture is known as "youth culture".

By dressing out of the ordinary, they create a "counter culture". On the other hand, in the Engineering student group, with harsh environmental conditions, most of the students are male, coupled with tough competition, it forms a tough student culture, including in resolving conflicts that arise tend to use violence as a way of resolution. According to one source, the assembly of bow weapons and the like can also be done in this place, because the materials and equipment are in the Engineering laboratory.

3.7.3. Differences in interests (vested interest) and loss of value that binds the two.

It may be that the difference in interests between the two groups of students causes the conflict to become more open (manifest), there is a desire to show other groups that

their group is the most influential or controlling in the campus environment or because of the struggle for a certain position. How strong the desire to show influence, which is deliberately punched here and there, in front of the opposing group, is recorded from the results of interviews with the perpetrators.

This incident occurred on March 26, 2003, at that time most of the students of the Faculty of Languages and Arts were carrying out activities outside the area so only a small number were left attending lectures, when suddenly a mob of Engineering students attacked freely armed with machetes, daggers, catapults, papporo, stones and homemade firearms. The sound of papporo and firearms sounded boisterous over the campus sky. Likewise with the students of the Faculty of Languages and Arts, they resisted even though the numbers were smaller and were pushed back, "This time Engineering may enter our area but tomorrow and the day after tomorrow I will not allow it," said Rizal (Initials). The values that bound the group since 1998 until now have disappeared.

4. Conclusion

First, the social reality triggers the tendency for students to behave aggressively starting from individual conflicts that occur between students, which then shift or turn to conflicts between groups. This is deliberately created so that actors gain sympathy, support, even assistance from members of their group; Second, clashes between UNM student groups tend to increase, this is because each conflicting group has seeds of conflict symptoms which at any time make a strong contribution to student aggressive behavior, both in the form of group prejudice, ethnocentrism, and discrimination; and Third, when compared to the existing conflict symptoms, group prejudice ranks first in contributing to the emergence of student aggressive behavior tendencies ($r^2 = 0.98$ or 98%), followed by discrimination (0.96 or 96%), and ethnocentrism (0.94 or 94%).

References

- [1] Efendi R, Ningsih AR. Pendidikan Karakter di Sekolah. Penerbit Qiara Media; 2022.
- [2] Wulandari T. Konsep dan Praksis Pendidikan Multikultural. UNY Press; 2020.
- [3] Gafur H. Mahasiswa & Dinamika Dunia Kampus. Rasibook; 2015.
- [4] Sarwono SW. Terorisme di Indonesia: Dalam tinjauan psikologi. Pustaka Alvabet; 2012.
- [5] Luthfi K. Masyarakat Indonesia dan Tanggung Jawab Moralitas. Guepedia; 2018.

- [6] Gunawan K, Rante Y. Manajemen konflik atasi dampak masyarakat multikultural di Indonesia. *Jurnal Mitra Ekonomi Dan Manajemen Bisnis*. 2011;2:212–24.
- [7] Koswara E. *Agresi Manusia*. Jakarta: Eresco; 1990.
- [8] Adam A. *Pelurusan Sejarah Indonesia 2007*.
- [9] Akbar EN. Pemberitaan Koran tentang Peristiwa 27 Juli 1996 (Kompas dan Suara Karya). *Avatara. E-Journal Pendidikan Sejarah*. 2015;3:370–83.
- [10] Arliman L, Arif E, SARMIATI S. Pendidikan Karakter Untuk Mengatasi Degradasi Moral Komunikasi Keluarga. *Ensiklopedia of Journal*. 2022;4(2):143–9.
- [11] Burlian P. *Patologi sosial*. Bumi Aksara; 2022.
- [12] Wahyu Egi Widayat D. *Penguatan Aswaja Annahdliyah Melalui Literasi Kampus*. CV. Pilar Nusantara; 2019.
- [13] HR HSC. *Budaya akademik dan kemahasiswaan*. Reativ Publisher; 2020.
- [14] Gafur H. *Mahasiswa & Dinamika Dunia Kampus*. Rasibook; 2015.
- [15] Purnomo AB. *Rakyat (bukan) tumbal (kekuasaan & kekerasan)*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama; 2007.