
IMPOLITE RESPONSES TO DONALD TRUMP'S POSTS ON INSTAGRAM

Melly Siska Suryani

Universitas Putera Batam, Batam, Indonesia

melsis.suryani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the impolite response posts on Instagram. Instagram is a virtual world communication media that allows language users to interact with more than two participants. It gives freedom to participants to express what they feel or want, including giving any response to other people's posts such as Donald Trump, President of America. This freedom tends to make participants ignore linguistic norms so that they give impolite response to other people's posts. In this study, the researcher described the impoliteness strategies given to Donald Trump's posts on Instagram. The source of data is all responses/comments on Donald Trump's Instagram. The data were collected by using observational method with non-participatory technique. Then, the data was analyzed by using pragmatic identity method. Furthermore, the results of data analysis were explained by using informal method. From the results of the analysis, it showed that among five strategies, only four strategies used to respond to Donald Trump's post on Instagram. The strategy that was not used was withhold politeness. It was reasonable because this strategy can only be found in verbal conversations, while the research data was taken from written conversations on Instagram. In addition, the research findings indicated that positive impoliteness was the most frequently used strategy.

Keywords: Impoliteness, Instagram, Response, Strategy

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is used to exchange the ideas between speaker and hearer or writer and reader. Nowadays, the use of language has become interactive with the rise of computers, internet, and mobile devices. These technologies have rapidly increased the opportunities of language use across cultures, social

classes, locations, and even time. It can be found in social media such as intagram.

Instagram enabled people from all over the world to share their ideas, opinions or comments. Since people are free to share anything, they are also free to give any response to any post. Sometimes they don't care about the

way they use their language. They don't pay attention to whom they speak and what the best choice of word used. This phenomena relate to impoliteness.

The research about impoliteness has been done by some researchers. Khosravi (2015) investigated the realization of impoliteness in reply articles published in academic journals in the field of applied linguistics as an instance of academic conflict. The data taken from a corpus of 49 reply articles published in academic journals. The results of the analysis including the frequency counts as well as normalized frequency scores demonstrated the prevalence of on-record impoliteness, i.e. the authors of the reply articles revealed a strong preference for using on-record impolite behaviors while responding to comments posed by other scholars in the field on their previously published works. The findings of the current study seem to contribute to the academic community by expanding the currently available literature on (im)politeness. Moreover, the findings would raise the consciousness of the academic courses instructors, novice and professional members of the applied linguistics discourse community considering the potential (im)politeness implications of their contributions to the discourse community in order to choose pragmatically appropriate alternatives.

Jannejad, Bordbar, Bardidieh, & Banari (2015) analyzed impoliteness in family discourse in verbal interactions between irreconcilable couples in Ahvaz, Iran. There was a corpus of 300 minutes of the couples' conversations, which was

provided by Family research center. The results showed women insult themselves twice more compared to their husbands and insult their spouses 5 times more, while men's insults were directed at their wives' family 2.3 times more compared to the other way around. But on the whole, women used impoliteness twice as much as men did. It was hypothesized that men used impoliteness more than women did. But the findings revealed that out of 175 impoliteness examples, 93 cases were utilized by women and 82 ones by men. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the findings of this study were contrary to expectations in that they depicted that although women, in order to save their face, were normally more conservative in verbal communication in different contexts in society and thus appeared politer than men, they tended to be more impolite in family discourse. It indicated that women were less concerned about their face in family conversations in comparison with other contexts.

Different from those two researches which took the data from corpus, this research obtained the data from Donald Trump's intagram. Donald Trump as a president of America uses Instagram to communicate with his citizens. One of his post was *Believe your selves. Believe in your future. And believe, one more, in America.* This post was intended to persuade American to walk together with him and support his leadership. Some netizens responded unexpectedly such as: *we have no future with you, or go away already.*

Since the post was posted by a president, there will be an expectation that netizens will respond politely. Unfortunately, the responses were sent impolitely and they threatened Donald's Trump's face.

According to Culpeper (as cited in Culpeper, 2013) impoliteness is presumed to have emotional consequences for at least one participant, that is, they cause or are presumed to cause offence. Therefore when the language is used impolitely it makes others lose their face. Moreover, Culpeper (as cited in Tutas, Nazan & Azak, 2014) stated that impoliteness as something that is performed intentionally. It means that when people do it, they are trying to attack other's face and break the harmony.

In addition, impoliteness more likely to occur when the speaker is more powerful than the addressee. Culpeper (as cited in Tutas, Nazan & Azak, 2014) stated that when the speaker is in a higher position he or she can use impoliteness more freely since he or she might have the means to (a) reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness and (b) threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite. Therefore, impoliteness is likely to occur in situations where the speaker has more power.

Interestingly, Donald Trump is the powerful man in America. He is the one who has a chance to use impolite words, but in fact he sent the words politely while netizens used the impolite

words to response his post on Instagram. Based on this phenomenon, the researcher wants to investigate more about the impoliteness strategy especially impolite responses which were given to Donald Trump's posts on Instagram.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Impoliteness is communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony Culpeper (as cited in (Culpeper, 2005). These strategies will cause the social conflict and disharmony. It will be different from politeness strategies in which the hearer face are being saved. In other words, impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2).

In addition, impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (1) Unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (2) With deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximized in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted. Furthermore, impoliteness is considered to be successful impoliteness when the intention of the speaker to offend (threaten/damage face) must be understood by those in a receiver role.

Generally, politeness and impoliteness are considered to be opposites of each other. Culpeper (as cited in Bousfield, 2008) proposed some impoliteness strategies:

1. Bald on record impoliteness

The FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimized.

It is important to distinguish this strategy from Brown and Levinson's Bald on record. For Brown and Levinson, bald on record is a politeness strategy in fairly specific circumstances. For example, when face concerns are suspended in an emergency, when the threat to the hearer's face is very small, or when the speaker is much more powerful than the hearer. In all these cases, little face is at stake, and more importantly, it is not the intention of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer.

2. Positive impoliteness

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. This can be done through the following ways, such as:

- Ignore, snub the other, fail to acknowledge the other's presence.
- Exclude the other from an activity
- Disassociate from the other, deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together.
- Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic
- Use inappropriate identity markers.
- Use obscure or secretive language.

- Seek disagreement, select a sensitive topic.
- Make the other feel uncomfortable
- Use taboo language (swear, or use abusive or profane language).
- Call the other names (use derogatory nominations).

3. Negative impoliteness

The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants. This can be done through the following ways, such as:

- Frighten - instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
- Condescend, scorn or ridicule - emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Be little the other (e.g. use diminutives).
- Invade the other's space - literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).
- Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect - personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'you'.
- Put the other's indebtedness on record -with a negative aspect, put the other's indebtedness on record
- Hinder – physically (block passage), conversationally (deny turn, interrupt)

4. Sarcasm or mock politeness

The FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus

remain surface realisations. Culpeper's sarcasm or mock politeness is close to Leech's (1983) conception of irony. This is of course the opposite of Brown and Levinson's social harmony that is achieved through off-record politeness. One more point to add is that sarcasm (mock politeness for social disharmony) is clearly the opposite of banter (mock impoliteness for social harmony)

5. Withhold politeness

This refers to the absence of politeness work where it would be expected.

Culpeper's strategies of impoliteness are further investigated and elaborated by Bousfield (2008) with four strategies. The four strategies are:

- ✓ Criticize – dispraise hearer, some action or inaction by hearer, or some entity in which hearer has invested face
- ✓ Hinder/block – physically (block passage), communicatively (deny turn, interrupt)
- ✓ Enforce role shift
- ✓ Challenges

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a descriptive qualitative research. Descriptive means that the researcher describes data as it is. The term qualitative research is an umbrella term used to refer to a complex and evolving research methodology. The approaches use a

wide variety of data collection methods, such as observation, interviews, open-response questionnaire items, verbal reports, diaries, and discourse analysis.

The data were collected by using observation method (Sudaryanto, 2015). The researcher observed Donald Trump's posts on Instagram started from Januari 2018 till March 2018. Then, the responses to Donald Trump's posts were observed by using non-participatory technique because the researchers didn't get involve in conversation. Next, the data taken were classified related to impoliteness strategies.

Furthermore, the data were analyzed by using pragmatics identity method. It was used because this research is a part of pragmatics. Therefore, the interpretation of data were based on context. Finally, the research result was presented by using informal method. The result of the research wasn't presented by using tables but it was explained by using sentences.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Impoliteness is strategies designed to attack face. These strategies will cause the social conflict and disharmony. The analysis on impoliteness strategies concerns on the way people respond to Instagram post by Donald Trump. There are five strategies applied. They are bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm politeness and withhold politeness.

1. Bald on record

Donald Trump posted the report about unemployment rate, average earnings up and about American job. The citizens reacted to the number showed. They think that it was only a manipulative report. Therefore, they responded it by saying *LOL, average earning aren't even up to match the inflation fot the year!! So still behind the eight ball Donny LOL*. Other responses were *this so inaccurate it's funny, the lies you tell people and they believe it*. These responses indicated bald on record strategies. The response senders argued the number showed by the president, may be because they have known the fact, the truth. Therefore they reminded the president to tell the truth

2. Positive impoliteness

Donald Trump posted "democrats for doing nothing for DACA". DACA (Deffered Action for Childhood Arrivals) is one of Obama's programs to protect immigrant children. By posting this words he attacked Obama and his party and under his leadership, he will stop this DACA policy. This post gave the bad response to him such as *you're idiot, rats, babylon's sons, fake potus clown*. These words are the taboo words. They arent suppose to be used to the president. This impoliteness strategy refers to positive impoliteness

3. Negative impoliteness

Donald Trump persuaded his citizen to be proud of his country, proud of being American. Therefore, he posted "We're bringing back four magnificent words: Made in the USA". One of response was *since when has USA been a word? Just goes to prove how stupid yanks really are*.

This response showed a kind of disagreement to his post. The response sender scorned and ridiculed the post. Therefore, it was a part of negative impoliteness strategies.

4. Sarcasm politeness

As a president of America, Donald Trump in his post tried to convince his country as a better place to stay. Through this post " There has never beena better time to HIRE in America, to INVEST in America, and to START LIVING THE AMERICAN DREAM". This posts had some impolite responses such as: *what was your promise to give to Iran? It was all a lie?*. This response was reasonable because Donald Trump broke the agreement with Iran related to nuclear weapon. The response sender questioned his word because what he said seemed different from reality. This response was categorized as sarcasm since it was conveyed indirectly.

Based on the analysis, the following were the impoliteness strategies which were found:

1. Bald on record impoliteness
 - *You are not good*
 - *Shame on America to have such president*
 - *LOL, average earning aren't even up to match the inflation fot the year!! So still behind the eight ball, Donny LOL*
 - *This so inaccurate, it's funny*
 - *The lies you tell people and they believe it*
 - *Don't give citizenship to ungrateful, spoiled brats*
 - *Stupidest president*
2. Positive impoliteness
 - *You are fucking idiot*
 - *You're like duck sauce*
 - *You are poo bag*
 - *Fat cat*
 - *you're idiot*
 - *Rats*
 - *Babylon's sons*
 - *Fake potus clown*
 - *Hey dummy, you reverse the Obama era gun sale to the mentally prohibition*
 - *Douche*
3. Negative impoliteness
 - *Since when has USA been a word? Just goes to prove how stupid yanks really are*
4. Sarcasm politeness
 - *What was your promise to give to Iran? It was all a lie?*
 - *If being the most corrupt and malignant president in the*

history of the country is the job, then well done, sir

- *Ok, gramp*

5. CONCLUSION

Impoliteness often damages a person's face or identity. In this research, the impoliteness analysis are based on five strategies, that are bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm politeness and withhold politeness. Furthermore, the strategies were applied to analyze impolite responses to Donald Trump's posts on Instagram.

From the analysis, it was found that only four strategies applied in responding Donald Trump post on Instagram. One strategy which was not found was withhold politeness. It is reasonable because this strategy is usually used in verbal conversation, while the data in this research were taken from written conversation. Furthermore, the response senders used positive politeness frequently, by using taboo words to show disagreement.

REFERENCES

- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. (A. Jucker H, Ed.). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show : The Weakest Link. *Jurnal of Polliteness Research*, 1, 35–72.
- Culpeper, J. (2013). Impoliteness: Questions and answers. In M.

- Jamet, Denis & Jobert (Ed.), *Aspects of Linguistic Impoliteness* (pp. 3–15). United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ferencik, M. (2017). I'm not Charlie : (Im) politeness evaluations of the Charlie Hebdo Attack in an Internet Discussion Forum. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 111, 54–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.02.002>
- Jannejad, M., Bordbar, A., Bardidieh, A., & Banari, R. (2015). The analysis of impoliteness in family discourse : Verbal interactions between irreconcilable Iranian couples. *ELT Voices- International Journal for Teachers of English*, 41(5), 19–41.
- Kecskes, I. (2015). Intercultural impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.023>
- Khosravi, M. (2015). A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in reply articles as an instance of academic conflict. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(3), 223–231.
- Sorlin, S. (2017). The Pragmatics of Manipulation : Exploiting Im/politeness Theories. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 121, 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.002>
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Tutas, Nazan & Azak, N. D. (2014). Direct-indirect impoliteness and power struggles in Harold Pinter ' s plays. In *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences:14th International Language, Literature and Stylistics Symposium* (Vol. 158, pp. 370–376). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.102>