

EXPRESSIVE SPEECH ACTS MEAN DYSPHEMISMS IN THE DISCUSSION SHOW ON TELEVISION

Reka Yuda Mahardika¹, Mimin Sahmini², Redzuan bin Abdul Aziz³

^{1,2}IKIP Siliwangi

³Showme Eduwav Berhad, Malaysia

¹ rekayuda@ikipsiliwangi.co.id, ² miminsahmni@ikipsiliwangi.co.id, ³ redzuan2010@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is motivated by several educated figures who convey expressive speech acts using dysphemism in several discussion programs on television. Based on this background, the purpose of this research is to explain how expressive speech acts are represented using dysphemistic language spoken by these learned figures. This study uses a qualitative approach with the theory of speech acts expressed by Brown and Levinson and politeness in Leech's language. Based on the results of the analysis it was found that expressive speech acts with dysphemism were spoken by the debate participants when the discussion turned into a hot debate. The speech act is expressed in sarcasm which violates the maxim of appreciation. Such unethical expressive speech acts have the potential to tarnish the face of the debate opponent and damage the integrity of the speaker himself.

Keywords: Expressive Speech Acts, Ethics, Dysphemism, Politeness Maxims

Abstrak

Penelitian ini dilatarbelakangi oleh beberapa tokoh terpelajar yang menuturkan tindak tutur ekspresif dengan bahasa disfemisme dalam beberapa acara diskusi di televisi. Berdasarkan latar belakang tersebut, tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk menjelaskan bagaimana representasi tindak tutur ekspresif dengan bahasa disfemisme yang dituturkan para tokoh terpelajar tersebut. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan teori tindak tutur yang diutarakan Brown dan Levinson dan kesantunan berbahasa Leech. Berdasarkan hasil analisis ditemukan bahwa tindak tutur ekspresif dengan bahasa disfemisme dituturkan oleh para peserta debat ketika diskusi berubah menjadi perdebatan panas. Tindak tutur tersebut diekspresikan dengan bahasa sarkasme yang melanggar maksim penghargaan. Tindak tutur ekspresif yang tidak beretika tersebut berpotensi mencoreng muka lawan debat serta merusak integritas si penutur itu sendiri.

Kata Kunci: Tindak Tutur Ekspresif, Etika, Disfemisme, Maksim Kesantunan

INTRODUCTION

Discussion is a representation of language skills that must be mastered by educated people. Discussion participants must have competence and ethics when discussing. Zulfikar (2019) describes the ethics of discussion, namely the right intention, the ability to listen, the ability to speak clearly and calmly, have a strong scientific foundation, the ability to speak rhetorically, be fair, and be cooperative. These competencies are the basis that must always be mastered and trained to be applied in all kinds of discussion rooms. This is because, often the nuances of the discussion change to a heated debate, especially if the topic being conveyed is a sensitive matter. In that context, the integrity, manners, and

maturity of a debate participant will be seen. Not infrequently in debates the integrity of educated debate participants is damaged because they are seen as not having the competencies mentioned above. This is because the debate participants show their emotions which are represented by expressive speech acts which mean dysphemism.

In the context of the debate, vocabulary meaning dysphemism should not be spoken because it has a negative effect. Because in an atmosphere of debate, especially when it's hot, ejecting vocabulary that means dysphemism means showing anger and annoyance which can destroy the integrity of the debate participants and audience. This according to Allan & Burridge (1991) occurs because the meaningful vocabulary of dysphemism is the use of language with negative connotations that hurts or disturbs the person being spoken to, being spoken to, and those who are listening. In a debate the participants should be able to communicate in polite language. The goal, according to Jayanti (2019), is for each of them to be able to maintain a positive face with one another.

Debates in public spaces in respectable events on television ideally prioritize scientific and ethical competence. This is because the debate in that context was followed by educated figures and watched by audiences on a massive scale. However, in fact, some educated figures have shown the opposite. They argue without regard to competence and ethics. As a result, they utter vocabulary meaning dysphemism and are trapped in the error of thinking in *argumentum ad hominem*, namely by attacking citizenship status, political affiliation, race, and other things other than the ideas being discussed (Srimayasandy, 2021).

Debates in a television program fall into the category of speech acts. According to Rohmadi (2004) speech acts are speech acts between two or more people that occur in certain speech situations. The speech situation referred to in this study is contained in a debate that occurred in a formal event on several television stations. Meanwhile, hot debates using language with a meaning of dysphemism are included in expressive illocutionary speech acts. Expressive illocutionary types can be defined as speech acts involving feelings and attitudes (Suyono, 1990). Another opinion was put forward by Dardjowidjojo (2005) who explained that expressive speech acts are used to express psychological states such as gratitude, condolences, congratulations, including swearing. Based on the explanation above, debate with dysphemism is included in expressive speech acts because it is expressed to show the expressions of the debaters.

Research on speech acts is an interesting thing to study. There are previous studies that examine this matter, including Kuncara (2013) which examines "Directive Speech Act Translation Analysis in Novels *The Godfather* and Its Translation in Indonesian" which derives its findings from eight directive illocutionary functions: commanding, suggesting, requesting, pleading, forbidding, advising, persuading, and soliciting. Ariyanti (2017) who conducted a study entitled "Humanist Expressive Speech Acts in Learning Interactions at SMA Negeri 1 Batang: Class Discourse Analysis". His research found that the form of direct speech in the imperative mode tends to be spoken more often in the aspect of observing. The function of humanist expressive speech acts tends to be used to criticize or suggest. Humanist expressive speech acts have the characteristics of considering and paying attention to the social context, interactional context, and individual agency. Then Murti (2018) who researched "Expressive Speech Acts in the Film of Honor Behind the Veil of Director Tya Subiakto Satrio". The results of this study indicate that expressive speech acts in the film *Kehoronan di Balik Kehoron* are composed of expressive speech acts in the form of: a) praising, b) thanking, c) saying sorry, d) happiness; and e) complain.

There is relatively much research on speech acts. However, this research has a different position from previous studies. This difference mainly lies in the focus of the study of expressive speech acts with meaning of dysphemism and language politeness violations spoken by learned figures and discussion events. Based on this focus, the purpose of this research is to explain the expressive speech acts with dysphemism which are spoken by educated figures in discussion programs on various television stations.

METHOD

The research used qualitative method with the research instrument itself (Sugiyono, 2017). The approach used is the theory of speech acts and language politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Leech, 1993). The research data was taken from social media Youtube in the form of postings of discussion programs on several television stations which ended in debates with language that is dysphemistic. The speakers studied were debate participants who spoke language with dysphemism meaning. The data collection technique uses the note-taking technique, namely listening to the use of language and then taking notes on the research object (Sudaryanto, 2015). The research procedure is passed through the process of data collection, codification, processing, analysis, and conclusions (Anshori, 2018).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Discussion programs attended by educated figures in formal events on television stations should ideally be filled with good language and ethical competence. Even if the discussion turns into an arena for debate, ideally it should still be carried out with good language competence and ethics. Because good language and ethical competence shows good standards of intellect and integrity. However, in the conversational texts carried out by these educated figures, there are inappropriate language and ethical competencies.

Conversational Text 1

Context: Discussion on the topic of religion with sources from two well-educated figures. The first resource person was a lawyer (ES) and the second source was a person who is known to often give lectures related to religion (HK). Both are well-educated figures who are often invited to appear on various television shows. At first the discussion went smoothly and politely, then the tension increased and turned into a heated debate which was marked by the presence of language with a meaning of dysphemism.

ES: He can't think yet (1a). Thinking is being able to distinguish what is different equates to the same. That's thinking.

HK: Ana would like to answer that in Christianity it is called the trinity. Not like genetics. If in Islam there are 99 trinities if that's the case. That shows the nature of God.

ES: So this is stupid again. (1b)

HK: Well, later please. Don't fool people.

HK: Ana wants to teach you.

ES: Teach what? Are you stupid teach kite? You are crazy! (1c)

HK: Listen first!

ES: What scientific debate do you want? Using the Qur'an I answer the Qur'an! Use my logic, Jabanin. But you don't exist!

HK: But your Koran is wrong! (1d)

ES: What's wrong? I read that person wrong.

ES: Yes, the same! You dog! (1e)

Analysis

The debate started to heat up when ES answered HK with the sentence "He can't think yet" (1a). This answer violates the maxim of respect and sympathy which demeans

HK as if he does not yet have high intellectual standards so that he is considered unable to think. HK responds with a logical argument, but ES responds to the argument with a condescending sentence "Well, this is stupid again" (1b) which again violates the maxim of appreciation. The diction "stupid" spoken by ES is a language with a dysphemism meaning because lexically it means "not having knowledge". HK didn't accept ES's answer, who thought he couldn't think and was stupid, so HK protested and asked for time to "teach ES". Hearing HK say the diction "teaches", ES does not accept it because this diction can be interpreted as if HK has more knowledge than ES. ES then answered with sentence (1c) containing the diction of "stupid" and "crazy" sarcasm which clearly means dysphemism because it is swearing or insulting. In KBBI "idiot" means "very stupid" while "crazy" means "mental disorder". The heated debate reached a climax when ES swore at HK with a sentence of sarcasm that was not appropriate to say "your dog!" (1e).

The debate between ES and HK is an example of a debate that violates the maxim of sympathy and respect. Violation of these maxims is represented by choosing sarcasm vocabulary meaning dysphemism such as "stupid", "stupid", "crazy", and "your dog". The vocabulary is inappropriate to say because it can cause the face of the interlocutor to be smudged and cause anger. Even so, HK decided not to continue and chose to leave the discussion.

Conversational Text 2

Conversation Text 2 Context: RG and IS discussed in the Rosi talk show regarding demonstrations in the context of the pros and cons of extending the presidency.

RG: The right of people to speak is allowed. Why can't the right of people to speak to remove the president be allowed? Both are constitutional! Just talk! But all of you are banned, don't step down before your term of office! Why? Just talk too.

IS: Eh, there's nothing to stop it. This man is wrong (1a). Democracy says it's permissible for people to demonstrate. Nothing is wrong. Demonstrations are permissible, they are legal. If he said it was forbidden there wouldn't have been a demonstration yesterday. This is the stupid mindset I said (1b).

Analysis

Debates can take place well provided that each can respect each other by using polite language and good ethics. With this, Iman (Republika, 2010) said debate would be avoided

from long-winded conversations or responses that were slurring and inviting anger. Even though the ethics of debate has become general knowledge and guidelines learned in middle and high schools, some educated figures still argue in impolite and unethical language. Even though Iman (Republika, 2010) explained that dirty words should not be uttered in debates by educated figures who should set an example.

Is as the resource person as well as the people's representative conveyed the diction "dumb" which means "not smart" and "stupid" to RG. This expressive speech act with a sarcasm tone is not appropriate to be spoken in the mass media in a formal discussion room because it can scar the face of the person being addressed. This dysphemism-meaning speech can also undermine the integrity of IS because it will be known as an unethical representative of the people when debating. Because no matter how hot a debate is, an educated figure must still be able to control language and put ethics first. As stated by Goleman (2001) someone who has emotional intelligence will be able to recognize their own feelings and those of others, and be able to manage emotions well in themselves and in others.

Conversational Text 3

Context: a debate took place between a lawyer and members of the DPR regarding the Corruption Eradication Committee, which was considered to be no longer united.

S : Yes, why? This is what you defend!

M : Eh, I'm the accused!

S : That's precisely why I take responsibility for it!

M : eh, I don't respect you!

S : You're crazy! (1a)

(Debate)

R : Bung M, Bung S, yes, I want to say that there are students watching it.

M : yes. Don't show your stupidity. (1b)

R : You are a lawyer, you DPR have shown that we can argue in a civilized manners. So how can you show integrity if you don't even have the proper manners to speak.

Analysis

The word "crazy" spoken by S to M violates the maxim of sympathy and appreciation. This violation has the potential to tarnish M's face because crazy lexically

means "mental disorder" or "impaired memory". Accusing a debate opponent who has the status of a representative of the people as well as an educated figure with a sarcastic diction is certainly an insult. Moreover, the word was spoken in a talk show which was watched massively and also directly watched by students. In addition to humiliating the face of the debating opponent, this insult also undermines the integrity of the speaker who will be considered unethical and educated.

On the other hand, M responds to S's insults with language that is also sarcasm. He answered "Don't show your stupidity," which has the potential to tarnish S's face because he violated the maxim of respect because he thought the other person was showing his "stupidity". Accusing a lawyer with the diction "stupid" which in KBBI lexically means "does not understand quickly" can certainly tarnish his face.

Conversational Text 4

Context: Discussions took place between the director of a BUMN and members of the DPR relating to one thing. Members of the DPR were angry because they thought that the president director had not prepared the meeting materials in full.

AK : Yes, sir, it's good to go out. Because there's no point in meeting here (1a).

You are not playing games with this DPR. President Director: I'm not kidding sir.

AK : So you have to complete the meeting materials. It's really good that you are here. Who put you like this? Is it useless for a nara country like this to understand (1b)? President Director: I was invited to come.

AK : Damn you (1c)!

Analysis

A meaningful speech by AK to the president director (1a). This speech means that the president director's presence at the meeting is not useful because he does not prepare the meeting materials in full. The CEO considered AK not being serious in this meeting. The CEO then responded with an explanation that he was serious in this meeting. However, AK remained in his stance. AK thought the president director was not serious in the meeting because he did not prepare the meeting material completely. AK then said the cynical sentence again (1b) which means the CEO is not responsible for the state. The CEO responded to AK's accusations in neutral language. However, this time AK replied

with an expressive speech act of sarcasm meaning the dysphemism of "brazen!". Insolent diction will certainly tarnish the CEO's face because it has a negative connotation of "disrespectful".

Conversational Text 5

Context: Discussions took place between members of the DPR and students. Students think the DPR does not accept student aspirations.

Student : In this lawsuit there are still many problematic bills that we have asked not to pass. In essence, we gave a motion of no confidence to the DPR.

Student : gentlemen, as the DPR, do not accept our aspirations...

Student : It's a shame, we don't believe it. Today we declare a motion of no confidence in the Council of People's Traitors (1a).

Analysis

The utterance of expressive speech acts means dysphemism arises because students think that the DPR does not accept their aspirations. As representatives of the people, the DPR should ideally not pass bills that are considered problematic by the people. Because they were considered not aspirational, the student representatives finally called the DPR a council of traitors to the people. The diction of traitor has the meaning of sarcasm because lexically it means a person who is disloyal or untrustworthy. With these spoofed acronyms, students regard the DPR as traitors to the people.

Expressive speech acts with language with dysphemism are inappropriate for anyone to say. Moreover, by an educated figure in a formal context that is watched by a massive audience. Because ideally according to Sukanto (Amrozi, 2019) the higher a person's IQ should be the higher his intelligence. However, in discussions that end in heated debates, oftentimes an educated figure is even provoked by his emotions so that they consciously speak language that has a meaning of dysphemism that has the potential to tarnish the face of the opponent in the debate. The impact is not only that the face of the opponent in the debate will be tarnished, but also that his integrity as an educated figure will collapse because he is considered unable to hold back his emotions and is unethical. This fact shows that educated figures with good IQ do not always have good ethics.

An educated figure should not only be required to have IQ (cognitive) intelligence, but also must have emotional intelligence. According to Goleman (Kompas, 2022) people

who have emotional intelligence can be seen from their ability to hold back, empathize, and speak well. This happens because with emotional intelligence, people will have a high sense of introspection so they are not easily angry, selfish, hopeless, and always have a sense of openness (Amrozi, 2019). This is an obligation because educated figures who often appear in the mass media should have a great responsibility to strengthen their integrity as well as educate and provide good guidance to the public.

CONCLUSION

An educated figure should not only be required to have IQ (cognitive) intelligence, but also must have emotional intelligence. According to Goleman (Kompas, 2022) people who have emotional intelligence can be seen from their ability to hold back, empathize, and speak well. This happens because with emotional intelligence, people will have a high sense of introspection so they are not easily angry, selfish, hopeless, and always have a sense of openness (Amrozi, 2019). This is an obligation because educated figures who often appear in the mass media should have a great responsibility to strengthen their integrity as well as educate and provide good guidance to the public.

REFERENCE

- Amrozi, S.R. (2019). "Pemikiran Daniel Goleman dalam Bingkai Pembaharuan Pendidikan Islam di Indonesia". *Jurnal Al Adalah*. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.35719/>.
- Allan, Keith and Burridge, Kate. (1991). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and The Censoring of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ariyanti, L.D. dan Ida Zulaeha. (2017). "Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Humanis dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran di SMA Negeri 1 Batang: Analisis Wacana Kelas". *Seloka* .Vol 6 No 2 (2017). Doi: [10.15294/seloka.v6i2.17272](https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v6i2.17272).
- Anshori, Dadang. (2018). "Stigma Negatif Bahasa Korupsi dalam Pemberitaan Media Massa". *Litera*, Volume 17, Nomor 2, Juli 2018.
- Brown, Penelope dan Stephen C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage*. Cambridge: University Of Cambridge Press.
- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. (2005). *Psikolinguistik: Pengantar Pemahaman Bahasa Manusia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Goleman, Daniel. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. Terjemahan: Kecerdasan Emosional oleh PT Hermaya. Jakarta: Gramedia.

- Iman, Fauzul. (2010). *Etika Berdebat*. [Online]. Republika.co.id. Tersedia: <https://www.republika.co.id/berita/101963/etika-berdebat>.
- Kompas.com. (2022). *Mengenal Kecerdasan Emosional*. [Online]. Tersedia: <https://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2022/06/10/133201171/mengenalkecerdasan-emosional?page=all>.
- Kuncara dkk. (2013). “Analisis Terjemahan Tindak Tutur Direktif pada Novel The Godfather dan Terjemahannya dalam Bahasa Indonesia”. *TransLing Journal: Translation and Linguistics* Vol 1, No 1 (January 2013) pp 1-20. Tersedia: <http://jurnal.pasca.uns.ac.id>.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. Jakarta : Penerbit Universitas Indonesia (UI-Press).
- Murti, Sri. Dkk. (2018). “Tindak Tutur Ekspresif dalam Film Kehormatan di Balik Kerudung Sutradara Tya Subiako Satrio”. *Jurnal Silampari Bisa*. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.31540/silamparibisa.v1i1.7>.
- Rohmadi, Muhammad. (2004). *Pragmatik Teori dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta: Lingkar Media.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung : Alfabeta, CV.
- Srimayasandy, Syahyuni. (2021). “Kesesatan Logika Argumentasi pada Testimoni di Tayangan Televisi *Homeshopping*”. *Mediasi - Jurnal Kajian dan Terapan Media, Bahasa, Komunikasi* Vol. 2 No.2, Mei 2021.
- Suyono. (1990). *Pragmatik Dasar-dasar dan Pengajaran*. Malang: Yayasan Asih Asah Asuh Malang.
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University.
- Zulfikar, Eko. (2019). “Etika Diskusi dalam Perspektif Al-Qur’an”. *Jurnal Studi Ilmu-Ilmu al-Qur’an dan Hadis* – ISSN: 1411-6855 (p); 2548-4737 (e), Vol. 20, No. 1 (Januari 2019), hlm. 1-23, Doi: 10.14421/qh.2019.2001-01

Sumber Youtube

- CNBC Indonesia. (2022). *Tegang! Detik-Detik Dirut Inalum Diusir Anggota Komisi VII*
- Kalam Kristus. (2022). *Full! Eggi sudjana vs habib kribo | perspektif-jt*
- Kompas TV. (2022). Talk Show ROSI. *Irma suryani VS Rocky Gerung Soal Pro Kontra Perpanjangan Masa Jabatan Presiden*.
- Kompas TV. (2017). Talk Show ROSI. *KPK Tak (Lagi) Kompak*.