Social–Societal Context Element Changes in Cyberpragmatics Perspective

R. Kunjana Rahardi

Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract—This article aims to describe evidence of change to the social–societal context seen from the cyber pragmatic perspective. The substantive data sources were texts on social media in which there were objects and data of this research. The data were collected by using the observation method equipped with note-taking techniques and recording techniques. Data were analyzed by applying the contextual analysis method. We applied the contextual analysis method or the extra lingual analysis method because of the cyberpragmatic perspective of this research with a virtual external context as the main determinant of its meaning. Before the analysis, data that were classified and typified properly were triangulated with the expert and consulted on relevant theories. The results show that the social–societal context element changes occur in the following context elements: (1) setting, (2) participants, (3) ends, and (4) instrumentalities. Setting element changes occurred in the aspects of venue, time, and atmosphere. The instrumental element changed in the aspects of the kinds of tools and the range of errand communication. The participant element changed in the aspects of perception of gender, age, and social status, and the last element, changed in the aspects of monodimensional goal manifestation and multidimensional goal manifestation.

Index Terms—cyberpragmatics, evidence of changes, multidimensional perspective, social–societal contexts

I. INTRODUCTION

Language is a double-edged sword. Its use depends on the motive of the users (Rahardi, 2020a). In the disruptive era, the other side of the coin is technology. Technology is an integral part of culture and its development; it cannot be separated from the society that owns it (Goddard, 2009). Since language is the social mirror, language cannot be separated from technology, as in information, digital, and internet technology (Finegan, 1985). Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the close relationship between language and technology has great implications for the development of the study of language fields under the umbrella of linguistics (Williams, 2012). Of course, the greatest impact is on the study of meaning or pragmatic meanings in verbal communication, where language is the means of communication (Locher & Graham, 2010).

The study of meaning focuses on pragmatics (Mey, 2003; Rahardi, 2020). It continues to shift from the most conventional pragmatics, called systemic pragmatics or semantico-pragmatics due to its systemic and semantic dimensions, to the general pragmatics, to the culture-specific pragmatics, and is now developing into a new branch of pragmatics called cyberpragmatics (Locher, 2013; Orsini-Jones et al., 2017; Yus, 2011). The latest pragmatics is the most closely related to technology, especially digital-based technology and internet-based technology. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that the study of a speaker's meaning is bound to context, be it social–societal, cultural, or situational dimensions (Rahardi, 2020a; Rahardi, 2020b). The three types of context in pragmatics play a simultaneously important role in determining the speaker's meaning. Ignoring contexts in interpreting the speaker's meaning will result in misunderstanding, fuzziness, and ambiguity (Mey, 2003). However, each type of context in pragmatics plays a significant role in determining what to mean.

The social–societal context plays an important role in determining the meaning of societal pragmatics introduced by (Mey, 2003). Cultural context is very important in determining the speaker's meaning from the perspective of cultural pragmatics, both in the sense of intercultural pragmatics, cross-cultural pragmatics, and culture-specific pragmatics proposed by Blum-Kulka (1987) and Halliday (1978). The situational context plays an important role in determining meaning in the general pragmatics perspective (Leech, 2007) and subsequent pragmatic developers (Limberg, 2009; Rahardi, 2019b). Thus, in the various types of pragmatics, it is clear that there is evidence of meaning triadicities, instead of meaning disabilities as the focal point in semantics (Rahardi, 2020a; Rahardi, 2020d).

This article should contribute to pragmatic studies both in and outside of Indonesia, which have not been explored fully. The development of pragmatic studies has lagged behind other fast-growing and ever-increasing research in linguistic and nonlinguistic phenomena. The development of digital technology and internet technology impacts the increasing use of language in social media, which inevitably results in various hoaxes and hate speech. The use of language in social media is not accommodated well in various research in language studies. Consequently, the issues of meaning in verbal communication are not elaborately researched. The ensuing consequence is the rampant cases of confusion, fuzziness, and misunderstanding in social media communication. Now is the right momentum for the study

of pragmatics to evolve from general pragmatics to virtual or cyberpragmatics. Similarly, the study of contexts in pragmatics must evolve from conventional external contexts to virtual external contexts.

This short paper focuses only on the socio-societal context from the cyberpragmatic perspective. The dimensions of the social–societal context to be described in this paper deal with the nature of changes, namely the changes to the elements of context. In certain cases, the description of the changes will be more exhausted to the aspects of each element of the social–societal context. As mentioned earlier, the changes are the results of the development of information technology, digital technology, and internet technology. It is important to describe the evidence and aspects of the element changes so that the interpretation of digital and virtual dimension speech is easier and clearer. Based on the description, the research problem is formulated as: "What is the evidence of the social–societal context element changes found in cyberpragmatics?" In agreement with the formulated problem, this article's objective is to describe the evidence of the social–societal context element changes in cyberpragmatics.

II. THEORETICAL REVIEWS

In this article, two basic theories are discussed as a framework of reference, namely the theory related to the changes from systemic pragmatics to cyberpragmatics (Locher, 2013; Yus, 2016), and the theory linked to the changes from conventional external context to virtual external context (Berry, 2006; Beyer, 2007; Rahardi, 2018). Regarding the first theory, it is worth noting that the study of the speaker's meaning is not independent of the semantic meaning (Chen, 2017). The pragmatic study is still oriented to two branches, namely semantics, and pragmatics. The systemic semantic meaning study is known as the systemic pragmatics era or semantico-pragmatics (Ray, 2004; Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020). Thus, the study of meaning is still dependent on the study of semantic meaning, which is dyadic.

The rigor of the study of meaning emerged coincidentally with the interdisciplinary linguistic sciences such as ecolinguistics (Gerbig, 2010; Kravchenko, 2016). Ecolinguistics was further developed into metaphorical ecolinguistics and naturalistic ecolinguistics (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020). Both branches of ecolinguistics emerged to respond to formalists' perspectives in linguistics who view language as being homogeneous. In its development, the sociology of language evolved into sociolinguistics, focusing on language variations. Contexts in sociolinguistics are needed to identify language variations, while contexts in ecolinguistics are needed to identify the role of the environment as metaphorical and naturalistic (Mühlhäusler & Peace, 2006; Wimberley & Scott, 2017). Thus, from the functionalists' perspective, the entity of contexts is seen as important as its existence.

Functionalism in linguistics assumes that language is heterogeneous. Language is never singular and homogeneous as the formalists believe (Jaszczolt, 2018; Wijana, 1997). The study of meaning is understood along that line. Originally, the study of meaning focuses on the dyadic meaning of a word. Recently, the study of meaning has focused on the triadic meaning of a word. The triadic meaning is derived from the involvement of and dependence on contexts because language is never independent of the context (context-bound) (Rahardi, 2019a; Verschueren, 1985). Although the study of meaning has shifted from the pure semantic meaning to the study of the speaker's meaning, in its early development, the functionalists had their footings on two sides, namely the semantic side and the pragmatic side.

The next stage is the development of general pragmatics. The development of pragmatic rules is linked to pragmatic parameters, pragmatic principles, Cooperative Principles, politeness principles, and other linguistic principles based on Western languages and cultures (Sperber & Wilson, 2002; Wearing, 2015). The study of language in non-European and non-American countries has not been widely explored. Thus, the pragmatic rules formulated based on the study of European and American languages are followed, borrowed, and applied blindly to the study of Mediterranean and Asian languages. Of course, the rules are not always applicable to all. The principle of linguistic politeness and its maxims, for example, cannot always be implemented in Asian society and cultures (Leech, 2007; Locher & Graham, 2010). Similarly, the cooperative principle and its maxims are not always suitable for non-Western communities and cultures. Thus, the development of general pragmatics, which led to the study of meaning based on external linguistic factors, was admittedly phenomenal in its heyday. However, it is no longer appropriate to apply it to the local languages and cultures. Meanwhile, local cultures possess a wealth of cultural wisdom and extraordinary cultural values (Rahardi, 2020; Roudometof, 2015).

Hence, the rigor to study meaning based on a specific local culture began. This development inspired cultural pragmatics, such as intercultural, cross-cultural, and culture-specific pragmatics. Therefore, pragmatics evolved into intercultural pragmatics, cross-cultural pragmatics, and culture-specific pragmatics (Wierzbicka, 2012; Yu, 2011). From systemic pragmatics to cultural pragmatics and its variations, pragmatics' development confirms the pragmatic studies' gap as described earlier. However, along with pragmatic development, globalization is also crucial in affecting all aspects of social life. The industrial revolution and the emergence of globalization gave birth to the glocalization perspectives proposed by Graddol (Beyer, 2007; Roudometof, 2015). In turn, they led to remarkable developments in information technology.

Language is increasingly complex as it involves aspects of information technology and digital devices. The development of increasingly complex matters is driven by the internet of things perspective of life (Palacio & Gustilo, 2016; Widiana, 2015). Language is inseparable from the technology-ridden reality. The original and simple function of a language to develop common sense and a vehicle for strengthening interpersonal cooperation seems to have been distorted. The growing use of language for different genres and purposes on social media has inevitably created hoaxes,

hate speech, and other language function abuse (Rahardi, 2020b). A new perspective in pragmatics, called cyberpragmatics, which is virtual, emerged in 2011 (Locher, 2015; Yus, 2011). Interpreting language cannot be independent of the virtual contexts as an inevitable impact of digital and internet technology manifested in various social media contexts such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc. With the advent of cyberpragmatics, the basis and concern of sociolinguistic studies have shifted from the social community to the virtual community (Yus, 2016). In the past, the similarity of the verbal repertoire between individuals creates a speech community. Now, the parameter has changed. The speech community has shifted to a virtual community.

The virtual community is not based on the similarity of verbal repertoire or the similarity of language competence (Schneider, 1999). The virtual community is characterized by the common interest in certain public figures, making the news in the digital media and the internet (Yus, 2016). Therefore, the netizens or the virtual community may not know each other, do not speak the same language, do not share the same cultural roots, and live thousands of kilometers away. Despite the long distance across different time zones, digital technology makes it possible for them to form a virtual community. Communication and interaction can be built and established well. They can even go beyond the social community in the past. This has led the researcher to examine the evidence of social–societal context elements and their aspects (Gonzáez-Lloret, 2012; Rahardi, 2019b). It guides researchers to examine and observe more carefully and deeply the evidence of changes in social–societal context elements and their aspects. The preliminary study context is divisible into three, namely the social–societal context, cultural context, and situational context. The social–societal context is based on society (Rahardi, 2020b).

The social context has a horizontal dimension, while the societal context is vertical. Social contexts are intertwined with social distance and social equality, while societal contexts are intertwined with social status and social ladder. The social and societal contexts are very crucial to determine the speaker's meaning from the perspective of sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics, proposed by Leech (2007), and the societal aspects, proposed by Mey (2003). The social contexts have been identified, while the local context is elaborated by Rahardi (2017). Mey (2003) further explains the social context, and the local context is developed further by Rahardi (2017). The social–societal context is also intertwined with the cultural context. This context refers to the various cultural dimensions shared in society, including cultural knowledge, cultural behavior, cultural artifacts, and the cultural wisdom held by society. The nature of cultural context has been discussed by Blum-Kulka (1987), Halliday (1978), Rahardi (2016), Suszczynska (2011), and Wierzbicka (2012).

The last type of context is situational context. Verschueren (1985) has specifically featured the situational context in Pragmatics. The general pragmatic studies typically address this general situational context. Subsequently, the virtual external context is currently being studied by Rahardi (2019b). This virtual external context will be very useful to study pragmatics from the perspective of cyberpragmatics (Dewi & Simanjuntak, 2017). In Rahardi's observation, the conventional external context has changed the context's elements and aspects. The result of the change is what Rahardi refers to as a virtual external context. The evidence of the changes is described in his articles, such as the change in the speaker and addressee, and other interlocutors. In the conventional external context, the three elements of context are usually seen from the dimensions of age, gender, and background (Hymes, 1979; Milroy & Gordon, 2003).

However, from the perspective of cyberpragmatics, the elements to consider in the interlocutors are aspects of their life, life philosophy, social circle, daily life, life mission, etc. The aspects attached to the interlocutors are very complex. Information on the interlocutors' gender and age alone will only inform the language variations. The pragmatic meaning of the speech will be correctly interpreted by taking into account the complex aspects mentioned earlier. Consider the other contextual elements, such as the channel of speech. The channels used to speak and communicate in the present are very different from those in the past. People needed to use "amplifiers" to hear their voices clearly by people from a long distance. For example, in remote villages, devices of pasimology, such as the sound of slit bamboo drums, bells, etc., are still used to signal incidents and summon villagers (Limberg, 2009; Patterson, 2010).

At present, such a device is ubiquitous and within a hand's reach, as in the "digital gadget." With digital devices such as smartphones, people can spread the news worldwide in just a matter of seconds by simply clicking or tapping the "share" button. On the one hand, the speed of information transmitted with the "digital gadget" device is an advantage (Palacio & Gustilo, 2016; Tarr & Warren, 2002). News travel in a fast, time-efficient, and effective manner. On the other hand, information speed is at the expense of language use, which is used carelessly. This may lead to long-term irrevocable damage to the language. It is so easy for religious groups, delinquent juveniles, and anarchist groups to plan and organize a crime or terrorist attack, and in just a matter of seconds, they orchestrate a series of attacks to destroy their targets.

In this paper, pragmatic theory shifts from systemic pragmatics to the cyberpragmatics; similarly, the theory of context changes from conventional external contexts to virtual external contexts. These contexts are used as a reference framework in this article.

III. METHODS

This research is descriptive-qualitative type. The source of this research's locational data is a variety of social media available on smartphones. The substantive data sources are texts on social media in which there are objects and data of this research. Furthermore, the object of this research is the evidence of a shift in the socio-societal context. This

research's data are excerpts of speech containing the object of research, which proves the shift in the social–societal context (Rahardi, 2020b). Therefore, it is obvious that the object of research, and its context, is the manifestation of the data in this study. The data were collected using the observation method, which is equipped with note-taking techniques and recording techniques. The recording and recording results are then transcribed for identification, selection, classification, and data typification (Mahsun, 2005).

Furthermore, the data were analyzed by applying the contextual analysis method. This contextual analysis method is applied by basing and linking the context. This contextual analysis method is also called the equivalent analysis method, especially the extra lingual equivalent analysis. The contextual analysis method or the extra lingual analysis method is applied because this research's perspective is the cyberpragmatics perspective with a virtual external context as the main determinant of its meaning (Locher, 2013). Before applying the analysis, data that has been classified and typified properly is triangulated with the expert and consulted on relevant theories. The purpose of implementing data triangulation is to ensure the validity of the analyzed data. After the triangulation process is complete and the data analysis process is done properly, the final step is to present the results of this study's analysis. Presentation of the analysis results is carried out by applying informal methods (Sudaryanto, 2015).

IV. RESULTS

In this section, two things are presented, namely research findings and discussions of the research findings. The researcher deliberately separates the research results from the discussion with the intention that these two things are clear and have a deep description. The following shows the presentation of the two parts presented one by one.

Elements of social–societal contexts change following the development of digital and internet technology. In addition to the context elements' changes, aspects of each social–societal context element are likely to change. The context elements are based on Dell Hymes' speaking grid, a classificatory grid as a descriptive framework for the ethnography of communication. Speaking is the mnemonic device to describe the setting, participants, ends, act sequence, keys, instrumentalities, norms, and genre. In this research, the setting can be differentiated into two, namely, the setting of place and the setting of time. The participants' element can be seen as two kinds, namely speakers as participants and hearers as participants. The element of objectives or ends can also be differentiated into two, namely the single and multiple ends. In addition, the element of norms can be divided into two, namely the norms of interaction and interpretation. The following table shows evidence of the changes.

TABLE 1
EVIDENCE OF SOCIAL–SOCIETAL CONTEXT CHANGES IN CYBERPRAGMATICS

Social–Societal Context Elements	Change Evidence	
	Existing	None
Settings of Time	√	
Settings of Place	√	
Speakers as Participants	√	
Hearers as Participants	√	
Single Ends	√	
Multiple Ends	√	
Acts Sequence		√
Keys of speaking		√
Passimologic Instrumentalities	√	
Digital Instrumentalities	√	
Norms of Interaction		√
Norms if Interpretation		√
Genres		√

V. DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 shows that the changes occur in the following grids: (1) participants, (2) setting, (3) ends, and (4) instrumentalities. Changes in the setting element occurred in the aspects of venue, time, and atmosphere. Changes in the participant element occurred in the aspects of perception of gender, age, and social status. Changes in the end element occurred in the aspects of monodimensional goal manifestation and multidimensional goal manifestation. Changes in the instrumentalities element occurred in the aspects of the kind of tools and the range of errand communication. Each piece of evidence of changes will be discussed in detail. The element of participants can be seen as two kinds, namely speakers as participants and hearers as participants. The element of settings can be differentiated into two, namely, the setting of place and time. The element of objectives or ends can also be differentiated into two, namely the monodimensional and multidimensional ends. Each of the above elements will be discussed in detail below.

A. Evidence of Context Change in the Participant's Element

The speaker and the addressee play very important roles in speaking and communication. With the speaker and the addressee, the other participants are the third party or audience involved in a conversation. In a real-life conversation, the presence of an audience determines the linguistic codes being used. The presence of a third party who has no

business in the subject matter may cause the speaker and the addressee inconvenience. The third party can be anyone who intentionally appears on the scene and wants to hear the conversation or any passersby who accidentally appear on the scene and overhear what is being said (Finegan, 1985; Schneider, 1999). The third-party could be any individual or a group of individuals. The age and gender of the speech participants were relevant to determining linguistic codes in the past. For instance, talking to children is different from talking to adults or the elderly. Similarly, the linguistic codes used to talk to men are different from those used to talk to women. In the study of language variations and the study of meaning, these elements are considered important.

From the perspective of cyberpragmatics, the aspects of participants are not the same as the ones presented earlier. When digital and internet technology is crucial to determine meaning in communication, the aspects discussed earlier do not play a significant role. Such aspects are not needed in a virtual conversation on social media whose participants have different cultural and social backgrounds (Yus, 2012). When we send a message, share news, and upload information and images on social media, should such aspects be considered? The answer is no. Anyone can share anything on social media in an instant, and it will be available online for anyone to see, regardless of their background, social interest, socio-political background, social circles, etc.

In other words, there has been a change in the boundaries of a region. Communication has become completely 'borderless' from one person to another. The aspects of age and gender are not important to be discussed in a virtual conversation. The comment sections in social media posts may involve people from different gender and age groups. The linguistic codes and manifestations are not determined by aspects of participants as identified earlier. This proves that in the virtual external context, the elements of participants have changed. Understanding the speaker's meaning by considering the change of the elements of the participants in cyberpragmatics will not result in the interpretation of the true meaning (Locher, 2013). Thus, the pragmatics' focus should be on different aspects from the earlier pragmatics because the aspects and context elements are different from those in the past. Table 2 showed the social–societal context changes in the element of participants.

TABLE 2
SOCIAL–SOCIETAL CONTEXT CHANGES IN THE ELEMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Elements of Participants	External Context	
	Conventional	Virtual
Gender	Female or male	Any gender
Age	Young or old	Any age
Social Status	Degree of social status	None
Member of Community	Social community	Virtual community

B. Evidence of Context Change in the Settings Element

One of the most important social–societal elements to be considered in interpreting the meaning of an utterance is the setting. Setting refers to the situation where an utterance is spoken. However, the setting is limited to the situation and the physical and social setting in which the utterance occurs (Milroy & Gordon, 2003). In a specific social setting, such as a family gathering in a Javanese community, people tend to speak formally and politely. The language used considers acceptable manners and etiquette to ensure that everyone feels valued and respected by others. In contrast, in the factory setting, factory workers in a particular factory will use different linguistic codes from those who work in a different setting in a different region. It is evident that in the social–societal context, a speech event's physical setting will greatly determine the linguistic codes (Fill & Penz, 2017).

In a sacred physical setting, such as the funeral service in a Javanese village, people tend to behave solemnly and speak in a hushed tone. It is culturally understood that, on such a sacred occasion, people speak softly and behave politely. In the church, the mosque, or other places of worship, people are expected to behave politely and speak softly in a hushed tone. The social setting determines the linguistic codes used in speech events. This cultural norm was a part of a social convention in the past. However, in the era when people believe in freedom of speech and democracy, the physical, social, and environmental settings seem to have changed dramatically (Clyne, 2006). Social settings are no longer considered in social media speech events. In the digital era, people no longer care about the social setting, which required politeness from past participants. In this day and age, people are more concerned with the message's urgency (Rahardi, 2020a).

Once again, urgency is the sole determinant. In times of grief, people can send messages without considering the addressee's psychological setting. For instance, a student may text a lecturer through social media as if nothing special happened, even though he knows that the lecturer is in a grieving psychological state. A few decades ago, when a neighbor died, people in the whole neighborhood came to pay respect to the dead and to help around the house. Not a single kiosk or food stall opened, no one went to school or work, and children stopped playing. The whole neighborhood was mourning the bereaved family.

In the digital era, the setting of the speech event has changed dramatically. It is no longer relevant to interpret the speaker's meaning in the current pragmatic study from the conventional external contexts as in the past. Someone is forced to compromise, delay, or even cancel her/his intention when he/she considers the conventional elements too seriously instead of the virtual external contexts (Rahardi, 2020). Thus, the evidence of a change of setting is very

important to note to understand the speaker's meaning in communication in the era of disruption. This proves that pragmatic studies should focus on more complex dimensions, unlike systemic pragmatics, general pragmatics, and culture-specific pragmatics (Culpeper, 2010). Social–societal context changes in the element of settings (Table 3).

TABLE 3
SOCIAL–SOCIETAL CONTEXT CHANGES IN THE ELEMENT OF SETTINGS

Elements of Settings	External Context	
	Conventional	Virtual
Venue	Determining linguistic codes	Undetermining linguistic codes
Time	Determining linguistic codes	Undetermining linguistic codes
Atmosphere	Determining linguistic codes	Undetermining linguistic codes

C. Evidence of Context Change in the Ends Element

The "ends" element refers to the speaker's purpose in communicating with the addressee and other participants. In communicating and interacting with each other, people almost always have a goal or purpose in mind. A person who habitually greets his neighbor positively is considered a polite member of society. On the contrary, a person who does not socialize with their neighbors, let alone greet them, is considered arrogant, unfriendly, and antisocial. The Javanese people use the expression "*ilang Jawan*e" to refer to someone who no longer observes the Javanese cultural norms. While waiting at a train station before a train ride, people normally strike up a polite conversation with fellow passengers. In such a setting, people tend to use phatic speech function to break the silence. When Indonesians meet fellow Indonesians in a foreign country, say in Europe or America, they will greet each other and strike up a conversation even though they have not known each other previously, simply because they are foreigners in the country. Thus, it is obvious that people greet each other and communicate for a purpose, whether the purpose is substantive, phatic, or others.

People have a communicative purpose when speaking. The linguistic codes people use may serve the function of small talk, a phatic function, or a substantial referential function commonly happening in verbal communication (Chen, 2017; Siegel, 2008). The notion of "ends" occurs in speech events and is considered to be true in sociolinguistics, systemic pragmatics, general pragmatics, and culture-specific pragmatics. The question remains whether in cyberpragmatics the notion of "ends" still applies. In other words, has the notion of "ends" changed in manifestations? It is safe to say that people have their "ends" in mind when they converse with others. However, the goals and purpose of communication in the present time are more multidimensional than the monodimensional goals and purposes of communication in the past (Chen, 2017).

The multidimensional goal or "end" occurs because life is getting more complex nowadays. An utterance that was interpreted individually in the past may have multiple meanings now. The utterance may have multiple ends. Metaphorically, in the past, when people shot a target, the bullet only hit one target at a time. In the era of cyberpragmatics, when people shoot, the bullet may hit several targets simultaneously. Thus, interpreting the purpose of people's speech in the era of cyberpragmatics is not as simple as it was in the past. People may not show their true colors in social media posts (Rasmussen, 2003). Behind their seemingly good image, they may have bad or even devilish intentions. This illustrates the changes from conventional external contexts to virtual external contexts. It is important to understand the new phenomena to warn people to be vigilant against strangers with hidden motives prowling in social media. Social–societal context changes in the element of ends (Table 4).

TABLE 4
SOCIAL–SOCIETAL CONTEXT CHANGES IN THE ELEMENT OF ENDS

Elements of Ends	External Context	
	Conventional	Virtual
Roles of ends	Determining linguistic codes	Undetermining linguistic codes
Characteristics of ends	Monodimensional ends	Multidimensional ends

D. Evidence of Context Change in the Instrumentalities Element

The element of social–societal contexts is related to the notion of a "channel" or medium to express the speaker's meaning to the addressee. In the past, to speak to a big audience, people used a loudspeaker or "amplifier" so that the meaning or purpose can be delivered well. As technology advances, the development of audio and video technology makes an impressive replacement (Swidler, 1986). To measure the success of a stage performance, the quality of audiovisual equipment during the show becomes the main consideration. News broadcasts are conveyed through loudspeaker devices to ensure the good quality of channels or "instrumentalities" in delivering the message. It is common to consider this as the conventional external context that applies to various pragmatics outside cyberpragmatics (Haider, 2019).

In today's internet era, the medium or "channel" to deliver meaning has changed dramatically. The medium to spread information is a small device within a hand's reach. Through smartphones, any information can go viral in a matter of seconds. In the past, tools to amplify the message were limited by time and space. However, from the perspective of cyberpragmatics, the channel is identified as smartphones. Through smartphones, the spread of the message or intention

is done simultaneously by tapping the sharing button in the smartphone (Binkley et al., 2012). The dissemination speed of the messages or information should go hand in hand with the quality of the information being delivered. Unconfirmed errors or inaccuracies in the information, no matter how small, will be irrevocable once they have spread to the world.

The rampant spread of fake news or hoaxes in social media lately is disconcerting as they are available to be read and accessed by everyone all over the world regardless of their inaccuracies. In the present-day world, one person can have several smartphones. They are also constantly connected to social media through their smartphones. When a person gives inaccurate information, instantly, many people respond to the errors for everyone to see. The dramatic changes in the "instrumentalities" of the virtual external context should be seriously heeded by the speakers and other speech participants from the perspective of cyberpragmatics (Bandura, 2002). Social–societal context changes in the element of instrumentalities (Table 5).

TABLE 5
SOCIAL–SOCIETAL CONTEXT CHANGES IN THE ELEMENT OF INSTRUMENTALITIES

Elements of Settings	External Context	
	Conventional	Virtual
Kind of tools	Passimological	Digital
Range of communication	Within the range	Beyond the range

VI. CONCLUSION

In a nutshell, it is important to restate the four pieces of evidence of changes in the social–societal context from the perspective of cyberpragmatics. The four pieces of evidence are in the elements of (1) participants, (2) setting, (3) ends, and (4) instrumentalities. The shift of elements of social–societal contexts from the conventional type to the virtual one determines the quality of communication in the disruptive era. Linguistics studies, especially about the branch of pragmatics, must refocus the core of the study, that is, the study of the speaker's meaning must be based on virtual external contexts. The impacts of informational, digital, and internet technology must be wisely considered in the study so that this branch of linguistics focusing on the study of speakers' meaning will run on the right track in the disruptive era. More extensive and in-depth observations of other elements of other social–societal contexts are called for to formulate evidence of changes more holistically. The detailed description and illustration of the evidence will significantly contribute to the growing research in the field of cyberpragmatics. Understanding the meaning of utterances in the digital and internet contexts will be easier to be done. Similarly, language will evolve with the community and culture where it is spoken, instead of being left behind due to limited research and observations of the community's language phenomena. Research rigors to examine the linguistic phenomena involving digital and digital technology must be encouraged in these modern times.

REFERENCES

[1] Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology*, *51*(2), 269–290. https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00092

[2] Berry, J. W. (2006). Contexts ofacculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 27–42). Cambridge University Press.

[3] Beyer, P. (2007). Globalization and glocalization. In J. A. Beckford & J. Demerath, *The SAGE handbook of the sociology of religion* (pp. 98–118). SAGE Publications Ltd.

[4] Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., Miller-Ricci, M., & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, B. McGaw, & E. Care (Eds.), *Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills* (pp. 17–66). Springer Netherlands.

[5] Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics*, *11*(2), 131–146. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5

[6] Chen, J. (2017). Research trends in intercultural pragmatics. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *37*(4), 530–533. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2016.1204903

[7] Clyne, M. (2006). *Some thoughts on pragmatics, sociolinguistic variation, and intercultural communication*, *3*(1), 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2006.005

[8] Culpeper, J. (2010). *Historical sociopragmatics.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[9] Dewi, U. P., & Simanjuntak, R. R. (2017). Social networking and identity construction in computer-mediated communication: Cyberpragmatics analysis of fandom online community in YouTube commentaries. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Communication and Information Processing*, 375–378. https://doi.org/10.1145/3162957.3163005

[10] Fill, A. F., & Penz, H. (2017). *The routledge handbook of ecolinguistics* (1st edition). Routledge.

[11] Finegan, E. (1985). Language: The social mirror. *Linguistic Society of America*, *61*(3), 729–730.

[12] Gerbig, A. (2010). The ecolinguistic reader: language, ecology and environment. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *4*, 91–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200308668051

[13] Goddard, C. (2009). *Not taking yourself too seriously in Australian English: Semantic explications, cultural scripts, corpus evidence*, *6*(1), 29–53. https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2009.002

[14] González-Lloret, M. (2012). Pragmatics: Overview. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved October 2, 2022, from https://www.academia.edu/9324037/Pragmatics_Overview

[15] Haider, I. (2019). Assessing interlanguage pragmatics through interactive email communication. In S. Papageorgiou & K.M. Bailey, *Global Perspectives on Language Assessment* (pp. 17). Routledge.

[16] Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.

[17] Hymes, D. H. (1979). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes, *Socio-Linguistics: Selected Reading* (pp. 269–293). Penguin Books.

[18] Jaszczolt, K. (2018). Pragmatics and philosophy: In search of a paradigm. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *15*(2), 131–159. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2018-0002

[19] Kravchenko, A. V. (2016). Two views on language ecology and ecolinguistics. *Language Sciences*, *54*, 102–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2015.12.002

[20] Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide?. *De Gruyter Mouton*, *3*(2), 167–206. https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.009

[21] Limberg, H. (2009). Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *41*(7), 1376–1394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.003

[22] Locher, M. A. (2013). Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated communication in context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *47*(1), 128–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.002

[23] Locher, M. A. (2015). Interpersonal pragmatics and its link to (im)politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *86*, 5–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.010

[24] Locher, M. A., & Graham, S. L. (2010). Introduction to interpersonal pragmatics. In M. A. Locher & S. L. Graham (Eds.), *Interpersonal Pragmatics* (pp. 1–16). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214338.0.1

[25] Mahsun. (2005). *Metode penelitian bahasa* [Language research methods]. Raja Grafindo Persada.

[26] Mey, J. L. (2003). Context and (dis)ambiguity: A pragmatic view. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(3), 331–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00139-X

[27] Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2003). Sociolinguistics: models and methods. In L. Milroy & M. Gordon, *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 1–22). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

[28] Mühlhäusler, P., & Peace, A. (2006). Environmental discourses. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *35*(1), 457–479. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123203

[29] Orsini-Jones, M., Lloyd, E., Cribb, M., Lee, F., Bescond, G., Ennagadi, A., & García Portillo, B. (2017). The Trouble with cyberpragmatics: embedding an online intercultural learning project into the curriculum. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, *7*(1), 50–65. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.2017010104

[30] Palacio, M. A., & Gustilo, L. (2016). A pragmatic analysis of discourse particles in Filipino computer mediated communication. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies*, *16*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2016-1603-01

[31] Patterson, M. L. (2010). Nonverbal communication. In I. B. Weiner & W. E. Craighead, *The corsini encyclopedia of psychology* (pp. 1–2). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0610

[32] Rahardi, K. (2016). Personal and communal assumptions to determine pragmatic meanings of phatic functions. *Lingua Cultura*, *10*(2), 95-98. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i2.897

[33] Rahardi, K. (2019a). Pragmatic perspective on phatic functions and language dignity in a culture-based society. *Asia Proceedings of Social Sciences*, *4*, 35–37. https://doi.org/10.31580/apss.v4i1.554

[34] Rahardi, K. (2019b). Contexts as the determining roles of Javanese phatic 'Monggo': Culture-specific pragmatics perspective. *Indonesian Language Education and Literature*, *5*(1), 47-60. https://doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v5i1.5035

[35] Rahardi, R. (2020). Ketriaditisan konteks pragmatik tuturan tidak santun: perspektif kultur spesifik [The Triadicity of Pragmatic Contexts on Impolite Utterances: A Culture-Specific Perspective]. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, *9*, 106-128. https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v9i1.2340

[36] Rahardi, R. K. (2017). Pragmatic phenomena constellation in specific culture dimension language study. *International Journal of Humanity Studies (IJHS)*, *1*(1), 84-92. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.v1i1.677

[37] Rahardi, R. K. (2018, 5 - 6 May). *Elemen dan fungsi konteks sosial, sosietal, dan situasional dalam menentukan makna pragmatik kefatisan berbahasa* [The elements and functions of social, societal, and situational contexts in determining the pragmatic meaning of language practicality]. Prosiding Seminar Tahunan Linguistik Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia [Conference session]. https://repository.usd.ac.id/31870/

[38] Rahardi, R. K. (2019). Integrating social, societal, cultural, and situational contexts to develop pragmatics course learning materials: Preliminary study. *Jurnal Gramatika: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, *5*(2), 169-178. https://doi.org/10.22202/jg.2019.v5i2.3572

[39] Rahardi, R. K. (2020a). On emblematic meanings of traditional medicinal herbs: Local wisdom values in the perspective of culture-specific ecopragmatics. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, *7*(1), 16-25. http://arbitrer.fib.unand.ac.id/index.php/arbitrer/article/view/187/134

[40] Rahardi, R. K. (2020b). *Pragmatik konteks ekstralinguistik dalam perspektif cyberpragmatics* [Extralinguistic context pragmatics in the perspective of cyberpragmatics]. Amara Book.

[41] Rasmussen, G. (2003). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *28*(2), 253–261.

[42] Ray, L. (2004). Pragmatism and critical theory. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *7*(3), 307–321. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431004044195

[43] Roudometof, V. (2015). Theorizing glocalization: Three interpretations. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *19*(3), 391-408. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431015605443

[44] Schneider, E. W. (1999). Sociolinguistic theory: Linguistic variation and its social significance. *Journal of English Linguistics*, *27*(1), 49–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/00754249922004426

[45] Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. (2020). Reduplication of word class of Indonesian prosedic morphology: Towards a semantico-pragmatic perspective. *Jurnal Kata*, *4*(1), 167-176. https://doi.org/10.22216/kata.v4i1.5249

[46] Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, modularity and mind-reading. *Mind & Language*, *17*(1-2), 3–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0017.00186

[47] Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa: Pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan secara linguistis* [Methods and various language analysis techniques: An introduction to research on cultural vehicles in a linguistic manner]. Sanata Dharma University Press. Retrieved October 19, 2022, from http://www.library.usd.ac.id/web/index.php?pilih=search&p=1&q=0000128363&go=Detail

[48] Suszczynska, M. (2011). Pragmatics across languages and cultures. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*(11), 2872–2875.

[49] Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, *51*(2), 273–286. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095521

[50] Tarr, M. J., & Warren, W. H. (2002). Virtual reality in behavioral neuroscience and beyond. *Nature Neuroscience*, *5*(11), 1089–1092. https://doi.org/10.1038/nn948

[51] Verschueren, J. P. (1985). *The pragmatic perspective.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[52] Wearing, C. J. (2015). Relevance theory: Pragmatics and cognition. *WIREs Cognitive Science*, *6*(2), 87–95. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1331

[53] Widiana, Y. (2015). A sociopragmatics study on social criticism in meme comics. *Prasasti: Conference Series*, *4*(1), 70-82. https://doi.org/10.20961/pras.v0i0.76

[54] Wierzbicka, A. (2012). *Cross-cultural pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton.

[55] Wijana, I. D. P. (1997). Pragmatik dan pembelajaran bahasa asing [Pragmatics and foreign language learning]. *Humaniora*, *5*, 26-30. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.1905

[56] Williams, L. (2012). Pragmatics of second language computer-mediated communication. In L. Williams, *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0942

[57] Wimberley, E. T., & Scott, P. (2017). *Ecopragmatics.* Common ground research networks. Retrieved November 29, 2022, from https://www.amazon.com/Ecopragmatics-Edward-T-Wimberley/dp/1612296122

[58] Yu, K.-A. (2011). *Culture-specific concepts of politeness: Indirectness and politeness in English, Hebrew and Korean requests*, *8*(3), 385–409. https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2011.018

[59] Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[60] Yus, F. (2012). *Cyberpragmatic*s. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[61] Yus, F. (2016). Towards a cyberpragmatics of mobile instant messaging. In J. Romero-Trillo, *Yearbook of Corpus Linguistics and Pragmatics 2016: Global Implications for Society and Education in the Networked Age* (pp. 7-26). Springer International Publishing.

R. Kunjana Rahardi, M. Hum is an Associate Professor in Linguistics and Pragmatics at Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. His education history is IKIP Sanata Dharma: English Language Education, Gadjah Mada University: Indonesian and Javanese Literature, and Gadjah Mada University: Literature. His subjects of study are linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and sociopragmatics. His Scopus ID: 57211394211, and ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7228.