

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

4.1 Conclusion

The current research carried out to investigate the impoliteness strategies by netizens in the comment on James Charles's tweet on February 27, 2021. This thesis analyzes impoliteness strategies uttered by netizens on the Twitter in James Charles's tweets. The research findings reveal that only four types of impoliteness strategies addressed these tweets. They are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness and sarcasm or mock impoliteness. Withhold politeness does not take participating in the tweets.

The writer found twenty-three comment utterances by netizens that contain impoliteness strategies. Between those twenty-three comments, there are ten tweets use positive impoliteness with a percentage of about 43%, five tweets use bald on record impoliteness strategies with a percentage of about 22%, two tweets use negative impoliteness with a percentage of about 9%, six use sarcasm or mock impoliteness with a percentage of about 26%. In this research, netizens most use positive impoliteness strategy in James Charles's tweet. It is because the netizens accused James of what he did in the past and now the same case is happening again. The netizens call him by other names and use taboo words.

Furthermore, the writer found 4 strategies between 5 strategies in

this research. In this research, the writer found that netizens more often positive impoliteness strategies in attacking James's face. The netizen attacks the hearer's face by giving him negative identity. Then, based on record strategies, the netizens attack the hearer directly and unambiguously. The least common impoliteness strategy used is negative impoliteness and Sarcasm and mock impoliteness. The netizen attacks hearer's negative face as negative impoliteness strategies and says the opposite or implicit meaning of the hearer condition as sarcasm or mock politeness.

In the conclusion of factor impoliteness, the netizen used affective impoliteness 12 times with a percentage of about 53%, coercive impoliteness 8 times with a percentage of about 34%, and entertaining impoliteness 3 times with a percentage of about 13%. The most factor that appears is affective impoliteness. It happens because James's triggered the netizen of James's utterance. This situation makes the netizen emotional and attacks James's back.

4.2 Suggestion

In this research, the writer only focuses on the comment on the tweet on February 27, 2022. Some comments also contain impoliteness utterance that analyzes on other dates. Besides the comment on February 27, 2022, the comment containing impoliteness strategies uttered by netizens on the other date is also important to analyze. It is because people can see the other point of view, not only on the day James tweet the apology. Consequently, the

other comment date on James Charles's tweet can be objected to or analyzed in the future. In addition, the researcher hopes that the future can find other data in conducting this research.

