

BAB I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Impoliteness is an attitude that violates the rules that have been applied in a society in social behavior. In doing communication, an individual or group should follow and pay attention to the rules of language that have been established. An individual or group is said to be polite in communication, if they follow the rules of language. However, they will be said to be impolite, if they do not follow the rules of language and the rules that apply. Impoliteness is also defined by linguistic actions that aim to attack the face of the interlocutor, which results in the speech partner feeling offended and uncomfortable or threatening the face of the speech partner (Jonathan Culpeper, 2011). Meanwhile, Pramujiono (2012) explains that impoliteness is a characteristic when communicating so that speakers tend to feel lose face. When the speech partner loses face during interaction, the speaker can be said to be impolite. So the concept of impoliteness happened when the speaker says unpleasant words and eliminates the face of the interlocutor so as to cause feelings of displeasure and trigger anger or worse cause feelings of resentment.

Impoliteness in language is a social symptom that cannot be separated from the influence of situational factors and social factors as part of non-linguistic factors (Suwito, 1983). Social factors consist of age, education level, social status, culture, closeness of relationship between speakers and interlocutors, occupation, living environment and gender. Meanwhile, situational factors consist of discussions about what, where, when, to whom, and who speaks what language.

Chair (2015) argued that impoliteness can be found in various places and times, be it in informal situations or formal situations. As for formal situations, among the examples are the impoliteness of language interactions that occur in seminars, meetings, discussion forums or debates. Informal situations are examples of impoliteness in language interactions that occur in family and social life. One example is the interaction of Indonesian netizens on social media.

Impoliteness has become increasingly common in social media interactions, especially in comment sections where anonymity and distance can lead to more aggressive behavior. The previous research shows that various impoliteness strategies, such as positive impoliteness and sarcasm, are often used by users to express disagreement or challenge others' opinions. For instance, @sud: *"You're already so*



rich is why you'd be perfect as one of the people". That statement is impoliteness because it use strategies that directly damage positive face. Face is a desire to be respected, accepted, and appreciated socially. This is one of the things that every researcher is interested in examining this topic.

Impoliteness is not uncommon nowadays, whether verbally or nonverbally, both in the real world or in the cyber world. Impoliteness is not always obvious to everyone's eyes because it depends on certain situations or contexts.

Impoliteness according to Culpeper (2016) is a disapproving attitude toward certain actions that take place in specific circumstances. Expectations or wishes with regard to social organization beliefs, such as how others perceive a person's or group's identity throughout an interaction, serve as support for this (Culpeper, 2016). Impoliteness itself is always regarded as percussive where there are still many people who think that anything that is contrary to politeness is considered impoliteness, especially among netizen who we often encounter in the digital era in various social media like today. Sometimes the impoliteness is wrapped with jokes that are only considered funny but hurt the other object being addressed. Some of them think that reprimanding someone's body size is a very normal or natural thing, but for those who receive the reprimand it may feel painful. Therefore, impoliteness is difficult to let go of in our culture, especially with the rise of social media where comments fields make it easier for others to express their opinions about something they think, so that they are not hesitate to say impoliteness. This is a problem today, that netizen often use impoliteness to other people on social media.

The topic of this research is the 2024 Indonesian presidential election. The presidential election was officially held on February 24, 2024. Elections are the process of electing government positions through a vote counting process that is carried out directly, generally, freely, secretly, honestly and fairly.

Currently, Anies Baswedan and Muhaimin Iskandar (Cak Imin) are the first presidential and vice-presidential candidates; Prabowo Subianto and Gibran Rakabuming are the second; and Ganjar Pranowo and Mahfud MD are the third. Voters weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each candidate's unique points of view. The younger generation has an important role in supporting the success of the election, for the first time the younger generation dominates the voter list. Among them, 55% of the total DPT is the Millennial Generation and also Generation Z based on the open plenary meeting of the recapitulation of the Permanent Voters List (DPT) for the 2024 presidential election. The Permanent Voters List (DPT) is an official document that contains the names of Indonesian citizens who meet the requirements to vote in elections.

Because the large number of voters from the younger generation, many of the presidential election contestants are fighting for the votes of the younger generation, including the presidential and vicepresidential candidates. The younger generation is often heralded as a generation that is technologically literate, critical in thinking, and innovative. Many campaigns from each candidate on social media have received various kinds of responses. Elections and public policies frequently become the topic of offensive comments on social media in Indonesia. Elections often trigger various perspectives and cause uproar and the most dominating is impoliteness in commenting, hate speech, hoax news that is often spread on various social media platforms.



nt study aims to put the spotlight on the kinds of impoliteness ors utilized by Indonesian netizens in the political discourse sidential and vice-presidential election, a deeper analysis of tical context is therefore required. Impoliteness is destructive, both ial media. A negative culture surrounding the use of social media politeness comments spreads widely.

One of the things that can happen in a presidential election campaign is shaping negative opinion. According to the researcher's hypothesis, shaping negative opinions is another reason for the use of impoliteness strategies. Social media has made a very important contribution in shaping the diversity and complexity of public opinion. Public opinion also has a bearing on social and political dynamics, as it can influence political choices, policy support and social movements (Ausat, 2023). The goal of opinion generation is to shape public perception in favor of a particular agenda, whether on social media in relation to a campaign or otherwise. This can be done through various strategies, such as persuasive communication, inclusion of data, and use of emotional language to create sympathy.

Studies on impoliteness strategies in online political discourse are also useful, particularly for comprehending how public opinion is influenced in the digital era. Given the increasing number of impoliteness strategies on social media, it's critical to comprehend how these strategies affect political attitudes and perceptions. In order to comprehend how impoliteness shapes online political discourse in Indonesia, this study will examine the strategies employed by Indonesian netizens in political discussions on social media.

From the above problems regarding impoliteness and social media, therefore the researcher wants to discuss impoliteness strategies on social media during the 2024 Indonesian presidential election campaign. That's because we as social media users are very curious and people want to know what kind of impoliteness is that and why most of us are not afraid to say things that are considered impolite on social media than in the real world, and with this research researchers hope that curiosity can be answered. Therefore, researchers offer a solution for all of us through this research to be more literate and aware of the importance of good manners both in the real world and in the cyber world. With this research, it can be a reference for knowledge to readers and a reference for other researchers who want to develop previous research related to this.

1.2 Research Questions

The research question in this study is formulated by two problems stated by the prior background, they are:

1. What are the impoliteness strategies used by Indonesian netizens on social media during the 2024 Indonesian presidential election?
2. What are the functions of impoliteness strategies used by netizens on social media during the 2024 Indonesian presidential election?
3. How is the form of shaping negative opinion as a function of impoliteness strategy apart from Culpeper's theory?



the Research

blems that were previously stated, this study is conducted with the es:

e impoliteness strategies used by Indonesian netizens on social the 2024 Indonesian presidential election.

2. To find out the functions of impoliteness strategies used by Indonesian netizen on social media during the 2024 Indonesian presidential election.
3. To explore the form of shaping negative opinion as a function of impoliteness strategy, apart from Culpeper's theory.

1.4 Scope of the Study

This research is conducted for Indonesian netizen on social media during the 2024 Indonesian presidential election. The research data used are words, phrases, and clauses derived from social media such as Twitter, Tiktok, and Instagram. The researcher used the theory of impoliteness strategies from Culpeper (1996) that has revision in 2005. Moreover, the researcher used Culpeper's (2011) theory of the function of impoliteness strategies to analyze the function of impoliteness strategies on social media. And also in this study, the researcher argues that shaping negative opinion is a function of the use of impoliteness apart from Culpeper's theory.

1.5 Significances of the Research

This study is aimed to provide readers with both theoretical and practical benefits. Theoretically, the purpose of this research is hoped that this research will be helpful for the development of Linguistic and provide benefits to the development of impoliteness theory. This research contributes to the understanding of impoliteness strategies as outlined by Culpeper, particularly in the context of political discourse on social media. By analyzing how these strategies manifest in online campaigns, the study expands the application of Culpeper's framework beyond traditional face-to-face interactions to digital communication platforms.

Practically, the results of this research can be used for future researchers and students in the academic field, which is a reference for further study in the impoliteness field. This study provides a novel application of Culpeper's impoliteness theory to communication, offering new insights into how impoliteness strategies are used to shape public opinion in digital spaces. This can inspire future research to explore similar frameworks in different contexts or platforms.



BAB II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter of research consists of two parts in order to make it easier to comprehend more about the object of the study, Indonesian netizen on social media during the 2024 Indonesian presidential election that the researcher used in this research. The first part is review of related theories that covers each explanation about pragmatic. Then continued to the second part, which included a theoretical framework to show the contribution of the theories mentioned in this research.

2.1 Previous Research

For this particular reason for building this research, the researcher had read several articles of scientific journals related to impoliteness as references to conduct this research. These articles also inspire the researcher to discover this study's uniqueness. These are several articles from other researchers that had been observed by the researcher as follows.

The first study stated by Bousfield and Haugh's (2012) Journal of pragmatics: mock impoliteness, jocular mockery, and jocular abuse in Australian and British English. This research used a qualitative descriptive method. His research focused on particular impoliteness which is mock and joke. Bousfield and Haugh (2012) mentioned that interactional practices of occasion evaluations of mock impoliteness can be considered impolite by some hearer in conversation, who strongly identify with the target in a particular way. Similarities in this study, both focus on the phenomenon of impoliteness and refer to the theory of Culpeper (1996) to classify the types of strategies used. As for the differences, the previous study focuses on the types of mock impoliteness strategies, while this study identifies five types of strategies: Bald on Record Impoliteness, Positive Impoliteness, Negative Impoliteness, and Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness. Thus, although both have the same methodological approach, the differences lie in the context, subject, and types of strategies analyzed.

The second research was conducted by Lucky (2015) in his work "A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in British TV-Series Sherlock. His research aims to analyze the strategy of impoliteness performed by characters in the film. Moreover, he analyzed the characters' response towards the impoliteness strategies. The source of data from his study comes from the utterances. His research showed that negative predominantly used by the characters. Furthermore, based on his ers used coercive impoliteness function the most frequently in the ence in this study is in the purpose of the analysis, the previous analyze strategies and responses while in this study to analyze is.



The next research was conducted by Murni and Gurning (2018) is entitled "Impoliteness Strategies Used by Governor Candidates of DKI Jakarta in Governor Election Debate 2017". This research has similarities, namely examining impoliteness strategies and their reasons, but the difference is that the researcher has a hypothesis that there is other reason of impoliteness strategies, namely shaping negative opinions.

The last research was carried out by Karina et al. (2023), entitled 'Teenagers' Impoliteness in the Digital Era and Its Relation to Social Media'. This study analyzed the impoliteness strategies that teenagers use on social media and the reasons behind them. Using a qualitative descriptive method, data were taken from Instagram, TikTok, and Twitter. The results show four main strategies. This research has a different from the previous one in the form of context although both analyze the use of impoliteness strategies on social media. In the previous study, it discussed the impoliteness that occurred among teenagers, which usually contained hateful comments, while this research discusses the comments on social media about the presidential election. In these comments there is shaping negative opinion which is the main point of difference in this study. This creates differences in the interpretation of the results.

2.2 Theoretical Background

2.2.1 Pragmatics

In everyday life, many unique things happen in communication. When someone produces an utterance, some people catch it as B or even C. This occurrence happens because of mishearing or the error of the mutual knowledge of the speaker and the hearer. But that will only happen sometimes because the factors that usually affect it. Because of that, earlier scientists put forward a scientific approach to studying language related to this term. This study specializes in spoken data to find out the meaning of an utterance which we now know as "pragmatics." According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is a study of speaker meaning. In fact, that pragmatic approach can be considered an academic approach for learning how others interpret an utterance.

According to Leech (1983) in identifying the meaning in speech in a situation, pragmatics could be used. Similarly, Leech (1983) recalled that pragmatics is a scientific approach related to interpreting an individual or more of an utterance if it produces the meaning of the utterance in the place and time the utterance occurs. As Yule (1996:3) has mentioned, pragmatism is a study of language related to how people interpret the meaning of language as contextual meaning, where the context becomes variable on how people interpret the utterances. Therefore, in communication, it depends on a lot of and expectations.



Based on the explanation above, the researcher concluded that pragmatics is a study of language related to how people interpret the meaning of language as contextual meaning, where the context becomes variable on how people interpret the utterances. Therefore, in communication, it depends on a lot of and expectations.

is a supporting description that explains an event where the context consists of the information related to space, time and socio-psychological factors. In this research, several pragmatic sections are listed, namely context, politeness, and impoliteness. Further discussion about context and other pragmatic terms that exist in this research will be discussed in the section below.

2.2.2 Context

Context has a significant role, as described above, where context is needed to understand the meaning of speech or text. Based on Curtis et al. (1996) it can be concluded that context is a supporting description that explains an event where the context includes space, time and socio-psychological factors. In the researcher's view, context plays an important role in producing texts for speakers that have a big effect on understanding the text for speech partners, listeners, or readers. In this case the speaker is required to observe the situation so that the text's reference can help the speech partner, listener or reader to understand the text that the speaker will be produce. Attention to pre-existing texts, the interlocutor, the target readers, and other things used as references to build context. The reference knowledge is known by both parties so that the partner can understand the text that is made. Context can be very complex if looking at the context; it also brings mutual understanding between speakers and speech partners. So that context can be a combination of everything real in an event and is used as a guide for speakers and speech partners in speaking or understanding the meaning of speech. Fromkin et al. (2011) proposed two kinds of context that are relevant to pragmatic studies: linguistic context and situational context.

Mey (1993: 39-40) stated that context is a complex matter not only consist of reference and of understanding what things are about as context also provides a deeper meaning to utterances. Asher (1994: 731) also stated that in linguistics, context is a term constantly used in all kinds of contexts but never explained where context has a relationship with meaning, which is also considered an important term in pragmatics. In linguistic context, Yule (1996: 21) also argued about this term; he mentions that context means the physical environment in which a word is used. The utterance "I never seen a big pig before," when uttered the speaker see a pig, has a totally different meaning if the speaker utters it after seeing his friend who physically has a big body. The utterance can have different meanings, which can be considered a joke or impolite.

In Wardhaugh (1998: 243-244), Hymes (1974) mentioned a concept for describing the situational context, which he uses the abbreviation "SPEAKING" as an acronym for the various factors he deems to be relevant. In this acronym, "S" stands for Setting and Scene. Setting refers to the time and place and Scene is the place abstract where something occurs in real life or fiction. After that, the acronym of "P" is for



Participants consist of speaker and listener, addressor and addressee, speaker. The next acronym is "E" for Ends which refers to the purpose of the speech events. "A" is an acronym for Act Sequence, which is the sequence of what it is said is being considered as sequence. After that the acronym for Key. It is correlated with the tone, manner or spirit in which the message is conveyed, and nonverbally such as behavior, gesture, posture,

or even deportment. Hymes mentioned that “I” refers to Instrumentalities, where it is the choice of channel and to the actual forms of speech employed, such as the language, dialect, code, or register that is chosen. The acronym “N” stands for Norms. Norms of interaction and interpretation are the specific behaviors and properties that attach to speaking. It is also related to how people react to its uniqueness. The last acronym is “G” for Genre, where it is demarcated types of utterances.

According to the definition above, the researcher concluded that context is abridge of knowledge to interpret utterances, act, or even activities to avoid misunderstanding in an environment of communication. In my thesis writing, context is an important factor in analyzing the comments or text that are polite or impolite.

2.2.3 Politeness

In communication, people use politeness to support others' faces to create a pleasant communication environment. Goffman (1967: 5) mentioned that in specific interaction, a person claims the positive social value for himself that is expected by others to be taken by him is called a face. Borrowed Goffman's face concept, Brown and Levinson (1987: 61), argued that everyone's self-image is tied to their own emotional and social feelings where they expect recognition from others. In this term, people tend to avoid hurting others' feelings. Furthermore, people as much as possible support others' selfidentity, which can be considered politeness. In accordance, Brown and Levinson (1987) discussed face threatening act (FTA) as a base factor of their politeness strategy. There are two types of FTA, negative face threatening act and positive face threatening act. Negative FTA attacks negative face of addressee while positive FTA attacks positive face of addressee. Based on Brown and Levinson theory (1987) there are four strategies of politeness such

1. Bald on record politeness, where speaker utterances not aiming to detract the FTA even though, people can use this strategy to minimize the FTA circumstantially
2. Positive politeness, where the strategy aims to support the hearer's positive face;
3. Negative politeness, which is a strategy to minimize the threat on negative face of the hearer;
4. Off record politeness, which is a strategy that happens when the speaker indirectly minimizes the threat of the face by expressing the utterances that has implicit meaning in its performance.

Hill and et al. (1986: 282) stated that a way politeness manifests itself in communicative interactions is called politeness, where the goal is to maintain the feelings of the other person. support mutual comfort, and maintain harmonious relationships.



9) says that politeness minimizes the effect of disrespect in social and to exaggerate the effect of being polite, while disrespect tends accordingly, Leech (1983) stated that politeness is asymmetrical in what the speakers say, so that politeness is very important.

) argued that politeness is a goal-oriented behavior aspect; that utterances are 'polite' is related to the purpose of using the utterance

to convey politeness; where to create harmony, people avoid conflict. Courtesy serves at least seven important functions in its function: avoiding conflict, ensuring cooperative interactions, managing impressions, building strength, ensuring obedience, showing respect, and being kind. These functions can be viewed as goals to be achieved and courtesy of one of the relevant communication strategies. Leech divides the principles of politeness into six kinds of politeness governed by the maxims of politeness.

Based on Leech (1983), these are the following types and functions of politeness maxims. Maxim of Wisdom, this maxim aims to make other people's losses as small as possible and give the biggest benefit. This maxim maximizes the benefits to others at the smallest possible cost. After that, there is Generous Maxim which minimizes profits for the speaker and maximizes profits for the listener. The third is Maxim of Praise, which aims to criticize others as little as possible and flatter others as much as possible in its application. In following, there is Maxim for Humility, which the speaker minimizes self-praise and express humility or insecurity. And then there is Maxim of Agreement, which tends to maximize agreement and minimize disagreement between oneself and others. Lastly, Maxim of Sympathy is in its application, maximizes sympathy and minimizes antipathy between oneself and others. Where there is a leveling of an achievement.

On the other hand, expressions of sympathy or condolences should be shown when someone experiences bad things. Examples include congratulations, sympathy, and condolences. In politeness, people pay attention to the interests, the wants, and the needs of the listeners which are in line with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies. Politeness is added as a mirror for the researcher to differentiate what is polite and impolite in this thesis writing. By knowing the origin of politeness, the researcher assumes that it will help to determine the impoliteness strategy on social media during 2024 Indonesian presidential election. Furthermore, the notion of impoliteness is discussed on below section.

2.2.4 Impoliteness

In politeness studies, recent studies thought that impoliteness is a "opposite" of politeness theories established by Brown and Levinson. Yet, in many research on politeness theory, impoliteness is always discussed. Therefore, Culpeper (1996) established Impoliteness theory in his work "towards anatomy of impoliteness", which is being evolved years by years. And now, impoliteness theory has become a concern for the linguist. Culpeper (2011) mentioned that impoliteness theory is a study that is still new, and any new field is susceptible to insecurities. In his work impoliteness: using language to cause offense, the approaches are used for impoliteness are social psychology, sociology, conflict studies, media studies, business studies, history, and



Culpeper (2011) mentioned the understanding of impoliteness and work. There are some definitions from other researches related to the definition comes from Locher and Bousfield (2008), where the definition of impoliteness is that impoliteness is behavior that is particular context. (Locher and Bousfield, 2008:3). Lakoff (1989)

quoted by Culpeper (2011) stated that rude behavior does not utilize politeness strategies where they would be expected, in such a way that the utterance can only almost plausibly be interpreted as intentionally and negatively confrontational (Lakoff 1989:103).

Beebe (1995) also argued that rudeness is an act that offend social norm in a place where it is also considered as an act that threatens others' face (FTA) (Beebe1995: 159). Culpeper (2003) stated that "... Impoliteness, communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony..." (Culpeper et al. 2003: 1546). Then, Culpeper (2005) also defined impoliteness happened in two ways (1) the speaker intentionally attacks other's face (2) the hearer considers the act as offensive and attacks the hearer's face. He also mentioned that impoliteness can perform in both ways at the same time. (Culpeper, 2005a: 38).

Holmes et al (2008) also stated that verbal impoliteness is where the hearer's face is threatened intentionally or not by the speaker in linguistic behavior, which also violates the social norms of the interlocutors' environment (Holmes et al., 2008:196). Culpeper (2011) concludes some key notions related to impoliteness, such as (1) the face of the interlocutors, (2) the social norms that exist in the environment in the act being performed, (3) intentionality, (4) emotion.

Culpeper also mentioned face and offence. Culpeper (2005) established a framework based on Spencer Oatey's (2002:540) notion of rapport managements. Culpeper's (2005) framework based on Spencer-Oatey (2002:540) mentioned quality face, social identify face, and relational face. This face theory related with Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of face. Spencer-oatey (2002) argued that Quality face is sense of personal self-esteem which is a fundamental want to be judged by others positively. after that, Social identify face is related to public worth sense where people want to be approved in social group roles. The Relational face is related to valid participants' relationship occurrence (e.g. distance and closeness, equality, inequality, perceptions of rights and obligations). Based on Spencer-Oatey (2002:540), Culpeper (2005) mentioned the two frameworks of sociality rights are equity and association right. Equity is the sense of worth of people to have personal consideration and fair treatment from others. And last, association right is the sense of worth of people to have relationship with others (involvement, emphaty, respect).

Furthermore, Locher and Bousfield (2008) mentioned relation between language and power that is related to impoliteness. As described in their work, it is believed that power generally is expressed through language. After that, in describing power, context needs to be used. Power is something flexible which tends to be relative and dynamic,



f power denial can happen. Furthermore, it is believed that power relationship between language and society. Locher and Bousfield into power-in, where the power is used in language, and power-relates to social institutions and society's constitution. Culpeper koff (1989) and Penman's (1990) works mentioned that powerful y to push power towards others and be free to perform impoliteness gap.

The researcher realized that impoliteness is considered “impoliteness” depending on the performed act context. Moreover, the use of power on language affects how impoliteness occurs. By understanding the definition of impoliteness, it is believed that it helps the researcher to analyze Indonesian netizen comments on social media during 2024 Indonesian presidential election.

2.2.5 Types of Impoliteness Strategies

Culpeper (1996) mentioned politeness and impoliteness is different because politeness stands to support the face of people while impoliteness does the opposite. Culpeper (2005) mentioned that people intentionally use the strategies as acts to insults others’ faces. Based on his research, Culpeper (2005) has mentioned five strategies of impoliteness: bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, off-record impoliteness and withhold politeness.

These are the following detail description of those types with the revision developed in 2005 of impoliteness strategies:

a. Bald on record impoliteness

Culpeper (2005: 41) explained that people who do face-threatening acts (FTA) in direct, clear, and without ambiguity would be considered bald on record impoliteness. Culpeper (2005:1) also mentioned that this type of impoliteness strategy happens when people tend to ignore hearers’ faces, while speaker (S) consciously think that the faces of others is irrelevant or minimized. This strategy is often used in situations where speakers feel the need to convey dissatisfaction or criticism in an explicit way, often in emotionally charged social or political contexts. For instances in a comment,

Edy: “Dasar anis goblok lok”

Edy: “Idiot Anies”

The comment issued by Edy is included as Bald on record impoliteness because the comment clearly insulting someone without ambiguous sentences and addressed directly to the recipient with saying that Anies looks like an idiot, even though he was an academic who had been a lecturer and rector, so this comment is included as Bald on Record.

b. Positive impoliteness



Positive impoliteness, refers to communication strategies designed to undermine one’s face desires. In this context, “positive face” refers to an individual’s self and appreciated by others. Positive impoliteness is often used in situations where speakers want to show dominance or express dissatisfaction in a subtle way.

Culpeper (2005: 41) defined that if the act of people damages the hearers’ face, and the person wants to be accepted by others, this kind of impoliteness

will be considered positive impoliteness. He believes that if people use this strategy, they will not take into account the interlocutors of the conversation. For instances in a comment,

Netizen: “Bapak jadi menteri kemarin kenapa dipecat?”

Netizen: “Why were you fired as minister?”

This comment directly addresses Anies' position as a former minister and questions the reason for his dismissal, which could be perceived as demeaning or criticizing his reputation. This serves to undermine the positive face that Anies wants to maintain.

c. Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is a communication strategy that aims to undermine the recipient's negative face desires. In this context, “negative face” refers to an individual's need to have autonomy and freedom in behavior without interference from others.

Culpeper (2005: 41) described negative impoliteness happens when people damage the negative face of the hearer where the wants to have freedom of action of the addressee is attacked. This kind of impoliteness will be considered negative impoliteness. For instances in a comment,

2 peluru: “Kalau jadi sales, pada ludes ni produk terjual”

2 peluru: “If you become a salesperson, the product will sell out”

This comment serves to undermine Anies' ability by implying that if he becomes a salesman, the products he sells will be sold out. This shows that the speaker doubts Anies' competence in politics, which can be considered as an attack on his reputation.

d. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

In this case, the face-threatening act (FTA) is performed with the use of impoliteness strategies that are insincere and thus remain a surface realization. This impoliteness is manifested through the use of remarks that openly mean the opposite of what they say and are made with the intent of hurting someone's feelings or criticizing something seriously or humorously. Sarcasm is defined as a remark made mockingly, ironically, or in bitter contempt to make the interlocutor look foolish. Sarcasm can be quite harsh and biting, or it can be said in jest (Culpeper, 2003). For instances in a comment,



u cerdas sampai Albert Einstein nggak paham”

part that even Albert Einstein couldn't understand”

This comment uses sarcasm by claiming that Anies' intelligence is so high that even Albert Einstein did not understand it. This is a form of mocking, as it implies that claims about Anies' intelligence are exaggerated or unrealistic.

e. With-hold Impoliteness

Culpeper (2005: 42) mentioned that with-holding impoliteness happens when the speaker or the speaker does not perform the impoliteness strategy, which is wanted by the hearer or keeps silent. It also can be considered deliberate impoliteness where someone is expected to be thanked by the speaker, but then he fails to express gratitude.

According to those types of impoliteness, the researcher analyzed the text to identify those strategies on social media. The researcher identified these impoliteness strategies by using Culpeper's (2005) impoliteness theory to answer the thesis question that exists in this thesis writing. Researcher classified the text in which Indonesian netizen have used impoliteness strategies and expressed impoliteness function.

2.2.6 Function of Impoliteness

In the performance of impoliteness in conversation, there must be function behind it. Culpeper in his latest work, identified the function of impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2011) in this notion, he realized that impoliteness strategies have their own common function in opposing interlocutor, but despite it, impoliteness also has specific functions. Culpeper (2011) mentioned three functions of impoliteness: affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertaining impoliteness. It is presented in detail below.

a. Affective impoliteness

The first function of impoliteness specific function stated by Culpeper is affective impoliteness. This specific function happens when the speaker outburst the impoliteness, which seeks unrestrained emotion existed in context. These emotions are considered as un-normal and forbidden and need to be avoided in the context. Culpeper (2011:223) stated that the increase of targeted emotions, such as anger that annunciates the target responsible for the negative emotion production will be considered as affective impoliteness.



ess

oliteness is the second specific function of impoliteness. Culpeper
: function happens when the impoliteness performed by the speaker
: arrangement. Culpeper (2011) also stated that this function of
here there is a power gap between the speaker and interlocutor in
monstrates that the speaker(s) gets more advantage or their current

benefits are reinforced or protected. Tedeschi and Felson (1994), quoted in Culpeper (2011:226) mentioned that this function encloses coercive action in its performed where it aims to harm others and to impose the agreement.

c. Entertaining impoliteness

This function is the last specific function of impoliteness. This function of impoliteness aims to entertain people even it harms the potential victim or delivered in "impolite" ways. Culpeper (2011) stated that entertaining impoliteness is a function of impoliteness where entertaining value is produced to the potential target. Despite harming the target, unexpectedly, impoliteness can raise the sense of humor to the one who hears it. Impoliteness is able to manage the equality between the listener and target audience and entertain the listener, which is different from other pragmatic studies that involves speakers and listeners.

d. Shaping opinion

In this study, the researcher argued that shaping negative opinion is a function of the use of impoliteness apart from Culpeper's theory. Shaping negative opinion in the context of impoliteness strategies refers to the way in which individuals or groups use impolite behavior or language to influence the views and attitudes of others. In communication situations, especially in political or social contexts, impoliteness is often used as a tool to challenge, criticize or discredit interlocutors, with the aim of shaping public opinion or influencing audience perceptions of an issue or individual. Shaping opinion usually use arguments or data in a persuasive focus by spreading inaccurate information.

Noam Chomsky (1988) has a critical view of opinion manipulation, especially in the context of mass media. In his famous book, "Manufacturing Consent," written with Edward S. Herman, Chomsky explains how the media can function as a tool to control and shape public opinion.

One of the key points of Chomsky's view of opinion manipulation is manipulation through language. Chomsky also highlights how language and framing can be used to influence how people think about certain issues. The choice of words and the way news is presented can shape public perception. Overall, Chomsky argues that opinion manipulation is a complex phenomenon that involves interactions, especially on social media.

Furthermore, the researcher identified the impoliteness strategy's function by 11) functions of impoliteness theory. Understanding the origin of the researcher to determine the impoliteness strategy and the ss in the text.



2.2.7 Social Media

McGraw Hill Dictionary defines social media as a tool used by people to interact with each other by creating, sharing, and exchanging information and ideas in a virtual network and community. Social media is an online media, where users can easily participate, share, and create content including blogs, social networks, and virtual worlds (Supriyanto and Rosmalia, 2021). Social media invites anyone who is interested to participate by contributing and giving feedback openly, commenting, and sharing information in a fast and unlimited time. Social media is synonymous with Twitter, Youtube, and Instagram which are the most widely used in the world (Supriyanto, 2016). And currently Tiktok is very viral among netizens.

Social media has a role in language communication. In social media, everyone is free to convey and write what they want to convey. In everyday life, social media has an important role in many ways not only limited to communication but social media can also be used as a place to deliver news, inform information, ask for news, and many other things that can be done. Of course, this makes language communication through social media widely used by the community rather than other media such as newspapers and blogs which are now rarely used.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

Several earlier studies are cited in the presentation of this study, all of which discuss and experience the same line of work. This contribution presents some of the research's concepts, methods, and theories. As a result, the researcher will discuss the highlight for each point in the schematic below:



