



IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES USED BY SUPPORTERS AND DETRACTORS OF AHOK IN THEIR ONLINE COMMENTS BY GENDER

Vini Mara Shinta¹, Hamzah², Delvi Wahyuni³

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: vinimarashinta@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to find impoliteness strategies used by supporters and detractors of Ahok differed by their gender in their online comments based on Culpeper's theory (1996). This research was descriptive qualitative research based on impoliteness strategies phenomena in written language. The data on this research were words, phrases, and sentences in online comments that contained impoliteness strategies found in social media, Facebook and Instagram, collected from January to October 2017. The instruments of this research were Wi-Fi, laptop, writing equipment, and indicators of impoliteness strategies. The results of analysis showed that from 300 comments collected, there were 584 impoliteness strategies found. The reason why number of strategies found bigger than the data collected is because the commentators mostly performed more than one strategy in one utterance. Four by five strategies found in this research were bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. The strategies that were not found was withhold politeness because it only occurred in spoken language. The most used strategies was positive impoliteness. The highest user of positive impoliteness was male detractors (52%).

Keywords: Impoliteness, Supporters, Detractors, Ahok, Comments.

A. INTRODUCTION

People have different styles and ways to use language when they communicate to one another. They often pay special attention to their word choices. They will choose their words wisely and use polite language to make the process of communication run smoothly. On the other hand, there are some

¹ English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on. March 2018

² Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

³ Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



people who do not think about the choices of word. When they ignore the word choices, they commit impolite language.

Men and women have their own way in communication. Impoliteness expressed by men and women is different one to another, depending on the social and cultural aspects since gender seems to have a close relationship with impoliteness. There must be differences between men's utterances and women's utterances. Eventhough it is said that women talk more than men, it is indicated that men tend to speak more impolitely than women. Lakoff (1975:45) states that women are more polite in speaking than men do, and the powerlessness of women is showed in both the way women are expected to speak, and are spoken of. In addition, it is also considered that women are 'better' speakers than men. Women are more polite and less forceful. Holmes (1995) notes that women communicate in a more tentative manner. However, men tend to be more competitive in their conversations, while women tend to show cooperation or agreement in their conversations (Coates, in Mills: 2005).

Impoliteness has grabbed attention of quite many researchers in the past. However, most of previous studies focused on face-to-face interactions. In today's society, communication has changed. Many new and improved technologies change the way of communication. There are computers and the internet that have contributed to the change of communication mode. Haggerty (2000) suggests that conversation is no longer entirely a face-to-face act or a simple chat over telephone. Because the way people communicate have change, the way people reacted to it also changes. People react differently when they are in face-to-face communication as opposed to when they are in online communication (Suler (2004). When they are in face-to-face communication with others, or especially with famous figures, people would normally not say what is on their mind directly to avoid disapproval or punishment. However, communicating online does not make them afraid to speak out or behave inappropriately since they do not see each other.

Because internet has become increasingly influential in communication in this era of globalization; there are lots of media for communication that make communication easier. It can be seen from the number of social media facilitating faster communication among people. Some of the most popular ones are Facebook and Instagram. Facebook and Instagram not only can be used for daily communication but also but also to discuss something more serious such as politics. Facebook and Instagram can be used by politicians to reach their supporters and as a medium for political campaign. As Facebook and Instagram become a medium of political communication, this has created a community of practice where people who have same interest in certain topics have their own groups of discussion. Some conversations deal with only one topic, but most others discuss more than one topic because the tendency of one topic will drag other topics into the conversation (Hamzah, 2013). For example, people who have interest in politics and current issues gather to discuss political issues as their

topic of discussion. Discussions sometimes lead to disagreements and become intense arguments, and this is when impoliteness comes in.

This study investigated how the supporters and detractors of Ahok do impoliteness strategies in commenting posts about Ahok in Facebook and Instagram differed by their gender. Ahok, an ex-Jakarta's governor, has been a subject of high controversy in Indonesia because of his alleged blasphemous comment about Surah Al-Maidah 51 in his campaign. Therefore, many people sue him and write many harsh comments in social media and in comment column of online articles. People who are still angry with him because of his action keep writing bad comments on any posts about him. They become Ahok haters and criticize whatever action that Ahok takes. After he loses in the election, he became suspect and jailed for two years on charge of blasphemy. Many people who agree and disagree with this judgment left the comment or opinion in the posts related to Ahok in social media. The investigated impoliteness strategies are five impoliteness strategies as means of attacking face as proposed by Culpeper; *bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness*. This research focuses on how supporters and detractors of Ahok did impoliteness strategies in commenting any posts related to Ahok because both male and female supporters and detractors have their own way to use the language and express the emotional feeling.

Brown and Levinson (in Bousfield, 2008: 34) categorize *face* into *positive face* and *negative face*. Positive face refers to the state when someone's need to be recognized by other people. Meanwhile, negative face is the want of someone that he or she does not want to be bothered by other people. When the face is attacked, there will be lack of politeness, leading to impoliteness in communication. Watts (2005) views impoliteness as negatively marked and inappropriate behavior, as perceived by participants (or by viewers and readers) in certain social and interactional contexts as inappropriate or impolite, while Terkourafi (2008: 70) argues that impoliteness is face threatening behavior in which the hearer attributes "no face-threatening intention" to the speaker. Making the definition and theory of impoliteness was rather problematic because there was no established theoretical framework to be used accurately. Culpeper et al. (2003:1564) claims that the use impoliteness is designed to attack someone's face and it can make a disagreement or conflict between people. Impolite language can make the relationship between people become disharmonious. When someone performs impoliteness strategy on his or her utterance, it means he or she has a purpose to attack the hearer's face. He or she can attack the hearer's face from his or her utterance.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a qualitative research with descriptive approach because it will answer the question about facts or describe existing language phenomena. Since the objectives of the research were to describe the types of impoliteness

strategies that used by supporters and detractors of Ahok differed by their gender, this research was included as descriptive qualitative research which the researcher described the phenomena of impoliteness in Facebook and Instagram posts' comments by interpreting the data. In accordance to Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009: 7), they state that literal description of the phenomena under study is produced by qualitative research. It means qualitative research focuses on describing or explaining the natural phenomenon. This is relevant to this study because this study investigates the occurrences of impoliteness acts uttered in natural communication in social media. The researcher used impoliteness strategies theory proposed by Culpeper (1996). The impoliteness strategies such as bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. To limit the data, the researcher only collected about 75 comments from male supporters, 75 comments from female supporters, 75 comments from male detractors, and 75 comments from female detractors. Thus, the researcher analyzed about 300 comments.

In collecting the data, the researcher login to Facebook and Instagram. The researcher go to the Facebook accounts which are Merdeka.com and Teman Ahok se Indonesia, and the Instagram accounts are @Mahadewi161 and @Suararakyat. Then the researcher chooses several posts which related to Ahok and read all the online comments by the detractors or supporters of Ahok. After that, the researcher looked into each commentators profile or the username to identify the gender of the commentators. Then, the researcher copied the comments which identify as impoliteness strategies. Finally, the researcher paste the data into Microsoft office data in order to make them could be written into a thesis.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Research Finding

After analyzing the comments, from total 300 comments the researcher found variety of finding. For male supporters from 75 comments, the researcher found 139 impoliteness strategies and it sub strategy. For female supporters from 75 comments the researcher found 136 impoliteness strategies and it sub strategy. For male detractors from 75 comments the researcher found 151 impoliteness strategies and it sub strategy. Meanwhile, for female detractors from 75 comments the researcher found 158 impoliteness strategies and it sub strategy. The findings show that there is one strategy that commentators do not use, i.e. withhold politeness. After doing the data analysis, all of the commentators show that they mostly perform positive impoliteness strategy followed by negative impoliteness as the second mostly used strategy. The reason why number of strategies found bigger than the data collected is because participants mostly perform more than one strategy in one utterance.

The comparison between male supporters and female supporters, and male detractors and female detractors in using impoliteness strategies in their comments can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. The Findings of Impoliteness Strategies Used by Supporters

No	Impoliteness Strategy	Male Supporters		Female Supporters	
		Total	Freq	Total	Freq
1.	Bald on Record Impoliteness	6	4%	16	12%
2.	Positive Impoliteness	62	45%	51	38%
3.	Negative Impoliteness	36	25%	47	33%
4.	Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	35	25%	23	17%
5.	Withhold Politeness	0	0%	0	0%
Total		139	100%	136	100%

Table 2. The Findings of Impoliteness Strategies Used by Detractors

No	Impoliteness Strategy	Male Detractors		Female Detractors	
		Total	Freq	Total	Freq
1.	Bald on Record Impoliteness	24	16%	18	11%
2.	Positive Impoliteness	79	52%	77	49%
3.	Negative Impoliteness	27	18%	47	30%
4.	Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	21	13%	16	10%
5.	Withhold Politeness	0	0%	0	0%
Total		151	100%	158	100%

According to table 1 There are four strategies that used by male supporters and female supporters. The ranks for the highest and lowest used strategies are same for both male and female supporters' impoliteness strategies. The highest used strategy by male supporters and female supporters is positive impoliteness; male supporters used impoliteness strategies more than female supporters it found (45%) in the data of male supporters, and (38%) in the data of female supporters. The second highest used strategy is negative impoliteness; this strategy is more used by female supporters which found (33%) in the data of female supporters, and (26%) in the data of male supporters. Next, sarcasm or mock politeness, male supporters used this strategy more than female supporters it found (25%) in the data of male supporters, and (17%) in female supporters' data. Then the lowest used strategy is bald on record, female supporters used this strategy more than male supporters, it found (12%) in female supporters' data, and only (4%) in male supporters' data.

According to table 2 there are also four strategies that used by male detractors and female detractors. The ranks for the highest and lowest used are same for both male and female detractors. The highest used strategy by male detractors and female detractors is positive impoliteness. Male detractors used this strategy more than female detractors. It found (52%) in the data of male

detractors, and (49%) in the data of female detractors. The second highest used strategy is negative impoliteness; female detractors used this strategy more than male detractors. This strategy found (30%) in the data of female detractors, while it found (18%) in the data of male detractors. Next, bald on record strategy, female detractors have bigger frequency of using this strategy than male detractors. This strategy found (17%) in female detractors data, and (16%) in the data of male detractors. Then the least used strategy is record sarcasm or mock politeness. Female detractors used this strategy more than male detractors. It found (13%) in male detractors' data and only (10%) in female detractors' data.

There are some utterances that have been analyzed by the researcher:

a. Bald On Record

According to Culpeper (1996) this strategy is performed in a direct, clear, and unambiguous way where the face is minimized.

1. Datum 13

Herry Lo L'amo Italiano : *Iya tu si gendut bisa ny koar koar depan monas....
uhh onta lari ke kandang.... hahhahahhaa.*

(The fat boy that only can talk big in front of *Monas*, the camel who run into cage, lol)

Datum 13 is from a male supporter. This datum belongs to bald on record impoliteness because the commentator insults the target very directly. It can be seen from the words “*si gendut*” and “*onta lari ke kandang*”. The commentator did not try to save the target' face and purposely insult the target physical appearance.

2. Datum 160

Bandigo : *Ikat aja di tiang listrik, dasar manusia bejad...!!!*

(Just tie him in power pole, the depraved human beings)

Datum 160 is from a male detractor. This datum belongs to bald on record impoliteness because the commentator insults the target very directly. It can be seen from the words “*Ikat aja di tiang listrik, dasar manusia bejad...!*” The commentator have a clearly intention to perform maximal offensive to the target by asking the other's to tie the target to power pole, and the commentator also directly attack his face by calling a jerk.

b. Positive Impoliteness

The use of this strategy deployed to damage the hearer positive face wants. Culpeper (1996) gives a list of example about this strategy which include ignore the other, exclude the other from an activity, be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, use inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or secretive language, seek disagreement, use taboo words, use derogatory remarks.

1. Datum 97

Nina Silueta : *si anies mayat dan ayat mau menjadi pemersatu? he onta pribumi ngimpi looo*

(Anies the human corpse wants to be the unifier? Hey, indigene's camel, don't dreaming!)

Datum 97 is from a female supporter. This datum belongs to positive impoliteness because the data contained calling the other name and inappropriate identity marker of positive impoliteness sub-strategy. Calling the other name can be seen from the word "*si anies mayat dan ayat*" and inappropriate identity marker can be seen from the words "*he onta pribumi*".

2. Datum 242

Tini Rostini : *AHOK.....? Udah basi.....* (Ahok? So out of date)

Datum 242 is from a female detractor. This datum belongs to positive impoliteness because the data contained be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic sub strategy. The sub strategy can be seen from the words "*AHOK..? Udah basi...*" The commentator show disinterest when people talked about Ahok.

3. Negative Impoliteness

The use of this strategy deployed to damage the hearer negative face wants. Culpeper (1996) gives a list of example about this strategy which include Frighten, condescend, scorn or ridicule, be contemptuous, do not treat the other seriously, belittle the other, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect (personalize, use the pro-nouns "I" and "You"), and put the other's indebtedness on record belong to negative impoliteness strategy.

1. Datum 59

Walujo Hadi : *Nieesss...nieess.. ente orang arab...mau sok jago...sok ngerti soal batik...koplaaakk luuuu..*

(Anies, you are an Arabian, but wants to looks smart and pretending to understand about batik, you really stupid)

Datum 59 is from a male supporter. This datum belongs to negative impoliteness because it contained condescending, scorning and ridiculing sub strategy. The sub strategy can be seen from ridiculing in the sentence "*ente orang arab...mau sok jago...sok ngerti soal batik...koplaaakk luuuu..*". The commentator ridiculed the target because the target is an Arabian, but he pretends to understand about Indonesian's culture.

2. Datum 128

Te Lie Chu : *Dasar si mulut bawel ngmong gk pake otak tar pasti kena karma nya .tinggal nggu wkt yg tepat.dia pasti kena kutukan.*

(The fussy mouth who talks without thinking, you will get karma, just wait the right time. He'll get cursed.)

Datum 128 is from a female supporter. This datum belongs to negative impoliteness because it contained frighten- Instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur sub strategy. The sub strategy can be seen from the words “*pasti kena karma nya .tinggal nggu wkt yg tepat.dia pasti kena kutukan.*” The commentator instill believe that the target will get karma and get cursed.

4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Sarcasm is used as a way to make fun of someone or to be unpleasant to somebody. Mock impoliteness appears when speaker speaks sarcastically to hearer and speaker manipulates sarcasm or mock politeness to promote disharmony without openly insulting/ acting impolitely toward hearer.

1. Datum 182

armand videografer : *hahaaa...gue mau ksh tau nie...yg bnci FPI dan Habib Rizieq itu ada 3 macam..satu..ahokers...kedua..tukang maksiat..ketiga munafikun...gue tebak lu yg ke dua...kalo salah yah maaf*

(Lol, i just want to tell you that there are three characteristic of people who hates FPI and Habib Rizieq, the first one is ahokers, the second one is immoral, and the third one is hypocrite. I guess you are the second one. Sorry if i am mistaken.)

Datum 182 is from a male detractor. This datum belongs to sarcasm or mock politeness because its promote disharmony without openly insulting or acting impolitely toward target. The strategy can be seen from in the words “*kalo salah yah maaf*” the last word in this sentence indicates that the commentator does not have intention on performing impoliteness.

2. Datum 241

mutia_3575 : *Coba kalau Napinya dari warga biasa. Hehe.. Hukum memang pilih2 buat fasilitasnya*

(If only the prisoner just the ordinary citizen, hehe. Law is not fair for its facilities)

Datum 241 is from a female detractor. This datum belongs to sarcasm or mock politeness because its promote disharmony without openly insulting or acting impolitely toward target. The strategy can be seen from mocking in this sentence “*Coba kalau Napinya dari warga biasa. Hehe.. Hukum memang pilih2 buat fasilitasnya*” the commentator shows mocking politeness strategy because she thinks that it's unfair for other prisoner if Ahok get special treatment as a prisoner too. Ahok should get same treatment like other prisoner.

Based on the result finding, detractors used more strategy than supporters. It can be seen by the total of strategies used. The most used strategies were positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness. Positive impoliteness was the mostly used strategies by all of participant such as male detractors, male supporters, female supporters, and female detractors, followed by negative impoliteness in the second position. The third and the last strategies are different. For male supporters and female supporters have same rank, the third strategy is sarcasm or mock politeness and the last is bald on record. Otherwise, for male detractors and female detractors also have same rank, the third strategy is bald on record, and the last is sarcasm or mock politeness. It can be mean that supporters and detractors are have similarity and different at the same time in using impoliteness strategies despite of their gender. After conducting the research, the writer could not find any commentator doing withhold politeness strategy. The possible reason could be that this strategy can only be used in spoken interaction process. Since the data are comments in a social media. There is no comments responded by other participants, so withhold politeness strategy could not be performed.

2. Discussion

From the result of this research, four of five strategies were found: bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. One strategy which was not found in this research was withhold politeness because it is usually found in spoken communication.

The biggest user of positive impoliteness strategy is male detractors, it appeared (52%) in their data. The second biggest user is female detractors, it appeared (49%) in their data. Then the third is male supporters because positive impoliteness strategies appeared in (45%) of their data. Female supporters used this strategies less than the other, it appeared about (38%) in their data. Negative impoliteness is more used by female. It can be seen by the finding that shows this strategy appeared on (33%) female supporters' data, followed by female detractors that have (30%) of negative impoliteness strategy in their data. The third position is male supporters, this strategy found 26% in the data. Then male detractors used this strategy least than the other. It appear for about (18%) in male detractors' data.

This result might be because social media is not face-to-face communication, people tend to do impoliteness because they did not see each other and they felt brave to do impoliteness. As stated by Suler (2004) states that people reacted differently when they were in face-to-face communication and when they were online. When they were in face to face with a famous figure, normally they would not say directly what was on their minds to avoid punishment or disapproval. On the other hand, communicating through online does not make them afraid to speak out or behave inappropriately, since they did not see each other.

The result of the research may imply that while coming to impoliteness level, written communication especially through social media tend to be less impolite than polite. As Culpeper proposed that positive impoliteness strategy

is the second least face threatening. The result also shows the combination strategy used between positive and negative impoliteness strategy. Those two strategies are often used because they have many sub-strategies compared with other strategies.

Finally, overall results of this research are four out of five impoliteness strategies are used both supporters and detractors, male or female, and they mostly used positive impoliteness to give online comments. Proved in the research that each strategy interlink and often show up together, the combination of positive and negative impoliteness strategy is the highest usage.

However, this finding is contradictory with Holmes (1995) he notes that women communicate with tentative manner. Ponyton (1989) states that women always in the soft side, weak, and closely related to an emotional state. He also states that woman is tender hearted and man can be heartless and unfeeling. While in this research male and female are similar in using impoliteness strategies.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research is about impoliteness strategies used by supporters and detractors of Ahok in their online comments on social media differ by gender. The writer would like to investigate what kinds of impoliteness strategies used by detractors and supporters of Ahok differ by their gender using the list of impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996). After conducting the research, the result showed that there are four impoliteness strategies used and positive impoliteness strategy is the mostly used strategy.

All commentators have used similar impoliteness strategies. The strategy that is mostly used by all commentators is positive impoliteness, followed by negative impoliteness in the second position. The strategy that is least used are sarcasm or mock politeness, and bald on record strategy. The most user of positive impoliteness is male detractors, it appeared (52%) in their data. On the other hand the least user of positive impoliteness is female supporters, they used this strategies less than the other, it appeared about (38%) in their data. Whereas, the most user of negative impoliteness is female supporters that shows this strategy appeared (33%) in their data. While the least used negative politeness strategy is male detractors. One strategy, withhold politeness, was not used at all. The possible reason could be that social media like Facebook and Instagram is not implying the real spoken interaction.

Finally, impoliteness strategies in giving online comments that performed by supporters and detractors of Ahok differed by their gender indicated that the commentators almost always commenting in impolite way even if they are a supporters or a detractors. It also indicated that their no gender difference in doing impoliteness strategies when giving online comments on social media. It can be seen that supporters and detractors, male or female using the impoliteness strategy similarly.

It is suggested that the students learn more about pragmatics, especially in impoliteness. There have not been many students who conduct research with impoliteness topic. Therefore, the researcher suggests that more students conduct research in pragmatics, especially in impoliteness. It is expected that the readers learn more about the aspect of impoliteness. When the readers know and understand impoliteness, they can control their impolite utterances and behavior. This study is also hoped can be good information about both impoliteness and impoliteness strategy to anybody who interested in learning it.

Note: This article is written based on the Vini Mara Shinta's thesis under the adviser of Dr. Hamzah. M.A., M.M. and Delvi Wahyuni S.S M.A.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, P., and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coates, J. (2004). *Women, Men and Language a Sociolinguistics Account of Gender Differences In Language* 3rd edition. Harlow: Longman.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards An Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25:349-367.
- Culpeper, J., Derek B., and Anne W. (2003). Impoliteness re-visited: With special Reference To Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1545-1579.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link, *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behavior, Culture* 1:35-72.
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalized impoliteness formula. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Volume 42, 3232-3245.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1989). "The limits of politeness." *Multilingua* 8: 101-129.
- Haggerty, K. (2000). *Conversation Analysis: A Study of On-line Chatrooms vs. Oral Communication*. Unpublished Thesis. Western Connecticut State University.
- Hamzah. (2013). Pengembangan Topik Di Dalam Cet Menggunakan Bahasa Inggris. *Lingua Didactia Volume 7 No 1, Desember 2013*. Universitas Negeri Padang.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman
- Omar, Z., and Wahid S. (2010). "Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Some of Harold Pinter's Plays". *Iraq Academic Scientific Journal*, 8 :189-210
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2007). Theories of Identity and the Analysis of Face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 639–656.
- John Suler (2004). *CyberPsychology & Behavior*. 7(3): 321-326

- Vanderstoep, S.W., and D. Johnston. 2009. *Research Method of Everyday Life*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. London: Cambridge University Press.

