CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Pragmatics as a field of study, aims to understand the meaning conveyed by people through their utterances and the surrounding context. Each person has their own unique way of expressing themselves, with some individuals carefully selecting their words while others may be less attentive, resulting in impoliteness. Holistic studies of communication encompass a wide range of phenomena and speech act types associated with impoliteness, as evident from lists of politeness and impoliteness strategies, including joking, conversational humor, compliments, requests, and swearing (Fromkin, Rodman, Hyams, 2003, p. 9).

Politeness or impoliteness can impact the smoothness of communication and affect the emotions of those involved. Some individuals may not pay sufficient attention when addressing others, resulting in conversations that are perceived as impolite. Consequently, not all conversations may be received as polite by others. Impoliteness occurs when speakers communicate with interlocutors, utilizing communicative strategies that attack the interlocutor's face. This may happen when speakers aim to convey something directly and emphatically, without considering the potential harm to the interlocutor's feelings and causing disharmony in the interaction (Culpeper, 1996).

Impoliteness is defined by Culpeper (2003) as communicative strategies designed to attack face, leading to social conflict and disharmony. According to Watts (2003), impoliteness is viewed as inappropriate behavior and negative markers within specific social and interactional contexts as perceived by the

participants. Mills (2009) describes impoliteness as any linguistic behavior intended to threaten the hearer's face or social identity. Politeness and impoliteness play pivotal roles in interpersonal interactions, as evidenced by extensive research conducted over the past three decades. Impoliteness offers researchers valuable insights into the dynamics of interpersonal relationships across various pragmatic phenomena, including friendly small talk, socializing humor, deference, and contextual interactions.

The rise of social media platforms has significantly transformed communication, offering numerous channels for interaction and connection, regardless of physical distance. Among the various social media platforms, Twitter stands out as a widely utilized medium. Twitter has become a popular outlet for individuals to publicly express themselves through concise yet impactful tweets. However, this freedom of expression has sometimes been misused, leading to hate speech and impolite comments. It is observed that individuals unknowingly engage in impoliteness through their tweets and replies on Twitter, where opinions are shared, arguments are presented, and topics are discussed to maintain relevance and avoid digression.

Unfortunately, hate speech on social media has become increasingly prevalent and alarming. Public figures, such as artists, often share their photos, videos, and opinions on social media platforms, attracting both supporters and critics. Some individuals transform into "haters" on social media, leaving bad or impolite comments targeting these artists. This behavior, referred to as "impoliteness," involves deviating from norms of politeness and encompasses

negative actions that can lead to disharmony in specific social interaction contexts.

Sam Smith, a British soul singer with a significant Twitter following has experienced hate speech in the comments section of their Twitter posts. Sam Smith's satanic-themed performance at the 65th Grammy Award ceremony sparked controversy and debates worldwide. While the singer-songwriters achieved recognition and made history as the first person to win Best Pop Duo, their performance was overshadowed by claims of being "demonic."

This satanic-themed performance generated a significant social perception and controversy, as many people associate satanic symbols with evil, violence, and a departure from traditional and religious values. The perceived implications of such performances on morals and societal ethics have further fueled the debate. In Brazil, for instance, there have been strong opposition and protests against the celebration of "Sarcófago," often referred to as the Satanic Carnival.

This study aims to contribute to the field of linguistics, particularly in the area of impoliteness, and hopes to serve as a foundation for future research in this domain. Understanding the underlying theories and strategies of impoliteness is crucial for individuals to discern when their utterances are impolite and whether they align with impoliteness strategies. Furthermore, raising awareness of the impoliteness strategies employed by netizens in Sam Smith's Twitter interactions can facilitate a more informed and mindful approach to communication.

In conclusion, effective communication forms the basis of human interaction, with individuals expressing their thoughts and opinions in diverse ways. However, impoliteness can arise when individuals fail to choose their

words carefully or disregard the potential impact on others. Research on impoliteness provides valuable insights into the dynamics of interpersonal relationships and serves as a reminder of the importance of respectful and considerate communication in various contexts, including social media platforms like Twitter.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

1.2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is the study of meaning in communication (Yule, 1996: 3). Pragmatics is a part of linguistics that contextually studies a meaning. When communicating, both the speaker and the listener must be able to understand each other. According to Leech (1983, p. 6), pragmatics is a study of meaning related to conversational states. When someone communicates about something, the meaning is based on a situation, and these conditions affect the speaker's meaning in communicating. Pragmatics can make someone know and understand the context of a conversation. Pragmatics has a function for someone, they do not misinterpret or assume the wrong way when interacting with other people. The advantage of this study is that we can determine the purpose and types of actions shown when communicating, such as an act of requests. Based on Yule (1996, p.4), pragmatics is interesting because it is about how people understand each other linguistically, but it can be a frustrating field of study because it requires understanding people and what is on one's mind.

In general, pragmatics deals with meaning aspects that focus on contextual meaning. Thus, pragmatics aims to broaden the scope of traditional linguistics by accommodating many of the problems and aspects that characterize the language

used. Pragmatics, as a subfield of linguistics, is concerned with the study of meaning in context. It explores how language is used and interpreted in real-life situations, taking into account the social, cultural, and situational factors that influence communication. Pragmatics aims to expand the scope of traditional linguistics by addressing the complexities and challenges associated with language use (Horn & Kecskes, 2013, p. 356).

One of the problems that pragmatics addresses is the gap between literal meaning and intended meaning. While the literal meaning of a sentence is derived from the words and grammar used, the intended meaning can vary depending on the context, speaker's intentions, and shared knowledge between participants. Pragmatics examines how speakers convey additional meanings through implicature, inference, and presupposition.

For example:

Literal meaning: "Is it hot in here?"

Intended meaning: "Please turn on the air conditioning."

In this example, the literal meaning of the question might be a simple inquiry about the temperature. However, the intended meaning is a request to adjust the environment by turning on the air conditioning. Pragmatics helps us understand how such implied meanings are communicated and interpreted.

Another aspect that pragmatics addresses is the use of politeness and impoliteness strategies in communication. Pragmatic analysis investigates how speakers manage their relationships and face-saving concerns through linguistic choices. Politeness strategies include using indirect speech acts, hedging, or employing positive politeness to maintain harmony and avoid threatening the face

of the interlocutor. On the other hand, impoliteness strategies involve using offensive language, sarcasm, or violating social norms to challenge or attack the face of the interlocutor.

For instance, consider the following interaction:

A: "I'm feeling really tired."

B: "Well, maybe you shouldn't have stayed up so late watching TV."

In this exchange, Speaker B employs an impoliteness strategy by indirectly criticizing Speaker A's behavior. The implication is that Speaker A's fatigue is self-inflicted due to staying up late. Pragmatics examines the subtleties of such interactions and the ways in which individuals manage politeness and impoliteness in their communication.

Overall, pragmatics addresses a wide range of problems and aspects in language use, including the interpretation of implied meanings, the negotiation of politeness and impoliteness, the role of context in communication, and the impact of shared knowledge and cultural factors on understanding. By examining these aspects, pragmatics enhances our understanding of how meaning is constructed and conveyed in everyday interactions.

Kogan (1981) has developed a pragmalinguistic conception concerning the evaluation of information in the text. He states that 'information' comes into existence only after a text has been perceived; the text alone does not involve any information. Therefore, it makes sense to speak about information only if we know what the characteristics of its users are. The relevance of the information can be different for the message producer and the message interpreter; this is caused by the different aims of both parties.

1.2.2 Concept of Face and Politeness

According to Culpeper (2003), impoliteness involves communicative strategies that are designed to attack face, resulting in social conflict and disharmony. The concept of face aligns with the notion of positive self-image and the desire to be respected and valued by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Politeness, as described by Watts (2003), encompasses linguistic and behavioral strategies employed to avoid threatening the face of others and to maintain social harmony in specific contexts. This indicates that the study aims to investigate how impoliteness, characterized by face-threatening acts, can impact interpersonal interactions on social media platforms like Twitter, where maintaining positive face and engaging in polite communication are crucial aspects of effective and respectful discourse.

Culpeper (2003) provides a definition of impoliteness in relation to attacking face, while Brown and Levinson (1987) are cited to explain the concept of face. Additionally, Watts (2003) is referenced to highlight the role of politeness in preserving face and maintaining social harmony. This citation helps establish a connection between the concept of face and the importance of politeness in communication, specifically in the context of the study's focus on impoliteness in Twitter interactions.

Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson introduced the concept of politeness, which refers to individuals' ability to employ specific methods to establish effective communication depending on the given communicative context. According to their theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987), politeness is associated with the notion of Face Threatening Acts. Moreover, various politeness

7

strategies exist, including the direct "bald on record" strategy, the positive politeness strategy, the negative politeness strategy, and the indirect "off record" strategy.

1.2.3 Impoliteness

Impoliteness The term "impoliteness" is extended by Culpeper (1996) based on the framework of politeness theory from Brown & Levinson (1987). He refers to impoliteness as the strategy in communication designed to attack the interlocutor's face and thereby cause social disruption. Culpeper defines several factors that are underlying the use of impoliteness. The first factor is the speaker's social relations and the speech partner, who is very close or intimate. The closer they are, the higher the possibility of impoliteness.

1.2.4 Strategy of Impoliteness

"Impoliteness strategies are 'opposite' in terms of orientation to face (i.e. Instead of maintaining or enhancing face, they are designed to attack face)" (Culpeper, Bousfield, and Wichmann, 2003: 1554). Impoliteness strategies are some strategies that are used to attack someone in the context of communication. Culpeper here divides impoliteness strategies into five types which is bald on record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, off record strategy, and withhold politeness. All of those strategies are much related to our daily utterances.

a. Bald on Record

Based on Culpeper (1996, p. 356), this strategy is an action or speech that is carried out in a way that is immediately clear and unambiguous and does not consider faces. Impoliteness can occur due to miscommunication which then ends in hatred or disappointment. When the speaker uses a face attack, the listener or the interlocutor will realize that the speaker does not like him or what he is doing and not infrequently. Some people respond to face attacks with facial attacks. In this type of bald on record strategy, the speaker attacks the face of the listener or the interlocutor directly and clearly. Culpeper et al. (2003, p. 1556) gave an example of this strategy.

For example:

"Your jacket is so ugly!"

The sentences is a type of bald on record impoliteness because the excerpt shows bald on record impoliteness addressed to the main character, someone says in loud voice and even concludes that interlocutor does not understand not to say anything.

b. Positive Impoliteness

This strategy aims to damage the positive desires directed by the hearer. A positive face can be seen in his desire to be liked or appreciated by others. According to Culpeper (1996, p. 356), he states that this strategy is intended to attack the positive faces of the listener or interlocutor. This strategy is commonly used to ignore or show an impolite attitude to someone but with a positive face and answer. This strategy means that it is used to show dislike for someone, but it is not demonstrated. Usually, the speaker just shows his face with a fake smile, fake words, and so on.

For example:

" I don't care what you do."

In this utterance, the speaker do not care about what someone do. Unconcerned about someone here is considered as positive impoliteness.

c. Negative Impoliteness

Culpeper (2005: 41) also states that negative impoliteness is "the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants". This strategy is used because the user wants freedom in doing something. This strategy aims to damage the negative desires directed by the hearer. Negative impoliteness strategies including of threat others, frighten, underestimate others, and explicitly associate others with negative aspects.

For example:

A: "Can you explain this to me?"

B: "Stupid! Even that, you don't understand!"

This sentences is a type of negative impoliteness because someone does negative rudeness to the other person because he feels smarter and stronger than the other person. Someone emphasizes his power as the most popular person to belittle the other person. The words issued by the interlocutor are considered as disrespectful expressions.

d. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

Sarcasm is the polar opposite of banter (mock politeness for social harmony). Sarcasm is a face-threatening conduct that is carried out through the use of politeness strategy. Someone can use sarcasm to express their opposing feelings, which is not the true meaning of what they say. To recognize whether

someone is being sarcastic, mocking you, or joking, one must often have a good understanding of the person.

For example:

"Oh, your shirt is absolutely gorgeous!" (when in reality they find it ugly).

This sentences is a type of off record strategy when someone's words show their insincerity and gratitude to the other person, because people will not thank you for something bad. The person means something different from his gratitude.

e.   Withhold Impolitenes

This strategy is a way of showing immodesty differently from other strategies. Withhold politeness is a strategy in interaction, using politeness but also impoliteness. In general, this strategy happens by accident that the speaker uses. As Culpeper (1996, pp. 356-357) states, this strategy occurs when the interlocutor is polite and the speaker has tried to express his attitude but fails. For example, when the hearer does not thank the speaker for the gift is given and when the hearer does not respond to the greeting said by the speaker, it can be considered as intentional impoliteness.

For Example :

A: "Are you okay?"

B: (silent)

This sentence is a type of withhold politeness because this is where the attitude of a person fails to meet the expectations of the other person politely by asking to respond again, but the other person gives a sign of understanding and silence. This is included in the category of restraining impoliteness, because his speech does not match the answer expected by the other person.

1.2.5 The Functions of Impoliteness

The latest attempt which is proposed by Culpeper (2011) resulted in three functions of impoliteness, they are: affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness, and entertaining impoliteness. Each of them is presented below.

a. Affective impoliteness

The first function of impoliteness is addressed as affective impoliteness. This function involves emotional outburst which occurs during a conversation between the producer of impoliteness and the target of impoliteness. Culpeper (2011: 223) states that affective impoliteness is the targeted display of intensely increased emotion, such as anger, which implicates that the production of the negative emotional state is the target's responsibility.

Example:

Brian: "What does that have to do with teaching?"

Margaret:"You know, if they move on to our classes and they fail, It'll be because they weren't prepared! It'll be because you failed, not them!"

The excerpt above occurs when Margaret is arguing with Brian about their respective performances in teaching their students. Margaret's excerpt above about "It'll be because you failed, not them!", she feels that if the students move on to classes it means because Brian is failed as a teacher. Margaret took her anger out on Brian from her negative thoughts, so she said that. Based on Culpeper's theory (2011), the excerpt is included in the affective function because the excerpt from Margaret shows emotions in expressing their anger.

b. Coercive impoliteness

The second function of impoliteness is coercive impoliteness. Coercive impoliteness seeks a realignment of values between the producer and the target such that the producer of the impoliteness benefits or has their current benefits reinforced or protected. The term producer and target here could refer not only to individuals but also to groups or institutions.

For example:

> **Manager**: "I want the file for my tomorrow's presentation on my desk in 10 minutes and bring a cup of coffee from the coffee shop across the street."
>
> **Secretary**:"Err… Okay, but I'm having my lunch right now. Is it okay if I do that after I finished?"
>
> **Manager** : "I don't care about what you are doing. 10 minutes."

The function of the impoliteness strategies used by the manager in the example is to affirm her position as the boss. She forces her secretary to carry her orders by using the power as she has higher status than her secretary in the office

c. **Entertaining impoliteness**

The last function of impoliteness is entertaining impoliteness. This function of impoliteness exploits the target or potential target of impoliteness which includes entertainment at their cost (Culpeper, 2011: 252). Together with all genuine impoliteness, a victim or potential victim are always required. The following example illustrates the entertaining impoliteness. In the example, A ridicules B's dress in a party.

> **A** : "What a pretty dress you wear tonight."
>
> **B** : "Oh, thanks. I made it myself."

A : "Wow, really? 'Cause I'd like to have one…. for my cat."

Although the utterances said by A might have hurt B's feeling, it can entertain the over-hearing audience.

1.2.6 Context

According to Leech (1983, p.13), the context of a speech is considered the background knowledge that speakers and listeners consider to be owned by speakers and listeners, which contributes to the listener's interpretation of what the speaker means to a particular speech. From this definition, it can be seen that context is a situation and condition that can be the background of an utterance. In impoliteness, context is important to determine which strategies used by a participant in conveying the message to the interlocutor. There are three kinds of context. They are linguistic context, situational context, and cultural context.

a. Linguistic Context

Linguistic context refers to the situation and conditions that surround an utterance in a conversation, as explained by Song (2010). It encompasses various elements such as the topic being discussed, the participants involved, the previous discourse, and the cultural norms and expectations. This context provides important cues and information that help in interpreting and understanding the meaning of the utterance. For example, consider a conversation between two friends, Alex and Sarah:

Alex:"I'm really craving something sweet."

Sarah:"There's a bakery just around the corner. They have amazing
pastries and cakes."

In this conversation, the linguistic context includes the fact that Alex expressed a desire for something sweet, and Sarah responded by providing information about a nearby bakery. The context of their conversation influences the interpretation of Sarah's response, as it is relevant to Alex's craving for something sweet. The linguistic context helps to convey the intended meaning and facilitates effective communication between Alex and Sarah.

b. Situational Context

According to Song (2010, p. 876), situational context is context that refers to the environment, time, place, etc., in which the discourse occurs, and also the relationship between the participants. Cutting (2002, p.4) gives an example to represent this context. In the situational context is evident in the fact that Alex and Sarah are conversing in a specific place:

Alex:"I'm really craving something sweet."

Sarah:"There's a bakery just around the corner. They have amazing pastries and cakes."

The mention of a "bakery just around the corner" indicates that the conversation is taking place in close proximity to a bakery. The situational context of being near the bakery influences Sarah's response and provides a practical solution to satisfy Alex's craving.

c. Cultural Context

Cultural context is the context that can be seen from the culture that becomes the background of the conversation. According to Song (2010), cultural context is the context in which talks about the speaker's culture, customs

background in language communities. In the cultural context, can be seen in the cultural understanding of the significance of baked goods:

Alex:"I'm really craving something sweet."

Sarah:"There's a bakery just around the corner. They have amazing pastries and cakes."

The mention of pastries and cakes in response to Alex's craving aligns with a cultural understanding that baked goods are commonly associated with satisfying sweet cravings. This cultural context helps Sarah provide a suitable suggestion that corresponds to their shared cultural knowledge and expectations.

1.3 Review of Previous Study

The research on politeness outweighs the research on impoliteness in terms of quantity. However, there have been numerous studies conducted on impoliteness by various researchers. Prior to conducting this research, the researcher extensively reviewed existing studies on the same topic to gain a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.

Erza (2018) from English Department Faculty of Languages and Arts, Padang University, with her journal entitled Impoliteness Used by Haters on Instagram Comments Male-female Entertainers. In this journal, the writer analyzed the impoliteness strategy used by haters on Instagram, male-female entertainers. The data in this study were analyzed using Culpeper's theory (1996) impoliteness strategies. The data were taken from the comments in the Instagram account named "lambe_turah". The writer found 200 comments that contained impoliteness strategies. Al-Ghazali's haters are the highest user of positive

Impoliteness with (32%) data. Meanwhile, Prilly's haters are the last most user of Impoliteness with (28%) data.

This research had a detailed explanation. This topic also became strength of this research as the phenomenon of cyberbullying became a matter of concern at this time. This research had a weak point, especially in the review of related studies. In this section, the writer did not explain the advantages and disadvantages of each research.

Secondly, the research entitled "An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing the Middle East Countries" Bustan & Alakrash (2020). This research to identify the types of impoliteness strategies addressed by Donald Trump in his post against Middle Eastern countries in written text. This research used a qualitative research design. This research used the impoliteness strategy by Culpeper (1996). The number of tweets used in this study was 17 tweets, the data collection was taken from 2015 to 2019. The research findings have revealed that there are only four types of impoliteness strategies that these tweets address to Middle Eastern countries. Bald on record impoliteness (4 tweets) is the most frequent impoliteness strategy employed by Donald Trump in his tweets toward the middle east countries followed by positive impoliteness (7 tweets). Then, negative impoliteness (8 tweets) condescending, scorning, or ridiculing comes in the third rank followed by sarcasm or mock politeness (3 tweets). However, invading the other's space, being silent and failing to thank are not found in the tweet.

This research had a detailed explanation, but also had a weak point, specifically in the background of the study. The writer put all the explanations of

theories in the background of the research. It takes a long time to read through. It would be better if the theoretical discussion was moved into the theoretical framework section. But when compared with previous research, in this study there are advantage and disadvantage from this research.

Emeliya Sukma Dara Damanik & Rora Rizky (2020) Wandini research about Impoliteness Commenting On Instagram "Kekeyi". They take the data from the Instagram account "Kekeyi" a viral beauty vlogger because of its uniqueness "using a water balloon as a sponge" and the controversy on social media. They use the theory proposed by (Culpeper, 1996). in the research they did using descriptive research. They found three types of impoliteness proposed by Culpeper, namely: Bald on Record impoliteness, negative impoliteness and positive impoliteness. Kekeyi followers are more dominant using a positive impoliteness strategy.

This research helped the writer in gaining information on how to analyze impoliteness strategies found on Instagram. This research has a weakness in terms of explanation. The explanation was too short and less detailed. This research had strength in the background of the research. In this section, she explained briefly and clearly so that it was easy to understand and unlike previous studies that took a long time to read.

Next, Muazzaro & Dewanti (2020) researched the impoliteness strategies in Donald Trump's speech. The aims of this research are to identify the types of impoliteness strategies and the most frequent types of impoliteness strategies performed by Trump. The research object to be analyzed is Donald Trump's speech at "Conservative Political Action Conference" held on 2018 in National

Harbor, Maryland, U.S. The data was taken from impolite utterances in Trump's speech in the video which was published in YouTube site within 1 hour 15 minutes 25 seconds. The researcher used descriptive qualitative method in this study based on impoliteness strategies phenomenon in verbal communication or spoken language. This research used impoliteness strategies theory proposed by Culpeper. The result showed that there four strategies which occurred and confirmed that Trump portrayed his power to attack the hearer. The data shows that Trump used negative impoliteness with nineteen utterances (19) or 39.6% of the entire speech, then followed by positive impoliteness that occurred fourteen utterances (14) or 29.2% of the entire speech, sarcasm or mock politeness that occurred eight utterances (8) or 16.6% of the entire speech, and then the least one is bald on record impoliteness occurred seven utterances (7) or 14.6% of the entire speech. Withhold politeness was absent in this study because this type usually happens in the dialogue, not in the monologue. Meanwhile, speech is a kind of monologue, so withhold politeness could not be found.

Culpeper's impoliteness strategies were chosen as the main theoretical framework due to their systematic and comprehensive approach to understanding and analyzing impoliteness phenomena across different communication contexts. This well-established framework serves as a solid foundation for the researchers' investigations, allowing them to gain deeper insights into the nature and utilization of impoliteness strategies in their respective studies. However, it is worth noting that prior research has not specifically examined Sam Smith's tweets, underscoring the significance of this current study. The primary objective is to explore the various types of impoliteness strategies employed by the speaker and

investigate the underlying factors that influence their usage. Through this research, individuals are encouraged to be more mindful of their language and behavior when participating on social media platforms. The valuable insights gained from previous studies aid the researchers in effectively analyzing impoliteness strategies.

1.4 Research questions

The writer will concentrate on the impoliteness strategies find in SamSmith's tweet replies in February 2023. In this research, several questions need to answered:

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

1.5 Objectives of The Research

This research aims to analyze and describe the types of using impoliteness strategies in Sam Smith'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 Sam Smith's comment.
2. To describe the function of impoliteness used by netizens in Sam Smith's comment.

1.6 The Scope of Research

In this research, the writer aims to explain the analysis of the impoliteness strategies that find in social media. The issue concerns Satanic and LGBT themes in Sam Smith's tweets on His Twitter account on February 07, 2023 following his performance at the 65th Grammy Award ceremony. 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 Sam Smith.