The Analysis Of Impoliteness In News Of LPDP Interviewee's Response

Muhammad Yusuf Alif Rifqi
Dr. Andika Dutha Bachari, S.Pd., M.Hum
Dadang Sudana, M.A., Ph.D.

ABSTRACT
This research is motivated by the high number of defamation cases leading to criminal cases in Indonesia. The aim of this study is to identify the impoliteness speech acts used by netizens on the social media platform Facebook. This research employs 5 impoliteness strategies as proposed by Culpeper: Bald on record, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, Sarcasm or Mockery, and Withhold Politeness, supported by Brown and Levinson's theory of face-threatening acts. The findings of this study indicate that the Negative Impoliteness strategy is the most frequently used impoliteness speech act, accounting for 35% of occurrences, while the Withhold Politeness strategy is the least used with only 5% of occurrences. Commentators tend to utilize the Negative Impoliteness strategy to criticize individuals who have attacked the collective face of their community.
Keywords: Speech Acts, Impoliteness, Face Threatening Acts

I.   Introduction

The phenomenon of political figures causing offense in Indonesia, leading to public discussions. These instances of offense arise from the statements made by figures who should have good communication skills (Wahyudi, 2019). Some statements have been considered as containing elements of discrimination and undermining certain groups, such as referring to hijab-wearing students as "*manusia gurun*" (Putri, 2022). These offensive remarks have triggered varied responses from netizens through social media and online news channels.

This research highlights the ethical issues concerning those in power, particularly their frequent misstatements leading to offense. Several cases of offense include a politician insulting a particular ethnic group (Siswanto, 2022), a public official offending a state institution (Effendi Simbolon controversy, 2022), and a minister making inappropriate remarks about a specific community (Yasonna Laoly's apology regarding Tanjung Priok, 2020). Some of these incidents have even resulted in police reports (Dilaporkan ke Polisi, Arteria Dahlan Siap Patuhi Proses Hukum, 2022).

This research discusses the concept of "face-threatening acts" in human interactions, where individuals use strategies to minimize face-threatening situations (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Face, according to Brown and Levinson, represents an individual's self-worth, and interactions between individuals are guided by the agreement to preserve each other's face.This study aims to explore face-threatening acts by political figures in online media using the impoliteness approach to understand the intentions behind such utterances.

II.   Theoretical Framework

Impoliteness refers to communication actions directed to produce attacks, threats to face, or disturb social situations. Various scholars have discussed impoliteness as a Face Threatening Act (FTA), but there is no uniform definition for it. According to Culpeper (2011), impoliteness is behavior that aggravates face in a specific context, involving intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal FTAs delivered: (1) without mitigation in contexts where it is required, and/or (2) with deliberate aggression to maximize the damage inflicted on face.

Culpeper (2005a) also defines impoliteness as either the speaker intentionally communicates a face-attack or the hearer perceives and/or constructs the behavior as face-attacking, or a combination of both. Terkourafi (2008) adds that marked rudeness occurs when the expression used is not conventionalized relative to the context of occurrence, and impoliteness occurs when the expression used threatens the addressee's face, but no face-threatening intention is attributed to the speaker by the hearer.

Impoliteness involves several conditions, as explained by Culpeper (2011). These conditions include face attack, dominance and power, adherence to social norms, communication goals, emotional state, relationship closeness, audience and setting, cultural differences, and politeness absence where expected.

There are various strategies of impoliteness formulated by Culpeper based on Brown and Levinson's theory of impoliteness. These strategies are deliberate actions aimed at attacking someone's face.

- Bald-on record: This strategy involves using intentionally offensive and vulgar language without considering politeness. It includes using swear words or insulting language, which goes against social norms and is often driven by anger.
- Positive impoliteness: In this strategy, the speaker deliberately attacks the positive face of others to demonstrate dominance and power. It may involve making threats or ultimatums to show strength over someone perceived as weak.
- Negative impoliteness: This strategy is used to attack the negative face of someone who wants to be free from interference or constraints. It includes belittling, mocking, and intruding into someone's privacy.
- Sarcasm or mock politeness: Sarcasm is employed to indirectly attack someone's face by manipulating language usage. It may be used in humorous contexts when both the speaker and the listener understand the intended humor.
- Withold politeness: This strategy is used when someone feels that politeness is expected in a particular context, but they intentionally withhold it, causing impoliteness.

III.   Methods

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research method to understand how groups or individuals respond to a specific issue. The analyzed text is a news article containing offensive utterances. The qualitative method is chosen as it focuses on understanding data in the form of words. The study refers to the impoliteness theory of Face Threatening Acts (FTA) by Brown & Levinson (1987) and Culpeper (2011). These theories serve as references since the data consist of statements made by a high-status individual, expected to use polite language. The research data is presented in Bahasa Indonesia.

The data for the research is categorized into primary and secondary sources. Primary data is the main focus of analysis, which includes news articles published on social media platform Facebook and netizens' comments on those posts. Secondary data comprises research journals and theories that support the study. Out of the 2054 comment data collected from the Facebook post, a specific method is used to select representative comments for analysis due to the large volume of data.

IV.   Findings and Discussion

The researcher divided the research objects into two groups, namely the text of responses from LPDP interviewees and the comments related to the text of the LPDP interviewee responses. There are a total of 427 utterances that the author documented and analyzed, allowing the identification of several impoliteness strategies used. Additionally, in some utterances, the author found the use of multiple strategies simultaneously.

In the comments on the text of LPDP interviewee responses, the most frequently used impoliteness strategy is Negative impoliteness, accounting for 35% (149 utterances), followed by Sarcasm or Mockery impoliteness strategy with 25% (105 utterances), Bald on record with 10% (45 utterances), and Withhold politeness with 2% (7 utterances). The researcher observed a uniqueness in the data, where 15% (65) of the total comments showed no indication of using impoliteness strategies. These comments varied widely, with some commentators providing comments that were completely unrelated to the context, such as discussing the Ukraine-Russia war, providing statistics about developments in Arab countries, and even discussing the commentator's childhood and comparing it with the present situation.

The research focuses on the phenomenon of political figures causing offense in Indonesia through their statements, leading to public discussions and varied responses from netizens on social media platforms. The study uses the impoliteness approach, based on the concept of "face-threatening acts" in human interactions, to explore the intentions behind these offensive utterances.

Various impoliteness strategies have been identified in the comments related to the text of LPDP interviewee responses. The most frequently used strategy is Negative impoliteness, followed by Sarcasm or Mockery impoliteness, Bald on record, and Withhold politeness. Interestingly, around 15% of the comments did not show any indication of using impoliteness strategies and were diverse in nature, discussing unrelated topics.

The findings shed light on the ethical issues concerning those in power and their frequent misstatements leading to offense. It highlights the importance of understanding and addressing impolite communication from political figures, as it can have significant implications for public perception and societal harmony.

Further research in this area can help in developing strategies to promote respectful and constructive communication by political figures, contributing to a more harmonious and inclusive public discourse.

References

[1].   Akbar, S., & Usman, H. (2006). Metode Penelitian Sosial. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
[2].   Aziz E. A., (2000). Indonesian Speech Act Realisation In Face-Threatening Situations. Monash University Linguistics Papers, 15-41
[3].   Bachari, A. D., & Juansah, D. E. (2017). Pragmatik: Analisis Penggunaan Bahasa. Bandung: Prodi Linguistik Sps Upi.
[4].   Bakshy, E., Simmons , M. P., Huffaker, D. A., Teng, C., & Adamic, L. A. (2010). The Social Dynamics Of Economic Activity In A Virtual World. Proceedings Of The 4th International Aaai Conference On Weblogs And Social Media.
[5].   Berita Demo Hari Ini. (2023, July 20). Retrieved From Detikdotcom: Https://Www.Detik.Com/Tag/Demo-Ricuh
[6].   Blackhart, G. C., Nelson, B. C., Knowles, M. L., & Baumeister, R. F. (2009). The Need To Belong: Desire For Interpersonal Attachments As A Fundamental Human Need. Psychological Bulletin, 497-529.
[7].   Bolls , P. D. (2010). Understanding Emotion From A Superordinate Dimensional Perspective: A Productive Way Forward For Communication Processes And Effects Studies. Communication Monographs, 146-152.
[8].   Bousfield, D. (2005). Face, Impoliteness, And Interpersonal Relationships. Journal Of Politeness Research, 181-207.
[9].   Bousfield, D. (2007). Impoliteness In Television Comedy: That Was The Week That Was. . Journal Of Politeness Research, 3(2), 159-185.
[10].   Bousfield, D. (2008). Impoliteness In Popular Culture. Journal Of Pragmatics, 695-699.
[11].   Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness Some Universals In Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[12].   Caza, B. B., & Cortina, L. M. (2007). From Insult To Injury: Explaining The Impact Of Incivility. Basic And Applied Social Psychology, 335-350.
[13].   Chen, G. M. (2015). Losing Face On Socal Media: Threats To Positive Face Lead To An Indirect Effect On Retaliatory Aggression Through Negative Affect. Communication Research Vol 42, 819-838.
[14].   Chiang, S.Y. (2009) 'Personal Power And Positional Power In A Power-Full "I"', Discourse & Communication 3(3): 255–71.
[15].   Clayman, S. And Whalen, J. (1988/1989) 'When The Medium Becomes Message: The Case Of The Rather–Bush Encounter', Research On Language And Social Interaction 22: 241–72.
[16].   Cohen, R. (1997) Negotiating Across Cultures: International Communication In An Interdependent World. Washington, Dc: United States Institute Of Peace Press.
[17].   Crawford, J. R., & Henry, J. D. (2004). The Positive And Negative Affect Schedule (Panas): Construct Validity, Measurement Properties And Normative Data In A Large Non-Clinical Sample. British Journal Of Clinical Psychology, 245-265.
[18].   Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards An Anatomy Of Impoliteness. Journal Of Pragmatics 25, 349-367.
[19].   Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness And Entertainment In The Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link. Journal Of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture, 35-72.
[20].   Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised Impoliteness Formulae. Journal Of Pragmatics, Volume 421, 3232-3245.
[21].   Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness Using Language To Cause Offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[22].   Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness Revisited: With Special Reference To Dynamic And Prosodic Aspects. Journal Of Pragmatics, 1545-1579.
[23].   Tannen, D. (1990). You Just Don't Understand: Women And Men In Conversation. Ballantine Books.
[24].   Terkourafi, M. (2005). Beyond The Micro Level In Politeness Research. Journal Of Politeness Research, 237-262.
[25].   Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework Competence In Intercultural Conflict: An Updated Face-Negotiation Theory. International Journal Of Intercultural Relations, 22, 187-225.
[26].   Vangelisti, A. L. (1994). Messages That Hurt. In W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), The Dark Side Of Interpersonal Communication (Pp. 53-82). Hillsdale, Nj: Lawrence Erlbaum.
[27].   Watson, C., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development And Measurement Of Brief Mea- Sures Of Positive And Negative Affect: The Panas Scale. Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 54, 1063-1070.
[28].   Wibowo, G. P., & Kuntjara, K. (2012). Impoliteness Strategies Used On Online Comments Inan Indonesian Football Website . Surabaya : Petra Christian University.
[29].   Williams, K. D., Cheung, C. K. T., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: Effects Of Being Ignored Over The Internet. Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 79, 748-762.
[30].   Williams, K. D., Forgas, J. P., & Von Hippel, W. (Eds.). (2005). The Social Outcast. New York, Ny: Psychology Press.
[31].   Wilson, S. R., Aleman, C. G., & Leatham, G. B. (1998). Identity Implications Of Influence Goals: A Revised Analysis Of Face-Threatening Acts And Application To Seeking Compliance With Same-Sex Friends. Human Communication Research, 25, 64-96.
[32].   Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.