

Political Discourse and its Effects on Higher Education: An analytical Study



Muhammad Sohail	Undergraduate Student of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Malakand
Dr. Sajjad Ali (Corresponding Author)	Assistant Professor, Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Malakand sajjadjmc@uom.edu.pk
Muhammad Irfan	Researcher at University of Limerick, Republic of Ireland
Ubaid Khan	Undergraduate Student of Journalism & Mass Communication, University of Malakand

Abstract: *This study aims to critically assess students' perceptions regarding the use of derogatory language by politicians and its broader societal implications. The researchers adopted a quantitative research methodology, utilising a survey design to systematically collect data. The survey was administered through both online platforms and face-to-face interactions, employing a self-constructed questionnaire comprising 43 closed-ended questions. A simple random sampling technique was employed to select participants, ensuring a representative study population. Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The findings reveal that the majority of respondents do not condone the use of derogatory, offensive, abusive, insulting, or disrespectful language. Moreover, they believe that discouraging such language could foster social cohesion and harmony. This study highlights the significant impact of derogatory language on various societal segments, emphasising the imperative for politicians to avoid such rhetoric to promote peace and societal well-being.*

Keywords: Politicians, Derogatory Language, Role of Media, Students Perception, Effects on Society

Introduction

Language plays a crucial influence in shaping public opinion as well as the implementation of political policies and decisions. Politicians' most effective tool for persuading their audience is language (David, 2014). Political discourse is supposed to be a productive discussion that helps to solve societal problems, but in recent years, it has devolved into a verbal battle where insulting language, hate speech, harsh slang, and other offensive language are utilized in place of productive discussion. Political language and speeches have an immediate impact on the audience, making politicians the society's thought leaders. (Hayat et al., 2023).

Politicians have used insulting rhetoric against their political rivals' parties, groups, and constituents throughout the past 50 years during political campaigning, election debates, and Jalsas (huge public gatherings). They insulted people, used slurs, and made derogatory statements about their race, gender, and sexual orientation. (Msughter, 2023). Such kinds of words for example Knut, nigger, darkie, cockroach, bitch etc. (Cervone, 2021). Derogatory language can take many different forms, such as verbal bullying, hate speech epithets, and sexism. It is any disrespectful statement that is meant to insult the opponent. For instance, the name "Knut" refers

to a woman and implies that she is dependent, weak, and unimportant, as well as that her genital system [reproductive system] is under attack.] (VANZAN, n/d).

Derogatory Language in Politics

Political camping refers to the election process, where candidates are elected, and when the election time comes the pressure and tension are always heavy, the contender comes to face each other. Political camping is a planned set of activities carried out by politicians and political groups. When they were face to face, they exchanged insults, slurs, harsh statements, and abusive language. Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton both made disparaging comments about one other throughout the 2016 US presidential election. they brought up their private life, activities, interpersonal relationships, insults, and offensive language. Donald Trump is referred to by Hilary Clinton as a "racist" who disrespects women. Hillary Clinton is described as "corrupted" by Donald Trump. (Fasakin, Oyero, Oyesomi, Okori.2017).

The use of derogatory language and slurs in Pakistani politics can be traced back to the early 1970s, specifically during Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's tenure as Field Marshal Muhammad Ayub Khan led a popular movement against him. Bhutto resorted to insulting and humiliating his political adversaries publicly, aiming to capture the audience's attention and diminish the standing of leaders from rival political parties. In a more recent context, former Prime Minister Imran Khan has accused opposition politicians of employing derogatory terms like "mouse" and "mice" during interviews and large public gatherings known as jalsas (Rais, March 18, 2022). This trend underscores the persistence of such language in Pakistani politics over the years.

The key characteristic of all leaders is a stance and declaration that is constructive. He deals only in matters of religion. He is a terrible leader who communicates ineffectively with opponents by using derogatory rhetoric. Islam can govern leadership, which is a significant aspect. Leadership should be built on fairness and a decent communication style even when there are

opponents if an ideal society is to exist. No of the situation, negative emotional language can affect how political programmers are judged. Insensitive assessments of targets result from this negative emotional language. Politicians' emotional language, particularly negative emotional language, leaves a stronger impression on people than plain emotional language does.

Additionally, Politicians often use metaphors in their speeches and other forms of communication to influence voters. At other times, metaphors can assist people understand an issue that is difficult to them. However, it might mislead the general public about what's really going on. In their communications with the public, political figures utilize ambiguous language. People's moral or ethical standards are influenced by language that employs political figures' methods. She saw how politicians strategically employed metaphors and used rhetoric to persuade the audience to support their position.

Similar to this, a nasty and impolitic political environment is detrimental to society's political trust. In addition to changing people's attitudes, offensive speech harms institutions of government. Moreover, when these disputes are broadcast on television, mistrust persists and political leaders gain power. Playing dirty by using insulting language and placing blame is a practice that predates the nation's political structure. Political leaders should speak on pertinent subjects rather than maligning your opponent. To insult such a horrible president with immoral and inappropriate rhetoric is really dishonorable. PTI (Tehreek-e-Insaaf) seized control of education. Leaders serve as a reminder of their nation's disciplined class. They ought to represent the pinnacle of morality, peace, and decency.

Imran Khan, the head of the PTI, however, used the word "Gadha" (donkey).PMLN backers. In Karachi, Tehreek-i-Insaaf supporters actually threw stones at a donkey and taped a piece of paper with the word "Nawaz" on it. When the PTI chairman used the epithet "donkey" during the 2018 N-League Supporters Election Campaign, this mentality spread throughout

society. Some members of society referred to it as a repulsive act of brutality and ruthlessness. Uncivil stuff can elicit immediate illusory gratitude, but in reality, it taints society and politics (Sarwar, Haq, Shafiq, Shahzad, 2020).

History of Student Politics

Ancient Greece, where educational institutions like the Academy in Athens promoted a culture of political activity and intellectual discussion, is where student politics have their roots. The idea of student participation in politics gained hold during the European Renaissance because students imbibe social and political ideals in colleges. College and university life is heavily characterized by student politics, which has had a major impact on societies and political systems around the world. The paragraph that follows provides a succinct history of student politics, highlighting important events and movements that have developed throughout time. Origins and Rise of Student Activism. (Beissinger and Kotkin, 2014).

The 18th and 19th centuries, which experienced significant social and political change, are regarded as the start of the modern era of student politics. Students started forming political clubs and organizations to advance democracy, national freedom, and civil rights. The French Revolution (1789–1799) and subsequent movements inspired students throughout Europe to engage in politics. (Blum, & Harvey, 2012).

There was a sharp increase in student participation after World War I. The emergence of youth-led movements like the German Student Union (1918) and the May Fourth Movement in China (1919) highlighted students' desire for social and political change. Students were heavily involved in the anti-colonial movements in Africa, Asia, and Latin America during the interwar era.

The 1960s saw a shift in student politics with widespread activism and demands for social justice. The American Civil Rights campaign and the global anti-war campaign against the Vietnam War have awakened students all around the world. Famous incidents like the May 1968 French protests and the Prague Spring in the Czechoslovak Republic show the value and

efficacy of student engagement. (Feinberg, Jonas, 2004).

Student politics have faced challenges under repressive regimes. In countries like China, the Soviet Union, and many other authoritarian regimes, student movements have been suppressed through censorship, surveillance, and state-sponsored violence. Despite these obstacles, students have persisted in promoting social change and democratic values. (Gilbert, 2008).

The shifting dynamics of the digital era in the twenty-first century have transformed student politics. Thanks to online platforms and social media, students today have more opportunities than ever to band together, express their thoughts, and take part in political discourse. Student-led efforts for gender equality, gun control, and halting climate change have achieved significant progress worldwide. (Lee, 2019).

Role of Media in Derogatory Language

In the age of digitalization, social media platforms play a pivotal role in connecting people and shaping public sentiment. However, recent times have witnessed a surge in negative attacks on individuals across various spheres, such as academics, athletes, politicians, religious and political leaders, and other prominent figures, whether intentional or unintentional. Regrettably, the widespread dissemination of such content can lead to social unrest, socio-political turmoil, and even physical violence. Our research endeavor focuses on categorizing and identifying the offensive content prevalent in social media messages, aiming to curb and deter hate campaigns. Modern-day social media posts frequently incorporate meme images alongside textual comments and replies, presenting novel challenges. To address this classification challenge, we employ an enclosed transformer network with encapsulated transformers (Bhowmick, Ganguli, Pau, & Sil, 2021). This approach aids in combating the negative impacts of offensive content on social media, contributing to a more constructive online environment.

Statement of the problem

The problem at hand revolves around the impact of derogatory language employed by politicians within university student politics, a concern that surpasses other related issues. This matter holds profound implications for the political atmosphere within universities and the overall well-being of students engaged in politics. The use of derogatory language exacerbates polarization, division, and the degradation of political discourse. Furthermore, it fosters feelings of disappointment, apathy, and disillusionment with the political system among student communities.

Beyond these social consequences, derogatory language can inflict detrimental emotional and psychological effects, particularly on marginalized groups, and further normalizes disrespectful behavior within the academic setting. Addressing this issue is vital not only for the harmony within university politics but also for nurturing a respectful and inclusive environment that promotes healthy political engagement and psychological well-being among students.

Objectives

- To investigate the impact of derogatory language used by politicians on students' political communication.
- To assess the effects of derogatory language on students' behavior and attitudes, particularly within the context of student politics.
- To examine how offensive language influences interactions among members of student political organizations, including its potential effects on group dynamics and relationships.

Research Questions

RQ1: What are the effects of derogatory language used by politicians on students' political communication?

RQ2: How does derogatory language impact students' behavior and attitudes?

RQ3: What are the effects of offensive language

on interactions among members of student political organizations, and how does it influence group dynamics?

RQ4: What is the overall effect of derogatory language on students, both in terms of their political engagement and their psychological well-being?

Hypotheses

H1: Media is presumed to be the most influential source of information for student political activism.

H2: It is expected that derogatory language used by politicians through media will have a positive motivational impact on the respondents.

H3: It is hypothesized that the use of derogatory language by politicians has a more negative impact on society than a positive one.

Review of Literature

Language is a fundamental tool through which individuals exchange thoughts, ideas, attitudes, and emotions across various contexts. This ability, bestowed by divine providence, distinguishes humans from other organisms. The utilisation of language varies depending on the situation, allowing individuals to issue commands, express emotions, convey information, and draw attention to the beauty of nature. Language can be categorised into two primary forms: formal and informal. Formal language is characterised by meticulous attention to word choice, phrase structure, and pronunciation, commonly used in formal settings such as schools, seminars, news reports, official documents, and business correspondence. In contrast, informal language is employed in casual interactions, particularly among friends, where fewer rules govern communication (Bibi, Ullah, & Raf, 2023).

The term "hate speech" extends beyond a mere semantic label used to categorise certain types of speech. It functions as a term of negative evaluation and a focal point for criticism of the actions or entities it describes. The identification of hate speech carries significant implications as it represents a specific form of discourse, often contested due to its definition. Some argue that

the term "hate speech" itself is problematic, defining it as "virulent dislike of a person for any reason," which can be misleading. Hate speech typically refers to speech that disparages individuals or groups based on characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, race, or disability (Anderson & Barnes, 2022).

The detection of offensive language has become increasingly critical, given language's dual potential to convey both positive and negative intents. Language serves as a medium for calling attention, describing, instructing, and persuading others. However, the negative effects of abusive language are profound, ranging from short-term emotional impacts such as irritation, fear, and self-blame, to long-term consequences like diminished self-esteem, depression, and various psychological and physical health issues. The use of abusive language can significantly alter individuals' behaviour and well-being, as noted in various studies (Guardian Report).

In contemporary society, derogatory language, threats, verbal abuse, hate speech, and slurs are frequently employed by politicians and citizens alike, particularly on social media platforms (Mehmood et al., 2022). The proliferation of harsh and offensive language is evident in both verbal and written communication, exacerbated by the rise of social media culture. Platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, and Twitter facilitate the exchange of videos, photographs, and messages among users of diverse cultural, religious, racial, and ethnic backgrounds (Khan et al., 2023; Khan et al., 2022). These platforms also become breeding grounds for cyberbullying, where offensive language in online comments often targets specific individuals, including celebrities, politicians, and various demographic groups (Akhter et al., 2021; Shakoor et al., 2022).

The 2013 Pakistani General Elections witnessed the use of cyber hatred as a political tool, where harsh language, irritation, and character assassination were employed as part of the digital electoral movement and poll rigging controversy. Political opponents were criticised using strong analogies and adjectives in tweets to gain more engagement. For instance, the

Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf (PTI) intensified its anti-Pakistan Muslim League (Nawaz) (PML-N) chants, epitomised by the "#GoNawazGo" movement. Similarly, the PML-N countered with the "#RoImranRo" hashtag, leading to a proliferation of hostile exchanges on social media (Siddiqua, 2021).

The general elections held in Pakistan on July 25, 2018, further highlighted the degradation of political discourse, with the language used raising fundamental questions about the nature of a civilised, advanced, and tolerant society. The use of character-attacking comments has become commonplace, with political leaders frequently resorting to bizarre, offensive, and controversial language during campaigns. Such language has permeated parliamentary discourse, a sacred space for law-making and policy formulation, further eroding the decorum expected in political communication (Sarwar et al., 2018; Bajwa et al., 2022).

Political language is often riddled with profanity, including lying, virtue signalling, and the use of code words and dog whistles. The pervasive use of derogatory language in politics presents significant challenges, notably in understanding why politics is particularly conducive to such language. While deceit and manipulation are not exclusive to politics, the prevalence of such behaviour among politicians necessitates further exploration. The malevolent nature of political discourse, characterised by the frequent use of offensive language, calls for a critical examination of the factors driving this trend (Gibbons, 2023).

Social media has emerged as a powerful tool for political engagement and discourse on a global scale, significantly influencing voting behaviour and public opinion. The utilisation of new media for political purposes has evolved rapidly, with political parties increasingly relying on platforms like YouTube and official websites to present their manifestos and other materials. During the 2013 general elections in Pakistan, political parties extensively used social media to engage with young voters. Today, both the ruling party and the opposition disseminate their political views through modern media, with young people actively responding to propaganda

in cyberspace (Zaheer, 2018).

The popularity of Twitter has surged in recent years, becoming a key platform for political discourse and public opinion shaping (Khan et al., 2022). In Japan, for example, Twitter has been recognised as a significant influencer of political public opinion. However, the platform has also become a breeding ground for cyberbullying, particularly in the early stages of social media development. Studies have highlighted the challenges of consistently identifying misogynistic or hostile messages, with online harassment of women in Japanese politics being a notable concern (Fuchs & Schäfer, 2021).

The incidence of online abuse among politicians has increased during major elections, such as the general elections in the UK and the US in 2015 and 2017. The rise in racial, religious, and ethnic intolerance has led to widespread harassment of politicians on platforms like Twitter (Gorrell et al., 2018).

Recent scholarship has consistently indicated the significant impact of derogatory language used by politicians on various aspects of individuals' lives, including political communication, behaviour, attitudes, group dynamics, political engagement, and psychological well-being. This body of research underscores the pervasive influence of such language on society and highlights the urgent need for further examination and potential intervention in this area (Bibi, Ullah, & Raf, 2023; Gibbons, 2023; Anderson & Barnes, 2022; Mehmood et al., 2022; Akhter et al., 2021; Siddiqua, 2021; Fuchs & Schäfer, 2021; Sarwar et al., 2018; Zaheer, 2018; Gorrell et al., 2018).

Similarly, the integration of modern Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies has introduced innovative methods for detecting and addressing hate speech and offensive language online (Irfan, Almeshal, and Anwar, 2023). AI-driven tools have the capacity to analyse vast amounts of data across multiple platforms, identifying patterns of harmful speech with a high degree of accuracy (Irfan et al., 2023). Machine learning algorithms are employed to flag content that exhibits characteristics of hate speech, enabling

platforms to take pre-emptive measures in mitigating the spread of harmful rhetoric. AI's role in this context is not limited to detection; it also extends to the analysis of the underlying sentiments driving such discourse (Irfan et al., 2023). By analysing linguistic patterns, AI can differentiate between various forms of speech, such as hate speech, abusive language, and politically charged rhetoric, thereby providing a nuanced understanding of the social and psychological factors at play (Irfan, Murray, and Sajjad, 2023). Moreover, AI's ability to adapt and learn from new data allows it to remain effective in the face of evolving language patterns and emerging forms of hate speech (Irfan, Murray, and Ali, 2023; Irfan, Aldulaylan, and Alqahtani, 2023).

However, the deployment of AI in this domain also presents challenges. Issues related to bias in algorithmic decision-making, the context-dependent nature of language, and the ethical implications of automated content moderation are critical areas that require ongoing research and refinement (Irfan, Murray, and Ali, 2023). As AI continues to evolve, its role in detecting and addressing hate speech will likely become increasingly sophisticated, offering both opportunities and challenges for ensuring responsible and effective communication in the digital age.

Theoretical Framework

Albert Bandura introduced the Social Learning Theory in 1977, emphasizing the intricate interplay between environmental factors and cognitive processes in human learning. According to this theory, individuals learn from one another through observation, modeling, imitation, and their surroundings. Social learning theory takes into account both cognition and behavior. Bandura incorporated two essential concepts into this theory. First, he highlighted the presence of mediating processes between external stimuli and responses. Second, he emphasized observational learning, where behavior is acquired by observing others in the environment.

In observational learning, individuals, especially children, observe and learn from the interactions

and behaviors of those around them, including family members, peers, and teachers. These observed individuals, referred to as models, play a significant role in shaping behavior. Bandura emphasized that observational learning is not possible without the involvement of cognitive processes. These mental factors intervene in the learning process, determining whether a new response is acquired. Essentially, cognitive processes mediate between external influences and individual responses, shaping the learning experience (McLeod, 2011).

The social learning theory is a psychology theory that place a strong emphasis on the contribution of social interaction observational learning of the formation of human behavior .Albart Bendura created in the 1960s, and it has science gained traction in a number of Despines including psychology ,education ,and criminology .(Bandura & Walters 1963).

Indeed, Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory is highly relevant to the issue at hand, which pertains to the impact of derogatory language used by politicians in university student politics. Bandura's theory posits that individuals, including students, learn through observation, modeling, and imitation of others in their environment. In the context of the problem described, students may be influenced by the derogatory language used by politicians, either directly or indirectly.

Students in university political settings may observe politicians using derogatory language as a means of communication. They may model their own behavior and communication style after what they witness from these political figures.

Students may imitate the use of derogatory language because they perceive it as an effective or normative way to engage in political discourse. This could contribute to the degradation of political discourse within the university.

Bandura's theory highlights the role of the environment in shaping behavior. In this case, the political environment within the university, including the behavior of politicians, can significantly influence students' attitudes and

actions.

Bandura's theory also emphasizes the role of cognitive processes, such as decision-making and reasoning. Students may engage in cognitive processes when exposed to derogatory language, leading them to either accept or reject such behavior.

Bandura's Social Learning Theory suggests that students may be influenced by the derogatory language used by politicians in their university political contexts, which can affect their behavior, attitudes, and political engagement. This influence could contribute to the polarization, division, and disillusionment mentioned in the problem statement.

Research Methodology

In this research the researchers applied quantitative research methodology because this is the suitable methodology to find out the students opinion about the derogatory language of politicians effects on them and society overall.

In this research the researchers used surveys design in both soft and hard from survey was conducted because it has easy accessible which allowing respondents to participate at their convenience. Online surveys remove geographic restrictions. It is possible to engage without physically distributing forms or shipping them to participants in different areas. This gives researchers the chance to collect data from a variety of responders.

In this research the researcher has taken the population of all universities BS students in Malakand division because to find out variation among the opinions and beliefs about the abusive language of politicians.

In this research the researcher used simple random sampling of probability sample because the researcher collected data from all the available students of University of Malakand.

A questionnaire is a type of research tool that asks a set of pertinent questions of respondents in order to gather information. These tests have an interview-style approach and either written or oral questions. Online, over the phone, on paper,

or in person, questionnaires can be qualitative or quantitative and don't always need to be delivered with a researcher present. In this research the researcher used online and on paper both Questionnaire.

In this research the independent variable is

politician derogatory language and dependent variable is the effects on students and society. The researchers applied Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Data was analyzed in descriptive statistics. Frequency distribution has been done, while presented the data in tabulation form.

Findings

Table 1. Gender and age of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	163	96.4
Female	6	3.6
Total	169	100.0

Age	Frequency	Percent
18	7	3.8
19	10	5.9
20	22	13.0
21	21	12.4
22	41	24.3
23	35	20.7
24	20	11.8
25	10	5.9
26	2	1.2
27	1	.6
Total	169	100.0

Table 1 presents the gender and age distribution of the respondents. The data indicates that 96.4% of the respondents were male, while 4% were female. Additionally, it highlights the age groups among the respondents: 9% were aged

18, 6% were aged 19, 13% were aged 20, 12% were aged 21, 24% were aged 22, 21% were aged 23, 12% were aged 24, 6% were aged 25, 1% were aged 26, and 0.6% were aged 27

Table 2. Semester of the respondents

Semester	Frequency	Percent
1 st	55	32.5
2 nd	34	20.1
4 th	10	5.9
6 th	31	18.3
8 th	39	23.1
Total	169	100.0

Table 2 provides an overview of the respondents' current semester enrollment. It reveals that 32.5% of the respondents were in their first

semester, 20.1% were in their second semester, 5.9% were in their fourth semester, 18.3% were in their sixth semester, and 23.1% were in their

eighth semester.

Table 3. Expose to media

	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Only a little	63	37.3	Less than hours	36	1.3
To some extent	48	28.4	1 to 2 hours	58	34.3
Very much	58	34.3	3 to 4 hours	45	26.6
Total	169	100.0	Above	30	17.8
			Total	169	100.0

Table 3 presents the respondents' exposure to various media sources. It reveals that 37.3% had minimal exposure, 28.4% had moderate exposure, and 26.6% had significant exposure to different media sources. The table further illustrates the specific types of media the respondents engaged with: 12.4% read newspapers, 16% read magazines, 8.9% listened to the radio, 10.7% watched television, and

49.7% used social media. Additionally, 2.4% selected other media options.

In Table 3, the data indicates the amount of time respondents spent on media consumption. Specifically, 21.3% spent less than an hour, 34.3% spent 1 to 2 hours, 26.6% spent 3 to 4 hours, and 16.6% spent more than 4 hours engaging with media.

Table 4. Favorite time and Place to expose media

	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Morning	36	21.3	At home	100	59.2
Afternoon	58	34.3	At university	18	10.7
Evening	45	26.6	Others	51	30.2
Others	30	17.8			
Total	169	100.0	Total	169	100.0

Table 4 provides insights into the preferred times for media exposure among the respondents. Specifically, it shows that 21.3% of respondents favored morning media exposure, 34.3% preferred exposure during the afternoon, and 26.6% favored evening media consumption. Additionally, 17.8% of respondents indicated

other preferred times for media exposure.

The table also reveals the locations where respondents use social media. Among them, 59.2% reported using social media at home, 10.7% at the university, and 30.2% at various other locations.

Table 5. Opinion about politicians derogatory language through media

	Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent		Frequency	Percent
Not at all	11	6.5	Newspaper	37	21.9	PPP	9	5.3
Only a little	21	12.4	Magazine	21	12.4	PTI	51	30.2
To some extent	82	48.5	Radio	5	3.0	PMLN	39	23.1
Very much	55	32.5	TV	12	7.1	ANP	46	27.2
			Social media	87	51.5	JUI	5	3.0
			Others	7	4.1	Ji	19	11.2
Total	169	100.0	Total	169	100.0	Total	169	100.0

Table 5 provides an overview of politician's derogatory language usage through various media channels as reported by the respondents:

Regarding the extent of derogatory language usage through media:

6.5% of respondents indicated that politicians do not use derogatory language through media at all.

12.4% stated that it happens only a little.

48.5% reported that politicians use derogatory language to some extent.

21.9% chose the option "very much" to describe the extent of derogatory language usage.

The table also illustrates the specific media channels through which politicians use derogatory language:

21.9% of respondents mentioned derogatory language usage through newspapers.

12.4% cited magazines.

3.0% referred to radio.

7.1% pointed to television.

51.5% identified social media as a platform for such language.

4.1% selected other options.

The table further reveals the political parties associated with the usage of derogatory language through media, with the following percentages:

5.3% attributed it to PPP.

30.2% to PTI.

23.1% to PMLN.

27.2% to ANP.

3.0% to JUI.

11.2% to Ji.

This data provides valuable insights into the perception of derogatory language usage by politicians through different media channels and its association with political parties.

Results

Table 6. Cross Tabulation of Gender and Effective source of information

H1: Media is presumed to be the most influential source of information for student political activism.

Gender * Do you think media is the most effective source of information for students Political Activism Cross tabulation

		Do you think media is the most effective source of information for students Political Activism				
		not at all	only a little	to some extent	very much	Total
Gender	male	17	25	50	71	163
	female	0	0	5	1	6
Total		17	25	55	72	169

Table 6 presents a cross-tabulation of gender and the perceived effective source of information for student political activism. The results substantiated the hypothesis, showing that out of 169 respondents, 72 individuals believed that media is the effective source of information for

students' political activism in the area. This finding provides empirical support for the hypothesis, indicating that a significant portion of the respondents, across genders, recognizes the media as a crucial source of information in the realm of student political activism.

Table 7. Media role in motivation of the respondents towards derogatory language usage

H2: It is expected that derogatory language used by politicians through media will have a positive motivational impact on the respondents.

	strongly agree		agree		netural		disagree		strongly disagree	
	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count
Politician derogatory language usage also change my political activism	15.4%	26	29.0%	49	17.8%	30	30.2%	51	7.7%	13
Politician derogatory language usage also change my language	19.5%	33	23.7%	40	22.5%	38	24.9%	42	9.5%	16
Disrespect attitude of politician towards other politicians also motivate positively	15.4%	26	18.3%	31	17.2%	29	27.8%	47	21.3%	36
critical attitude of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	9.5%	16	21.9%	37	21.9%	37	34.3%	58	12.4%	21
critical attitude of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	8.9%	15	7.7%	13	11.8%	20	42.6%	72	29.0%	49

Insulting attitude of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	9.5%	16	7.7%	13	20.1%	34	42.0%	71	20.7%	35
Offensive attitude of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	7.1%	12	16.6%	28	27.2%	46	30.8%	52	18.3%	31
Allegation of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	16.0%	27	22.5%	38	18.9%	32	22.5%	38	20.1%	34
Slang language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	26.0%	44	17.2%	29	16.6%	28	21.3%	36	18.9%	32
Foul language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	30.2%	51	13.6%	23	11.2%	19	24.9%	42	19.5%	33
Obscene language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	7.1%	12	11.8%	20	21.9%	37	27.8%	47	31.4%	53
Harmful language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	8.3%	14	8.3%	14	8.9%	15	23.7%	40	50.9%	86

Disgusting language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	10.7%	18	20.1%	34	8.3%	14	19.5%	33	41.4%	70
Indecent language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	17.2%	29	19.5%	33	14.2%	24	29.0%	49	20.1%	34
Taboo language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	17.2%	29	18.9%	32	13.6%	23	30.8%	52	19.5%	33
Hate Speech of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	16.0%	27	17.8%	30	14.8%	25	26.0%	44	25.4%	43
Ethnic & racial language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	13.6%	23	20.7%	35	13.6%	23	30.8%	52	21.3%	36
Gender discriminatory language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	11.8%	20	21.9%	37	16.0%	27	25.4%	43	24.9%	42
Disabilities exposing language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	12.4%	21	23.7%	40	14.2%	24	29.0%	49	20.7%	35

Harassment oriented language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	20.1%	34	14.8%	25	12.4%	21	25.4%	43	27.2%	46
Film dialogue oriented language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	10.1%	17	23.7%	40	18.3%	31	26.0%	44	21.9%	37
Vulgar language of politician towards other politicians also motivate me positively	11.2%	19	11.2%	19	12.4%	21	40.8%	69	24.3%	41

The customized Table presents data related to students' motivation regarding positively addressing derogatory language. However, the findings contradict the initial hypothesis of the study. Most students disagreed with the notion that they changed their language, attitude, behavior, and discouraged the use of harmful, offensive, abusive, taboo, insulting, ethnic and racial language, gender-discriminatory

language, harassment-oriented language, and vulgar language in politics. This suggests that, contrary to the hypothesis, students did not show a significant positive motivation toward addressing derogatory language, nor did they adopt behaviors or attitudes that actively discouraged such language in political discourse.

Table 8. Politician derogatory language impact on society

H3: It is hypothesized that the use of derogatory language by politicians has a more negative impact on society than a positive one.

	strongly agree		agree		netural		disagree		strongly disagree	
	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %	Count	Row Total N %
I think usage of politician derogatory language has negative impact on society	61	36.1%	65	38.5%	19	11.2%	23	13.6%	1	0.6%

I think usage of politician derogatory language has negative impact on Students Politics	68	40.2%	63	37.3%	16	9.5%	19	11.2%	3	1.8%
I think usage of politician derogatory language leads to polarization and division in our society	63	37.3%	60	35.5%	22	13.0%	23	13.6%	1	0.6%
I think usage of politician derogatory language leads to disappointments in followers and society overall	47	27.8%	86	50.9%	14	8.3%	20	11.8%	2	1.2%
I think usage of politician derogatory language leads to indifferences in followers and society	61	36.1%	64	37.9%	23	13.6%	16	9.5%	5	3.0%
I think due to usage of politician derogatory language followers and society overall loss of faith on political system	62	36.7%	63	37.3%	30	17.8%	14	8.3%	0	0.0%
I think usage of politician derogatory language motivate me to use myself as well as	25	14.8%	31	18.3%	33	19.5%	44	26.0%	35	20.7%

The customized Table 8 provides an overview of the respondents' perceptions regarding the impact of politicians' derogatory language on society. The majority of respondents agreed that this language not only affects society as a whole but also has an impact on the followers of the specific political party due to the use of abusive and offensive language by the media.

These study results align with the hypothesis, suggesting that derogatory language used by politicians indeed has an impact on society. The findings underscore the notion that such language has repercussions that extend beyond individual politicians or political parties, affecting the broader social fabric and their respective supporters.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The study's findings offer a comprehensive view of how respondents engage with media, perceive its role in political information, and react to politicians' derogatory language:

Media Engagement: The majority of respondents use media for information, awareness, education, and entertainment. Social media is the most popular platform due to its accessibility, interactivity, personalization, and real-time updates. This aligns with the global nature of media exposure and its role in providing diverse information and expert analysis.

Time Spent on Media: Most respondents dedicate 1 to 2 hours to media consumption, driven by factors such as time constraints, conscious media consumption, personal preference, and balancing their interests.

Preferred Media Consumption Times: Afternoon is the preferred time for media consumption, offering breaks from work or study, opportunities for entertainment, social interaction, and engagement in personal interests and hobbies.

Social Media Usage: Social media is predominantly used at home, providing comfort, privacy, extended availability, personal space for self-expression, connectivity with family and friends, and customization options.

Media as an Effective Source: Media is viewed as the most effective source of information for students regarding political matters. Respondents highly value media's reach to global politics, its contextualization of political issues, interactive engagement, diverse information sources, and expert analysis.

Media Exposure for Political Information: Social media is the primary source for political information due to its effectiveness in mobilizing political activism, conveying political messages, presenting diverse perspectives, providing real-time updates, and offering accessibility.

Politicians' Derogatory Language: Politicians

predominantly use derogatory language through social media, appealing to a broad audience. Nontraditional and unethical language usage is noted in major political parties, including PTI, ANP, and PMLN, with the influence of their leaders being a contributing factor.

Students' Behavior and Perception: Students generally do not adopt or promote politicians' abusive and foul language. They do not encourage disrespect towards other politicians and refrain from using critical, insulting, offensive, and harmful language. This indicates a divergence between political rhetoric and student behavior.

Perceived Impact on Society: Most respondents believe that politicians' derogatory language negatively affects society, student politics, and leads to polarization, division, disappointment among followers, indifference, and a loss of faith in the political system.

These findings provide valuable insights into the complex relationship between media, politics, and the attitudes and behaviors of students, shedding light on their motivations, preferences, and reactions to derogatory language in the political sphere.

Conclusion

In summary, the findings of this study provide valuable insights into the media consumption habits, preferences, and attitudes of university students, as well as their reactions to derogatory language used by politicians. The following key conclusions emerge from the research:

The majority of respondents are highly engaged with social media as their primary source of information. This preference is driven by the platform's accessibility, user-friendly interface, interactive features, personalization options, and real-time updates.

Most respondents allocate one to two hours for media consumption, with a preference for afternoons and evenings. This usage pattern is influenced by time constraints, deliberate media consumption, personal choices, and the comfort and privacy of home settings, which also enable self-expression and connectivity with family and friends.

Social media stands out as the most effective medium for accessing political information among students. It offers exposure to global politics, facilitates contextual understanding of political issues, promotes interaction and engagement, and provides access to diverse perspectives.

Respondents favor social media for political information due to its capacity to mobilize political activism, convey political messages, offer a wide range of viewpoints, provide real-time updates, and ensure easy accessibility.

Politicians predominantly employ derogatory language on social media platforms, appealing to a broad and diverse audience. Notably, major political parties like PTI, ANP, and PMLN exhibit a higher tendency to resort to non-traditional and unethical language compared to others.

Students, in contrast, do not emulate politicians in adopting abusive or derogatory language. They refrain from inciting hatred toward other politicians and avoid using critical, insulting, derogatory, obscene, harmful, or indecent language. Their conduct remains respectful and does not involve hate speech, harassment, or vulgarity.

Overall, respondents hold the view that derogatory language in politics has a negative impact on society. It affects student politics, contributes to polarization, diminishes faith in the democratic process, and leads to disappointment and apathy.

In conclusion, this study offers a comprehensive understanding of how university students engage with media, perceive its role in politics, and respond to derogatory language in political discourse. It emphasizes the importance of responsible political communication and highlights the distinct behavior and attitudes of students in this context. These findings contribute to a broader discourse on the influence of media and political rhetoric on young individuals and their role in shaping the democratic fabric of society.

6.1. Recommendations

- Politicians are encouraged to harness

the power of social media as it is a highly influential source of information and communication for the public.

- Politicians should refrain from using derogatory, abusive language, and hate speech on social media platforms. Instead, they should prioritize respectful dialogue, constructive problem-solving, and engaging in civil debates that promote inclusivity and mutual understanding.
- It is advisable for politicians to avoid adopting a negative language approach in their online interactions.
- Politicians should abstain from using offensive or taboo words as a means to attack other political figures.
- Politicians should steer clear of making disparaging remarks about others and refrain from employing vulgar language in their online communications.
- By adhering to these recommendations, politicians can contribute to a more positive and constructive online political discourse, fostering greater public trust and engagement in the political process.

References

- Akhter, M. P., Jiangbin, Z., Naqvi, I. R., AbdelMajeed, M., & Zia, T. (2021). Abusive language detection from social media comments using conventional machine learning and deep learning approaches. *Multimedia Systems*, 1-16.
- Anderson, L., & Barnes, M. (2022). Hate speech.
- Bandura, A. (1962). Social learning through imitation. "The President's National Medal of Science: Recipient Details/NSF-National Science Foundation." Retrieved from www.nsf.gov.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1963). Social learning and personality development. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Beissinger, M. R., & Kotkin, S. (Eds.). (2014).

- Historical legacies of communism in Russia and Eastern Europe. Cambridge University Press.
- Bhowmick, R. S., Ganguli, I., Paul, J., & Sil, J. (2021). A multimodal deep framework for derogatory social media post identification of a recognized person. *Transactions on Asian and Low-Resource Language Information Processing*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Bibi, M., Ullah, S., & Rafi, K. (2023). Use of slang language in Imran Khan's political speeches. *Global Social Sciences Review*, VIII(9).
- Blanchard, R. (2018). Response to commentaries: Meta-analysis of probability samples and other new evidence. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 47(1), 49-57.
- Blum, L. A., & Harvey, E. R. (Eds.). (2012). *The color of democracy in women's regional writing*. University of Iowa Press.
- David, M. K. (2014). Language, power, and manipulation: The use of rhetoric in maintaining political influence. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 5(1), 164-170.
- Definition of research tool | Different forms of research tool. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.civilengineeringterms.com/research-methodology/definition-research-tool-forms/>
- Dependent and independent variables. Retrieved from <https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/variables>
- Fasakin, A., Oyer, O., Oyesomi, K., & Okorie, N. (2017). Use of hate speeches in television political campaign. In *Proceedings of SOCIOINT 4th International Conference on Education, Social Sciences and Humanities-Dubai, UAE* (pp. 1382-1388).
- Feinberg, W., & Jonas, M. (Eds.). (2004). *The emergence of youth cultures: Sources, contexts and reactions*. Transaction Publishers.
- Ferber, R., Sheatsley, P., Turner, A. G., & Waksberg, J. (1980). What is a survey?. EMBRAPA-DMQ.
- Fuchs, T., & Schäfer, F. (2021, October). Normalizing misogyny: Hate speech and verbal abuse of female politicians on Japanese Twitter. *Japan Forum*, 33(4), 553-579.
- Gibbons, A. F. (2023). Bad language makes good politics. *Inquiry*, 1-30.
- Gilbert, D. (2008). *Student politics in Africa: Representation and activism*. Zed Books.
- Goertzen, M. J. (2017). Introduction to quantitative research and data. *Library Technology Reports*, 53(4), 12-18.
- Gorrell, G., Greenwood, M., Roberts, I., Maynard, D., & Bontcheva, K. (2018, June). Twits, twats and twaddle: Trends in online abuse towards UK politicians. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media* (Vol. 12, No. 1).
- Grusec, J. E. (1994). Social learning theory and developmental psychology: The legacies of Robert R. Sears and Albert Bandura.
- Hayat, M. S. Z., Ali, M., Sultan, R., Fatima, N., & Akhtar, S. (2023). Critical discourse analysis of violence in the speeches of Pakistani political leaders. *OEconomia*, 6(2), 114-139.
- Independent vs. dependent variables | Definition & examples. (2022). Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/independent-and-dependent-variables/>
- IntechOpen, Cervone, et al. (2021). The language of derogation and hate: Functions, consequences, and reappropriation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 40(1), 80-101.
- Irfan, M., Aldulaylan, F., & Alqahtani, Y. (2023). Ethics and privacy in Irish higher education: A comprehensive study of artificial intelligence (AI) tools implementation at University of

- Limerick. *Global Social Sciences Review*, VIII(II), pp. 201-210. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023\(VIII-II\).17](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023(VIII-II).17)
- Irfan, M., Almeshal, Z. A., & Anwar, M. (2023). Unleashing transformative potential of artificial intelligence (AI) in countering terrorism, online radicalisation, extremism, and possible recruitment. *Global Strategic & Security Studies Review*, VIII(IV), pp. 1-15. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023\(VIII-IV\).01](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023(VIII-IV).01)
- Irfan, M., Murray, L., & Ali, S. (2023). Insights into student perceptions: Investigating artificial intelligence (AI) tool usability in Irish higher education at the University of Limerick. *Global Digital & Print Media Review*, VI(II), pp. 48-63. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.31703/gdpmr.2023\(VI-II\).05](https://doi.org/10.31703/gdpmr.2023(VI-II).05)
- Irfan, M., Murray, L., & Ali, S. (2023). Integration of artificial intelligence in academia: A case study of critical teaching and learning in higher education. *Global Social Sciences Review*, VIII(I), pp. 352-364. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023\(VIII-I\).32](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023(VIII-I).32)
- Irfan, M., Murray, L., & Sajjad, (2023). The role of AI in shaping Europe's higher education landscape: Policy implications and guidelines with a focus on Ireland. *Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review*, 4(2), pp. 231-243. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol4-iss2-2023\(231-243\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol4-iss2-2023(231-243))
- Irfan, M., Murray, L., Aldulayani, F., Ali, S., Youcefi, N., & Haroon, S. (2023). From Europe to Ireland: Artificial intelligence's pivotal role in transforming higher education policies and guidelines. *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 33(S1), pp. 1935-1959. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373690104_From_Europe_To_Ireland_Artificial_Intelligence_Pivotal_Role_In_Transforming_Higher_Education_Policies_And_Guidelines
- Irfan, M., Murray, L., Aldulaylan, F., Alqahtani, Y., & Latif, F. (2023). Sentiments and discourses: How Ireland perceives artificial intelligence. *Remittances Review*, 8(4), pp. 3625-3642. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.33182/rr.v8i4.250>
- Khan, A. N., Ali, S., Amin, S., & Irfan, M. (2021). Effects of Facebook on exam performance of social sciences students: A case study of the University of Malakand. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 9(2), pp. 748-758. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2021.9274>
- Khan, N. U., Ali, S., & Irfan, M. (2022). Influence of mobile phone usage on the academic performance of students: A case study of Malakand Division students. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence in Control*, 14(2), pp. 1-15. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359897664_Influence_of_Mobile_Phone_Usage_on_the_Academic_Performance_of_Students_A_Case_Study_of_Malakand_Division_Students
- Khan, Z., Azeem, M., & Irfan, M. (2021). Habit of study and academic achievements in District Dir (Lower) and District Malakand. *Webology*, 18(6), Article 4025. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360159325_Habit_of_Study_and_Academic_Achievements_in_District_Dir_Lower_and_District_Malakand
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Age International Publishers.
- Lee, C. K. (2019). China's precariats. *Globalizations*, 16(2), 137-154.
- McLeod, S. (2011). Albert Bandura's social learning theory.
- Mehmood, A., Farooq, M. S., Naseem, A., Rustam, F., Villar, M. G., Rodríguez, C. L., & Ashraf, I. (2022). Threatening

- URDU language detection from tweets using machine learning. *Applied Sciences*, 12(20).
- Msughter, A. E. (2023). Nigerian press coverage of hate speeches in the Daily Trust, The Nation and The Guardian newspapers. In *The Psychology of Trust*.
- Population vs. sample: Definitions, differences and examples. (2023). Retrieved from <https://www.simplilearn.com/tutorials/machine-learning-tutorial/population-vs-sample>
- Rais, B. R. (2022, March 18). The foul language of Pakistani politics. *Arab News Pakistan*. Retrieved from <https://www.arabnews.pk/node/2044941>
- Sampling methods. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/sampling-methods/>
- Sarwar, M. S., Haq, W. U., Shafiq, J., & Shahzad, K. (2020). Effect of political leaders' televised uncivil language on society: Citizens' following of negative and non-Islamic language.
- Sarwar, M. S., Haq, W. U., Shahzad, K., & Shafiq, J. (2018). Uncivil language of political leaders and voting patterns: Measuring the impact on youth voters during Pakistan general elections. *Journal of the Punjab University Historical Society*, 33(1).
- Shakoor, A., Ali, S., Irfan, M., Muhammad, J., & Khan, A. (2022). Human rights violation reports in English and Urdu press during democracies and dictatorial regimes in Pakistan from 2002 to 2013. *Central European Management Journal*, 30(4), pp. 502-520. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.57030/23364890.cemj.30.4.48>
- Siddiqua, A. (2021). Use of cyber hate in the electoral campaigns by the mainstream political parties of Pakistan. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*. doi:10.xxxx/xxxxxxx
- Udupa, S. (2018). Gaali cultures: The politics of abusive exchange on social media. *New Media & Society*, 20(4), 1506-1522.
- Vanzan, C. (n.d.). The language of hate and its appropriation.
- Vehovar, V., Toepoel, V., & Steinmetz, S. (2016). Non-probability sampling. In *The Sage Handbook of Survey Methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 329-345).
- Vogt, W. P., Gardner, D. C., & Haeffele, L. M. (2012). *When to use what research design*. Guilford Press.
- What is a questionnaire and how is it used in research. (2022, June 29). Retrieved from <https://www.cint.com/blog/what-is-a-questionnaire-and-how-is-it-used-in-research>
- What is independent variable. (2023, March 10). Retrieved from <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/what-is-independent-variable>
- Zaheer, L. (2018). New media technologies and youth in Pakistan. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, 55(1).
- Zegeye, A. (2009). *Introduction to research methods*. Retrieved from <https://ds.amu.edu.et/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/241/Introduction%20to%20Research%20Methods.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>