



How to cite this article:

Suganda, D., Yuliawati, S., & Darmayanti, N. (2022). Expression of emotion as impoliteness markers in comment columns in Instagram Indonesia: A pragmatic study. *RENTAS: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya*, 1, Julai, 2022, 119 – 136. <https://doi.org/10.32890/rentas2022.1.4>

**EXPRESSION OF EMOTION AS IMPOLITENESS
MARKERS IN INSTAGRAM COMMENTS SECTION
IN INDONESIA: A PRAGMATIC STUDY**

¹Dadang Suganda, ²Susi Yuliawati, & ³Nani Darmayanti
Departmen Linguistik, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya,
Universitas Padjadjaran

³*Corresponding author: n.darmayanti@unpad.ac.id*

Received: 14/4/2022 Revised: 13/6/2022 Accepted: 4/7/2022 Published: 31/7/2022

ABSTRACT

The development of social media in Indonesia has increased sharply and is marked by the use of social media by almost half of Indonesia's population. One of the social media that Indonesians are interested in is Instagram. On Instagram, users can carry out social, economic, cultural, and language interactions. Thus, it is significant to study language interactions used to mark the emotional expression of speakers through the use of curses. The present study is entitled "Expression of Emotion as Impoliteness Markers in Instagram Comments Section in Indonesia: A Pragmatic Study". The study aims to describe the form, reference, and impact of using emotional expressions as impoliteness markers. The meaning of the emotional expression in this study is limited to the use of swear words on three popular Instagram accounts in Indonesia. This study used the descriptive qualitative method. Data

were collected using observation and note-taking techniques and then classified based on form, reference, and impoliteness. The theory used in this research is the theory of the form and reference of swear words in Indonesian developed by Wijana (2004) and the theory of impoliteness by Culpeper (2008). Based on the results of the study, it is known that the swear words in the Instagram accounts which are used based on their form consist of words, phrases, and clauses. The references of swear words that appeared include characteristics/conditions, animals, objects, body parts, spirits, activities, and professions. The form and reference to the curse words mark (a) positive impoliteness, (b) negative impoliteness, and (c) sarcasm or pseudo-politeness. These three forms of impoliteness occurred because what the speakers said contradicted what was considered by the interlocutors, and what was stated by the speakers was considered to violate the cultural norms/values that exist in Indonesia, so the interlocutor resorted to scolding to express their emotional expressions. The research findings can be used to understand the culture of how Indonesians express their thought and feeling on social media. Furthermore, the research contributes to increasing literacy of language politeness in social media.

Keywords: Form of swear word, reference of swear word, impoliteness, social media.

INTRODUCTION

Social media users in Indonesia in 2020 reached 160 million of the country's total population of 272.1 million (<https://wearesocial.com/digital-2020>). This shows that the number of social media users has reached 58.8% or half of the total population. One of the social media platforms that is actively used by Indonesian citizens is Instagram. The number of Instagram users in Indonesia in 2020 is 63 million people. In 2017, Indonesia was even nominated as having the biggest Instagram users in the Asia Pacific (Natisha, 2017).

Besides social, cultural and economic interaction, language interaction used by speakers when communicating on Instagram is also interesting to be studied. Instagram as a social media has captured the users' language behaviour naturally in written verbal form. In social media, such as Instagram, language is not only a medium to convey

information/ideas of the speaker, but also a form of expression of the speaker, such as expressions of happiness, admiration, sadness, and also emotion.

One of the emotional expressions shown by Instagram users is swear words. The main purpose of swearing is to express emotions, especially anger and frustration. Swear words are well suited to express emotion as their primary meanings are connotative. The emotional impact of swearing depends on one's experience with culture and its language conventions (Jay & Janschewitz, 2008). In linguistics, swear words in communication practice can be studied through the field of pragmatics under the topic of politeness and impoliteness of utterance.

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves (Yule, 1996). Cristal (1997) also states that "Pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication".

There are many pragmatics studies about politeness, impoliteness, and swear words conducted by experts, including Yaqin and Shanmuganathan (2020), Etae et al. (2016), Mayasari and Muzaki (2019), Ardi et al. (2018), Tongwanchai, (2015), Caballero et al. (2018), Johari et al. (2015), Mirzaei Jegarlooei and Allami (2018), Shum and Lee (2013), and Kusno (2015). They conducted studies of politeness in relation to culture, economy, prosody, education, and politics. However, not many discussed the use of swear words on Instagram in terms of their form and reference.

Yaqin and Shanmuganathan (2020) conducted an ethnography study based on the politeness model of Brown and Levinson in the Sasak Tribe marriage ceremony. Tongwanchai (2015), Etae et al. (2016), Izadi (2013), and Mirzaei Jegarlooei and Allami (2018) investigated politeness in the educational field which concludes that cultural factor affects the realization of politeness in the educational realm between students and teachers. Gunawan (2018) and Johari et al., (2015) conducted a politeness study in advertisement and business fields.

The results show that politeness was chosen by advertisers/speakers to achieve their economic goals. On the other hand, Shum and Lee, (2013) conducted a study about debates in two discussion forums on the Hong Kong internet based on politeness strategy.

In the realm of literature, Ardi et al. (2018) conducted a study about certain results in literary works. Politeness studies were also studied based on its prosodic aspects, which mark the delivery of politeness as an aspect of emotional communication (Caballero et al., 2018). In politics, Kusno (2015) discusses the pragmatic phenomena (obedience and violations) in the rubric of *Wacana Kompasiana's* IDR 11.2 trillion aspiration funds proposed by the DPR/ Indonesian Legislative assembly (Kusno, 2015)

Research related to Indonesian language abuse has also been conducted by several researchers, including Wijana (2004), Sulistyorini (2019), Fasya and Suhendar (2013), and Mayasari and Muzaki (2019). Wijana (2004) analyzed curses in Indonesian based on their forms and references. According to him, curses in Indonesian can be in the form of words, phrases and clauses. The references to curse words can be in the form of body parts, animals, circumstances, etc. Sulistyorini (2019) discusses curses in English on the internet which shows that swearing has described literal meanings and creative meanings in various contexts, both personal and private.

On the other hand, Fasya and Suhendar (2013) describe their research based on a sociolinguistic perspective, which discusses how the social class, gender, and age of language users determine the use of curse words in Indonesian. Mayasari and Muzaki (2019) conducted a study of swear words in the local language of Temanggung city. Based on the analysis of curse variations in the Javanese language of the Temanggung dialect, several types of curses were found, including curses based on body parts and animal names. (Mayasari & Muzaki, 2019).

A newer approach to modesty includes rudeness (see Arndt, 1985; Beebe, 1995; Bousfield, 2007; Culpeper, Jonathan, Derek Bousfield, 2003; Kasper, 1990; Lakoff, 1989; Locher, 2005; Thomas, 1983) (Lakoff, 1989) which already includes situations where the speaker deliberately or inadvertently uses offensive speech for purposes other than social harmony.

Disrespectful behaviour is different from hopes, desires and beliefs about certain values. Often, behaviour that is seen as negative is considered “disrespectful” when there is conflict, defence, or hope that other people share their beliefs or values. In other words, an action may qualify as disrespectful if the listener has considered that the speaker damaged the face of the listener or conversation partner and displayed threatening action.

Culpeper (1996) developed the concept of modesty strategy as the opposite strategy to the obedience strategy of Brown and Levinson (1987), namely strategy (a) bald on record impoliteness namely the strategy of impoliteness which is deliberately carried out frankly regardless of the face of the conversation partner, (b) positive impoliteness that is a deliberate strategy to threaten the positive face of the conversation partner, (c) negative impoliteness is a strategy that is deliberately aimed at threatening the negative face of the conversation partner, (d) mock politeness, that is pseudo or mock politeness strategies, (e) withhold politeness that is impoliteness occurs due to the absence of proper politeness.

The description above shows that curse is a form of emotional expression that can mark impoliteness in communication interactions on Instagram. Cursing has a distinctive form and is always bound by culture and speakers. Therefore, this study intends to examine how the forms and references to curses used by speakers in interacting on Instagram and how impoliteness is realized as a result of the use of these curse words.

METHODOLOGY

This study utilizes the use of language in communicating on Instagram. A qualitative descriptive method was used in this research process. This method describes facts and data analysis systematically, factually, and accurately (Sudaryanto, 1998, p.62). The data source used in this study was taken from the comments in (1) status of Indonesian *selebgram* (referring to a famous Instagram user) named Kekeyi who called herself a doll, and (2) status of Indonesian *selebgram* named Sarah Keihl who stated she wanted to sell her virginity to help the handling of Covid-19. The object of this study is the utterance in the comments sections of both accounts that contain swear words.

The data collection methods involved observation and note-taking methods, namely observing the use of language without intervention. The determining tool is the linguistic intuition of researchers as speakers of Indonesian. Then, the data were collected based on the type and recorded into the data card. The data analysis was carried out simultaneously after the collection. The analysis comprises the pragmatic equivalent and the split method. The pragmatic equivalent method determines conversation partners. The application of this method is carried out using the pragmatic sorting technique, namely the sorting power that uses conversation partners as the determinant. The data analysis was also carried out using the distributional method, namely the method with the direct element sharing technique. The technique for direct elements is in the form of dividing one linguistic construction into several parts to form the intended construction. The analysis was carried out to determine the impoliteness strategy and the factors that influence impoliteness.

RESULTS

The Forms of Swear Words

The forms of swear words included in the comment of Indonesian *selebgram* Instagram (IG) include words, phrases, and clauses. The majority were in the form of words. Among the 209 data obtained, 152 were determined as swear words. They were subsequently categorized into four, namely root words, affix words, compound words, and abbreviations. On the other hand, 51 data of cursing in the form of phrases were found in the 209 research data. Cursing in Indonesian phrases is typically marked by the word *dasar* and suffix *-mu*. Besides words and phrases, cursing in the form of clauses was also found, comprising as many as 6.

The following are examples of swear words in the form of words, phrases and clauses. (1) *tip.santuy: Trend norak mau pansos gini kenapa jadi marak sih? tangkepin aja biar kapok. Sampah;* (2) *indahpangayom: Otak udang, pake cara gitu biar dapet banjir bintang tamu sama collab di youtube,gitu amat yak cari duwit;* (3) *rhrekusuma: DASAR MURAHAN;* (3) *hanifebrika02: Dasar tante tante gatau trimakasih ...skrg lo lagi musuh kan sama miko.. ga punya temen lo skrg.*

In (1), there is the word *sampah* which is a root word form because it can no longer be divided into smaller units and can stand on its own. In data (2), there is the word *otak udang* (literally meaning shrimp brain) which is a compound word because it combines two words and forms a new meaning. The word *otak udang* that is meant in the sentence is not literally the brain that shrimp has, but to be understood figuratively and has the meaning of someone stupid or difficult to understand. In data (3), there is a curse of *dasar murahan*. It is also in the form of a phrase that is formed by combining the words of *dasar* and *murahan*. When viewed from its syntactic behaviour, the word *dasar* functions as a modifier while the word *murahan* functions as the main part. This makes both words a phrase-shaped curse. In data (4), there is a curse of *dasar tante tante gatau trimakasih* that is not in the form of a word or phrase. The curse of *dasar tante tante gatau trimakasih* can be categorized as a form of a clause because it fulfils the predictive element when viewed from its function.

Table 1

Swear Words based on Their Forms

No	Form of Swear Words	Total	Percentage
1	Word	152	72.7%
2	Phrase	51	24.4%
3	Clause	6	2.8%

Reference of Swear Words

The swear words found in the comments section of Indonesian’s IG *selebgram* refer to characteristics/situations, animals, things, body parts, supernatural creatures, activities, professions, and religion. Swear words that refer to nature/condition are the ones used the most by followers of Indonesian’s IG *selebgram*. This indicates that both physical and non-physical characteristics/conditions are still the main targets when followers curse at the Instagram comments section.

Characteristics/Conditions

Of the 209 data that have been collected, 103 data contain insults that have the meaning of characteristics/circumstances. This indicates that most followers cursed by attacking the nature/situation of the person being scolded. According to KBBI (The Great Dictionary of

Indonesian Language), the conditions are of (1) nature; about (an object) (2) atmosphere; the current situation (KBBI, 2008:7). The characteristics/conditions used as a curse are *gila* (crazy), *goblok* (stupid), *sinting* (crazy), *pendek* (short), *jijik* (disgusted), *gendut* (fat), *tolol* (stupid), and *sarap* (crazy). Examples of the use of cursing that refer to nature/condition are in data (5): wiches.litteraly: *ih kok goblok bgt sih lo ampun deh* (why are you so stupid, oh my gosh); and (6): angeladewanti: *Sapa yang mau disedekahin dr hasil zina? Najis bat* (Who would like to accept something from adultery? So disgusted). In data (5) there is a lexical curse of *goblok* which refers to a “condition”. According to the KBBI, *goblok* means very stupid (KBBI, 2008: 456). Then in data (6), there is a curse *najis* which also refers to a “condition”. *Najis* means *jijik* (disgusted) (KBBI, 2008: 949).

Animals

In curse words, the meaning of animal is generally used to equate certain characteristics of an animal to the individual who is the object of abuse. Therefore, not all animals can be used as a means of cursing. According to KBBI, animals are animate creatures that can move (move from one place to another) and react to stimuli but have no sense (such as dogs, buffalo and ants) (KBBI, 2008: 194). In the 209 data that were found, there were 28 swear words about animals. The animals used as insults are *anjing* (dog), *amoeba*, *bangsat* (bastard), *kutu busuk* (bed bug), *kangkong*, *gorilla*, *monyet* (monkey), *kambing* (goat), and *babi* (pig).

The usage examples include (7) maolanamao: *pengen viral nih si monyet* (wants to go viral, the monkey) and (8) teduhandre: *3MILIAR AJA MASIH KURANG??BANGSAT!* (3 BILLION STILL INADEQUATE?? BASTARDS!) In data (10) there are lexical curses on animals, namely *monyet* (monkey) and *bangsat* (bastards). The word *monyet* means ape, whose hair is greyish and has a long tail, but the skin of the face, palms and soles of the feet are hairless” (KBBI, 2008: 929). The word *bangsat* means bedbugs/bed bugs (KBBI, 2008: 134).

Object

The meaning that refers to an object also has the same usage as the meaning of an animal, which is to equate the bad character possessed

by the individual subject to cursing. Therefore, not all objects are used as a means of a curse, although it does not rule out that an object that does not have a bad character will still be used as a curse because it has a relationship with the abused target. According to KBBI, objects are everything in nature that is tangible or bodily (not spiritually); substances (for example water, oil) (KBBI, 2008: 168). In the 209 data found, 23 curses had the meaning of objects.

The examples are (11) kevinjonathan1178: *Masi aja nyari tameng lu tai, udh salah blagu nyari alesan bego* (still looking for your shield, you shit, you are wrong but still looking for reasons you stupid). In data (11) there is a curse word of *tai* that refers to an object. Lexical word of *tai* was found in 7 data out of 209 data obtained. The cursing of *tai* has the meaning of (1) food waste from (2) a variety of dirt, sediment, or goods that are considered waste (waste, rust, waste, etc.) (KBBI, 2008: 1376). The ugliness of the nature of cursing *tai* which has an unpleasant odour and its shape makes this word considered as cursing that refers to an object.

Body Parts

Cursing using body parts is generally associated with five senses and sexual activities. According to KBBI, a part is something (objects, tools, etc.) that is complementary (KBBI, 2008: 113), and a body is the whole body of a human or animal visible from the tip of the foot to the tip of the hair (KBBI, 2008: 1942). In the 209 data that have been collected, there were 24 data on body parts meaningful abuse.

The following is an example of cursing that refers to body parts. (12) nhagunawan: *Baaccoott mb yunnn* (talking too much), (13) rahmad_furqon12: *Lawak lo kontol* (your joke is like a dick), In data (12) and (13), there are swear words of *bacot* and *kontol* that refer to body parts. In data (12) there are lexical curses on the body parts of *bacot* that appear in 8 of 209 data. *Bacot* means mouth (KBBI, 2008: 110). Then, in data (13) there is a lexical curse of *kontol* (penis) which was found in as many as 6 out of the 209 data obtained. The curse word *kontol* means male genitalia; testicles (KBBI, 2008: 729). This shows that the use of *kontol* in cursing refers to body parts related to sexual activity.

Activities

According to KBBI, activity is activeness; doings (KBBI, 2008: 31). Cursing related to activity refers to or is related to sexual activity.

However, this curse is generally used to express an unfavourable situation compared to the actions of the individual who is the target of abuse. Of the 209 data, 10 cursing data had the meaning of activity.

The following is an example of cursing that refers to activities. (15) dionisius_ad: *Pencitraan jancuk* (imaging of *jancuk*). Here, the swear word of *jancuk* refers to an activity. There are 5 lexical swear words of *jancuk* out of the 209 collected data. The swear word of *jancuk* comes from Javanese, which in Indonesian means *bersanggama*. According to KBBI, *bersanggama* means having sexual relations, intercourse, having an entity, or a mixture of them (KBBI, 2008: 1221).

Professions

According to KBBI, profession is a field of work based on certain expertise (skills, vocational, etc.) (KBBI, 2008: 104). Swear words associated with professions refers to professions that are lowly, prohibited, prohibited by religion, or not in accordance with morals. These professions are used in cursing because of the ugliness and are then equated according to the individual actions of the target person. From the 209 data, 12 were placed under the category of profession.

Some of the curses include: (16) sarahkenzi9: *nyari sensai aja lo perek bisa'y* (Looking for sensation is all you can do, *perek*). Here, the word of *perek* refers to a profession. There is only 1 data of lexical curse that refers to the profession of *perek* out of the obtained 209 data. *Perek* is an acronym taken from the first syllables of *perempuan* (woman) and *eksperimen* (experiment). *Perek* is generally associated with the prostituted profession and the cursing of *perek* has the meaning of *perempuan eksperimen* (prostitutes).

Religion

Swear words referring to religion that are commonly used are terms, rules, or stories from a certain religion that indicates bad or prohibited characteristics. According to KBBI, religion is a teaching, a system that regulates the system of faith (belief) and worship of Almighty God as well as rules related to the association of humans and humans as well as humans and their environment (KBBI, 2008: 15). Of the 209 data, there were 5 data entailing religious meaning.

The following is an example of a curse with religious meaning: 17) alfariskyperdana: *Dasar kaum nabi luth* (You follower of Prophet Lut). In data (17), there is a curse *dasar kaum nabi luth* which is a curse with religious meaning. The cuss of *dasar kaum nabi luth*, seen from its lexical meaning, then the word *dasar* means “just the way it is” (about customs, character, behaviour, etc.). According to KBBI (2008:903), the word *kaum* means community (people who work together, have similar beliefs, have the same rank and so on). The word *nabi* (prophet) (KBBI, 2008: 637) means the person who is chosen by God to receive His Revelation, and the word *luth* refers to the seventh prophet and apostle sent by Allah in Islam. But the real meaning is referring to the story of the Sodomites, who were sinners because they committed sexual deviations. This interpretation has references from historical stories of Islam, Christianity and Judaism; hence basically the cursing of *dasar kaum nabi luth* refers to a curse with religious meaning.

Supernatural Creatures

According to KBBI, supernatural creatures are creatures that are considered to live in the supernatural (worlds) outside the physical realm (for example, demons and genies) (KBBI, 2008: 863). Just like cursing referring to animals and objects, cursing alluding to spirits is also commonly used to equate the ugliness of a spirit that often disturbs human life. Apart from that, the allusion of ghosts can also be used to equate the ugliness of the faces of spirits who are used as a means of a curse. Of the 209 data, there are 2 cursing data which have the meaning of spirits.

The following is an example of cursing data referring to supernatural creatures. (18) ulianhacuz: *Beda kuyang! Maap ini nyindir? Astaghfirullah bikin termos ku panas aja ah*. Data (18) contains the word *kuyang*. The lexical reference of *kuyang* as spirits is found in 1 out of the 209 data that have been collected. *Kuyang* refers to a female ghost who according to the beliefs of the people of East Borneo, at night, her head and stomach contents can fly and suck the blood of pregnant people or people who have just given birth (KBBI, 2008: 766).

Table 2

Swear Words Based on Their References

No	Type of Swear Words	Total	Percentage
1	Characteristics/Situations	103	49.2%
2	Animals	28	13.3%
3	Objects	23	11.0%
4	Body Parts	19	9.0%
5	Activities	10	4.7%
6	Professions	12	5.7%
7	Religions	5	2.3%
8	Supernatural Creatures	2	0.9%

Swear Words as Impoliteness Makers

Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is the use of strategies aimed at damaging the positive faces of the listener or interlocutor. Things that constitute positive impoliteness include ignoring, assuming that the partner is invisible, self-separation, being unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity/designations, using secret language which the interlocutor cannot understand, using taboo, abusive language, or profane, using derogatory nicknames in greeting, and so on. Based on the research data, it can be said that the positive impoliteness strategy found in cursing on Instagram as a social media is divided into two, namely (1) the impoliteness strategy using swearing or harsh words, and (2) the impoliteness strategy using inappropriate nicknames. Below are some examples:

(21) nuzularyop: ***anjing kekey anjing kekey anjing***

(22) adrianasimpp: ***suaranya jelek banget***

(23) gaboran16: ***Pelacur***

(24) sofia7950: ***Sampah banget*** sih

(25) widia_lidia: ***TAIK nih org***

Both (21) and (22) are curses directed at Kekeyi, an Indonesian celebrity who claims to be beautiful and has just published the song *Aku Bukan Boneka* (I'm not a Doll). (21) is a positive impoliteness marked

with verbal abuse using a reference to an animal *anjing* (dog). In this sentence, the speaker conveys the curse directly without looking at the speaker's face. Kekeyi's self-claim as a beautiful celebrity triggered insults from commentators on her Instagram because the person concerned was deemed not beautiful (according to the commentators), which resulted in the use of animal curses in the comments section. In the Indonesian culture, which is mostly populated by Muslims, dogs are used as a curse because they are disgusting, forbidden (haram), and should not be kept by Muslims. Thus, the swear word of *anjing* in the context of an angry, emotional, and hateful situation is used to denote immediate impoliteness. (22) is also a form of positive impoliteness in the form of phrases with references to very bad conditions. In this sentence, the speaker conveyed his insults directly by cursing Kekeyi. Opponents cursed because Kekeyi was not (in fact) a singer, which means her voice when singing was considered very bad.

All three data of (23), (24), and (25) are insults delivered in Sarah Keihl's comments section, who wrote that she would sell her virginity to help deal with Covid-19. This status triggered insults because Sarah Keihl was considered to purposely look for sensation by writing this status on her Instagram. (23) is an insult in the form of the word *pelacur* (prostitute) using a professional reference. (24) is a curse in the form of phrases that use object references, and (25) is a curse in the form of words with object references. These three curses are insults that indicate positive impoliteness because they threaten the face of the conversation partner directly, clearly, and unambiguously. The results of the analysis show that in (21) and (22), the impoliteness of the curses is based on the contradiction between what the speaker says and what the interlocutor assesses, which results in the expression of emotions by the interlocutor to the speaker. Meanwhile, in data (23) to (25), the impoliteness expressed with insults was triggered by actions stated by the speaker as violating the existing norms by the interlocutor, in which the interlocutor responded (by cursing) to express his emotional expression.

Negative Impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is the use of strategies aimed at damaging the negative faces of the listener or interlocutor. These strategies include: scaring (instilling the belief that their actions will be detrimental), demeaning/harassing, ridiculing or mocking, insulting, not treating

the interlocutor seriously, belittling the interlocutor (underestimating), attacking others (seizing opportunities), using negative pronouns, placing other people who have dependents, and so on. The following are some examples:

- (31) sorteoX: wakakaka **mampus** di takedown
- (32) put.rww_ : Lagu lo copy right **asu**, dah disindir yg punya lagu aslinya masih gak malu?
- (33) sarahkenzi9: nyari sensai aja lo **perek** bisa'y.
- (34) yulianasari536: **Sakit jiwa** ya mbak.a. klo ga mampu mah nyumbang doa aja.

Both data (31) and (32) are negative impoliteness which is indicated by curses in the form of words of *mampus* and *asu*. These two insults were conveyed in the comments section of Kekeyi's Instagram status which announced her new album titled "I'm not a doll", even though the copyright of the song was identified as belonging to another singer (plagiarised). These two curses indicate impoliteness which is classified as degrading/harassing, mocking, insulting, not taking partners seriously and fearing what Kekeyi was doing could bring about problems.

Meanwhile, data (33) and (34) are curses in the form of words addressing Sarah Keihl, who announced that she was selling her virginity to help deal with the Covid-19 problem. The word **perek** and **sakit jiwa** are forms of swearing that indicate negative impoliteness by using negative personal pronouns.

The results of the analysis show that the insults that mark negative impoliteness in all of the data above were triggered by the anger of the commentators over the status written by the two celebrities, that their status was contrary to norms and culture, namely using someone else's song/plagiarism and selling virginity as the most taboo act in the Indonesian culture.

Pseudo-impoliteness

Pseudo-impoliteness is called sarcasm. This strategy of impoliteness is carried out by pretending to be polite. The impoliteness strategy in the form of pseudo politeness can be seen in the following data.

- (35) puspharidho_1618: *Aku kira kamu beda ternyata sama aja, taik.*
(36) honeyy.fa: *Cantik cantik goblok*
(37) ayuashariramandey: *Iyo gadis perawan dasar mulut kodok*
(38) trstnmlidy13: *Cantik namun tolol. Silahkan bang yg mau gratis dipinang aja kuy mbanyah~*

The references to pseudo-impoliteness in (35) to (38) are indicated by the curse words of *taik*, *gobol*, *mulut kodok*, dan *tolol*. These swear words were expressed in the comments sections of the two celebrities. These four data are analysed as pseudo-impoliteness because the interlocutor initially threw praise first, then finally cursed using swear words. These four pseudo-impoliteness examples were triggered by the reader's anger towards the actions of both *selebgrams*.

CONCLUSION

The rapid development of social media in Indonesia can also be a portrayal of how Indonesians speak. One of the interesting aspects is that social media has become an open medium in conveying the expressions of its users, including cursing words that have an impact on impoliteness. This research has proven that Indonesian speakers on social media widely use swear words. The results show that based on the forms of the Indonesian swear words, the words in the comments of Indonesian *selebgram* Instagram (IG) include words, phrases, and clauses. The most common swear words found are in the form of words. Among the obtained 209 data, 152 were considered as swear words. Meanwhile, based on the reference, the curses refer to characteristics/conditions, animals, objects, body parts, activities, professions, religions, and supernatural creatures. In relation to the aspect of pragmatics, the use of curses also marks the practice of impoliteness in utterance communication on Instagram as a social media platform. The impoliteness that is realized from the curses used is divided into three, namely positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and pseudo-impoliteness. This research helps understand the cultural expressions of Indonesian people on social media. It can also be one of the foundations for the need to increase literacy culture and language politeness to create a polite culture on social media.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to all individuals who contributed, directly or indirectly, to the development and publication of this manuscript.

FUNDING ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Each author contributed equally to the conceptualization, drafting, and finalization of all sections of this manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors report no conflicts of interest for this work and declare no potential conflict of interest concerning the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data supporting this research are provided within this paper.

REFERENCES

- Ardi, H., Nababan, M. R., Djatmika, & Santosa, R. (2018). Characters' politeness strategies in giving command: Should translators keep them? *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 24(2), 181–193. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2402-14>
- Arndt, H., & R. J. (1985). Politeness revisited: Cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23.
- Beebe, L. (1995). Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In *Linguistics and the education of language*

- teachers: Ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic aspects.* Georgetown University Press.
- Bousfield, D. (2007). Beginnings, middles, and ends: A biopsy of the dynamics of impolite exchanges. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(12).
- Brown & Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge University Press.
- Caballero, J. A., Vergis, N., Jiang, X., & Pell, M. D. (2018). The sound of im/politeness. *Speech Communication*, 102(July), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.specom.2018.06.004>
- Crystal, D. (Ed.). (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan, Derek Bousfield, and A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23(3).
- Etae, S., Krish, P., & Hussin, S. (2016). Politeness strategies by Thai EFL tertiary learners in an online forum. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 24(February), 67–80.
- Fasya, M., & Suhendar, E. (2013). Variabel sosial sebagai penentu penggunaan makian dalam bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 53(9), 81–102.
- Izadi, A. (2013). Politeness in spoken review genre: Viva voce context. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 21(4), 1411–1429.
- Jay, T., & Janschewitz, K. (2008). The pragmatics of swearing. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 4.
- Johari, D., Ali, A. M., & Paramasivam, S. (2015). A literature review of rapport management in business meetings. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 23(December), 71–88.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14.
- Kusno, A. (2015). Pematuhan dan pelanggaran prinsip kesopanan serta fungsinya dalam wacana terkait usulan dana aspirasi DPR di rubrik politik Kompasiana. *Jurnal Widyaparwa*, 43(1).
- Lakoff, R. (. (1989). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua*, 8.
- Locher, M. and R. W. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1.

- Mayasari, I., & Muzaki, A. (2018). Types and markers of politeness depicted in. *Inovish Journal*, 3(1).
- Mayasari, I., & Muzaki, A. (2019). Abusive swearing variations in the Temanggung Javanese dialect: Type and social reality. *Hortatori*, 3(01), 64–72.
- Mirzaei Jegarlooei, S. H., & Allami, H. (2018). (Im)politeness strategies and use of discourse markers. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2018.1461048>
- Natisha, A. (2017). Pengguna instagram di Indonesia capai 45 juta. *Antaranews*.
- Shum, W., & Lee, C. (2013). (Im)politeness and disagreement in two Hong Kong internet discussion forums. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50(1), 52–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.01.010>
- Sulistyorini, H. (2019). The pragmatics of swearing: How it contextually counts. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*, 3, 324–333.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4.
- Tongwanchai, F. (2015). Pragmatic competence in requests of Thai learners of Spanish. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 23(December), 131–141.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2004). Makian dalam bahasa Indonesia: Studi tentang bentuk dan referensinya. *Humaniora*, XVI, 242–251.
- Yaqin, L. N., & Shanmuganathan, T. (2020). Politeness strategies of the pembayun(s) in the bride-kidnapping practices of Sasak culture. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 28(1), 89–102.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.