

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of The Research

Communication is a mediator people need in daily life. Communication helps people to exchange information. In communicating, language gives a big significant role. The utilization of language for communication is different from each other. People talk in the same language. Thus, people get the meaning of the message that people say. The language someone uses for older people is different from the one they use with the same age. If someone talks with someone older than them, they use formal sentences. In other cases, communication happens between people of the same age. They use informal sentences. People communicate face to face, through a call, or send messages through email, SMS or social media. Currently, technology makes everything more accessible, especially communicating. People used to send mail and receive the mail weeks after the sender sent the mail. On the other hand, these days texting is very easy, the message sends within a second. People reply at the same minute if they have a good connection. Texting with each other provide by social media.

In the last few years, social media has improved a lot and many kinds of social media exist on the internet. The most famous social media people use are Instagram, Facebook and Twitter. One of the social media

that people use is Twitter. Twitter has become a popular social media system where users share everything that happened to them (Benevenuto, 2010). Twitter is a platform where people tweet about their thought. Murphy (2018) says that Twitter is undeniably as a communication platform nowadays. People around the world about 554.7 million using Twitter (Murphy, 2018). On Twitter, people tweet their feelings or even leave a comment on someone else's tweets. Many kinds of words and sentences that people use on Twitter.

The phenomenon on Twitter is the language that users use with other users when they hate a person. An impoliteness utterance is one phenomenon that happens when users hate another person or user. According to Pacheco (2019), impoliteness is a kind of aggression and the speakers enjoy impoliteness violence. In this case, the speaker is in a position of comfort, feeling safe from any damage or attack that might not attack the speaker.

As stated by Culpeper, impoliteness is about the face of the participant in the communication process (Culpeper, 1996). Impoliteness also refers to the face concept of Positive face and negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Impoliteness is a hostile activity towards some practices happening in a particular activity. Some people do not think about what people tweet or comment on Twitter and attack someone else's face. Pageyasa & Ihsan (2019) in Wijayanti & Mubarak (2020) said that social

media is a platform to express something that is not under control because many users spread hate speech content and even impoliteness utterances on social media.

Based on the phenomena, many people give impoliteness utterances to others without realizing it. Impoliteness utterances in the form of spoken or written. Impoliteness is capable of being written anywhere, such as on social media. The common impoliteness utterances that people give to someone who is part of the LGBT. According to Stefanita and Buf (2021) in their research, LGBT people are more likely than straight people to receive hateful messages. Some of the problems that happen around us, people that LGBT are not acceptable because they are minor in the population. James Charles is one of the influencers that get hate speech on his Twitter column. James Charles has 7,5M followers on Twitter and 24,4M subscribers on his YouTube channel. James Charles is a male American makeup artist and Youtuber. James Charles often tweets the cut scene of his YouTube content doing makeup. He is also posting some new videos that he posted on YouTube to Twitter to inform people about his new video. In the fact that James Charles is a male that gets many Twitter users to send hate speech in his comment section on Twitter. James Charles has written several tweets that contain LGBT and get many impoliteness utterances from other users.

This study aims to help readers improve the area of linguistics, mainly in the area of impoliteness. Hopefully utilized in the subsequent

research of impoliteness studies. The basic concept of strategy itself considered important. If people know theory of the strategy impoliteness, they know whether giving impoliteness utterances or not and whether they are utter impoliteness strategies or not. Furthermore, people are aware of the impoliteness strategy that the netizens used in James Charles's Tweets.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

1.2.1 Pragmatic

Pragmatic is a branch in linguistic studies that analyzes the meaning through someone's utterances and emotional expressions. The speaker's attitude of the speaker is delivered or becomes the representation of the real meaning or intention. Pragmatic is a study of language based on a functional perspective that tries to explain the aspects of the linguistic structure by invoking pressures and the causes of linguistics (Levinson, 1983). Pragmatics is not only analyzing the meaning through someone's utterance but also through their emotional expressions.

1.2.2 Concept of Face and Politeness

In studying pragmatics, people learn how an utterance's sentence, structure, and context affect its meaning. Before talking about impoliteness, there is a theory that makes the impoliteness theory exists. One of the branches of pragmatics, Politeness, focuses and analyzing the relation of human expression to create and become the representation of the meaning of the speaker's statement. Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson first

proposed the politeness concept. Politeness is people's capacity to use ways to build good communication that relies on the communicative situation. According to (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the politeness theory is related to the Face Threatening Act. There are also some types of politeness strategies, there are the bald on record strategy, the positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy and off record strategy. Some theorists have examined the concept of power and social distance.

a. Bald on Record

Bald on record strategy is a strategy of politeness that does not aim to minimize the threat of being polite to the hearer. In this strategy, the speaker usually speaks direct and sometimes the speaker makes the hearer embarrassed because the hearer has a close relationship with the speaker. The listener is mostly family or close friends.

For example:

1. Get off the bed!

This example says it directly to the hearer without minimizing the threat.

2. Come on! I will help you.

This example also minimizes the threat and the speaker directly gives help to the hearer without hesitation.

b. Positive politeness strategy

Positive politeness is a strategy in which the speaker needs to be accepted and liked by others, to be treated as a member of the same group and to build a relationship with others. Mostly this strategy happens in close relationships. Its function is not to ruin the relationship that they had. In this positive politeness strategy, the speaker makes the hearer treated well and has a desire to be respected.

For example:

1. Let's do this together if you want to.

In the example above, the speaker wants to engage the listener to do the activity together and the utterances the speaker treats the listener well.

2. We will buy a new one if you would like to.

This example means a connection that the speaker and hearer have. In that sentence, the speaker does not give any chance to the hearer to refuse.

c. Negative politeness strategy

Negative politeness strategy is a strategy that makes the speaker and hearer feel awkward. Usually happens when the speaker and listener are not in a close relationship. The speaker feels that they will interrupt the hearer and the risk of face-threatening is less to the hearer. This strategy places the speaker and the hearer in an awkward

situation.

For example:

1. I am sorry to bother you, but do you know where the nearest pet shop is?
2. Can you lend me a pencil?

In these examples, the negative face of the speaker attacks because the listener must go out to buy something at a pet shop and lend the speaker a pencil. In using the utterances, the speaker talks in a politely the speaker does not attack the listener's face.

d. Off Record Strategy

Off record strategy is a strategy that the speaker minimizes the threat to the hearer's face and avoids face-threatening by asking something. This strategy considers as the polite strategy.

For example:

1. I forgot where I put my handphone and charger as well.

In this example, the speaker indirectly asks the hearer to lend the hearer's handphone and find the speaker's handphone without directly asking the hearer to do so.

1.2.3 Impoliteness

Brown and Levinson's politeness theory defines when a person always has a positive and a negative face, a public self-image, and want to

maintain. Culpeper used this theory to create impoliteness. Impoliteness is the point at which the speaker would consistently not like to ensure the substance of the beneficiary yet needs to assault the face. The relation between impoliteness and the face concept is essential. Besides the politeness strategies, there are also strategies for impoliteness.

According to some experts, impoliteness is the attack on others' faces to create a conflict in a communication process. Culpeper's factor influences the rates of the impoliteness of someone's utterance in a conversation, there are attitudinal factors, linguistics pragmatics factors and contextual and co-textual factors.

1.2.4 Impoliteness Strategies

Culpeper created five impoliteness super strategies opposite to politeness to create impolite utterances (Culpeper, 1996).

a. Bald on record impoliteness

The face-threatening act (FTA) may be a threat to a person's face that is performed during a direct, clear, unambiguous and cryptic approach in circumstances wherever the face is not inapplicable or decreased. It is apparent and easy impoliteness. Fauziati illustrates a case where a face is involved in a difficult situation and the threat to the hearer's face is tiny (Fauziati, 2014).

For example:

1. Come in!
2. Do sit-downs!
3. Stop complaining!
4. Utterances from a parent to a child.

This situation happens because the speaker is much more potent than the hearer. The examples use direct, clear and to the point.

b. Positive impoliteness

Positive impoliteness strategy refers to the methods that are unit designed to break the addressee's positive face desires, the hearer does not like it if their positive face damages or under attack.

For example:

1. Your hairstyle is embarrassing

In this example, the hearer does not like their face under attack.

The positive face that the hearer damages.

c. Negative impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is an impoliteness that functions to attack the hearer's negative face. Thus, it also wants to claim territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction.

According to Kantara, he gives an example of negative impoliteness in a scene in a TV series titled “House, M.D”, the example is “My girl”. The phrase is negative impoliteness strategy that shows a threat to the girl as a patient and the speaker is a doctor that forces her to agree with the speaker as a doctor (Kantara, 2010).

d. Sarcasm or mock impoliteness

Based on Culpeper, sarcasm performs face-threatening acts (FTA) and use politeness strategy that does not express genuine feelings or sarcasm or mock impoliteness used a politeness for impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996). The face-threatening act (FTA) with the utilization of politeness methods and therefore the result is sarcasm or mock impoliteness stay polite solely on the surface.

For Example:

1. Do help yourself (won't you?)”

Based on the example, the speaker shows of command without regressive action.

e. Withhold politeness

Withhold politeness is anticipation during a certain scenario. However, neglected for a few reasons, some instances of withholding impoliteness concerned the absence of manners.

The example:

1. There is no good thing talking to you!

In the example, there is a base idea the speaker said is ordinarily required by politeness. However, the speaker does not do so.

1.2.5 Impoliteness Factors

Culpeper proposes factors of impoliteness. These factors share the operation of contradicting social relationships, identities, and social norms (Culpeper, 2011). There are:

a. Affective impoliteness

In this affective impoliteness, the speaker uncovers their displeasure through the listener, consequently generating a negative passionate moment between the speaker and the listener. As stated by (Buss, 1961) angry aggression is a response to frustration and/or provocation.

Culpeper mentioned some examples of affective impoliteness that cause anger (Culpeper, 2011). There are:

1. You don't even have the brains or the decency as a human being.
2. I'm gonna let you know just how I feel about what a rude little pig you are.

As mentioned in the example, the utterances they said happen when people anger. People talk badly and give an affective impoliteness to the hearer.

b. Coercive impoliteness

Coercive impoliteness is an impoliteness that raises realignment between the speaker and the listener. In this way, the speaker benefits from

the hearer's face want. Culpeper believes that this impoliteness sort takes place, to more significant extent, within the things wherever the producer belongs to a better and more robust social level than the hearer's (Culpeper, 2011).

Culpeper illustrates a police officer and a taxi cab whose wheels crossed the white lines. There are the utterances the police officer said as the example below:

For Example:

1. Do you understand me?
2. You got it?
3. I'm speaking real straight, slow English.

From that example, the police officer shows that he has power and talks in a rude way to the taxi cab.

c. Entertaining impoliteness

Entertaining impoliteness is impoliteness produces once the speaker makes fun of the listener's degree. Utilizes the objective's feelings to get amusement.

Culpeper gives an example of entertaining impoliteness in the situation of a letter to complain about a cable company service as the example below:

For example:

1. Nothing more entertaining than overdone criticism.

2. Nice read. A total lol.

That example shows the readers is entertained by the letter. It shows from the sentence “a total lol” which indicates the reader is entertained by the letter of the cable company.

1.3 Review of Previous Studies

In this research, the researcher reviews some previous studies related to this study. The researcher focuses on impoliteness strategies. To help the researcher get a better understanding of impoliteness strategies.

The First research is an article titled “An Analysis of Linguistic Impoliteness in the Selected American Movies” This article is written by Nasirli Aysel (2021). This research writes about phenomena that happen in selected American Movies based on Culpeper’s Framework. The method the writer use is descriptive and qualitative method. The impoliteness strategies used by the users are the first study to analyze. This research results in the writer getting all impoliteness strategies already used in movies. The most used impoliteness strategies in movies are positive and negative impoliteness strategies.

The strength of this thesis is the writer concludes all the impoliteness strategies of Culpeper’s theory. The writer also focuses on the reason for the person using impoliteness strategies and it helps the writer with the factors that the person uses. The writer includes every reason from all the impolite strategies. This study helps the researcher to analyze the factors and reasons for the impoliteness utterances they used. The weakness of this article is the researcher does not discuss

the factor of the main character using the impoliteness strategies. The other weakness is that the data source is different from the writer.

The second study is an article titled “Hate Speech Used by Haters Lady Gaga on Social Media” by Indah Permata Sari Siahaan, Rahmadsyah Rangkuti, Rohani Ganie (2019). The study discussed impoliteness strategies in Lady Gaga on her Instagram comments. In the research, writers find four types of impoliteness and three factors of impoliteness strategy haters of Lady Gaga use. To support the research, the writers use the theory proposed by Culpeper to find the impoliteness strategy the haters use and the theory of factor of the Impoliteness strategy the haters use. The writers find the haters’ impoliteness strategies in Lady Gaga’s Instagram comments. The strategies are Bald on record, Positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness and sarcasm or mock impoliteness. The writers do not find withhold impoliteness in the comment. The haters’ dominant strategy in Lady Gaga’s Instagram comments is negative impoliteness. The strength of this thesis is one of the writer’s objectives is the factors of impoliteness strategies. It helps the researcher to analyze the second research question. This research also has a weakness, the writers do not give specific reasons why the writers choose Lady Gaga. The difference between my research and this research is the data source. This research was taken from Instagram, while my research is from Twitter.

The third study is an article entitled “Impoliteness in Facebook Status Updates: Strategic Talk Among Colleagues “Outside” the Workplace” by Bernie Chun Nam Mak and Hin Leung Chui (2013). In this paper, the writers examine

how colleagues of an Italian restaurant in Hong Kong employ impoliteness strategies to get things done, based on a talk on Facebook Status Updates. The writers used Culpeper's framework to analyze the study. In collecting the data, writers collected data by documenting 200 statuses in a period for specific seven months, started October 2011 to February 2012.

Previous studies show similarities with the writer's theory to analyze impoliteness. In contrast, the writer focuses on the comment on Twitter meanwhile Bernie Chun Nam Mak and Hin Leung Chui's studies through Facebook status. The study's strength is that the writer explains everything in detail and the data source is the same social media. The explanation and the example are easily understood. This thesis leads the researcher to make better research. It is a useful guide in conducting the research. The weakness is the factor of the speaker using impoliteness strategies is not available in this research.

The fourth study is an article entitled "Impoliteness Strategies and Power Performed by Netizens on Twitter" by Rugun Mastiar Pangaribuan, Rahmadsyah Rangkuti, Roma Ayuni Lubis, University of Sumatera Utara (USU), Medan. The study discussed netizens' impoliteness strategies in Jefri Nichol's tweets. The result shows four impoliteness strategies: bald on record, impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness and sarcasm or mock politeness. The writer in this study shows the power performed by the netizens and Jefri.

This study differs from the researcher, the study discussed the types of impoliteness and the power netizen used. The differences become the weakness of

the study which analyzes the power the netizen used in impoliteness strategy and makes the study different from the researcher's study. Despite that, the strength is the study help researcher analyze the source of the data is Twitter. The data also helps the researcher understand the type of impoliteness strategies. Because the analysis is easy to understand.

The fifth study is entitled "The Impoliteness Strategies of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Twitter" by Khairina Juliana Br Pane, Rahmadsyah Rangkuti, And Muhammad Yusuf. In this study, writers find the types of impoliteness strategies that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu used on Twitter. The writer only finds the types impoliteness that the Prime Minister used. In the meantime, the researcher finds the types of impoliteness and the factor the netizens used in Charles James's tweet.

The fifth studies help the researcher to analyze and apply the theory to the utterances that the researcher finds on the tweet. The previous studies contribute to understanding in researching impoliteness in utterances. This research focuses on the impoliteness strategies that they used and the factors of using impoliteness strategies. The strength of the article, the analysis of the data is explained quite well and is easy to understand. The data of each impoliteness strategy are a lot. Thus, it helps the researcher to analyze the data. The weakness in the data is not to mention what time the prime minister tweeted.

Based on the previous studies, there is no specific analysis of James Charles's tweets. Furthermore, this research focus on the types and factor the

speaker uses in the impoliteness strategies. This research makes people aware of using and speaking on social media. All those studies help the researcher to analyze impoliteness strategies.

1.4 Research questions

The writer will concentrate on the impoliteness strategies find in James Charles's tweet replies in February 2021. In this research, several questions need to answered:

1. What are the impoliteness strategies performed by netizens in James Charles's comment?
2. What are the impoliteness factors used by netizens in James Charles's comment?

1.5 Objectives of The Research

This research aims to analyze and describe the types of using impoliteness strategies in James Charles's tweets by other Twitter users. This research aims to address the following research questions, there are two objectives to achieve, those are:

1. To find out the impoliteness strategies performed by netizens in James Charles's comment?
2. To describe the impoliteness factors used by netizens in James Charles's comment?

1.6 Scope of The Research

In this research, the writer aims to explain the analysis of the impoliteness strategies that find in social media. The data takes from a social media called Twitter. Based on the tweet, this research examines replies to James Charles's Tweet of him flirting with a boy minor. This problem is an LGBT issue because James is flirting with a boy while he is an adult man. The researcher took the data from public tweets on James Charles's Twitter account on February 27, 2021. There is pride event that held at London on February. In collecting data, the writer collects data from tweets containing English utterances and the exact day the tweet was published. This research is limited to the theory of impoliteness, proposed by (Culpeper, 1996). This research describes the kinds of impoliteness strategies the Twitter users use in replies to the tweets of James Charles.

