

TRIGGER OF IMPOLITENESS LANGUAGE IN POLITICAL COMMENTS ON SOCIAL MEDIA

Rosmita Ambarita
STIE Al-Washliyah Sibolga
rosa_ambar@yahoo.com

Abstract

This current study is concerned with cyber pragmatics that analyzes the trigger of language impoliteness on social media, which is used by netizens in political comments. Instagram and Facebook are the media interactions that contain impolite comments. The main theory used in this study is impoliteness theory pioneered by Culpeper (2011) which explains that impoliteness is communication behavior that intends to attack the face of the interlocutor. The method used is a qualitative method. Data is collected using note-taking techniques through screen capture and data is obtained through a questionnaire in the form of a Google form. The results of data analysis based on the most dominant or first triggering factor were criticized with 36% (n=36), factors showing feelings of disappointment as much as 31% (n=31) with political discourse in different situations. The third trigger factor is a form of incongruity as much as (n=17), then the fourth trigger factor is as dislike as much as (n=7), the fifth trigger factor is as a result of anger as much as (n=4), the sixth trigger factor is forms of incompatibility as many as (n=3), and the least frequency of triggering factors are forms of distrust and annoyance respectively as many as (n=1). Based on the results of data analysis from the research problem, there are several functions of linguistic impoliteness, namely to criticize, be sarcastic, and express anger and disappointment.

Keywords: *Trigger, Impoliteness Language, Political Comments, Social Media*

Abstrak

Kajian kali ini berkaitan dengan pragmatik siber yang menganalisis pemicu ketidaksopanan berbahasa di media sosial yang digunakan netizen dalam komentar politik. Instagram dan Facebook merupakan media interaksi yang mengandung komentar tidak sopan. Teori utama yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah teori ketidaksopanan yang dipelopori oleh Culpeper (2011) yang menjelaskan bahwa ketidaksopanan adalah perilaku komunikasi yang bermaksud menyerang wajah lawan bicara. Metode yang digunakan adalah metode kualitatif. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan teknik pencatatan melalui screen capture dan data diperoleh melalui kuisioner dalam bentuk Google form. Hasil analisis data berdasarkan faktor yang paling dominan atau pemicu pertama mendapat kritik sebanyak 36% (n=36), faktor menunjukkan perasaan kecewa sebanyak 31% (n=31) dengan wacana politik dalam situasi yang berbeda. Faktor pemicu ketiga berupa ketidaksesuaian sebanyak (n=17), kemudian faktor pemicu keempat berupa rasa tidak suka sebanyak (n=7), faktor pemicu kelima akibat marah sebanyak (n=4), faktor pemicu keenam adalah bentuk ketidakcocokan sebanyak (n=3), dan faktor pemicu yang paling sedikit frekuensinya adalah bentuk ketidakpercayaan dan rasa jengkel masing-masing sebanyak (n=1). Berdasarkan hasil analisis data permasalahan penelitian, terdapat beberapa fungsi ketidaksantunan berbahasa, yaitu untuk mengkritik, menyindir, dan mengungkapkan kemarahan dan kekecewaan.

Kata kunci: *Pemicu, Ketidaksopanan Berbahasa, Komentar Politik, Media Sosial*

1. INTRODUCTION

Technological developments underlie the birth of social media which is currently changing people's communication behavior. Social media makes communication possible without the limits of distance and time. With social media, people with different social backgrounds can communicate with each other for various information, ideas, and feelings, and provide mutual support so that the function of communication can truly be felt by social media users. However, when communication is misused by using impolite language in giving messages, ideas, comments, or opinions, communication conflicts arise which lead to violations or norms of politeness which can give a bad picture of people's behavior. Language becomes impolite not only because of the use of harsh words accompanied by feelings of anger but also because of contradictions and conflicts of interest. Culpeper (2008) said that when someone tries to defend the positive social values they believe in from threats or pressure from other people, this can give rise to reactions that cause people to lose face. This means that impoliteness arises when there is an antipathy between the speaker and the interlocutor. Language is said to be impolite when the choice of words used creates a force of language that is displeasing to the interlocutor. A language is said to be impolite when the speech conveyed is detrimental to the speaker, whether delivered with harsh words or an angry tone. Sometimes speech becomes impolite because the speaker deliberately wants to attract the interlocutor in a furious, emotional tone that makes the interlocutor powerless to defend himself, (Chaer, 2010: 72), (Rahardi, et al. 2018: 95), (Dynel, 2016), (Maros and Rosli, 2017), ((Tomaszczyk and Pezik, 2021), (Colaco, et al, 2021).

Language impoliteness has various types to express speech. Culpeper (2011:220-235) says that there are three types of language impoliteness, namely affective impoliteness which expresses emotions such as sadness, anger, and feelings of instability, entertaining impoliteness which uses the speech partner as the target object of entertainment, and forceful impoliteness which relies on differences in status. speakers and speech partners. This type of linguistic impoliteness shows a communication expression that attacks the face of the interlocutor. In language use, the relationship between language, vocabulary, and gender of the speaker is very closely related to sociolinguistics in conveying it also reflects the relationship power between the speaker and the speech partner. Ambarita and Mulyadi (2020)

The language impoliteness spoken is driven by various trigger factors. Culpeper (1996:350) said that there are 3 trigger factors behind the use of language impoliteness, namely 1) the social relationship between the speaker and the speech partner which is

very close or intimate, 2) the existence of an imbalance of power or social power between the speaker and the speech partner, 3) the wishes of the speaker who deliberately does not want to protect the face of the interlocutor, which may be due to a conflict of interest. Language impoliteness based on forms, types, strategies, and triggers can be found on social media.

Language impoliteness is a form of bad behavior that can give rise to or cause social conflict or social disharmony. The study of impoliteness was pioneered by Jonathan Culpeper. Impoliteness is a negative attitude and behavior that occurs in a certain context (Culpeper, 2011: 254). This means that impoliteness is related to someone's behavior that is not good according to the speaker's intentions. Impolite behavior is supported by hopes, desires, and/or beliefs about certain values. Often behavior that is seen as negative is considered "disrespectful" when there is conflict, defending, or expecting other people to share their beliefs or values. Impoliteness that uses considerations that are linked to the understanding of a group or community, whether in the form of stereotyped roles of class, gender race ethnicity, and culture.

Language impoliteness is a negative attitude and behavior that occurs in a certain context. Impolite behavior is supported by hopes, desires, and/or beliefs about certain values. Often behavior that is seen as negative is considered "disrespectful" when there is conflict, defending, or expecting other people to share their beliefs or values (Culpeper, 2011: 254). Then, according to Locher's view (2011: 51), impoliteness in language can be understood as follows, '...behavior that is face-aggravating in a particular context.' In essence, impoliteness in language refers to the behavior of 'face-aggravating'. Face-harassing behavior is more than just 'threatening' the face (face-threaten). Bousfield (2010) proposes four prototypical features of impoliteness. These are speaker intention, the impact of the speaker's utterance on the potential face damage, and the perception of the hearer of the speaker's words hurtfulness, which leads to the hearer's face damage. Bousfield (2008) argues that impoliteness does not emerge in pure and strict isolation; rather some antecedent events trigger the impoliteness onset.

Culpeper et al. (2003) examined the triggers of impoliteness. Data were collected from a TV series entitled "The Clampers." In a follow-up study (2003), they also gathered data using recordings from law courts. They concluded that some linguistic and iambic aspects, including "intonation, loudness, and speed of utterances," provoke impoliteness, for example, high tones and the pace of speaking. Bousfield (2007) conducted a study to examine impoliteness regarding utterance conductance and establishment. Data were collected from three TV shows, namely "The Clampers," "The Soldiers to Be," and

"Boiling Point" (Wijayanto et al., 2018). He concluded that speakers are apt to deliberately use some strategies to ensnare their addressee to respond impolitely. For instance, they utilize rhetorical or unpalatable questions to oblige their interlocutor to take the blame. Moreover, there occurs a verbal strategy to provoke face violations and impoliteness called "response-seeking challenge" (Wijayanto et al., 2018). On the other hand, several studies examined impoliteness in different speech acts such as complaints, threats, requests, etc. Aydınoğlu (2012) studied the gender difference in using impolite forms as occurred in six plays written by Geralyn Horton. Extracts of the plays were analyzed according to conventionalized impoliteness and its responses as proposed by Culpeper (2011) and Bousfield (2007). The findings uncovered that males deploy impolite utterances more than females, and the frequency of the strategy types displayed significant differences. Implicational impoliteness emerged less than conventionalized impoliteness; males employed the latter more regularly. However, females tend to operate more pointed criticism, whereas males are apt to utilize negative expressions and insults more often. Besides, the primary impoliteness triggers were disputes, disagreements, disapproval, sorrow, helplessness, disappointment, and anger. Wijayanto et al. (2018) scrutinized the intentions and factors that motivate the employee.

Another interpretation related to impoliteness, Locher (2011: 54) explains that impoliteness in the language is that the action is not just 'face-harassing' behavior, but rather behavior that 'plays with one's face' so that impoliteness in the language is understood as, 'The issuing of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive face-threatening acts (FTAs) that are purposefully performed.' This emphasizes the 'gratuitous' and conflictive dimensions of impolite language practices. As a summary of several theories of impoliteness presented in the previous section, it can be emphasized that there are several theories regarding linguistic impoliteness as a language act that insults the face and plays with the face, as well as language behavior that threatens the face which refers to frivolity (gratuitous), to the point of causing conflict. , and the action is carried out on purpose (purposeful), language behavior to make people lose face, or at least the person 'feels' they have lost face. In addition, language impoliteness is related to language behavior when the addressee feels a threat of losing face (face threat), and the speaker does not get the meaning of the face threat from his speech partner, and language behavior that is normatively considered negative (negatively marked behavior), because it violates social norms that apply in society

Impoliteness can occur when speakers are unable to control what they say so that the language used becomes impolite. Culpeper (1996:350) says that there are 3 factors behind the use of language impoliteness, namely:

- a) The social relationship between the speaker and the speech partner is very close or intimate
- b) There is an imbalance of power or social power between the speaker and the speech partner
- c) The speaker's desire to deliberately not want to protect the face of the interlocutor, may be due to a conflict of interest.

This means that language impoliteness arises because it is influenced by a push that gives rise to contradictions and conflicts in communication. Furthermore, Chaer(2010:69) states that several factors or things cause a speech to be impolite, namely:

1) Criticize directly with harsh words

Criticizing the interlocutor directly and using harsh words will cause a speech to become impolite or far from being polite. Providing direct criticism and using harsh words, can offend the feelings of the person you are saying, making it considered impolite

2) Encouragement of the speaker's emotional feelings

Sometimes when speaking, the speaker's emotional impulse is so excessive that there is an impression that the speaker is angry with the person he is speaking to. Speech that is expressed with emotion by the speaker will be considered impolite speech. Speech delivered emotionally and with anger, by placing emphasis such as putting a question mark,

3) Protective of opinions

Often when speaking a speaker is protective of his opinion. This is done so that the other party's words are not believed by other parties. The speaker wants to show other people that his opinion is correct, while the speaker's opinion is wrong. Speech like that will be considered impolite. The speaker protects the truth of his speech. Then state that the opinion expressed by your opponent is wrong.

4) Deliberately accusing the person you are saying

Often speakers convey accusations to their speech partners in their speech. The speech becomes impolite if the speaker gives the impression of conveying his suspicions about the person he is speaking to.

5) Deliberately cornering the speaker

Sometimes speech becomes impolite because the speaker deliberately wants to corner the person speaking to him and make him helpless. With this, the speech delivered by the

speaker makes it impossible for the interlocutor to defend himself. The speech is considered impolite, because it shows that the speaker is speaking rudely, in an angry tone, and with annoyance.

2. METHODOLOGY

This research uses descriptive research with a qualitative approach. Qualitative research aims to describe and interpret data that is related to the facts, circumstances, variables, and phenomena that occurred during the research and presents it as it is. The data intended in the qualitative approach is an understanding of language impoliteness on social media through netizen comments to place thoughts by diverse situations to focus on the research context. Creswell and Poth (2018: 81) say that the qualitative approach places thinking on the diversity of situations and thoughts held by each participant so that they can focus on the research context. Then this research uses a phenomenological research model because it is related to social phenomena, namely language impolite speech. netizens in political discourse on Instagram and Facebook. This research model studies things in their natural context and tries to understand and interpret phenomena about meaning. The data was obtained through interviews with 20 social media activists using Google Forms. According to Creswell (2007) in phenomenological research, interviews were sufficient and in-depth with around 5-25 people.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Based on the results of the questionnaire given to 20 participants, there are several trigger factors of linguistic discrepancy in commenting on the political context on social media illustrated in the following table:

Frequencies of **impoliteness triggers**

Triggers of impoliteness	Situation					Numbers	%
	1	2	3	4	5		
Unbelieve	1	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Nonconformity	5	6	3	0	3	17	17%
Disappointed	6	4	7	7	7	31	31%
annoyed	0	0	0	1	0	1	1%
angry	0	0	1	0	3	4	4%
Dislike	4	2	0	0	1	7	7%
Criticize	4	8	9	10	5	36	36%
Incompatibility	0	0	0	2	1	3	3%

Total	20	20	20	20	20	100	100 %
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------------

Based on the illustration in the table above, it was found that the frequency of the most dominant or first trigger factor was criticized as much as 36% or (n=36), and the second factor showed feelings of disappointment as much as 31% or (n=31) towards political discourse with the situation. different. The third trigger factor is a form of incongruity as much as (n=17), then the fourth trigger factor is as dislike as much as (n=7), the fifth trigger factor is as a result of anger as much as (n= 4), the sixth trigger factor is forms of incompatibility as many as (n=3), and the least frequency of triggering factors are forms of distrust and annoyance respectively as many as (n=1).

Based on the results of the questionnaire analysis that triggers language impoliteness on social media, in the context of political discourse, various forms of impoliteness are used when facing unpleasant political situations. Netizens or social media users tend to use impolite language that describes criticism and disappointment in political comments based on the context of the inherent political news situation compared to its implicational nature. Several aspects result in netizens being free to comment on social media, although sometimes many of them cause problems in the future, some of which are guided by the 1945 Constitution article 28 paragraph 3, namely regarding freedom of association, gathering and expressing opinions (everyone has the right to freedom of association, assembly and express opinions) so that netizens are free to comment on social media.

Furthermore, netizens lack an of understanding the ITE Law, which regulates commenting on social media, namely Article 27 paragraph 3 and Article 28 paragraph 2 of the ITE Law, which often causes legal violations and gives rise to cyber crimes. The findings in this research imply language impoliteness. generally caused by feelings of hatred and dislike of netizens towards the content of news or posts on social media, giving rise to impolite comments such as posts/news from several presidential and vicepresident candidates for the 2024 ELECTION.

The findings also reveal that netizens more often attack their interlocutors with insulting formulas. They use criticism that addresses the negative behavior of their interlocutor. In addition, they formulate unpleasant/prejudicial questions to attack the person they are talking to. Then they use impolite netizen comments to criticize the current government's leadership and policies, for example in the government policy post regarding BLT assistance for cooking oil, many netizens gave impolite comments because they did not agree with the policy which was deemed not beneficial to society.

In the results of this research, the reason netizens comment impolitely is as a form of criticism, a form of disappointment, and dislike of the situation or context of news on social media.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the analysis of factors that trigger language impoliteness show 8 reasons, namely 36 reasons for criticizing, 31 comments for showing disappointment, 17 comments for showing inconsistency, 7 comments for showing dislike, 4 comments for anger, 3 comments for incompatibility, and showing disbelief, and because of annoyance, 1 comment each. The research results conclude that the function of impoliteness in commenting on social media is to criticize the government, make sarcasm, express anger, and show disagreement and disappointment with government policies posted in political discourse.

5. REFERENCES

- Ambarita & Mulyadi(2020) Gender and Language Politeness.*European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies* 2 (2), 19-29
- Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness in the struggle for power. In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice* (pp. 127–154). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110208344.3.127>
- Chaer, A. (2010). *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Rineka Cipta.
- Colaco, L., Vijayarajoo, A., & Lin, T. (2021). The Use of Impoliteness Strategies in Online Feedback Relating to A General Election in Media. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v11-i9/10975>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research-Language Behaviour Culture - J POLITENESS RES-LANG BEH CUL*, 1, 35–72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>

- Culpeper, J. (2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. In D. Bousfield & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in Language* (pp. 17–44). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/9783110208344.1.17>
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dynel, M. (2016). Conceptualizing conversational humor as (im)politeness: The case of film talk. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0023>
- Locher, M. A. (2013). Cyberpragmatics: internet-mediated communication in context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 47(1), 128–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.002>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2018). Elemen dan fungsi konteks sosial, sosietaI, dan situasional dalam menentukan makna pragmatik kefatisan berbahasa. *Bahasa Di Era Digital: Peluang Atau Ancaman?*, 654–658.
- Wijayanto, A. (2014). Ketidaksantunan berbahasa: penggunaan bahasa kekerasan di sinetron bertema kehidupan remaja. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa Dan Dampaknya Dalam Pembentukan Karakter*, 115–125.