



EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION IN SOCIETY 5.0 ERA: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Edited by
Yoppy Wahyu Purnomo & Herwin





Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

DO NOT COPY
ali_mustadi@uny.ac.id

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 4TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CURRENT ISSUES IN
EDUCATION (ICCIE 2020), YOGYAKARTA, INDONESIA, 3–4 OCTOBER 2020

Educational Innovation in Society 5.0 Era: Challenges and Opportunities

Edited by

Yopy Wahyu Purnomo & Herwin

Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

CRC Press/Balkema is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2021 selection and editorial matter, the Editors; individual chapters, the contributors.

Typeset by MPS Limited, Chennai, India

All rights reserved. No part of this publication or the information contained herein may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without written prior permission from the publisher.

Although all care is taken to ensure integrity and the quality of this publication and the information herein, no responsibility is assumed by the publishers nor the author for any damage to the property or persons as a result of operation or use of this publication and/or the information contained herein.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

Published by: CRC Press/Balkema
Schipholweg 107C, 2316 XC Leiden, The Netherlands
e-mail: enquiries@taylorandfrancis.com
www.routledge.com – www.taylorandfrancis.com

ISBN: 978-1-032-05392-9 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-07231-9 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-20601-9 (ebk)

DOI: 10.1201/9781003206019

Impoliteness language on social media: A descriptive review of PGSD UNY students

O.M. Sayekti, A. Mustadi, E. Zubaidah, S. Sugiarsih & E.N. Rochmah
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Sleman, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: A student who is a prospective elementary school teacher must be able to provide examples of good and polite behavior, attitudes, and speech. A person's polite speech reflects direct or indirect communication through social media, which is currently the primary communication medium amid the COVID-19 pandemic. This study aimed to describe the existing impoliteness in social media PGSD FIP UNY students. The type of research used is the population's analysis is content with the active student in Elementary School Teacher Education Study Program Faculty of Education, State University of Yogyakarta. The sampling technique used purposive sampling. Data collection techniques divide into three techniques, documentation, observation, and literature study. This study's data were PGSD UNY students' utterances written on social media, Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, and Twitter. The method used to analyze the data used the content analysis schema technique, according to Krippendorf. This study indicates that students PGSD FIP UNY are still doing some impoliteness in their social media. Forms of impoliteness language include: (1) maxim of wisdom, (2) maxim of generosity, (3) variations maxims awards, (4) maxim of simplicity, (5) maxims of agreement, (6) maxim of generosity and agreement, (7) maxim of wisdom and consensus.

1 INTRODUCTION

Humans use language to communicate and interact with others. In the 4.0 revolution era, language is even more strategic because of technology that helps humans communicate. Computer Media Communication (CMC) is a new thing in the world of linguistics. CMC focuses on how language relates to computer communication media such as social media. In this case, language is used to communicate not only directly but also indirectly or through cyberspace. The existence of technology will make it easier to communicate even though we are far apart. Especially during the COVID-19 pandemic like today, the role of technology for communication can be felt. That can imagine what would happen if the technology was not as advanced as it is now.

Communication via computer, one of which can do using social media. Humans today use social media a lot in their daily activities. They are starting from Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, WhatsApp, telegram, and many more. The wearer also from all walks of life. Both age and social status. If the first social status or age will limit the communication behavior, but with social media restriction, it becomes no longer exists. Currently, many critical national figures are active in social media. Many heads of regions, public officials, or the rector of a university active in social media. Thousands of followers do not see the social status.

They do this so that the people or students become closer to them.

Someone uses social media to communicate with other social users. In this case, social media works by utilizing internet networks (Hammod & Abdul-Rassul 2017). The term social media itself derived from the word "media" and "social." "Media" is defined as a means of communication (Laughey 2007 McQuail 2010). The word "social" can interpret that each individual's life can contribute to society. This statement is in line with Durkheim's statement in (Fuchs 2017) that media and all software are "social" or in the sense that both are products of social processes. From these various statements, it can conclude that social media is a digital-based communication tool used by the public in various forms of "social media." It is in line with the statement (Serwaa & Dadzie 2015) "*one cannot talk about technology without mentioning social communication media. Social media is an internet service which enables people to interact freely, share and discuss information about their lives*".

Currently, social media presence has been able to change the world. The consequences also must be understood and skeptical by all parties. The presence of social media is increasingly an opportunity for individuals who are involved in it to free expression (Watie 2016). However, back to himself, each individual must have limits in his opinion so that what they convey does not hurt or harm the other party. In other words,

individuals as communicators must apply language politeness. If a speaker adheres to language politeness, then the problems that often arise with freedom of communication on social media will be smaller. The opposite can happen if an individual is so free in a comment on social media, then the impoliteness cannot be avoided. Language impoliteness focuses on violating social norms or maxims in conversation (Oz et al. 2018). Papacharissi (2004) stated that one should uphold ethics, honesty, relevance, and giving if needed in communication. In line with Papacharissi, Locher (2010) stated that communication through social media is different from communication through direct face to face. Because of the interactions that occur on different social media with face-to-face interaction. Speakers must pay attention to the politeness language used when communicating.

Impoliteness seems to have occurred because of communication through different social media with direct communication. When communicating directly, people will pay more attention to the other person's face in front of them. However, if communicating through social media, face opponents said little attention. Because the interlocutor is not in front of the speaker, this will result in emotional communication. The speaker will write down what is on his mind, accompanied by the emotions that are in his head. As a result, impoliteness will appear (Liu 2017).

It also occurs in social media used by the Elementary School Teacher Education Faculty of the Education University of Yogyakarta. As the millennial generation, they tend to have freedom of speech. Their right of opinion has resulted in some deviation in language politeness. Impoliteness is a form of specific negative behaviors that occur in the context of speaking. Impoliteness arises because of the contradiction between desired and expected cause emotions speakers (Culpeper 2011). In Rahardi (2017), Mirriam also stated that language deviation is the behavior of someone who does not respect the interlocutor in a particular context. In this study, the impoliteness related to violations of politeness maxims. The maxims of language politeness include: (1) the maxim of generosity, (2) the maxim of wisdom, (3) the maxim of consensus, (4) the maxim of simplicity, (5) the maxim of appreciation, (6) the maxim of sympathy Leech in (Rahardi 2005) states that this research has a purpose of describing impoliteness of the language used by PGSD students on their social media accounts.

2 METHOD

This research includes content analysis research. Content analysis is a scientific technique for interpreting text or content. Krippendorff (2004) defines content analysis as a research technique to infer the meaning of the text or through procedures that can be trusted (reliable), can be replicated or applied in different contexts (replicable), and are valid. In general, there are three approaches to content analysis: description,

explanatory, and predictive. This study focused on a descriptive approach that describes the aspects or characters of a message or text (Eriyanto 2011). This study's data are PGSD UNY students' speeches written on social media, *Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, and Twitter*.

Meanwhile, this study's data sources were messages and stories written by PGSD UNY students on social media, Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, and Twitter. Selection of the research sample using a purposive sampling technique. That is, before sampling, the researcher determines the required criteria by being selected first. The method used to analyze the data used a content analysis scheme technique according to Krippendorff (2004) with the following stages: (1) data collection (unitizing), sampling, reducing, inferring, telling (narrating).

3 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Result

The results of this research on Analysis of Impoliteness Language in Social Media: A Descriptive Review of PGSD UNY Students in the form of descriptions of language politeness and deviations that occur on *Twitter, WhatsApp, Instagram, and Facebook* social media used by PGSD UNY students. Data is taken from students' social media, both PGSD Central Campus, Mandala, and Wates. The data took approximately six months. The entire 502 cards wrote after going through data reduction to 435 speeches. Data in the form of impoliteness amounted to 80 utterances—the data took from three PGSD campuses, namely the Central Campus, Mandala Campus, and Wates Campus. The data distribution can see in Table 1.

Table 1. Impoliteness language on social media of PGSD UNY students.

No	Maxim Impoliteness	FB	Twit	IG	WA
1	Wisdom	–	5	2	24
2	Generosity	–	6	3	14
3	Simplicity	–	1	–	6
4	Sympathy	–	–	–	–
5	Consensus	–	–	–	4
6	Appreciation	–	–	–	8
7	Generosity and consensus	–	–	1	1
8	Wisdom and generosity	–	2	–	–
Total		0	13	6	53

The data in Table 1 shows the distribution of language politeness maxims deviations on social media owned by PGSD FIP UNY students. Eighty-five speeches do not obey (deviate) from politeness. The maxims' most deviations are in the *WhatsApp* social media's wisdom maxims, 24 utterances. Meanwhile,

there is no deviation at all on all social media belonging to PGSD FIP UNY students in the maxim of conclusion. On the Facebook social media, there were no deviations from civility in language because students are rarely active on the Facebook social media even though they have a Facebook account.

3.2 Discussion

3.2.1 Deviations of the maxim of wisdom

Deviation from the maxim of wisdom is a maxim that maximizes the benefits of others and minimizes the losses of others. In communication, there is often a deviation from the maxims of wisdom. Some of the characteristics of wisdom maxims deviation include: (1) Using harsh diction, (2) directing orders, (3) reprimanding with harsh diction, (4) giving direct suggestions (not using the word sorry.), (5) refusing with a high tone, (6) refuse with rough diction.

(165) "Ego vs. Keras Kepala. Mau sampe kapan? Terserah, dah muak aku/EFR." (Bahasa version)

(165) "Selfish vs. stubborn. How long? Whatever, I am fed up/ EFR." (English version)

Data number (165) is a speech that contains deviations from the maxims of wisdom. It refers to harsh diction, such as the word "disgusted" in his speech. Besides, speakers indirectly also provide suggestions without using the word sorry. The speech's context is that the speaker is annoyed with high egoism coupled with stubbornness. Finally, the speech number (165) appeared. Speech number 165 will avoid deviating from the maxims of wisdom if the speakers use subtle diction and provide suggestions accompanied by the word sorry.

(319) "Cewe, anjay ada yak cowo kek gitu brengsek banget. Cowo, anjy juga tuh ada cewek jahat banget kek gitu, gak habis pikir (Foto kalimat motivasi tentang kesehatan hati)/P." (Bahasa version)

(319) "Girl, fuck, how could there is such a bastard boy? Guys, wtf, how could there is such a mean girl like her? it does not make any sense (Photo of a motivational sentence about liver health) / P." (English version)

Speech number (319) is also an aberration of the maxim of wisdom. In the speech, the speaker repeatedly mentions the harsh words "fuck and bastard." in Bahasa, "Anjay" is a slang language to express resentment. When a speaker utters this harsh word, it leads to the maxims of wisdom's deviant behavior. Because one of the maxims deviation characteristics is speaking harshly or using harsh diction, this is an immoral act given that the speaker is a prospective elementary school teacher. Elementary school teachers must be able to exemplify both attitudes, actions, and words.

3.2.2 Deviations of the maxim of generosity

The maxim of generosity is the maxim that maximizes self-sacrifice and minimizes self-gain. However, sometimes in communication, there is often a deviation from the maxim of generosity. Some of the characteristics of deviation from the maxim of generosity include (1) disrespect for the interlocutor (interrupting the conversation), (2) not allowing the interlocutor to argue, (3) prejudice against the interlocutor, (4) humiliating the other person.

(36) "Saku KKN 6 bulan Cuma 50 ribu itu ga wirth it. Jelas kurang yo. Subsidi kuota aja masih nggak nyampe. Itu mah tega banget/WH." (Bahasa version)

(36) "The six months KKN allowance of only IDR 50,000 is not worth it. Not enough. Quota subsidies have not been received yet. Very heartless/WH." (English version)

From the data number (36), it appears that there is a deviation from the maxim of generosity. The speech has a speaker context in which a student feels disadvantaged by the campus due to the KKN policy. The speaker then has a wrong prejudice against the speech opponent (campus). Speakers thought that the campus had the heart for students because they only gave them an allowance of IDR 50,000 for six months. However, behind this speech, there is a fact that is not yet known to the speakers. After a few days, the campus finally said that there would be an additional KKN allowance. Allowance of IDR 50,000 is a prefix, and allowance will give later. From the campus narrative, it can conclude that the speakers have prejudice before the speakers investigate further.

(175) "Ra ayem. Wes njajal iki kui yo tetep wae, Ramasyuk. Ono wae sek gagal ning h-1 pelepasan. Iki mah diculke bubar jalan bablas. Tur rarti dalan (KKN)/NM." (Javanese version).

(175) "Anxious. Having tried, but it is still the same. Disappointing. Some failed on H-1. That is what is called being released then dismissed but not knowing the way." (English version)

Data number (175) is still on the issue of KKN among students. Indeed, this issue became a hot topic at the time. Many students deviate from the maxim of generosity on the issue of KKN. As in data number (175) from this data, speakers feel disadvantaged by the campus. Bad speakers think by thinking that the campus does not release procedurally well. As a result, respondents felt that KKN was less conditioned and caused confusion among students when implementing it. It is a series of speakers' prejudices against the campus.

3.2.3 Award maxims deviation

Several characteristics, including characterize deviation from the maxims of appreciation (1) Giving

criticism that puts others down, (2) talking that hurts others, (3) not saying thanks when receiving suggestions or criticism from others, (4) not respecting others' opinions. Some speech on social media conducted by PGSD students also leads to the characteristic deviation maxim awards.

(111) "Biasane jarang bahkan mungkin ratau ngomongke nyebahine dosen neng story. Tapi iki wis terlalu mumeti bagi mahasiswa. Intine ra gur pisan pindho ngenei, saben dina/NA." (Javanese version).

(111) "I seldom talked, even never talk about Lecturer in the story. However, it is too complicated for students. The point is that it happened not only once or twice, but it happens every day/NA." (English version)

Data number (111) has the characteristic that the speaker gives criticism that puts others down. The context of the speech is that the speaker gives criticism to one of the lecturers. The reason the criticism came out was that the assignment given by the Lecturer was too heavy. This task is not only once but many times and makes the speaker feel dizzy. In this case, the speaker does not appreciate the actions taken by the Lecturer.

(353) "Oke sebenere bahas SS yang kemarin saya kirimkan. Btw sebelum ini saya coba search di amazon dan beberapa toko online dunia yang fokus di sektor kesehatan. Hasilnya mengejutkan harga rapid tes nggak lebih dari 9 atau kalau dirupiahkan dengan kurs sekarang (14.429,45) HARGANYA 129.865,05. Nggak sampai 150.000 ya, ini untuk pembelian alat, btw saya ambil yang lumayan "mahal" untuk alat sebagai contoh. Oke ada yang komen, kan itu belum termasuk bea cukai Jawaban saya simpel, coba kamu cek peraturan (Terkait tarif rapid test)/FS." (Bahasa version)

(353) "Okay, discussing the SS that I sent yesterday. Before, I searched on Amazon and several online stores worldwide that focus on the health sector. The result is surprising that the rapid test price is not more than \$9, or if it is converted into the current exchange rate (IDR 14,429.45), the price is IDR 129,865.05. Not up to IDR 150,000, yes, this is for purchasing equipment, by the way, I took a relatively "expensive" tool as an example. Okay, there are comments, right that does not include customs. My answer is simple, try to check the regulations (Regarding rapid test rates) / FS." (English version)

The data number (353) took from one of the students' WA statuses. The context of speech number (353) is a criticism that puts others down. The other person, in that case, is the government or the health service. The health office has the authority to set the highest price for a rapid test. He considered

that the rapid tests in Indonesia were too expensive. Even though the price of the tool for rapid alone is only around IDR 15,000. Then why in Indonesia the cheapest rapid rate is IDR 150,000. This criticism has certainly brought down the government. Reading speech number (353) implies that the government is making a big profit from this rapid test price.

3.2.4 *Perversion of the maxim of wisdom and generosity*

There is often a deviation from the maxims of wisdom and generosity in communication on social media. These two maxims co-occur. The characteristics of the wisdom maxims deviation are: (1) Using harsh diction, (2) directing orders, (3) reprimanding with harsh diction, (4) giving direct suggestions (not using the word sorry), (5) refusing with a high tone, (6) refuse with harsh diction. Then the characteristics of deviation from the maxim of generosity include: (1) Disrespect for the interlocutor (interrupting the conversation), (2) not allowing the interlocutor to have an opinion, (3) prejudice against the interlocutor, (4) humiliating the interlocutor. The following are some of the utterances that indicate deviations from the simplicity maxim, including:

(202) "Asyuuu yak kerjanya ngoyo kuliah Kerja kuliah Kerja ninggalin rapat ninggalin tanggung jawab. Kok dituduh ambil uang/ RK." (Bahasa version)

(202) "Damn, I worked hard by going back and forth to study and work, leaving meetings, leaving responsibilities. How come you could be accused of taking money/ RK." (English version)

Deviations from the maxims of generosity and consensus have characteristics, including (1) disrespect for the interlocutor (interrupting the conversation), (2) not allowing the interlocutor to have an opinion, (3) prejudice against the interlocutor, (3) humiliating the interlocutor. The consensus maxims deviation characteristics include: (1) Giving criticism that puts others down, (2) speaking that hurts others, (3) not saying thanks when receiving suggestions or criticism from others, (4) not respecting other people's opinions.

(15) "Kalo kamu mau sambat soal kampus tapi takut DM atung Almira karena bisa aja di post difeed ig nya dan malah kena amukan buzzernya agagaga. Kalo kamu sambat soal kampus tapi kamu kesel mau sambat yang bagian apa, saking akehe sing arep disambati. Nganti bingung arep milih sing endi. Ya wis lur gpp. Cuman satu sambatan dari lubuk hatimu paling dalam soal kampus di link paling atas. Gasss ke aja." (Bahasa version)

(15) "If you want to hang around about the campus but are afraid of DM Atung Almira because you can post it on Instagram and instead

get the buzzer tantrum gaga. If you are hampered about the campus, you will get annoyed about what part of it you want to be obstructed because there are too many to complain about. Thus, it made it confused which one will have complained. It is okay, Guys. The Only splash from the bottom of your heart in the matter of campus is at the top link. go on.” (English version)

Data number (15) is a form of speech where deviations from the maxims of generosity and consensus—deviation from the maxims of generosity indicated by speech that knocks down the interlocutor. The context of the speech is that speakers respond to complaints about campus problems. The speaker laughs at the interlocutor, who often gets tantrums from other students when the interlocutor complains about campus problems through the Chancellor's Instagram account. The deviation of the maxims of consensus is marked by the dropping of criticism that does not respect others. The other person in this speech is the campus. In the speech, the speakers dropped the campus's excellent name because they thought there were too many shortcomings provided by the campus. Such as speech:

“Kalo kamu sambat soal kampus tapi kamu kesel mau sambat yang bagian apa, saking akehe sing arep disambati. Ngantfi bingung arep milih sing endi”.

If translated into excellent and correct Bahasa, it will say:

“Confused. What do you want to complain about because there are so many things currently being complained about.”

(26) “Kalau berdasarkan kajian UNY bergerak kemarin kan dilampirkan ya terkait rencana pengeluaran dana dari setiap fakultas. Nah disitu banyak rencana anggaran yang tidak bisa dialokasikan selama pandemi. kebanyakan rencana anggaran tersebut bersumber dari UKT. Nah aku tuh ga paham dengan alasan mereka kekeh ngga mau nurunin UKT yang berlaku ke semua mahasiswa. Karena meskipun ada layanan penyesuaian UKT, mulai dari penyicilan, peringanan, penangguhan, namun permohonan tersebut belum tentu diterima semua dan kriteria kelolosan permohonannya pun tidak ada kejelasan/RW.” (Bahasa version)

(26) “ Based on the previous UNY study, we attached the plan for spending funds from each faculty. So many budget plans cannot allocate during the pandemic. Most of these budget plans come from UKT. We do not understand why they do not want to reduce the UKT that applies to all students. Because even though there is a UKT adjustment service, starting from installments, mitigation, deferral, but all applications are not necessarily accepted and the criteria for passing the application are not clear / RW.”

Data number (26) contains deviations from the maxims of generosity and consensus. The maxim of generosity deviates because, in the speech, the speaker prejudices against other people (campus). The wrong prejudice is in the form of speakers' dissatisfaction with the request to reduce UKT. Speakers considered that the criteria for passing the UKT reduction application were unclear. The deviation from the maxims of consensus is marked by giving criticism that puts others down (campus). Here, speakers write stories on social media, which indirectly bring down their campus. Without further researching the causes of the criteria for applying for UKT relief.

4 CONCLUSION

This study aims to describe the impoliteness of language in the social media of PGSD UNY students. This study's findings reveal that PGSD UNY students still practice impoliteness language on their social media accounts. The forms of language deviation include: (1) deviations from the maxims of wisdom, (2) deviations from the maxims of generosity, (3) deviations from the maxims of appreciation, (4) deviations from the maxims of simplicity, (5) deviations from the maxims of consensus, (6) deviations from the maxims of generosity and consensus, (7) deviations maxim of wisdom and consensus.

The weakness of this research is the limited number of research subjects. Because it only uses an active student population at PGSD UNY. Future research is expected to look at language deviations carried out on social media in terms of gender. Besides, the scope of research also needs to be expanded. Not only are language irregularities made by PGSD UNY students, but PGSD students outside YSU also need to be researched. This research is also beneficial for students because the results obtained can be used by students to learn language politeness.

From this conclusion, the suggestion is that students should learn about language politeness as a candidate for elementary school teachers. From now on, we have made it a habit to apply politeness in language. Because what they write on social media will be read by many people, even their students later. Students must be able to provide role models for their students or the wider community.

REFERENCES

- Culpeper, J. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*.
- Eriyanto 2011. *Analisis Isi: Pengantar Metodologi untuk Penelitian Ilmu Komunikasi dan Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*.
- Fuchs, C. 2017. *Social Media: A Critical Introduction*.
- Hammod, N. M. & Abdul-Rassul, A. 2017. *Impoliteness Strategies in English and Arabic Facebook Comments. International Journal of Linguistics 9: 97*.
- Krippendorff 2004. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*.
- Laughy, D. 2007. *Key Themes in Media Theory*.

- Liu, X. 2017. Impoliteness in Reader Comments on Japanese Online News Sites. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics* 3: 62–68.
- Locher, M. A. 2010. Introduction: Politeness and impoliteness in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Politeness Research* 6: 1–5.
- McQuail, D. 2010. Teori Komunikasi Massa. 392.
- Oz, M., Zheng, P. & Chen, G. M. 2018. Twitter versus Facebook: Comparing incivility, impoliteness, and deliberative attributes. *New Media and Society* 20: 3400–3419.
- Papacharissi, Z. 2004. Democracy online: Civility, politeness, and the democratic potential of online political discussion groups. *New Media and Society* 6: 259–283.
- Rahardi, K. 2017. Linguistic Impoliteness in The Sociopragmatic Perspective. *Jurnal Humaniora* 29: 309.
- Serwaa, N. A. & Dadzie, P. S. 2015. Social media use and its implications on child behaviour: a study of a basic school in Ghana. *International Journal of Social Media and Interactive Learning Environments* 3: 49.
- Watie, E. D. S. 2016. Komunikasi dan Media Sosial (Communications and Social Media). *Jurnal The Messenger* 3: 69.

DO NOT COPY
ali_mustadi@uny.ac.id