



Impoliteness Strategies in Online Political Discourse: A Case Study of Indonesian Netizens' Comments on Tiktok

Regita Widya Murti , Hendi Pratama, Henrikus Joko Yulianto

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Accepted 30 March 2024

Approved 8 June 2024

Published 15

September 2024

Keywords:

Impoliteness Strategy,
Online Political
Discourse, Tiktok
Comment Analysis,
Case Study

Abstract

This study analyzes impoliteness strategies in online political discourse, specifically focusing on the comments made by Indonesian netizens on TikTok regarding the presidential and vice-presidential candidate pairs. This research employed a qualitative descriptive approach to portray the phenomenon of impoliteness in the digital realm, especially in political interactions within the context of Indonesia's presidential election. The study applied Culpeper's (1996) theory of impoliteness strategies, and the data were collected from the Indonesian presidential election, specifically from TikTok accounts. Comments were gathered from the Anies-Muhaimin, Prabowo-Gibran, and Ganjar-Mahfud pairs. The data used in this study consisted of 60 instances of dark humor found across three TikTok accounts of presidential and vice-presidential candidates, which were then analyzed according to five categories of impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock, and withhold impoliteness. The results show that dark humor is most commonly conveyed through sarcasm or mock (35%), followed by positive impoliteness (28.3%), negative impoliteness (20%), bald on record impoliteness (16.7%), and no instances of withhold impoliteness. Thus, the findings contribute to understanding how impoliteness strategies are used by netizens to express political criticism or opinions online and their impact on political discourse in Indonesia. By understanding impoliteness, we will better appreciate politeness on social media and in person.

Correspondence Address:

Kampus UNNES Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang

E-mail: yuliana231997@students.unnes.ac.id

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

TikTok, in particular, has emerged as a central arena for information exchange, discussion, and even political debate. TikTok, with its short and engaging video format, has emerged as an effective platform for conveying political messages. This effectiveness can be attributed to several factors such as; 1) reaching young voters, in which TikTok enables politicians to engage with young voters who frequently use the platform, 2) creative content, in which political messages are presented in creative, engaging, and easy-to-understand video formats, and 3) direct interaction, where politicians have the opportunity to interact directly with voters through comments and direct messages. The freedom afforded by social media enables individuals to express hate speech in posts without fear of repercussions. Hate speech employs impoliteness strategies to convey discriminatory or hateful messages. These strategies include insults, sarcasm, irony, and mockery, which perpetuate harm and reinforce social divisions (Culpeper, 1996). Hate speech utilizes impoliteness to dehumanize, degrade, and intimidate targeted groups, exacerbating social tensions and violence. Social media platforms allow users to easily create pseudonyms or false identities, providing many users with a sense of security when sharing various forms of hate speech. As Widyatnyana et al. (2023) explain, hate speech involves verbal actions that can harm or disrupt harmony among individuals. It includes words, behaviors, and written content used by individuals or groups to provoke, incite, or insult others (Mase et al., 2021). Hate speech cases on social media take many forms, such as defamation, provocation, insults, and more. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) in Ruansyah et.al (2018), all members of a society do not regard face as simply a set of norms or values they uphold, but rather as fundamental needs that every individual understands others also desire. These needs are typically in the collective interest of society, and it is generally beneficial for members to fulfill them to some

extent. They also acknowledge that face can, and often is, disregarded in situations requiring urgent cooperation, where efficiency is prioritized, or during social breakdowns (Ruansyah, 2018.). Additionally, as Thomas (1995) and Yule (1996) emphasize, the face is something that can be damaged, preserved, or enhanced through interactions with others. In this way, face is not a static concept, but one that is continually shaped and influenced by social interactions.

Impoliteness in political discussions can be seen as a response to feelings of frustration, dissatisfaction, or disagreement with certain figures or policies. Culpeper (1996), as cited in Shabrina (2024), noted that impoliteness strategies involve actions that harm others through disparaging words or statements. Culpeper categorizes impoliteness into several strategies, including 1) bald on record impoliteness: direct, unambiguous delivery of a face-threatening act (FTA) without any attempt to mitigate the impact, often used in situations of intended offense, 2) positive impoliteness: aimed at damaging the target's positive face, undermining their desire for approval and acceptance through tactics like ignoring or mocking, 3) negative impoliteness: targeting an individual's negative face, disrupting their desire for autonomy by employing threats, criticism, or hostility, 4) sarcasm or mock politeness: superficially polite language used insincerely or ironically to mask criticism, and 5) withhold politeness: intentionally omitting expected politeness as a subtle form of disrespect, such as not thanking someone after assistance. These strategies frequently appear in social media political discourse through sharp comments, insults, and sarcasm aimed at particular figures or groups (Culpeper, 2011; Ruansyah & Rukmini, 2018).

In Indonesia, elections and public policies often become topics that spark impolite comments on social media. For example, the 2024 General Election has provoked varied reactions from netizens, both supporting and opposing specific candidates. TikTok, with its dynamic video format and algorithms that

encourage viral content, accelerates the spread of strong, often impolite opinions, even featuring such content on its 'For You Page (FYP)', which makes it easier for users to find trending videos on presidential candidates (Penney, 2017; Affandi, 2024). This may influence public perception of particular candidates or parties and potentially impact overall public opinion during presidential and vice-presidential elections (Ausat, 2023).

Research on impoliteness strategies in online political discourse also holds practical relevance, especially in understanding how public opinion is shaped in the digital age. With the rising use of impoliteness strategies on social media, it's essential to understand how these strategies influence political perceptions and attitudes. This study aims to analyze impoliteness strategies used by Indonesian netizens in political discussions on TikTok and to understand the role of impoliteness in shaping online political discourse in Indonesia. Issues surrounding impoliteness strategies have also been explored by Tahir et al. (2024), who investigated hate comments made by Indonesian netizens regarding the 2024 presidential election on YouTube talk shows from 2023. This study found that anonymity and personality traits contribute to hate comments related to the 2024 presidential election, impacting the election process. The study's limitations include restricted generalizability, methodological constraints, and potential biases in interpreting online comments, so this research was completed it.

Meanwhile, Guo and Johnson (2020) conducted an experimental study to investigate different types of hate speech among college students, reporting that students tend to view the impact of hate speech on others as greater than on themselves. Their perception of these messages' effects on themselves was a significant indicator of supportive attitudes toward hate speech. Furthermore, Paasch-Colberg and Strippel (2022) identified categories of hate comments and examined how these categories are practically moderated, finding strong consensus on extreme hate

comment cases. They found overlap with the theoretical concept of hate speech and impoliteness forms, emphasizing the need for interdisciplinary research on hate speech dynamics and its societal impact. However, hate speech in the form of social media comments in the Indonesian political context, especially concerning political discourse, has received limited attention.

In line with that, Wrenn and Reed (2019) argue that presidential and vice-presidential campaign speeches significantly influence public discourse and opinions on socio-political issues. They identified rhetorical strategies like personal narratives, metaphors, and emotional appeals that reinforce political identities and shape public policy. The research shows campaign language and rhetoric build candidate images, form public opinion, and impact government decisions. Then, speeches in presidential and vice-presidential elections shape public discourse and opinions on significant social and political issues, potentially impacting government-public relations and government decision-making processes (Kilian, 2021).

Currently, there are three presidential and vice-presidential candidates: Anies Baswedan and Muhaimin Iskandar (Cak Imin) pair for candidate number 1, Prabowo Subianto and Gibran Rakabuming for number 2, and Ganjar Pranowo and Mahfud MD for number 3. Each candidate has distinct viewpoints and perspectives, leading to pros and cons among supporters. Thus, a more comprehensive study of hate speech in a political context is necessary, as the current study seeks to provide insights into the types of hate comments and factors used by Indonesian netizens in the political discourse of the presidential and vice-presidential election. Hate speech is a harmful behavior, both on social media and in person. If hate speech becomes prevalent, it can create a negative culture surrounding the use of social media in our country. According to the Digital Civility Index (DCI) report from Microsoft, Indonesia ranks 29th out of 32 countries in terms of internet user civility. This position

makes Indonesia the country with the lowest level of civility in Southeast Asia. This research is expected to contribute to the study of social media and political discourse, particularly in Indonesia's increasingly polarized context.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative phenomenological approach with a pragmatic perspective to explore the use of impoliteness strategies in Indonesian online political discourse on TikTok because it allows for an in-depth understanding of how participants perceive, interpret, and construct meaning through language in their specific sociopolitical context.

A qualitative descriptive research characterized by a descriptive approach, centers on exploring complex social situations in a comprehensive and in-depth manner. This approach uses problem formulation as the foundation for investigation, allowing researchers to delve broadly and thoroughly into the context under study. In this context, this study examines the phenomenon of impoliteness in political comments, which reflects how users express their opinions, frustrations, or criticisms in online political discussions.

The aim of this study is to analyze the impoliteness strategies in TikTok comments of three pairs of Indonesian presidential and vice presidential candidates, namely presidential and vice presidential candidate pair number 1 Anies Baswedan (@aniesbaswedan) and Cak Imin (@amuhaiminiskandar), then candidate pair number 2, namely Prabowo Subianto (@subiantoprabowo08) and Gibran Rakabuming (@gibran_rakabuming) and finally presidential and vice presidential candidate pair number 3, Ganjar Pranowo (@ganjarpranowo) and Mahfud MD (@muhmahfudmdofficial).

The data was collected from comments on TikTok, a platform where political content often provokes strong reactions. The study focused on posts made by politicians regarding

political issues from October 2023, the first day of registration for presidential and vice presidential candidates, until February 2024. The findings beyond this timeframe were not considered. The researchers analyzed 60 comments, specifically targeting those that contained impolite remarks and the most liked comments. Comments were recorded, transcribed, and identified. The data collection process involved three stages. First, TikTok comments were recorded through screenshot or take a note. Next, the comments were manually transcribed for easier analysis. Finally, the transcribed comments were identified and categorized based on themes like hate speech, discrimination or impoliteness strategies, and contextualized for in-depth analysis. According to qualitative research, data analysis can be split into three activities, based on Miles and Huberman (1994), propose a four-stage qualitative data analysis framework. Initially, data reduction involves selecting and coding relevant data. Next, data display utilizes tables and graphs to visualize patterns and themes. Then, data transformation categorizes data into themes such as hate speech and discrimination. Finally, verification ensures data validity through triangulation and validation, enhancing research credibility and reliability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This study aims to analyze impoliteness strategies used by Indonesian netizens in political discussions on TikTok and to understand the role of impoliteness in shaping online political discourse in Indonesia. After transcribing content and identifying instances of dark humor, 60 examples of dark humor were found as data sources in this study from three TikTok accounts of presidential and vice-presidential candidate pairs. Different from previous research, Apriliyani et al. (2019) published a journal article that purpose to identify the impoliteness strategies employed by male and female Instagram commenters who hate Habib Rizieq and Felix Siauw in Instagram comments. Additionally, the

researchers discover that male and female haters employ different impoliteness strategies. All instances were analyzed using Miles and Huberman (1996) impoliteness strategies, with the results displayed in the table below:

Table 1. The Total of Impoliteness Strategies from the Three Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidate Pairs

No	Types of Impoliteness Strategies	Freq	%
1	Bald on Records Impoliteness	10	16.7
2	Positive Impoliteness	17	28.3
3	Negative Impoliteness	12	20
4	Sarcasm or Mock	21	35
5	Withhold Impoliteness	0	0
Total		60	100

Table 1 shows that hate comment is most often conveyed through sarcasm or mock impoliteness, with 21 jokes making it the most common form among the strategies. This is followed by bald on record impoliteness with 10 instances, which represents the smallest category. Next, there are 12 jokes using negative impoliteness. According to Culpeper (2017), Negative impoliteness aims to disturb the individual's desire not to be disturbed, whereas negative politeness maintains the negative face, for example scare comments, ridiculing or criticizing, insulting and being cruel. Meanwhile, positive impoliteness occurs when people separating from those with differing opinions, using inappropriate names or nicknames, etc. In this study found that 17 comments using positive impoliteness. Notably, no instances of withhold impoliteness were found in the study of Online Political Discourse: A Case Study of Indonesian Netizens' Comments on TikTok.

The Discussion of Impoliteness Strategies in Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidate Pair Number 1

The researchers found several comments on the TikTok account of the presidential and vice-presidential candidate pair number 1 that contained impoliteness strategy. The following is a table of the results of the comments

Table 2. Total Impoliteness Strategies from Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidate pair number 1 (Anies Baswedan - Muhaimin Iskandar)

No	Types of Total Impoliteness Strategies	Total
1	Bald on Records Impoliteness	5
2	Positive Impoliteness	7
3	Negative Impoliteness	2
4	Sarcasm or Mock	6
5	Withhold Impoliteness	0
Total		20

The total 20 comments in the two TikTok accounts @aniesbaswedan and @amuhaiminiskandar, there are 5 (25%) comments containing bald on records impoliteness, 7 (35%) positive impoliteness, 2 (10%) negative impoliteness and 6 (30%) sarcasm or mock. From the accounts of the presidential and vice-presidential candidate pair number 1, the most are positive impoliteness at 35%.

Example 1: Positive Impoliteness

"@R27: abah kapan dilantik kata anak-anak udah fix jadi presiden somalia ya. (Father, when will you inaugurate (as president) the people said that you are selected as Somalia President)

"@sud: Udah merakyat pak, makanya cocok jadi rakyat aja. (You're already so down-to-earth, sir, which is why you'd be perfect as one of the people)"

The two statements above are included in positive impoliteness because they use strategies that directly damage positive face or a person's desire to be respected, accepted, and appreciated socially. In this case, the sentence seems to insult the target's hopes or expectations to get a high position (president), but in a sarcastic way by linking it to a position in a country that is irrelevant or seen as less prestigious. Then, other comments also contain sarcasm or mock, where in this account it reaches 30%.

Example 2: Sarcasm or Mock

“@Uni**: *Humanis sangat cocok jabatan RW.*
(You're so humanist, so good in resident associations)”

This statement is considered sarcasm or mock because, while it appears to praise someone for being "humanist" and "good in resident associations," it implies that their capabilities are more suited to local or small-scale community leadership rather than higher roles like national leadership. The compliment is insincere, as it subtly downplays the individual's qualifications or ambitions for larger roles, thus making it a sarcastic remark.

Example 3: Bald on Record Impoliteness

“@Shi: *Kasian lu badut* (What a pity you, clown)”

The phrase "What a pity you, clown" exemplifies bald on record impoliteness due to its straightforward, unmitigated delivery of a face-threatening act. In this sentence, "clown" refers to the insulting tone that describes candidate pair 1 as an "entertainer" and a politician who is unlikely to win the election. This type of impoliteness is characterized by directness, where offensive language is stated clearly without any attempt to soften or disguise it. By explicitly calling someone a "clown," the speaker aims to demean and ridicule, leaving no ambiguity about the insult's intent. Bald on record impoliteness also entails a lack of redressive action, meaning the speaker makes no effort to lessen the impact of their words. In this case, the phrase serves as a direct affront, designed to undermine the target's self-esteem or social standing in a blunt,

unmistakable manner. According to Culpeper's framework, bald on record impoliteness is used in situations where the speaker seeks to deliver an overtly offensive message, which is clearly achieved here with the unembellished insult.

Example 4: Negative Impoliteness

@Pu*xx: *Kalah woy* (You lose, man.)

Of the accounts of the presidential and vice presidential candidate number 1, the one with the least amount of negative impoliteness is 10%. The phrase "You lose, man" exemplifies negative impoliteness because it aims to damage the listener's "negative face" their desire to maintain autonomy, respect, and freedom from criticism. Negative impoliteness strategies are designed to undermine a person's confidence or sense of self-worth through statements that confront or criticize. By saying "You lose," the speaker asserts dominance and judgment over the listener, subtly implying failure or inadequacy without attempting to soften the impact. In this way, the phrase functions as negative impoliteness by explicitly attacking the listener's sense of self or competence.

The Discussion of Impoliteness Strategies in Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidate Pair Number 2

Table 3. Total Impoliteness Strategies from Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidate pair number 2 (Prabowo Subianto – Gibran Rakabuming)

No	Types	of Total	%
	Impoliteness Strategies		
1	Bald on Record	2	10
	Impoliteness		
2	Positive	5	25
	Impoliteness		
3	Negative	6	30
	Impoliteness		
4	Sarcasm or Mock	7	35
5	Withhold	0	0
	Impoliteness		
Total		20	100

On the TikTok account of the presidential and vice-presidential pair number 2, namely Prabowo Subianto (@subiantoprabowo08) and Gibran Rakabuming (@gibran_rakabuming), researchers found several hate comments containing impoliteness strategies. Even comments that contain elements of sarcasm as much as 35% and are the most common type of comments thrown by social media users towards them. Then, comments lead to negative impoliteness by 30%, positive impoliteness 25% and the smallest percentage is bald on record impoliteness only 10%.

Example 5: Sarcasm or Mock

@ci***: *Sengkuni datang.* (Sengkuni is coming)

@yog****: *Ayo bersama prabowo Gibran kita menangkan Anies-Imin* (Let's join Prabowo-Gibran to win Anies-Imin)

The statements like "@ci***: *Sengkuni is coming*" and "@yog****: *Let's join Prabowo-Gibran to win Anies-Imin*" are examples of Sarcasm or Mock Politeness in Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies. These phrases display a sarcastic undertone and an indirect insult, using irony to subtly undermine the target. In the first example, "*Sengkuni*" (a well-known antagonist in classic tales) is used to label someone in a disparaging way, implicitly comparing them to a devious character, thus ridiculing them indirectly. In the second phrase, "*Let's join Prabowo-Gibran to win Anies-Imin*," the user is ironically calling for support of one political candidate while aligning with their opposition. This twist conveys a satirical jab, suggesting absurdity in the statement and mocking political dynamics. Both examples display insincere politeness or sarcasm, where politeness is not genuine but rather a means of mockery. This approach to political discussion allows users to express discontent or criticism without direct confrontation, using humor and irony to mask or soften their critique. These tactics are common in political discourse on social media, where individuals employ subtle jabs to convey opposition or dissatisfaction

with specific figures or policies, all while appearing superficially respectful.

In addition, comments containing Sarcasm or Mock in the account of candidate pair number 2 amounted to 35% and were the most comments compared to other impoliteness strategies.

Example 6: Negative Impoliteness

@ri***: *Mau siapapun asal jangan 02* (Whoever it is, as long as it's not number 02)"

@yog****: *Saya tetap Pak Anies, kasian prabowo udah waktunya untuk istirahat* (I still support Pak Anies. It's sad for Prabowo; it's time for him to rest)

These statements from two accounts like "@ri***: Whoever it is, as long as it's not number 02" and "@yog****: I still support Pak Anies. It's sad for Prabowo; it's time for him to rest," are examples of Negative Impoliteness. This strategy involves a direct attack on someone's autonomy, dignity, or competence. In the first example, the user expresses a dismissive attitude towards candidate number 02 without any direct reasoning, suggesting a strong rejection of that option. The second statement subtly undermines Prabowo by implying he is too old or no longer fit for the role, using a patronizing tone by suggesting it's "time for him to rest." Both remarks undermine the targeted individuals, conveying an intent to discredit or diminish them through subtly disrespectful language.

Example 7: Positive Impoliteness

@vi****u: *pak Indonesia tidak hanya butuh orang pintar tapi Indonesia butuh orang yg punya hati* (Indonesia doesn't need a smart person, but Indonesia only needs someone who has a heart (kind))"

The statement "@vi****u: Indonesia doesn't just need a smart person, but someone who has a heart") is an example of Positive Impoliteness, because it subtly undermines a public figure's positive face, their desire for respect and approval. By implying that intelligence alone isn't enough and that a "heart" is more valuable, the commenter suggests that the targeted individual lacks emotional qualities or kindness, casting them in

a negative light. This approach erodes the person's perceived likability or moral standing, hinting that they are deficient in empathy or human connection, which are qualities the public might value highly. This indirect criticism challenges the positive image the target may wish to project, aligning with Positive Impoliteness strategies.

Example 8: Bald on Record Impoliteness

@yog****: *Jalan aja setengah mati itu. Susah angkat badan gara-gara gemoy. Keliatan ngos-ngosan pula* (He's hard to walk. It's difficult to lift his body because He's so chubby, you can see he is out of breath too)

The statement "Walking is so hard. It's difficult to lift his body because he's so chubby. You can see he is out of breath too" exemplifies Bald on Record Impoliteness, because it directly targets a person's physical characteristics in a blunt, unfiltered way, without any attempt to soften or mitigate the statement. Bald on Record Impoliteness involves delivering face-threatening acts (FTAs) explicitly and with no effort to be polite or indirect. Here, the comments about the person's weight, difficulty in movement, and visible exhaustion are presented plainly, focusing on negative traits in a way that could embarrass or offend. There's no sign of humor, irony, or attempt to soften the impact; instead, the comments are straightforward, likely meant to criticize or belittle openly. This clear, unembellished approach to delivering potentially hurtful observations is why it qualifies as Bald on Record Impoliteness.

The Discussion of Impoliteness Strategies in Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidate Pair Number 3

The researchers also found comments containing impoliteness in the TikTok accounts of presidential and vice-presidential candidate number 3, Ganjar Pranowo (@ganjarpranowo) and Mahfud MD (@muhmahfudmdofficial). The following is a table showing the total number of impoliteness strategies uttered by

social media users to the presidential and vice-presidential candidate pair number 3, there are: **Table 4.** Total Impoliteness Strategies from Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidate pair number 3 (Ganjar Pranowo – Mahfud MD)

No	Types of Impoliteness Strategies	Total	%
1	Bald on Record Impoliteness	3	15
2	Positive Impoliteness	5	25
3	Negative Impoliteness	4	20
4	Sarcasm or Mock	8	40
5	Withhold Impoliteness	0	0%
Total		20	100

From the table above, it can be concluded that the highest percentage of impoliteness strategy is sarcasm or mock with a total of 40%. Positive impoliteness 25%, negative impoliteness 20% and bald on record impoliteness 15%.

Example 9: Sarcasm or Mock

“@muh*****: *bapak Ganjar orang nya sungguh sangat merakyat,oleh karena itu saya sangat mendukung bapak jadi rakyat.* (Mr. Ganjar is truly a very down-to-earth person, which is why I fully support him to become a people (citizen))”

“@bak*****: *Wuih, mantap gayanya. Kemlinthi.* (wow, that is cool style. So cocky!)”

The first comment from “@muh***** and the second hate comment from account @bak***** fall under Sarcasm or Mock Politeness due to their insincere or mocking tone. In the first comment, while it seems like a compliment praising Ganjar for being "down-to-earth," the statement "I fully support him to become a people" ironically suggests that Ganjar, despite his supposed humility, might be better suited for an ordinary role rather than a leadership position. This sarcastic remark subtly undermines the idea of being “merakyat”

(down-to-earth) and mocks his suitability for leadership. In the second comment, the phrase "Wow, that's cool style. So cocky" initially appears to compliment someone's style, but the addition of "kemlinthi" (meaning overly showy, cocky or arrogant) reveals the true intent is to mock the person for their arrogance. Both comments use a superficial form of politeness or praise, but their underlying meaning is to insult or ridicule, making them clear examples of sarcasm or mock Politeness in impoliteness strategies. In fact, the two accounts of presidential and vice-presidential candidate number 3 have the highest number of sarcasm than any other presidential candidate, namely reaching 40%.

Example 10: Positive Impoliteness

"@snt****: Itu bukan konten kreator tiktok kita harus bisa memilih presiden yang multi talenta (That's not a TikTok content creator; we need to choose a president who is multi-talented)"

"@97***: Orang pintar pilih Ganjar Pranowo. (Smart people chose Ganjar Pranowo)

In the first comment, the speaker suggests that a TikTok content creator is not suitable to be a president and implies that a president should possess a wider array of talents. This subtly undermines the capabilities of those who may support the idea of a content creator being involved in politics and disrespects them by implying that they lack the "multi-talented" qualities needed to lead the country. The second comment, "Smart people chose Ganjar Pranowo," implies that only those who are intelligent would support Ganjar, suggesting that anyone who supports other candidates (presumably not Ganjar) is not smart. This is a form of positive impoliteness because it attacks the target's need to feel valued or intelligent by implying that their opinion or choice is inferior or less rational. Both comments are strategies aimed at damaging the target's positive image or self-esteem, which is the core characteristic of positive Impoliteness.

Example 11: Negative Impoliteness

"@ang***: Bersama Ganjar acak-acak Indonesia (with Ganjar, let's mix up Indonesia)"

@lex****: saya blum punya pilihan buat pilih siapa pak tapi sekarang setelah liat ini yakin ga pilih bapak (I didn't have a choice on who to vote for, sir, but now after seeing this, I am sure I won't vote for you.)

The comments from TikTok accounts @ang*** and @lex****, as they target the recipient's negative face, their desire to maintain autonomy and avoid imposition. The first comment suggests that supporting Ganjar would result in chaos for Indonesia, indirectly criticizing the recipient's choice and questioning their judgment. This undermines their autonomy by implying that their support for Ganjar is misguided, which could damage their self-image. Similarly, the second comment directly rejects the individual being addressed, stating that after seeing the content, the speaker is now certain they will not vote for them. This comment challenges the recipient's autonomy by imposing the idea that their campaign or actions have convinced the speaker to reject them. It affects the target's ability to influence the speaker's opinion, diminishing their sense of control over the situation.

Example 12: Bald on Record Impoliteness

"@adi***: maaf ya pak kemarin Q gk coblos nomor tiga, karena saya takut dengan negri ini dipimpin bapak. (Sorry, sir, yesterday I didn't vote for number three, because I'm afraid this country will be led by you)."

The comment is an example of Bald on Record Impoliteness because it directly and openly expresses a face-threatening act (FTA) without any effort to soften or mitigate the impact. In Bald on Record Impoliteness, the speaker makes a blunt statement or comment that does not attempt to protect the face or reputation of the person being addressed. In this case, the speaker unapologetically criticizes the individual (presumably a political figure) by saying they are "afraid" of the person leading the country. This statement is clear, direct, and unambiguous, meaning it is a straightforward attack on the recipient's leadership abilities.

There is no attempt to mitigate the harshness of the criticism with hedging or softening phrases (e.g., "I think" or "Maybe"), which makes it a Bald on Record Impoliteness. It is delivered in a manner that is confrontational, and its intent seems to provoke or challenge the recipient by questioning their competence and suggesting their leadership would lead to a negative outcome for the country.

TikTok offers several advantages in the political realm, particularly because it facilitates rapid information dissemination and direct engagement with younger audiences. First is quick information sharing, TikTok enables the widespread sharing of information in a short amount of time. This is particularly useful for political campaigns, clarifying issues, or responding to trending news. Second, the potential for virality, engaging and relevant content can quickly go viral, allowing politicians or political movements to gain significant attention in a short period. However, it is crucial to be aware of the risks associated with using TikTok in politics, such as the spread of misinformation, manipulation of public opinion, and concerns regarding user data privacy. Therefore, it is essential to use this platform ethically and responsibly.

CONCLUSION

This study investigates the use of impoliteness strategies in the online political discourse of Indonesian netizens on TikTok, focusing on the comments related to the three presidential and vice-presidential candidate pairs. The findings reveal distinct patterns in how political candidates are portrayed in online discussions, with notable differences in the types of impoliteness strategies used across the three candidate pairs. The findings show that Sarcasm or Mock (35%) is the most prevalent impoliteness strategy across all candidates, followed by Positive Impoliteness (25%), Negative Impoliteness (20%), and Bald on Record Impoliteness (16.7%). Interestingly, no instances of Withhold Impoliteness were found, indicating that while users were quick to

criticize or mock the candidates, they did not refrain from doing so altogether. Candidate Pair 1 (Anies Baswedan - Muhaimin Iskandar), the most common strategy was Positive Impoliteness (35%), indicating that netizens targeted the candidates' public image or social face, often through indirect insults or sarcastic remarks. Sarcasm or Mock also played a significant role (30%), further emphasizing a pattern of ironic humor and mockery. In contrast, Negative Impoliteness was less frequent (10%), showing that although there was some direct criticism, it was not as dominant. For Candidate Pair 2 (Prabowo Subianto - Gibran Rakabuming), Sarcasm or Mock remained the most prominent strategy (35%), with Negative Impoliteness slightly higher (30%) compared to the other pairs. The Bald on Record Impoliteness strategy was less commonly used (10%), indicating that direct insults were less frequent. The last, for Candidate Pair 3 (Ganjar Pranowo - Mahfud MD), Sarcasm or Mock again dominated (40%), reinforcing the idea that TikTok users commonly use humor and irony to convey criticism. Positive Impoliteness and Negative Impoliteness appeared in smaller proportions (25% and 20%, respectively), with Bald on Record Impoliteness making up 15% of the comments. In conclusion, this study highlights the prominence of Sarcasm or Mock in Indonesian political discourse on TikTok, underscoring the role of dark humor and irony in shaping online discussions. The varied use of impoliteness strategies reflects the complex nature of political engagement on social media platforms, where users often employ humor, sarcasm, and mockery as tools to express dissatisfaction, criticize, or challenge political figures.

REFERENCES

- Afandi, M. (2024, March 18). TikTok bikin candu sekaligus bikin dungu, tetap kritis dalam memainkannya. *Pikiran Rakyat*.

- Apriliyani V. et al., (2019). Impoliteness strategies used by male and female haters of Habib Rizieq and Felix Siauw found in Instagram comments. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*, 8(1), 158-167.
- Ausat, A. M. A. (2023). The role of social media in shaping public opinion and its influence on economic decisions. *Technology and Society Perspectives (TACIT)*, 1(1), 35-44.
- Brown, P. & Levinson. (1987). *Some universal in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Canty, R. T., Sormin, E., Rahmadayani, R. D., Novita, T., & Gaol, L. (2024). Analisis ujaran kebencian pada kolom komentar akun Tiktok Mayang Lucyana. *Bahasa Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 2(1), 198-207.
- Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Culpeper, J. dan Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In: Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., Kádár, D. (eds). *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*.
- Dhara, K., Hutomo, K., Brigitta, L., & Arzella, N. (2020). Penggunaan Instagram sebagai media kampanye politik pada Pemilihan Kepala Daerah DKI Jakarta 2017: Studi kasus pada Basuki Tjahaya Purnama (Ahok). *Commentate*, 1(2), 193-207.
- Dwiana, R., Barus, R. K. I., & Sinambela, S. S. (2024). "TikToker" political campaign in the 2024 Presidentia and Vice-Presidential Election. *Komunika*, 20(01), 2024. 47-56
- Guo, L., & Johnson, B. G. (2020). Third-person effect and hate speech censorship on Facebook. *Social Media and Society*, Jonathan Culpeper (1996). *Towards an anatomy of politeness*. *Jurnal Pragmatics*, 6(2), 1-12.
- Karmila, R.D., et.al. (2023). Violation of the principle of language politeness in Instagram comments @Kemenkominfo and its relevance in learning in Senior High School. *ICOLAE 2022, ASSEHR* 757, pp. 1869-1893, 2023.
- Kilian, S. (2021). From the "Paris agreement" to the "London pact": Political aspects of the democratisation of Poland's April constitution of 1935. *Historia i Polityka*, 36(43), 99-113.
- Mase, R., Wongkar, V. A., & Tooy, C. S. (2021). Sanksi hukum terhadap ujaran kebencian. *Lex Crimen*, 10(9), 108-115.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis*. Sage Publications
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Politeness Theory. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Paasch-Colberg, S., & Strippel, C. (2022). "The boundaries are blurry": How comment moderators in germany see and respond to hate comments. *Journalism Studies*, 23(2), 224-244.
- Penney, J. 2017. *The citizen marketer. Promoting Political Opinion in the Social Media Age*. Oxford University Press.
- Ruansyah, Rajif Alif., & Dwi Rukmini. (2018). The host's politeness strategies in Ellen Degeneres Reality Talk Show. *EEJ: English Education Journal*, 8(1) 96-100.
- Shabrina, Annisa Nurul., & Hendi Pratama. (2023). Impoliteness strategies of dark humor on Trevor Noah's Show "Son of Patricia". *EEJ: English Education Journal*, 13(3), 391-397.
- Siahaan, R., et al. (2023). Impoliteness strategy used by netizen in the comment column on Nadiem Makarim's Instagram post about online policy. *INNOVATIVE Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(2), 1199-1214.
- Sinaga, A.R., Saragi, Christina N., & Harpen Silitonga. (2024). Analysis of impoliteness comments of netizen on Najwa Shihab YouTube channel.

- DE_JOURNAL (Dharmas Education Journal), 5(1), 96-103.
- Subyantoro, S., & Apriyanto, S. (2020). Impoliteness in Indonesian language hate speech on social media contained in the Instagram account. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 11(2), 36-46.
- Tahir, Ismail. & Muhammad Gana F.R. (2024). Hate speech on social media: Indonesian Netizens' hate comments of presidential talk show on YouTube. *LLT Journal*, 27(1), 230-251.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Makna dalam Interaksi: Pengantar Pragmatik*. London: Longman.
- Widyatnyana, K. N., Rasna, I. W., & Putrayasa, I. B. (2023). Analisis jenis dan makna pragmatik ujaran kebencian di dalam media sosial twitter. In *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia* (Vol. 12, Issue 1).
- Wrenn, M., & Reed, A. (2019). Developing academic discourse through literacy and the 2016 U.S. presidential election: A design-based approach. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 63(2), 189-200.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.