TEENAGERS' IMPOLITENESS IN THE DIGITAL ERA AND ITS RELATION TO SOCIAL MEDIA

ASSAHRA KARINA[1], ABD.HALIM[2], MUFTIHATURRAHMAH BURHAMZAH[3]

English Literature Study Program, Universitas Negeri Makassar

*Corresponding Email: abd.halim@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the impoliteness strategies used by teenagers on social media and to explore the reasons for using language impoliteness by teenagers on social media. The researchers used a descriptive qualitative method to explore impoliteness phenomena by teenagers on social media and The data is taken from several popular social media in the world, like Instagram, tiktok, and twitter. The result of this thesis proves that there were 5 types of impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996). Of the 50 samples taken, it was found 4 impoliteness strategies used by teenagers on social media comments, namely Bald on Record Impoliteness (8), Positive Impoliteness (16), Negative Impoliteness (15), and Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness (11) and Withhold Politeness (0). Positive Impoliteness was the high percentage strategies used by teenagers on social media comments and the lowest strategy was Bald On record Impoliteness. The function for using impoliteness strategies by teenagers on social media were affective impoliteness (17), coercive impoliteness (4), and entertaining impoliteness (5). The reasons for using language impoliteness by teenagers on social media were to vent negative feelings or anger and dislike, increase his power with patterns of abusive language, and to entertain the viewers. The new reasons were found namely hatred and impartiality.

Keywords : Impoliteness, teenagers, social media, strategies.

INTRODUCTION

As living beings or social beings we need social interaction with each other, interaction between fellow humans or our interactions with other living things. Interactions that occur with each other make it easier for us to live in society. In addition, with the interaction, harmony in establishing social life can be established. Social interaction is a reciprocal relationship between one another, both between individuals, individuals with groups, and between groups. In these interactions, individuals or groups are in line with or against directly or indirectly because the interaction is carried out by more than one party who does not always think the same. Social interaction can be in the form of reprimanding each other, shaking hands, talking to each other, or fighting each other can also be classified as a form of social interaction, because the requirements of social interaction are social contact and communication (Andriani, 2016).

The term of communication can't not be separated from our life. It becomes a very important thing to interact with, no matter if it is communication between individuals and individuals, groups with groups, or individuals with groups. With communication, something can be conveyed from sender to receiver. Therefore, communication is one form of social interaction that is needed, both written communication or oral communication. Both Oral communication and non-Oral communication are both used to interact and exchange information with each other, but in the digital world like now people can still communicate without meeting face to face or meeting by social media. However, in its journey, social media does not always have a positive impact on the user, like a coin, social media also has two sides, a good side and a negative side. Not only that, everything that used to be private can now become public. They left with a more developed mindset after the birth of the internet (Holtz & Appel, 2011), this phenomenon enters all circles, without exception teenagers.

Social media has many advantages that make everyone interested in using it both in the economy as we can sell without opening a shop house in front of the house or renting an expensive shop house to market our wares, with social media only armed with the internet we can sell and not infrequently many people who are successful in selling on social media. In addition, in the communication field with social media we don't need to meet distant relatives at home, only with social media and internet access we can see them not only that, in the field of science, for example, we don't need to climb all the way to the top of Mount Rinjani to find out how high the mountain is, only with social media and the internet we can find out the height and width of the mountain.

Nowadays, teenagers are among those who use the internet or social media the most. 170 million (61.8%) of Indonesia's 274.9 million people use social media, with teenagers making up the majority of these users, according to the report Digital 2021: The Newest Insights into the Status of digital (source: kompas.com). For teenagers, social media has become an addiction as well as a second world that makes users no day without social media whether it's Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, TikTok, or YouTube, and so on. This is because the use of social media is seen as a place that can help teenagers to guide them to find their identity. Teenagers have access to online communities through social media that provide them the chance to participate socially and receive comments from the community about themselves (Guzzetti, 2008). Teenagers, however, are not always on a straight path as they develop. Some of them are also impacted by the negative content on social media; in some cases, social media sometimes is made up of negative elements. One of them is that teenagers grow up to be rude or not polite (impoliteness), either with each other or even with older interaction opponents.

Nowadays, teenagers are among those who use the internet or social media the most. 170 million (61.8%) of Indonesia's 274.9 million people use social media, with teenagers making up the majority of these users, according to the report Digital 2021: The Newest Insights into the Status of digital (source: kompas.com). But, as they grow, teenagers do not necessarily follow a straight route. Some of them are also impacted by the negative content on social media; in some cases, social media sometimes is made up of negative elements. One of them is that teenagers grow up to be rude or not polite (impoliteness), either with each other or even with older interaction opponents.

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

From the above problems regarding impoliteness, teenagers, and social media, therefore the researchers want to discuss impoliteness in teenagers in the current digital era and its effects on social media. That's because we are as a social media user and classified as a teenager, are very curious and we want to know what kind of impoliteness is that and why most of us are not afraid to say things that are considered impolite on social media than in the real world, and with this research we hope that curiosity can be answered. Therefore, we offer a solution for all of us through this research to be more literate and aware of the importance of good manners both in the real world and in the cyber world, regardless of age, but especially teenagers who are currently at the top of the most social media users. With this research, it can be a reference for knowledge to readers and a reference for other researchers who want to develop previous research related to this.

From the case, the researchers then established two questions to the problem of the strategies and function that can be the reason by teenagers to do impoliteness to others, they are:

1. What are the Impoliteness strategies used by teenagers on social media?
2. Why do teenagers use Impoliteness to others on social media?

Review of literature

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is defined by Yule (1996) in terms of the meanings that are conveyed by the speaker or author and then understood by the audience or reader. Pragmatics, therefore, has more to do with the analysis of what a person means through their speech than what the word or phrase means in his speech (Siddiqui, 2018).

Impoliteness

In 2011, Culpaper states that impoliteness is a negative attitude in a certain behavior based on encouragement by the expectations, or desires of others in social interactions, especially how one's identity is shown by others in interactions that position the other person as behavior that is considered negative and impolite. Impoliteness arises when they contradict how a person expects it, wants it, or how he thinks it should be. This behavior is considered a violation and many factors can worsen the assumption of the behavior, one of which is whether a person understands the behavior as something intentional or unintentional (Culpeper, 2016). Through his study, he argued that Impoliteness is a theory of backward-looking guidance, according to him Impoliteness is an act that is done deliberately selflessly and contrary to verbal and threatening the face intentionally, (1) not reduced in the context of mitigation needed, (2) done with aggression deliberately aggravated to increase the facial damage caused. To get a successful irreverence, the recipient must understand the intentions of the speaker or author who is perceived as a threatening or facially damaging role (Bousfield, 2008a).

Other opinions according to experts Impoliteness as aggressive face work (Goffman, 1982). While, (Spencer-Oatey, 2012) concludes that Impoliteness needs to be organized to confront it and analyzes a more comprehensive view of it based on accepted principles. When an expression is unfavorable and utilized in a way that threatens the other person's face, it is considered impolite and can result in rudeness, but there is no intention to threaten the face intended by the listener or speaker (Terkourafi, 2001). Meanwhile, according to (Ellen et al., 2001), the understanding of common sense must be distinguished by theoretical understanding (Ningsih et al., 2020).

Impoliteness strategies

According to Culpaper (2016), the tactic used to target people's faces and spark societal turmoil and violence is impoliteness. Siahaan and colleagues 2019 According to Culpaper (2016), the

tactic used to target people's faces and spark societal turmoil and violence is impoliteness (Siahaan et al., 2019)

The most famous strategy of Impoliteness was introduced by (Culpeper, n.d.). The strategy of Impoliteness introduced by Culpaper is based on a strategy of decency by Brown and Levinson (1987). (Culpeper, n.d.) asserts that to understand the definition of Impoliteness is impossible without understanding the phenomenon of politeness. Thus, the framework of Impoliteness analysis needs proper consideration (Mohammed & Abbas, 2016). There are so many definitions about Impoliteness according to many experts in the world.

The Impoliteness strategies introduced by Culpaper is superior to others since it is based on actual data (Bousfield, 2008). In addition, Culpaper relies on media, data and television programs to prove how Impoliteness functions (Mohammed & Abbas, 2016). (Culpeper, 2016) proposed five Impoliteness strategies as the following:

1. Bald on record Impoliteness

   A face is not irrelevant while using the Face Threatening Act (FTA), which is a straightforward, clear-cut, and brief method.

2. Positive Impoliteness

   This tactic aims to undermine the recipient's positive demeanor or need for approval and appreciation. The activity of ignoring others can fall under this strategy, excluding others in certain activities, uncaring or sympathetic, disinterested, and not using clear markers as well as vague or secret language, using taboo words, and derogatory comments (Culpeper, 2016). Ignoring, insulting, or not paying attention to interests or needs, Exclude others from an activity, Separating from others or rejecting similarities, Unsympathetic or interested and unconcerned, Using inappropriate identity markers, Using language that is secret or unclear, Avoiding approval, Make others feel uncomfortable, Using abusive language to express views that oppose a person, Mention or call out the name of someone with a derogatory nomination or by another name.

3. Negative Impoliteness

   This strategy strikes the negative face of the recipient which is a claim to personal protection, the right not to interfere, freedom of action, and freedom of coercion by scaring, scorning, laughing, degrading, treating others not seriously, invading the space of others, associating others with negative aspects, as well as recording the debts of others included in the strategies of negative Impoliteness (Thielemann et al., 2011). Attacking other people's spaces, such as positioning themselves closer to the person mentioned, Scary, which is threatening others that there will be adverse actions, Demeaning/ scorning, that is, insulting others, Treating others less seriously is like underestimating others, Associating others with their flaws, keeping a record of their obligations.

4. Sarcasm or Mock impoliteness

   This is an impression that can be interpreted disrespectfully because the intention not to offend shows familiarity because some people need to know the person in order to know the condition of being mock or joking (Cited in Ningsih, 2020).

5. Withhold Impoliteness

   This strategy is an action that refers to the absence of politeness in the expected place. Like not saying thank you to someone who gave a gift (Culpeper, 2016).

Impoliteness Function

Culpaper provides a thorough examination of the natural text while describing the three purposes of impoliteness (Siahaan et al., 2019), such functions there are :

1. Affective Impoliteness
   This function entails a focused expression of an intensified emotion, like rage, with the implication that the creation of that negative emotional state is the target's fault. Coercive Impoliteness. This style involves the speaker using unprofessional speaking patterns to gain more control over the listener.
2. Entertaining Impoliteness
   This type of impoliteness according to Culpaper as entertaining impoliteness, in which the main victim is not the speaker's interlocutor who uses harsh words but is directed to a third party who considers the display of Immorality to be funny.

The Concept of face

1. Negative and positive face
   The face is a key notion in examining perceptions, according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) derived face for politeness theory. They show that "Modesty is a socially motivated linguistic act consisting of the participants' mutual interactive efforts to support and nurture each other's faces (public self-esteem)". They also say that humans have two facial traits: A person's persistent desire to be liked and appreciated by others is a positive face, whereas, negative face is a person's wish to live without following other people's rules.
2. Face threatening act (FTA)
   Face threatening act is a caution or threat that could harm the listener's good or bad face. A negative face threat is an action that demonstrates a person's intent to accept the upcoming freedom of action. While threatening with a smile implies that one doesn't give a damn about what the other person wants or feels (Brown and Levinson, 1987). According to Brown and Levinson (1987) FTAs can be avoided by using certain strategies to minimize threats. When someone performs an FTA, they must pay attention to the face involved, the less threatening the action, the more disrespectful the person will be (Siahaan et al., 2019).

METHOD

Research Design

This research uses descriptive qualitative methods to explore impoliteness phenomena by teenagers on social media. In order to draw conclusions about the phenomenon being examined, it entails "the gathering, analysis, and interpretation of the facts that have been collected."(Mahmud, 2019).

Source of the Data

The data is taken from several popular social media in the world, like Instagram, tiktok, and twitter. The researchers use that source of data because social media are the most popular social media. In this study, researchers used 50 samples taken from 50 posts by teenagers because these posts received a lot of impolite comments.This social media also includes column comments that can show the opinion of other people. With this characteristic, the updates will likely trigger people to comment, because commentary is written material, it was used as a source of data in this study.

Procedures of Collecting the Data

The data of this research takes screenshot comments that are used by teenagers on social media. Firstly, Searching /Looking for impolite comments on social media (Instagram, tiktok, and twitter) that are used by teenagers. Then, Identifying, using Culpeper's idea of impoliteness tactics, this method to decide which behaviors fall within that category. After that, Classifying, this procedure,

which classified the statements under distinct impoliteness tactics categories. Then, Describing, this process begins by classifying the impoliteness strategies used by adolescents on social media and analyzing the reasons for using these impolite strategies according to Culpaper (2016). Finally, Conclude and explain the data that is classified as impoliteness.

Techniques of the Data Analysis

The data analysis process was carried out based on the data analysis model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2018). This analysis process goes through three stages of data analysis, including data condensation, data display, and drawing conclusions of the data that has been presented.

Data Condensation

The processing of unprocessed data discovered in written records in the field for analysis is known as data condensation. This process of selecting comments made by teenagers on social media, focusing on utterances containing impoliteness strategies in order to ensure that it was truly appropriate as the data, and categorizing these impolite utterances into impoliteness strategies according to the expert, is all part of the data condensation process.

Data Display

Data display is an organized collection of information that allows taking action and then drawing conclusions. These views can be text, charts, diagrams, and tables, or matrices. In this step, the data is compiled based on the writings of teenagers on social media which are considered as impoliteness.

Drawing Conclusion

This step is the final step to consider what the data analyzed means and conclude the data that has been researched. Based on the way the gathered data appears, conclusions are generated. The researchers will now confirm and draw a conclusion about the findings of the investigation into the issue under consideration.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Impoliteness Strategies used by teenagers on Social Media

Bald on record

<u>**Extract 1**</u>

@gustyan_smile : "Aduhhhh malah kaya emak2 yg udah punya anak 5"

@gustyan_smile :"uh even like mothers who have 5 children"

The comment issued by @gustyan_smile is included as Bald on record impoliteness because the comment clearly insulting someone without ambiguous sentences and addressed directly to the recipient with saying that @mayanglucyana looks like a mother who has 5 children, even though she's still a teenager, so this comment is included as Bald on Record.

Positive impoliteness

<u>**Extract 2**</u>

@ray_indra1 : "kok kayak janda tua"

@ray_indra1 : "why are you like an old widow"

This comment issued by @ray_indra1 and @chellynsan_ is included as positive impoliteness because this comment refers to the strategies that are designed to damage the addresses's positive face wants, and this comment also use inappropriate identity markers like **"widow"** and **"sissy"**.

So, this comment is included as positive impoliteness because this comment uses a word that is classified as positive impoliteness.

Negative Impoliteness

<u>Extract 3</u>

Putri958720 : Hidungnya jelek amat😂

Putri958720 : her nose is really ugly 😂

This comment belongs to the type of negative impoliteness based on Culpaper's theory which insults someone's negative face by saying that @chndrika_'s nose is very ugly. Beside that, this comment is also followed by a laughing emoticon which shows @putri958720 insulting @chndrika_ nose whether from the comment and the emoticon that she gives to @chndrika_, so this comment is included in the negative impoliteness.

Sarcasm / Mock Impoliteness

<u>Extract 4</u>

@maulana_malik321 : Buset itu wajah apa minyak goreng woy, berminyak amat😂

@maulana_malik321 : damn, is that face or cooking oil, so oily 😂

In this comment, @maulana_malik321 said that @kurma's face is like cooking oil by comparing @kurma's face with cooking oil and also @maulana_malik321 using a laughing emoticon that means mocking Kurma's face. The comment was include as Sarcasm orang mock impoliteness because this comment was realized using sharp satire by comparing the account owner's "face" with "cooking oil" and also use word "damn" which means @maulana.malik321 despite @kurma_26, so this comment is classified as sarcasm or mock Impoliteness.

Reasons of using Language Impoliteness to others on Social Media

Affective Impoliteness

<u>Extract 5</u> @gnocchipolenta : you dirty ass! Don't dirty vegetables and fruit. If you want to strip in the trash,. It's clean food for people to eat.

This function involves a targeted display of an increased emotion, for example anger, with the implication that the target should be blamed for generating that negative emotional state (page 223). He said that this type may be impulsive due to the overflow of negative emotions, but this type is still often used strategically in social norms.

Coercive Impoliteness

<u>Extract 6</u> : @chellynsan_ : "kok malah kayak banci"

This type is the type where the speaker tries to increase his power over the listener through socially inappropriate speech patterns.

Entertaining Impoliteness

<u>Extract 7</u> : @maulana_malik321 : damn, is that face or cooking oil, so oily 😄

This type of impoliteness according to Culpaper as entertaining impoliteness, in which the main victim is not the speaker's interlocutor who uses harsh words but is directed to a third party who considers the display of Immorality to be funny.

Hatred and impartiality

<u>Extract 8</u> : @lioernalioerna : alayyyyyy itchy, grabbing other people's husbands, I just follow you to remind you of your courage, Ms. Riri, open your crotch... don't sing spiritual songs, you don't deserve.

The new reasons were found namely hatred and impartiality, as happened in the case experienced by @nissa_sabyan who received impolite comments by teenagers not because of her

post, but because of rumors circulating about her affair with someone's husband, so that the comments that were issued not because of someone's post but the hatred and impartiality that did exist before.

Discussion
Impoliteness Strategies used by teenagers on Social Media
In addition, from Culpaper's theory (1996), which became the theoretical reference for this study, which formulated 5 impoliteness strategies, namely bald on record, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock impoliteness, and withhold impoliteness, four impoliteness strategies were found from a total of 50 data. The data taken from the comments column posted by teenagers, it was found that positive impoliteness was the highest strategy carried out by teenagers on social media comments consisting of 16 data. The second is negative impoliteness which consists of 15 data. Then, the third is Sarcasm or mock politeness which consists of 11 data, and the lowest strategy is Bald On Record which consists of 8 data. Although withholding politeness prefers to keep silent in response to speaker utterances, which is a tactic used to avoid performing as expected politeness strategy, it was discovered that there was no withhold politeness present. The study could not discover evidence of haters responding to teens' posts with silence in the comments they made on social media.

In the previous study, namely research by Tria Widya Ningsih (2020) entitled "Impoliteness realized by Social Media users in Celebrities' Instagram" had several similarities and many differences with this study. First, previous studies both discussed impoliteness on social media, and so does this research. In addition, the research methods used both use qualitative methods and also use the theory by the Culpaper as a reference. However, the difference is that in the previous study, Tria Widya Ningsih only focused on Instagram social media, while in this study, researchers used several social media such as Instagram, Twitter and Tiktok. so that the data obtained is broader with the target subject focusing on teenagers only.

In addition, in Tria Widya Ningsih's research, she found that of the 5 strategies proposed by Culpaper, 4 of them were found to be impolite strategies used by social media users, including bald on record, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness and sarcasm or mock impoliteness. In addition, in Tria Widya Ningsih's research, she found that of the 5 strategies proposed by Culpaper, 4 of them were found to be impolite strategies used by social media users, including bald on record, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness and sarcasm or mock impoliteness. With the presentation of 6 bald on record impoliteness, 19 positive impoliteness, 29 negative impoliteness, and 6 sarcasm or mock impoliteness. can be seen in Tri Widyaningsih (2020) research, the most highly used impoliteness strategy is Negative Impoliteness while in this study Positive Impoliteness is the most highly used impoliteness strategy by adolescents. Then the second highest strategy by previous research is positive impoliteness with a percentage of 19 data, while in this study, the second highest impoliteness strategy is negative impoliteness with a percentage of 15 data. Then the next highest impoliteness strategy is Bald on record which has the same percentage as Sarcasm impoliteness namely 6 data, whereas in this study, Sarcasm or mock Impoliteness is an impoliteness strategy used by teenagers on social media with a percentage of 11 data and followed by bald on record as the least impolite strategy used by teenagers on social media with a percentage of 8 data.

You can see some differences regarding the results found, although previous research only found 4 of the 5 strategies according to Culpaper (1996) as well as this study which only found 4

of the 5 strategies proposed by Culpaper 1996, but the data obtained differed in terms of the percentage and use of the strategies used. highest used to the least used by social media users. It is these findings that make this research different from previous research so that there is novelty in this study.

However, for the impoliteness strategies found, previous research and this research both did not find impoliteness based on the theory put forward by Culpaper 1996. Because being silent in response to the speaker's remarks is a common style of politeness that avoids appearing to be the expected politeness technique. Researchers found no evidence of haters remaining silent in response to posts made by youngsters on social media. So, neither in the current study nor in earlier ones, was there any evidence of withholding impoliteness.

Reasons of using Language Impoliteness to others on Social Media
As for the function of impoliteness which is the reason for teenagers committing impoliteness according to Culpaper's theory (1996) there are 3 functions namely Affective Impoliteness, Coercive, and Entertaining functions. Of the 50 data taken from adolescent impolite comments on social media, 3 functions were found which were formulated by Culpaper (1996). That is, from the 3 functions, it was found that the entire function of impoliteness was formulated by Culpaper, namely Affective Impoliteness, Coercive, and Entertaining functions. There were three functions of impoliteness strategies used by Teenagers on Social Media. These rude behaviors included emotive, coercive, and entertaining impoliteness. The researchers identified 21 data for the Coercive Impoliteness function in the table above. The role of coercive impoliteness, which occurs frequently in teens' usage of impoliteness tactics on social media, might be inferred. Affective impoliteness was the second-most prevalent function, with 14 data. And the final function—entertaining impoliteness—had the lowest frequency of all the functions where teenagers used impoliteness tactics on social media, with 8 data.

As for the function of impoliteness which is the reason for teenagers committing impoliteness according to Culpaper's theory (1996) there are 3 functions namely Affective Impoliteness, Coercive, and Entertaining functions. Of the 50 data taken from adolescent impolite comments on social media, 3 functions were found which were formulated by Culpaper (1996). That is, from the 3 functions, it was found that the entire function of impoliteness was formulated by Culpaper, namely Affective Impoliteness, Coercive, and Entertaining functions. There were three functions of impoliteness strategies used by Teenagers on Social Media. They were affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness, and entertaining impoliteness. From the table above, the researchers found 21 data for using the Coercive impoliteness function. It could be concluded that Coercive impoliteness function had high frequency of function for impoliteness strategies used by teenagers on Social Media. The second most dominant function was Affective impoliteness, there were 14 data. And the last function was Entertaining impoliteness that had the lowest frequency of function using impoliteness strategies by teenagers on Social Media, it was 8 data.

The data shows that from the 3 functions of impoliteness performed, the reasons for using language impoliteness by teenagers on social media were to vent negative feelings or anger and dislike, increase his power with patterns of abusive language, and to entertain the viewers. The new reasons were found namely hatred and impartiality there were 7 data, as happened in the case experienced by @nissa_sabyan who received impolite comments by teenagers not because of her post, but because of rumors circulating about her affair with someone's husband, so that the comments that were issued not because of someone's post but the hatred and impartiality that did

exist before. This reason is the latest reason found as a reason for teenagers to commit impoliteness towards other people on social media.

Furthermore, in terms of the functions or reasons for using impoliteness put forward by Culpaper 1996, previous studies found 3 of the 3 functions of using impoliteness according to Culpaper namely Affective Impoliteness, Coercive, and Entertaining functions. In Tria Widya Ningsih's research, the highest function of impoliteness is not explained in detail but as a whole, namely to ridicule or humiliate others, and to entertain others. However, in research Tria Widya Ningsih found that there were new reasons, namely to show disapproval, to show dissatisfaction, to mock celebrities, and to clarify something. Whereas in this study, researchers found 3 of the 3 functions of impoliteness formulated by Culpaper, namely Affective Impoliteness, Coercive, and Entertaining functions and in this study the researchers described the function most used was Coercive impoliteness with a percentage of 21 data. The second highest used function is Affective Impoliteness with a percentage of 14 data, and the lowest function used is Entertaining Impoliteness which functions to entertain others with a percentage of 8 data. However, there are 7 functions or reasons that are not included in the three functions stated by Culpaper 1996, namely the reasons for using impoliteness to show hatred and impartiality, in the discovery of this data, impolite comments made by teenagers towards other people are not related to that person's posts, but hatred and previous impartiality towards the owner of the post as happened in the case experienced by @nissa_sabyan who received impolite comments from teenagers not because of his posts, but because of rumors circulating about his affair with other people's husbands, so comments were issued not because of someone's post but hatred and pre-existing impartiality. This reason is the latest reason found as a reason for teenagers to act disrespectfully towards other people on social media.This reason is not included in the 3 functions of impoliteness put forward by Culpaper 1996 so that researchers feel that there are new reasons regarding the function of impoliteness that one person performs towards another person. Researchers consider that this reason is a difference from previous studies and can be an update from data that has been found previously.

CONCLUSION
Culpeper listed five different types of rudeness tactics (2011). Four impoliteness tactics were discovered among the 50 samples, including Bald on Record Impoliteness (8 samples), Positive Impoliteness (16 samples), Negative Impoliteness (15 samples), Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness (11 samples), and Withhold Politeness (0 sample). Teenagers employed Positive Impoliteness in a high percentage of their social media remarks, whereas Bald On Record Impoliteness was their least preferred tactic. Although withholding politeness prefers to keep silent in response to speaker utterances, which is a tactic used to avoid performing as expected politeness strategy, it was discovered that there was no withhold politeness present. Although withholding politeness prefers to keep silent in response to speaker utterances, which is a tactic used to avoid performing as expected politeness strategy, it was discovered that there was no withhold politeness present. The study could not discover evidence of haters responding to teens' posts with silence in the comments they made on social media. Teenagers on social media primarily used affective impoliteness (17), coercive impoliteness (4), and entertaining impoliteness as their purposes (5). Teenagers on social media use rude language to express their negative emotions like anger and hatred, gain more authority by using harsh language, and amuse the audience.

REFERENCES

Bousfield, D. (2008a). Impoliteness in Interaction. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis Journal.* 47,49,55. 2001

Culpeper, J. (n.d.). *Impoliteness (book chapter).Journal of Impoliteness*

Culpeper, J. (2016). Impoliteness strategies. Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy and Psychology, 4, 421–445. *Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*

Guzzetti, B. J. (2008). Identities in Online Communities: A Young Woman's Critique of Cyberculture. *Journal of E-Learning and Digital Media*, *5*(4), 457–474.

Holtz, P., & Appel, M. (2011). Internet use and video gaming predict problem behavior in early adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, *34*(1), 49–58.

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Journal Business Horizons*, *53*(1), 59–68.

Kecskes, I. (2017). Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication. *Journal of Politeness Research*, *13*(1), 7–31.

Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *8*(3), 597–606.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage publications Journal.

Mohammed, H. N., & Abbas, N. F. (2016). Impoliteness in literary discourse: A pragmatic study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *5*(2), 76–82.

Ningsih, R., Boeriswati, E., Yuliastuti, L., & Jakarta, U. N. (2020). *3 1,2,3*. *7*(1), 159–169. *Jurnal ilmiah sosial humaniora*

Perspectives, C. (2006). Co the First Phase of the Scientific Study of Adolescence. *Journal Development science*.

Siahaan, I. P. S., Rangkuti, R., & Ganie, R. (2019). Hate Speech Used by Haters of Lady Gaga on Social Media. *Nusa: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, *14*(4), 573.

Siddiqui, A. (2018). The principle features of English Pragmatics in applied linguistics. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 9(2), 77. *International Journal Peer*

Spencer-oatey, H. (2012). What is Culture? A compilation of quotations. *GlobalPAD Open House*, 2. *global journal pad intercultural.*

Thielemann, F. K., Arcones, A., Kappeli, R., Liebendrfer, M., Rauscher, T., Winteler, C., Frhlich, C., Dillmann, I., Fischer, T., Martinez-Pinedo, G., Langanke, K., Farouqi, K., Kratz, K. L., Panov, I., & Korneev, I. K. (2011). What are the astrophysical sites for the r-process and the production of heavy elements? *Journal Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics*, *66*(2), 346–353.

Watts, R. J. (2005). Richard J. Watts Politeness. *Notes*, *February*, 2003–2005. *Public Relations Review*

Yule, C. M. (1996). Trophic relationships and food webs of the benthic invertebrate fauna CATHERINE MARY YULE. In *Journal of Tropical Ecology* (Vol. 12, pp. 517–53