MOCK IMPOLITENESS IN COMMENTARY COLUMN OF "THIRTY MILE ZONE" YOUTUBE CHANNEL

THESIS

By:
Amelia Azzarista
NIM 18320098

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG
2022**

MOCK IMPOLITENESS IN COMMENTARY COLUMN OF "THIRTY MILE ZONE" YOUTUBE CHANNEL

THESIS

Presented to

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S.)

By :

Amelia Azzarista
NIM 18320098

Advisor :

Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D
NIP 196906282006041004

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK
IBRAHIM MALANG
2022**

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

I state the thesis entitled **"Mock Impoliteness in Commentary Column of Thirty Mile Zone Youtube Channel"** is my original work. I do not include any materials previously written or published by another person, except those cited as references and written in the bibliography. Hereby, if there is any objection or claim, I am the only person who is responsible for that.

Malang, 30 June 2022

The researcher

..melia Azzarista

NIM 18320098

APPROVAL SHEET

This to certify that Amelia Azzarista's thesis entitled **Mock Impoliteness in Commentary Column of Thirty Mile Zone Youtube Channel** has been approved for thesis examination at Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, as one of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S.).

Malang, 30 June 2022

Approved by

Advisor,

Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP 196906282006041004

Head of Department of English Literature

Ribut Wahyudi, M.Ed., Ph.D.
NIP 198112052011011007

Acknowledge by
Dean,

Dr. M. Faisol, M.Ag.
NIP 197411012003121003

iii

LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Amelia Azzarista's thesis entitled **Mock Impoliteness in Commentary Column of Thirty Mile Zone Youtube channel** has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S.) in Department of English Literature.

Malang, 30 June 2022

Board Examiners   Signatures

1. Chair   Ulil Fitriyah, M.Pd., M.Ed.
   NIPT   19820823201802012176

2. First Examiner   Dr. Hj. Galuh Nur Rohmah, M.Pd., M.Ed.
   NIP   197402111998032002

3. Advisor   Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D.
   NIP   196906282006041004

Approved by
Dean of Faculty of Humanities

Dr. M. Faisol, M.Ag.
NIP 197411012003121003

MOTTO

"Whatever you decide to do, Make it meaningful."

(The researcher)

DEDICATION

   With all prayers and thanks giving to the presence of Allah swt, this work is dedicated to : My dear father and mother, there are no other words that can be said other than thank you which is immeasurable for the love, motivation, sacrifice and prayers that always follow my steps. My dearest brothers and sisters (Arisma and Naura) who always provide encouragement, prayer, and joy. Don't forget my best friend (Mudasyir) who always motivates me to finish this thesis on time and get good results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank God for the presence of Allah SWT, for all His grace and grace so that the thesis entitled "Mock Impoliteness in Commentary Column of "Thirty Mile Zone" Youtube Chanel can be completed properly. Sholawat and greetings are still poured out to the great Prophet Muhammad SAW. This thesis was prepared to fulfill one of the requirements for completing undergraduate education (S1) in the Language and Literature study program, majoring in English Literature, Faculty of Humanities Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.

In arranging this thesis, a lot of people have provided motivation, advice, and support for the researcher. In this valuable chance, the researcher intended to express her gratitude and appreciation to all of them. First, the researcher's deepest appreciation goes to her beloved parents, her mother (Lianah) for the endless love, pray, and support also her father (Agus Ashari) for the phone call every week in order to remins me to keep going and never giving up.

The researcher presents his sincere appreciation goes to Mr. M. Faisol, M.Ag as the dean of Faculty of Humanities Universitas Islam negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Also this thesis would not have been possible without the help, support, and patience of my advisor, Mr. Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D for his supervision, advice, and guidance from the early stages of this research as well as providing me with a wonderful experience over the last few month and correction until the completion of this thesis. The researcher greatest appreciation also goes

Malang, 30 June 2022

Amelia Azzarista

ABSTRACT

Azzarista, Amelia (2018) *Mock Impoliteness in Commentary Column of Thirty Mile Zone Youtube Channel*. Undergraduate Thesis. Department of English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Advisor Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D.

Key word : *pragmatics, mock impoliteness, Thirty Mile Zone*

Impoliteness is behavior that deviates from language norms or politeness. Impoliteness is also said to be a language behavior that insults the face. The phenomenon of impoliteness can often be found in human life and behavior in this modern era.. One of them that is interesting to note is the impoliteness in commenting. This research uses a pragmatic study which is focused on identifying one of the impolitenesses, namely mock impoliteness. This study will identify the attacking action of mock impoliteness, especially in the youtube comment column. The purpose of this study is to examine more deeply the innuendos that appear which are the mock impoliteness category and the strategy for the emergence of these innuendos using the theory from Culpeper (1996), especially on one of the American youtube accounts, Thirty Mile Zone which is gossip news from artists. This research uses descriptive qualitative method. Collecting data from this study is to observe the data that is already available. The object of this research is the comments on several video posts on the TMZ youtube account. This study analyzes in detail the vocabulary including mock impoliteness.

التجريد

اززا رهيتا, امليديا(2018) الالمبالة الاصطناعية ف التعليقات على فئاة Thirty Mile Zone يوتيوب. فرضيةً. برلمج دراسة الألدب الإجنليزي ، كلية العلوم الإنسانية ، موالان مالك إبراهيم الدولة الإسالمية جامعة مالنج. املشرف عبد العزيز، املاجسرتن.

مفتاح الرمز: الرباغماتية وعدم أدب التقليد و Thirty Mile Zone

الالمباالة اللغوية هي سلوك ينحرف عن قواعد اللغة أو الألدب. يقال ا أي أن قلة اللغة هي سلوك لغوي يهني الوجه. اً غالب ما توجد ظاهرة عدم الألدب ف حياة الإنسان وسلوكه ف هذا العصر احلديث. تستخدم هذه الدراسة دراسة براغماتية تركز على حتديد أحد عدم الألدب، أال وهو عدم الألدب املصطنع . عند التعليق ، ليس من غي املألوف العثور على تعليقات غي حمرتمة. ست حدد هذه الدراسة أعمال اهلجوم اليت تتظاهر بعدم االحرتام، السيما ف عمود التعليقات على يوتوب. الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو إجراء فحص أعمق للسخرية اليت تظهر وهي فئة السخرية الومهية واسرتاتيجية ظهور اهلجاء ابستخدام نظرية كولبيي)1996 ،(خاصة على حساب يوتوب أمريكي، Mile Thirty Zone هي اخار ثرثرة من الفنانني. استخدمت هذه الدراسة املنهج الوصفي النوعي. يتم مجع البياانت من هذه الدراسة هو التعليقات على العديد من منشورات الفيديو على حساب يوتوب Zone Mile Thirty . حتال هذه الدراسة ابلتفصيل املفردات مبا ف ذلك الالملباالة الزائفة.

ABSTRAK

Azzarista, Amelia (2018) *Mock Impoliteness in Commentary Column of Thirty Mile Zone Youtube Channel*. Skripsi. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Humaniora, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing Abdul Aziz, M.Ed., Ph.D.

Kata kunci : *Pragmatik, Ketidaksantunan tiruan, Thiry Mile Zone.*

Ketidaksantunan adalah perilaku yang menyimpang dari norma atau kesantunan berbahasa. Ketidaksantunan juga dikatakan sebagai perilaku berbahasa yang menghina wajah. Fenomena ketidaksopanan sering dijumpai dalam kehidupan dan perilaku manusia di era modern ini. Salah satunya yang menarik untuk disimak adalah ketidaksopanan dalam berkomentar. Pada saat berkomentar tidak jarang ditemukan komentar yang tidak sopan. Penelitian ini menggunakan studi pragmatik yang difokuskan untuk mengidentifikasi salah satu ketidaksantunan, yaitu ketidaksantunan tiruan. Penelitian ini akan mengidentifikasi aksi ketidaksopanan tiruan khususnya di kolom komentar youtube. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengkaji lebih dalam sindiran yang muncul yang merupakan kategori mock impoliteness dan strategi munculnya sindiran tersebut menggunakan teori dari Culpeper (1996), khususnya pada salah satu akun youtube Amerika, Thirty Mile Zone yang merupakan berita gosip dari artis. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Pengumpulan data dari penelitian ini adalah dengan mengamati data yang sudah tersedia. Objek penelitian ini adalah komentar pada beberapa postingan video di akun youtube TMZ. Studi ini menganalisis secara rinci kosakata termasuk ketidaksopanan tiruan.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Mock impoliteness on social media widely used by people when they commented. Mock impoliteness happens too not only in the form of words or sentences only but in the use of certain utterances. Mock impoliteness is a problem that is not paid attention to. One small (related) example of this phenomenon is the use of language in social networking media Youtube. Whether consciously or not mock impoliteness in the social networking media youtube is questionable. Today the presence of social networking media youtube has a lot of influence on the thoughts and views of the user community.

In interacting through social media with other people, the important thing to note is politeness in language. Politeness in communicating is not only a desire to express opinions and exchange information but also to establish social and emotional relationships with the other person. So that in conveying communication messages to others, the choice of words and how to convey the message needs to be considered so that it can be well received by the other person. The more indirect a speech delivered, the more polite the speech (Rahardi, Setyaningsih, and Dewi, 2016:73).

Humans do not only communicate face-to-face with their interlocutor, as it is well known that currently the world of the internet is growing rapidly. Through the internet, humans can communicate with people who are far from them. They

no longer bother to communicate with their loved ones who are far from their side. In addition to being a source of information, social media has been widely used to help people's daily processes and activities. almost everyone uses social media, from short messages to the latest social media, namely virtual reality such as youtube. They create their own virtual content, such as activities at home, traveling, and their hobbies (A, M, Kaplan,. & M, Haenlein, 2009). One of them is that they can share stories with others through one of the most popular social media, namely YouTube. Through YouTube they can also see the reactions of the people around them after watching the stories that have been shared. However, through social media, humans can also bring each other down, one of which is through comments from stories that have been shared. There are many people who share comments posted by other people's stories with comments that do not contain politeness in commenting. This results in a decrease in the moral value of an individual which reflects weakness in speaking. In the end, there will be a conflict in communication due to the lack of being polite in language.

Impoliteness is the main attraction in this study because communicating through social media is very important to pay attention to, because not only people who make comments on YouTube know but everyone will also see it. So that in speaking it is not only vocabulary that needs to be considered but how to convey it to the speech partner is also very important to note. Speech acts are pragmatic elements that involve a speaker and a speech partner in which there is a speech interaction between one person is the speaker and the other is the listener. Austin in his book *How to Do Things with Words* (1962) stated that when a

speaker speaks, there are three speech acts carried out simultaneously. The three speech acts include: perlocutionary act, locutionary act, and illocutionary act. It can be seen that impoliteness is the opposite of politeness. Impoliteness in the form of behavior that can cause social conflict. Culpeper (1996) states that the impoliteness strategy is a development of the politeness strategy put forward by Brown and Levinson (1987). Culpeper (2005) defines impoliteness to arise when 1) the speaker communicates by using facial attacks intentionally, 2) the listener perceives the speaker's behavior as intentional facial attacks or a combination of 1 and 2.

One of the impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996) is sarcasm or mock politeness. Mock impoliteness is a type of impoliteness strategy that is shown as if the speaker is polite but in fact is not sincere. Mock impoliteness has a hidden meaning that actually serves to threaten the face of the interlocutor. According to Leech (1983), the more intimate the relationship, the less need to be polite. This is usually a sign of someone's closeness in a conversation. Mock impoliteness is conveyed implicitly so that it can make a speech seem not rude but touching and contains contradictory elements.

This research will focus on discussing the mock impoliteness which comes from a comment from an American youtube account, TMZ. TMZ (Thirty Mile Zone) is a news website that was first released on November 8, 2005. TMZ (Thirty Mile Zone) debuted in 2005 and is considered the fastest and most popular gossip site in Hollywood. At first, the owners of TMZ admitted that they paid their sources to open their mouths as well as to shoot exclusive photos for their

articles. Even TMZ was the first site to report news of Michael Jackson's death in 2009. Meanwhile, mainstream sites such as CNN and The New York Times still had to wait a few hours before confirming the news from TMZ. Pragmatic theory is very useful in this research because it can find out the impoliteness that occurs when someone comments on social media. The conclusion is that the study of pragmatic theory will help fluency in analyzing mock impoliteness in this study.

Research on impoliteness strategies has been carried out by several previous researchers and has become an inspiring researchers to discuss one of the forms of impoliteness strategies. Previous researchers mostly used positive politeness and negative politeness strategies to be studied, but in this study using a different impoliteness strategy, namely mock impoliteness so as to produce discussion that is different from previous research. There are several studies that become a research reference.

The research of Wang and Charlotte (2019) concern at intercultural similarities involving the impoliteness between Chinese and British and their functions. This study aims to uncover similarities in pragmatic processes across the two languages/cultures, more specifically co-development in the conventionalization of forms that seem polite to impolite function used in English and Chinese forum communities in recent times decade or more. The case of the study selected for analysis is the word 'hehe' in Chinese and 'HTH' [hope that helps] in British English. In both cases, this item before have been identified as potentially mocking polite through their presence in a meta-discussion of impoliteness in the forum itself. The similarity in previous research and current

research is the same as discussing impoliteness in social media where the main object is mock impoliteness in pragmatic studies.

The research of Michael Haugh and Derek Abuse (2012) focused on describes two specific interaction practices of banter, joke ridicule and joke harassment, male-only interpersonal interactions in the UK and Australia, and compares the topics of ridicule and harassment. Often there is an assessment of mock impoliteness behavior as impolite, rather than modesty or impoliteness, and that judgments are seen to come from similarity which places a value on "not too serious". The similarities between previous studies and the present study are the same as discussing mock impoliteness, but the difference is that in previous studies comparing mock impoliteness used by Australians and British people, they also used the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) and there was also a study of jocular mockery. Meanwhile, the current study uses mock impoliteness on people's comments on an American YouTube channel and uses the theory of mock impoliteness strategy from Jonathan Culpeper (1996).

The research of Karin Aijmer (2019) concern at mock impoliteness carried out by teenagers today. This study aims to explore impoliteness by using apologies by adolescents. The research data is taken from the Bergen Corpus of London Teenage Language (COLT). early discoveries for materials analysis is looking for 'expressions of apology' operationalized as one of sorry form to explain the frequency and its function! In the next step, the researcher investigates how the expression of apology used in an insincere way. An apology used only for mockery is usually followed by a response that denies or rejects apology. An

insincere apology is characterized by the tone of an insincere apology. Teenagers' conversational style when apologizing is also marked by mimicry on their faces like people acting. The similarity in previous research with current research is discussing mock impoliteness that occurs in everyday life. While the difference in previous studies using apologies in addition to mock impoliteness and the object is teenagers, whereas in the current study only discusses mock impoliteness that occurs on social media.

The research by Mengyuan Yin and Honghong Zhou (2019) explains mock impoliteness as a speech act that attacks the social rights of the interlocutor in a particular language context. The film The Legend of Zhen Huan was chosen as the main object of the research because it has a typical and representative conversation with the mock politeness research being studied. Researchers prove that this film has an effective explanation and strengths about character choice and use of mock impoliteness. The similarities in previous research and current research are the same as discussing mock politeness by applying it to the appropriate object, the difference is that previous research used film as the object of research and used Leech's theory, while the current study uses comments on an American youtube channel and uses mock strategies. impoliteness proposed by Jonathan Culpeper.

The research by Sean McKinnon and Pilar Prieto (2014) aims to examine genuine vs mock impoliteness, especially in the context of discourse, as well as prosodic and gestural patterns in the discourse. A total of 97 participants were asked to rate the target impoliteness of genuine and artificial utterances separately.

The results of the study indicate that the evaluation of the intended imitation utterances resulting in more mock impoliteness on the listener. Disrespect is characterized by an uncertain gesture from the speaker of mock impoliteness. From this research, the result is that mock impoliteness is more complex than mock politeness in general. The similarity between previous research and the present study is the same as discussing mock impoliteness using the theory of Jonathan Culpeper (1996), but the difference is that previous studies analyzed mock impoliteness through the gestures spoken by someone while in the current study observing mock impoliteness from someone's comments.

The research by Muteb Alqarni (2021) analyzes an impolite speech which is considered a curse by Bani Buhair as a well-constructed speech act and follows linguistic rules and patterns. The Buhairi curse formulates the construction of their evil curse by deriving the verb from the previous root consonant in the discourse. This study argues that the evil curse is an impolite expression that strengthens solidarity between Buhairi groups. This study shows that the mock impoliteness model by Haugh and Bousfield (2012) accommodates the curse of evil better than the other models of politeness and impoliteness, proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Culpeper (1996), respectively. The similarity between previous research and current research is that it examines mock impoliteness in speech acts and the theory used is the same, namely Culpeper (1996). The difference is that previous studies used swear words which were considered impolite by Arab tribes and considered a curse, while in the current study using American YouTube objects and analyzing comments containing elements of impoliteness.

The research by Liu Shengnan (2021) aims to outlining mock impoliteness in the Roast China talkshow, where mock impoliteness often occurs during speeches. This study uses the theory of Culpeper (2011) and Wang and Taylor (2019) in identifying conventional mock impoliteness in emerging data. The results of the corpus data and data analysis of the Roast! shows that a number of uses of rhetorical and imperative question formulations can be considered as conventional mock impoliteness formulas. The similarity between previous research and current research is the same as discussing mock impoliteness, but the difference is that in previous studies using mock impoliteness objects at speech events in China which caused many incidents of mock impoliteness, while in the current study using American YouTube media, most of which did contain comments that caused mock impoliteness.

The research by Adonis D. Rivera (2021) aims to investigated the impoliteness and mock impoliteness strategies used by millennial Facebook (FB) groups in their interactional exchanges based on the Culpeper (2011) and Haugh and Bousfield (2012) framework. The type of language and gender of those who interact on the Facebook messenger is also determined. This study reveals that the type of mock impoliteness strategy that is often used by millennial FB users is the type of criticism, threats, and also ridicule. In addition, the factors that influence millennial FB users to express mock impoliteness are emotions, lack of awareness, too much intimacy with friends. This study also revealed that female interlocutors used impoliteness and mock impoliteness strategies in their interactional exchanges more often than men. The similarity between previous

research and current research is the same as examining mock impoliteness using social media objects. The difference is in previous studies using mock impoliteness objects with Facebook messenger. They analyzed how the interaction between women and men on messengers and which ones often gave rise to mock impoliteness, while in the current study using an American youtube channel as an object to examine mock impoliteness. Not comparing how women and men interact but how the comments on youtube raise mock impoliteness.

The research by Heba Abdelraheim Ibrahim Alkady (2020) aims to explores the strategy of impoliteness in the language of the TV show Abla Fahita. Abla Fahita is one of the online public figures on Egyptian social media, who has become an online 'millionaire'. The show is famous for its ridicule on the social. Impoliteness and mock impoliteness appear prominently in Duplex but with the intention of not dropping. Abla Fahita provides new vocabulary in impoliteness and mock impoliteness. The similarity between previous research and current research is that it examines mock impoliteness in society. The difference is in previous studies using mock impoliteness on one of the TV broadcasts which often brings up mock impoliteness, while in the current study using comments on YouTube which often bring up mock impoliteness.

The research by Chengwei Xu and Wentao Gu (2020) reveals that mock politeness and mock impoliteness are usually characterized by an unique prosodic pattern as opposed to literal meaning. The researcher chose the discourse that was carried out to collect the original mandarin utterances and there was mock impoliteness in the imperative and interrogative methods. The results of the study

revealed that mock impoliteness was higher than mock politeness. The similarities between the previous research and the current study are the same as discussing mock impoliteness, the difference is that in previous studies examining mock politeness and mock impoliteness using Mandarin prosodic characters and the result is that mock impoliteness is higher than mock politeness. Meanwhile, the current study uses mock impoliteness on social media where people often mock impoliteness on comments.

B. Problems of the Study

The problems of this research are :

1. What types of mock impoliteness are used in the comment column of Thirty Mile Zone youtube channel?

2. How is the mock impoliteness strategy used in the comment column of Thirty Mile Zone youtube channel?

C. Objectives of the Study

From the problems of the study that have been stated, so this research has the objectives of the study, namely :

1. Identifying the types of mock impoliteness used in the comment of Thirty Mile Zone youtube channel.

2. Describe the use of mock impoliteness in the comment column of Thirty Mile Zone youtube channel.

D. Scope and Limitation

Based on the background of the study that has been described, this study aims to examine the impoliteness that occurs when making comments on someone's YouTube channel. The scope of this research is speech acts while the limitation is mock impoliteness which is an impoliteness strategy in speaking proposed by Jonathan Culpeper (1996). This study will only examine the mock impoliteness found on one of the YouTube channels in America, namely TMZ. Then from the comments that have been given by the public on video postings on the channel, Jonathan Culpeper will analyze and classify them as mock impoliteness. Mock impoliteness theory from pragmatic studies is very useful for this research, especially to examine politeness in commenting on social media. In addition, this study will also discuss what types of mock politeness are used when giving comments and explain the use of mock impoliteness in comments on social media.

E. Significance of the Study

Language impoliteness in commenting on social media can have an influence on the language of the people who see the comments. Videos posted by a youtube channel and there are comments that contain mock impoliteness will be seen directly by other people who watch the video. The presence of social media can not only have a positive effect on society but can also have a negative effect on language. The difficulty of clarifying the meaning of this negative effect is exacerbated by the fact that cybercrime does not refer only to a different type of criminal, but rather to a series of illegal and illicit activities. The researcher hopes

that through this mock impoliteness research it will be useful, especially one's knowledge of politeness in commenting on social media, especially on YouTube. Besides that, it is also hoped that the public will be more careful in expressing the language of comments that will be addressed in a YouTube video post.

1. Theoretical Significance

Theoretically, this research will increase knowledge about speech acts, more specifically the mock impoliteness when commenting on social media using the theory from Jonathan Culpeper. This research is useful as input as a communication science, especially in commenting on social media in cyberspace and can be used as a reference for learning in further research, especially in the pragmatics subject of mock impoliteness based on Jonathan Culpeper's impoliteness principle.

2. Practical Significance

This research is useful as additional material for studies in communication, especially regarding cases that occur in cyberspace and the theory of the mock impoliteness strategy that is applied in one of the comments on the YouTube channel. In addition, the results of this study will be useful as information object for readers to find out the types of mock impoliteness when make comments in social media. So it can provide a good response to people who make comments in social media.

F. Definition of Keyterms

a) Mock impoliteness is an insincere expression. Speakers seem impressed say something nice but the real meaning is the opposite. According to Leech (1983), mock politeness is a form of irony that applies a friendly way of being disrespectful. In my research mock impoliteness will be associated with comments made to people in the youtube comments column which they intend to insinuate which have no real meaning.

b) Commentary Column is Comments are responses written by news readers in the comments column which is placed at the bottom of a story. Types of reader comments are classified based on two things, namely: comments on news and comments on comments. Fill in the comments also categorized into two, namely comments that are positive or negative support and comments that are negative or against someone or an event that is reported.

c) TMZ (Thirty Mile Zone) is a news site that is considered the fastest and most popular gossip site in Hollywood. This YouTube channel will be a benchmark for assessing mock impoliteness on social media.

CHAPTER I I
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. An Overview of Pragmatics

According to Levinson (1983) pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and a context within the structure of that language. Meanwhile, according to Yule in Cutting (2002), pragmatics is a meaning and utterance in a context that analyzes a meaning and can be explained by a physical and social knowledge. Pragmatics examines the speaker's intention in utterance used instead of examining the meaning of speech (Saifudin, 2005). In other words, it is understandable that pragmatics studies how people use language in a certain context certain context. In pragmatics, there are two important things that need to be observed, namely: language use and context. The use of language here concerns language functions, while context is closely related with the culture in society that shows one society with others not the same. According to Leech (1989:13) pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to speech situations (SU).

Thomas (1995) reveals that pragmatics is knowledge that examines meaning in an interaction. Pragmatics expresses the intention of an utterance in communication events, therefore pragmatic analysis seeks to find the speaker's intentions, both expressed and implied behind the speech. The intent of an utterance can be identified by considering the components of the speech situation which include the speaker, the interlocutor, purpose, context, speech as a result of activity, and speech as a verbal act (Rustono, 1999:17).

Until now, the notion of pragmatics has developed. There are four scopes covered in pragmatics, namely: 1) Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning, 2) pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, 3) pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said, 4) pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance (Yule 1996:3). Another understanding is conveyed by Levinson (1983) that there are at least four developments of pragmatic meaning, namely 1) pragmatics as a study of various psychological and sociological phenomena in sign systems in general and language in particular, 2) pragmatics as a study of abstract concepts that have references to speakers, 3) pragmatics as a study of deixis terms, 4) pragmatics as a study of language use. In general, pragmatics leads to the use of language, but there are two interpretations of the meaning of pragmatics in the use of language, namely pragmatics is seen as the use of language in general and leads to the study of the use of certain languages specifically that differ from one language community to another. The use of language to communicate in society, especially in applying the principles of cooperation and courtesy applies differently. These differences apply in culture and language users in different social situations, different social classes from one society to another.

1. Context

In conducting pragmatic analysis, understanding context is very necessary. Context is part of a description or sentence that can give know the clarity of the meaning of the situation related to the speaker's utterance. For understand the conversation well, it is very important to know the context of the conversation.

According to Leech (1989:13) context is the background knowledge of speech that is shared by both the speaker and the speaker's opponent. According to Mey (in Nadar, F.X., 2009:3-4) context is an environmental situation that allows speech participants to interact and make their utterances understandable. Context can also refer to the physical, mental, and knowledge conditions that exist in the minds of speakers and interlocutors.

Hymes in Rustono (1999:20) explains that the factors of speech events are eight, namely: 1) Setting or scene, place and atmosphere of speech events; 2) Particpant, speaker and interlocutor; 3) end or destination; 4) act or actions; 5) key, namely tone of voice and variety of language used in expressing speech and how to express it; 6) instrument, namely a tool to express speech either orally or in writing; 7) norm or anorma, namely rules that must be obeyed by every speaker; 8) genre, namely activities such as interviews, discussions, campaigns, and others. According to Levinson (1983), one must be able to distinguish between the actual situation of the speech with various characteristics of their speech to be able to find out a context. The context in pragmatics according to Cutting (2002) is divided into 3, namely:

1) Situational context

Situational context or situational context is what the speaker know about the situations in which the interaction takes place at the time of speaking. Context situational also includes physical or what can be seen around them during the conversation.

2) Background knowledge context

Background knowledge context is what the speaker and addressee know based on their background knowledge and what they know about each other. Background knowledge context is divided into two kinds namely, cultural general knowledge and interpersonal knowledge.

3) Co-textual context

Co-textual context is a context that is usually in the form of deixis and is in the text itself. Co-textual context includes what they know about what they said in the conversation.

2. Speech Act

Speech act is a pragmatic element that involves a speaker and a speech partner in which there is a speech interaction between one person is the speaker and the other is the listener. Gunarwan (1994:43) states that: which is similar that speech acts have an important position in the pragmatics because speech acts are one of the units of analysis. The three speech acts are perlocutionary act, locutionary act, and illocutionary act. Perlocutionary act is a speech act that aims to influence the interlocutor to understand a situation so as to comply with the wishes of the speaker. A locutionary act is a speech act that merely states something or the utterance itself. Illocutionary act is a speech act that states a certain intention or something that the speaker wants to achieve when he says something.

Searle (1979:39) views that the illocutionary act is the smallest unit in linguistics. Searle divides 5 kinds of illocutionary acts, namely: assertive illocutionary acts, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Assertive illocutionary acts are illocutions that state the truth, for example: stating, stating opinion, and report. A directive illocutionary act is an illocutionary act that produce effects in the form of actions taken by speakers, for example: ordering, ordering, begging, and giving advice. Illocutionary act commissive is an illocutionary act that makes the interlocutor bound to an action in the past future, for example: promising and offering. An expressive illocutionary act is an illocutionary act that expresses the speaker's psychological attitude towards implied in the illocutionary, for example: thanking, congratulating, apologizing, criticizing, praising. The illocutionary act of declaration is an illocutionary act whose successful implementation results in conformity between the content and reality, for example: dismiss, resign, baptize, name, sentence, excommunicate / throw away, (Leech, 1989:105). An utterance has a goal in order to achieve it, it requires conditions, such as the lexical content of the utterance must be in accordance with the context (social situation) that is where the utterance occurs. That is, the speaker must be serious about what he says and the interlocutor must hear the speech according to its purpose.

B. Face

Face is a concept that helps in understanding how impoliteness events occur. Bousfield (2008) argues that face is an important part of politeness and impoliteness. The speaker must be able to keep the face of the interlocutor so that

communication can run smoothly and harmony between the two is maintained. However, on the other hand, speakers can attack the face of the interlocutor intentionally with the aim of damaging the interlocutor's self-image. Face is divided into two kinds, namely positive face and negative face. According to Brown and Levinson (in Cutting, 2002) positive face is a person's desire to be accepted and liked by others. While the negative face is a person's desire to have the freedom to act and not depend on others.

Because threats to the face also have the potential as a form of attack, some people call it Face Attack. Face attacks are generally actions that are considered by the interlocutor as an attack that is done intentionally. Active neglect of the face to the point of threatening until someone's wok disappears is referred to by Culpeper in Kawa's dissertation (2013:112) as impoliteness. Face Attack that threaten the negative face of the interlocutor according to Brown and Levinson (1987:66) include:

i. Actions that result in the interlocutor agreeing or refusing to do something such as expressions about: ordering, asking, giving advice, giving advice, reminding, threatening, etc.

ii. Actions that express the speaker's efforts to do something to the interlocutor and force the interlocutor to accept or reject the action, such as the expressions of offering and promising.

iii. Actions that express the speaker's desire to do something to the interlocutor or what the interlocutor has, such as praising or congratulating, admiring, hating, etc.

Face attacks that threaten the positive face of the interlocutor according to Brown and Levinson (1987:66-67) are:

i. Actions that show that the speaker gives a negative assessment of the interlocutor such as criticizing, demeaning, or humiliating, etc.).

ii. Actions that show the speaker's indifferent attitude towards the positive face of the interlocutor such as opposition, disagreement, emotion, or disrespectful expressions.

Brown and Levinson (1987:67-68) explain that Face attacks that have the potential to threaten the speaker's negative face are acts of expressing and receiving thanks, defending, accepting offers, responding to embarrassing actions of the interlocutor, and making promises that the speaker does not want. Meanwhile, actions that threaten the positive face of speakers according to Brown and Levinson (1987:68) are apologizing, receiving congratulations, doing embarrassing physical acts, humbling themselves, and admitting mistakes.

C. Politeness Strategy

Before analyzing impoliteness, it is necessary to understand politeness first. Language politeness cannot be separated from the concept of a person's face as a member of society. According to Yule (2014:132) politeness is a form of language behavior that shows understanding of the faces of other people who are speech partners in a conversation. On social media, politeness behavior is known as netiquette which refers to polite language ethics (Yus, 2011: 256). Leech (1983:132) argues that the basic principles of politeness can be categorized into several maxims, namely:

a) The maxim of modesty is to reduce the losses of others and increase the benefits of others. If in speech the speaker tries to maximize people's profits otherwise, then the interlocutor must also maximize his own losses, right? on the contrary. For example: *Can I ask for help to send the file on the laptop?*.

b) The maxim of generosity is reducing one's own gain and increasing self-sacrifice. The maxim of generosity can be called the maxim of generosity, meaning that people who speak are expected to respect others. Example: I'll help you do this craft assignment, I'll send it to you later.

c) The maxim of approbation is to reduce criticism of others and add praise to others. Someone can be considered polite if in communication they try to give respect to others. In this maxim, the expected conversation and the speech partner are not open to each other, not to each other criticizing, not hating each other, and not blaming each other interlocutors. Speakers who enjoy other speech participants during the activity speaking can be said to be impolite. It's said like that, because action is an act that does not respect other people. Called unwholesome, such actions should be avoided inreal association Example: You are more beautiful now than when you were in school.

d) The maxim of simplicity is reducing self-praise and increasing self-criticism. Maxim simplicity can be called the maxim of humility, in the communication of the speech participants expected to have a heart attitude in a way reduce self-esteem. People can be called arrogant be careful if in speaking

communication always excels himself or praise himself. Example: My body is getting fatter now.

e) The maxim of agreement is to reduce disagreement with others and increase conformity with others. This maxim emphasizes that the speaker and the speech partner can foster each other compatibility, agreement or agreement in speaking activities. Speakers and speech partners can be said to have a polite attitude if there has been agreement or compatibility in speaking activities. If we look at people who speak today, often the interlocutor uses nods to sign agree, thumbs up, face without wrinkles on the forehead, and more. Example: I believe you can and prove it to people who don't like you.

f) The maxim of sympathy is to maximize sympathy and minimize antipathy. The purpose of this maxim is so that the speech participants can maximize their attitudes sympathy between one party and the other. Public speech in Indonesia, upholding the attitude of sympathy for others in everyday communication. If the speech participant does not have an attitude sympathy, it can be said that the speech participant has an antipathy attitude and can be considered as an act of disrespect. Sympathy to other people can be shown by giving a smile, nod, hold hands, and more. Example: Congratulations on your graduation.

D. Impoliteness Strategy

It can be seen that impoliteness is the opposite of politeness. Politeness serves to form a harmony but impoliteness is in the form of behavior that can lead to social conflict. According to Culpeper (1996) the impoliteness strategy is a development of the politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

Impoliteness cannot be found without the concept of politeness, so it can be said that politeness and impoliteness are two related concepts. In terms of terminology, Culpeper (2008:36) argues that impoliteness is a communication behavior that intends to attack the face of the speech partner or causes the speech partner to feel that his face is being attacked. So that impoliteness can occur when there is an intention from the speaker and the awareness of the interlocutor against the impoliteness caused by the speaker. According to Mills (1996) acts of impoliteness can only be understood and analyzed pragmatically when they are related to the understanding of speech groups and only in terms of a wide variety of discourse strategies between the speaker and the interlocutor. So it can be seen if an important element of impoliteness is a deliberate factor. This form of impoliteness is theoretically based on the concept of politeness strategy by Brown & Levinson (1978) which introduces the concept of a positive face which refers to a person's desire to maintain and show close relationships with others and a negative face which refers to a person's desire not to offend or hurt other people's feelings. (Crystal, 2008: 184).

According to Leech (2014) impoliteness can be created if the principle of impoliteness is twisted. This means that impoliteness can be caught from the presence of utterances that are inappropriate or violate the principle of politeness. An action can be categorized as impoliteness if the interlocutor has considered that the speaker damaged his face and showed threatening actions. In real cases, there are strategies used by speakers in their utterances to bring up the concept of impoliteness. The strategy was articulated and developed by the impolite strategy

researcher, Culpeper. Based on Brown & Levinson's concept of facial modesty, the strategy of impoliteness in practice does not aim to support the desire of a person's face but to attack his face. There are 5 types of politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson, namely: bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record, and withhold politeness. The 5 impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996) which is based on the politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) namely:

a. Bald On-Record Impoliteness

The bald on-record type of impoliteness strategy is a strategy impoliteness spoken frankly without further ado. This action can be done when the bully has a higher power and position than the victim. But according to some researchers on social media this strategy doesn't work. Perpetrators use this strategy but that does not mean they are in a higher position than the victim. This is because no identity can be found in cyberspace so that the perpetrator feels free. In this case, the perpetrator does not feel that position and power are things that must be considered or disrespectful because it is done in the real world.

b. Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness is used to attack the opponent's positive face talk. Usually this strategy is used to attack the opponent's face people who want to be considered part of a group. For example, ignoring the interlocutor, not caring about the interlocutor, refusing, using secret language that cannot be understood by the interlocutor, etc.

c. Negative Impoliteness

Negative impoliteness is the opposition of positive impoliteness which aims to hurt the negative face of the interlocutor. For example, threatening, demeaning, harassing, insulting, not seriously treating the interlocutor, etc.

d. Withold Impoliteness

Withhold impoliteness occurs due to the absence of politeness when politeness should occur but the speaker does not act whatever. For example, not thanking the interlocutor who provided help.

e. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

Sarcasm or mock politeness is a type of impoliteness strategy which is shown as if the speaker is polite but in fact not sincere. Like an expression of irony.

E. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

Innuendo is generally categorized as an act that is not polite (Haverkate: 1994). In social media, there are also innuendos such as mock impoliteness, one of which is in YouTube comments. Mock impoliteness is one type of impoliteness strategy proposed by Culpeper (1996). Mock impoliteness is an expression that is said insincerely to the other person. The speaker seems to say something good but the real meaning is the opposite. Leech (1983) argues that mock impoliteness is a form of irony that applies a friendly way of being disrespectful. The mock impoliteness itself can be a sign of closeness between two or more participants in a conversation. Mock impoliteness is usually enhanced by exaggerated facial expressions such as moaning and smiling. Mock impoliteness is usually conveyed

implicitly so that it can make a speech seem not rude but touching and contains contradictory elements.

Judging from the goals and intentions, mock impoliteness is divided into two categories namely : the first is motivated mock impoliteness and mock impoliteness is not motivated. Motivated mock impoliteness is an assumed speaker intends to commit an act of impoliteness with dishonest intentions. Then, mock impoliteness not being motivated is an act of impoliteness which is not meant to be impolite. Not intended means not understanding that what is done is not polite. This misunderstanding can be caused by various factors, e.g. different cultures (related with ethnicity), understanding the context different, or proximity factors (Mills, 2003).

The researcher uses the mock impoliteness strategy theory of Culpeper (1996) to describe the form of impoliteness used in youtube comments. This theory has five contents, namely: The first is demeaning or mocking behavior. This action is to produces or perceives displays of power that violate the understanding of power hierarchies. Next is to insults (including derogatory statements and implications). This action is to producing or feeling low value displays for some target. The next is sharp criticism (including expressions of disapproval and statement of error, weakness or loss). This action is to produce or view low value display for multiple targets. The next is encroachment. This action is to produce or view views from violation of personal space (literal or metaphorical). The last is failure to reply. This action is to produce or view a display from violation of reciprocal norms.

CHAPTER I I I
RESEARCH METHOD

A. Method

The method used as mock impoliteness on an American youtube channel TMZ is descriptive qualitative because this study analyzes the comments that appear on an American youtube channel and will describe which ones are mock impoliteness comments and relate them to the theory of impoliteness strategy from Jonathan Culpeper. Hancock, Ockleford, Windridge (2009:7) say descriptive research method is to explain and deepen social phenomena around us. There are several steps used by researchers to compile this research, namely:

1. Research Design

Design qualitative research is a method research used to examine the condition of existing objects, both natural phenomena and man-made phenomenon due to basically qualitative methodology is research procedures that result in qualitative descriptive data in the form of words written or spoken from people and observed behavior (Bodgan and Tailor in Prastowo, 2011:22). This research method does not include field research because this research uses one of the objects of social media, namely YouTube. This study intends to make a systematic, factual and accurate description of mock impoliteness regarding the data, nature, and relationship of the phenomenon being studied.

2. Data Collection

Collecting data in this study is by looking for comments that are in accordance with the research, namely comments that contain elements of mock

impoliteness and linking them to the theory of strategic impoliteness from Jonathan Culpeper in the comments column of the video posting TMZ, one of the American YouTube channels. Researchers pay attention to every comment expressed by internet residents in the TMZ comment column. Then the researcher will obtain data in the form of commentary text and the name of the commentator on the post of one of the TMZ videos. Then the results of the observations in the form of observations, comments containing mock impoliteness, and other supporting documents. Then Screen capture of comments, video postings from TMZ, grouping table on the theory of impoliteness strategy, and problems that occur when collecting data are stored in handphone memory.

3. Data Analysis

The results of the observations were analyzed with existing documents, namely the mock impoliteness strategy theory from Jonathan Culpeper. Then the data processing is carried out by describing the data findings in the form of reports. In carrying out the mock impoliteness research on the video posted by TMZ, one of the American YouTube channels, the following is done:

The first the researcher explain the background of TMZ which is an American youtube channel. After that the researcher observ the comments on some of TMZ's vidoe post that can be categorized as mock impoliteness. The next is describe and give the examples of comments that are mock impoliteness. The last is analyze these comments to find the types and how the mock impoliteness is used in the comments using the theory of mock impoliteness strategy from Jonathan Culpeper.

B. Table of Method

Summarize

Research Question	Data Source	Data Collection	Data Analysis
1. What are the types of mock impoliteness used in comments?	Video post from TMZ, an American YouTube channel	The researcher watched the video, then the researcher looked at the comment column on the channel and sorted out the comments to find and identify comments that contained mock impoliteness words.	The comments were analyzed for the types of mock impoliteness using Jonathan Culpeper's (1996) theory.
2. How is the mock impoliteness strategy used in comments?	Video post from TMZ, an American YouTube channel	The researchers looked back at the comments section of one of TMZ's video posts to analyze how mock impoliteness strategies were used in comments.	Describe the use of mock impoliteness in one of TMZ video American youtube Comments

CHAPTER IV
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

A. The Types of Mock Impoliteness

The results of this study are in the form of a description of the violation of the principle of politeness in language, namely mock impoliteness contained in the comments on the TMZ youtube video clip. In addition, it is also about how the mock impoliteness occurs. Mock impoliteness is divided into two categories, namely:

a) Mock impoliteness is motivated, namely speech from a speaker who intends to perform an act of impoliteness with dishonest intentions.

b) Mock impoliteness that is unmotivated is not understanding that what it is doing is an act of impoliteness. These misunderstandings are caused by various factors such as different cultures or different understandings of contexts.

B. The Use of Mock Impoliteness

Meanwhile, the use of mock impoliteness in YouTube comments can be categorized into 5 theories, they are : The first is demeaning or mocking behavior. This action is to produces or perceives displays of power that violate the understanding of power hierarchies. Next is to insults (including derogatory statements and implications). This action is to producing or feeling low value displays for some target. The next is sharp criticism (including expressions of disapproval and statement of error, weakness or loss). This action is to produce or view low value display for multiple targets. The next is encroachment. This action

is to produce or view views from violation of personal space (literal or metaphorical). The last is failure to reply. This action is to produce or view a display from violation of reciprocal norms.

C. Findings

The first comment classified as mock impoliteness on the TMZ youtube channel in one of the videos entitled "Melissa Gorga Says She's Good with Teresa Giudice Despite 'RHONJ' Reunion Drama". The video was posted on May 6th 2022 which lasts approximately 1 minute, shows that a woman named Melissa Gorga will be holding a reunion with Teresa and Joe Judice. Melissa said that she would be fine because they were like family, but there was something odd that said it was as if Melissa was not doing well and was trying to avoid the reporters. In response to this, there are several comments that appear and fall into the category of mock impoliteness.

(1) Grab your popcorn

Judging from the intent and purpose of the comment, it is classified as an unmotivated mock impoliteness. The comment shows that what the commentator has written is something unintentional. On the other hand, comments like that are done unintentionally but are considered impolite comments that can cause misunderstandings. Maybe the intention of the person who wrote the comment was out of curiosity to see the continuation of his cheerful life, but such a thing should be a privacy from Melissa and her family.

The mock impoliteness strategy in the comments was used to demean Melissa, as already explained that what happened to Melissa and her family could be a private one. It can be seen from the way Melissa avoids the reporters who keep approaching her and asking questions. The person who wrote the comment shouldn't have said that.

(2) She looks sooo different, I didn't even recognise her!

Judging from the comments according to the intent and purpose, it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. Such comments are deemed to be intended to be impolite with dishonest intentions or done intentionally. The person who wrote the comment clearly intentionally wrote such a sentence because of Melissa's different appearance. Such behavior belongs to the category of motivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy in the comments was used to humiliate Melissa by saying I didn't recognize her. Such behavior was clearly included in the mock impoliteness which meant to insult Melissa.

(3) Side guy

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. The person who wrote the comment intentionally satirized Joe Judice, who is a relative of Melissa. Maybe that person's intention was to defend Melissa but he had deliberately carried out an act of impoliteness that was meant to be satirical.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to criticize Joe Judice. The person who wrote the comment criticized Joe Judice for being the source of problems in Melissa's life. Criticism as in the comments is included in the act of mock impoliteness even though the aim is not at the people in the video.

(4) She called TMZ to watch her walkout

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. The speaker in the comment took an act that was considered to be intentionally impolite, namely making a comment to corner Melissa. In these comments, it seems as if they were intentionally written to give a statement which is not necessarily the case.

The mock impoliteness strategy in the comments was used to demean Melissa. The author of the comments like to belittle Melissa by saying that Melissa purposely called TMZ to see her walkout. The statement is like Melissa is giving a play so that she becomes viral and many media approach her.

(5) She's so thirsty

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives it is included in the unmotivated mock impoliteness. Speakers of the comments do not understand that what has been done is an act of disrespect. These comments can cause misunderstandings for people who don't know what the speaker really means. This misunderstanding can be caused by contextual factors that are different from what those who commented on the video post wanted to convey.

The mock impoliteness strategy in the comment was used to humiliate Melissa. In the sentence "thristy" the author of the comment said something that could insult Melissa. The ambiguity of the word thristy can cause misunderstandings because basically thristy is used for thirsty people. It could be that the word thirsty means a thirst for praise or a thirst for mercy from others for him. Therefore the strategy used in this comment is to be condescending.

(6) Melissa is the worst sister in law ever

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. The speaker in this comment is considered to have intended to commit an act of impoliteness which was done intentionally. The speaker deliberately said that Melissa was the worst sister-in-law ever. Maybe according to the speaker that the statement is indeed in accordance with Melissa but comments like that also include acts of impoliteness in commenting on social media.

The mock impoliteness strategy in the comment was used to criticize Melissa. Th speaker provide criticism that is not polite to do on social media. Maybe the speaker's intention is to convey the actual situation but it is inappropriate to do it on social media. criticizing disrespectful is the same as demeaning someone. Therefore, the speaker's criticism is classified as mock impoliteness.

In the second video entitled "Tristan Thompson Sends Khloe Kardashian's Mom Kris Jenner Roses for Mother's Day" there are several comments that are classified as mock impoliteness. The video was posted on May 11th 2022 which is

about 3 minutes 27 seconds shows that Khloe Kardashian's ex-husband Tristan Thompson gave her ex-mother-in-law a bouquet of flowers on Mother's Day. Tristan Thompson's behavior actually invites a lot of the public to find out what's really going on. People feel that giving a bouquet of flowers to ex-in-laws is a rare thing. Not only that, behind Tristan Thompson giving his ex-in-law a bouquet of flowers is to establish a good relationship. Not only with her mother-in-law all the Khloe Kardashian sisters are also treated well with Tristan Thompson. However, with this incident, not only was the public giving praise to Tristan Thompson, there were also some negative comments that contained satirical elements. These comments can be classified as mock impoliteness. In response to this, there are several comments that appear and fall into the category of mock impoliteness.

(1) There's not enough flowers in the world that could make up forthis guy's behavior

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the unmotivated mock impoliteness. This is because the person who wrote the comment accidentally stated that what was written was an impolite act that could lead to misunderstandings. People who don't understand what the commentator meant may actually misunderstand that Tristan Thompson's behavior was bad.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to demean Tristan Thompson. Comments written by someone are used to mock as if giving a bouquet of flowers on Mother's Day is not enough to make up for mistakes that have been made or to change bad habits. Even though it's explained in the video

that Tristan Thompson is already trying to mend his relationship with his ex-mother-in-law and Khloe Kardashian's family.

(2) He does not want her! He wants a lady who's body is real and has an education.

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. The utterances of the commentators thought deliberately to commit acts of dishonest or dishonest intent. The person deliberately intended to ridicule Tristan Thompson that he didn't actually sincerely give the bouquet to his ex-in-law. Tristan Thompson is considered only using his ex-in-law to establish a good relationship with Khloe Kardashian.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the sommentary is to humiliate Tristan Thompson. The person insulted that what Tristan Thompson did was not sincere and had a purpose. Even though he didn't know what really happened, just by looking at Tristan Thompson's good behavior towards his ex-in-laws, he could immediately insult him with these comments. The person attempted to insult Tristan Thompson through comments that were shared without knowing the real situation.

(3) He's trying to clap those next.

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the unmotivated mock impoliteness. This is because the person who wrote the comment accidentally stated that what was written was an impolite act that could

lead to misunderstandings. The comments he wrote could lead to misunderstandings for people who don't know them.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to criticize Tristan Thompson. The commentary criticized that Tristan Thompson might be happy if his mission to reconnect with his former in-laws had been successful. In fact he had no idea what was going to happen to Tristan Thompson next. The person is only able to criticize it.

(4) Barf

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. This comment was intentionally written by the speaker to provide a statement that what Tristan Thompson had done was so disgusting to him that he commented barf. Comments like this are clearly done on purpose and as a result are included in the act of mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the sommentary is to humiliate Tristan Thompson. This comment is used by speakers to insult the actions that have been carried out by Tristan Thompson. Even though what Tristan Thompson has done is a good deed. Even though he gave flowers to his ex-in-laws, things like that could keep their relationship on the mend.

(5) He shouldn't sent them anthrax

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. Speakers make comments that are not polite and are done on purpose. This comment confirms that what Tristan Thompson gave

his ex-in-law was anthrax. In fact Tristan Thompson gave a beautiful bouquet of flowers. Comments like this are considered impolite.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to demean Tristan Thompson. What Tristan has done seems like a bad thing. The commentator likens what he had given his ex-in-law to giving him a contagious disease. This is meant to belittle Tristan Thompson's actions.

In the third video entitled "Paparazzo That Once Got Beat Up by Mike Tyson Says Man on Plane "Got Lucky"" there are several comments that belong to mock impoliteness. This video was posted on April 24th 2022 which is about 1 minutes 27 seconds. In the video, it is said that Papparazo, who had been hit by Mike Tyson, felt very painful. Former heavyweight boxing champion Mike Tyson and 50-year-old paparazzo Tony Echevarria both want to file offenses against each other. Echevarria said that Mike Tyson hit him during the incident. Echevarria fell to the ground and had a headache and was hospitalized with a wound to his forehead. He recounted how Mike Tyson smacked his forehead until it bled. This is because a paparazzo often camps out at Los Angeles' largest airport to photograph celebrities in transit. However, the problem is that they often follow celebrities even to the men's restroom to take their photos. Therefore Mike Tyson acted by hitting him. In response to this incident there were several comments written by several people who watched this video and included an act of impoliteness.

(1) "You can't mess with the bull" well said

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the motivated mock impoliteness. This is because in these comments the speech delivered by the speaker is considered to be intended to carry out an act of impoliteness. The sentence "the bull" is a word that is inappropriate for humans.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to humiliate Paparazzo. The comment seemed to insult Paparazzo by saying that he was a bull. Although the bull is a strong animal, the word "the bull" should not be confused with a person. People who are said to be like bulls in this regard will also feel that they have been insulted.

(2) He looks like the black version of Dana White

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the unmotivated mock impoliteness. This is because that what has been written by the person who made the comment is considered an act of impoliteness. In this case it could of course lead to misunderstandings between the two parties mentioned, although there may be good intentions in the comments.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to criticized. These comments are included in criticizing something. It has been mentioned there that in comparison with the sentence "the black version of Dana White", the sentence is of course included in body shaming. Even though body shaming is something that can hurt people compared to other people. Therefore the comment is included in the mock impoliteness.

(3) Headaches for weeks geez

This comment is classified as motivated mock impoliteness because the speech delivered by the speaker is considered to have carried out an act of impoliteness that was carried out intentionally. Maybe the speaker's intention is to justify, but the sentence used to comment contains an element of impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to criticize Papparazo. The speaker criticized what Paparazzi said was that he had a headache for a month, in fact generally a headache for a week at most. That is the intent of the speaker. However, the language used to criticize contains an element of impoliteness so that it can be considered mock impoliteness.

(4) Everybody has a plan until they get punched in the mouth.

Judging from the intent and purpose of the comment, it is classified as an unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that what is written in the comment is an act of impoliteness. This can lead to misunderstandings caused by different contextual understanding factors. This comment includes unmotivated mock impoliteness because it is conveyed through quotes that have an implied meaning. So if people who don't understand the meaning of these quotes can think that Papparazo is wrong, not Mike Tyson.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the sommentary is to demean Paparazzo. The comments conveyed through these quotes seemed to give an understanding that Papparazo was demeaned by the way they commented to show

their pleasure because Papparazo was hit by Mike Tyson. The commentator feels that Papparazo deserves to be beaten by Mike Tyson for what he has done.

(5) The big bull!!!

Judging from the intent and purpose of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. Through the comments that have been shared, the speaker is considered to have intended to do an act of impoliteness on purpose. In this comment the speaker intentionally equates the Paparazzo with a bull. This is clearly included in motivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to humiliate Paparazzo. The action taken by the speaker is an insulting impolite act. Equating humans with animals is wrong. Even though you feel annoyed with people, equating humans with animals is very disrespectful. Moreover, this kind of thing is done and shared on social media where many people will see it.

(6) He's famous now

Judging from the intent and purpose of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that what he has shared in the comments column is an impolite sentence which can cause misunderstandings because of the different understanding of the context between what the speaker wants to convey and the responses of others.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary is to demean Paparazzo. Maybe according to the speakers of the word famous here will bring luck to Paparazzo for what has happened to him and Mike Tyson. However, this

famous word could also cause Paparazzo's bad actions to be more famous and more people will hate him and avoid him. Although basically famous is a word that has a good meaning, but it can be bad if it is not clear, especially to insinuate someone.

The next video is titled "Farrah Abraham Wants to be Stand-Up Comedian After Leaving Treatment Center. This video aired on April 24, 2022 which is 3 minutes long. This video explains Farrah Abraham's confession that she wants to be a comedian. However, after she announced the news in an interview with TMZ and posted it on her personal Instagram page, Farrah actually received some comments and criticism from others. In fact, many people consider it not serious and just a joke from him. Although it appears that Farrah's trauma treatment has helped her to move forward and fight the sexual assault she has experienced, many people do not believe Farrah's statement. There are some comments made that belong to mock impoliteness. Some of these comments are as follows.

(1) OMG, so sad what she has done to her face

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as an unmotivated mock impoliteness. Speakers do not understand that what has been said can lead to misunderstandings caused by inadvertently understanding different contexts. Even though that person may give a sense of empathy, it could be possible to make the comment as a comment that satirizes Farrah. Therefore, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary column is to criticize Farrah Abraham. The criticism given by the speaker could have made Farrah hurt by her decision. Such comments cannot be shared on social media to criticize others.

(2) The scarier thing is she is responsible for another human life

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as an unmotivated mock impoliteness. Speakers do not understand that what has been said can lead to misunderstandings caused by inadvertently understanding different contexts. Even though that person may give a sense of empathy, it could be possible to make the comment as a comment that satirizes Farrah. Therefore, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary column is to criticize Farrah Abraham. The criticism given by the speaker could have made Farrah hurt by her decision. Such comments cannot be shared on social media to criticize others.

(3) She has so much filler in her face! make it looks enormous

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. The speaker's comments are considered intended to carry out an act of impoliteness that is carried out intentionally. The speaker deliberately said that Farrah Abraham's face looks enormous. Actions like this are included in the act of mock impoliteness, especially if they are carried out on social media.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary column is to humiliate Farrah Abraham. The speaker insults Farrah Abraham's face by saying that her face looks enormous. This can also be included in the act of body shaming, which is physically insulting someone. Body shaming on social media is also included in the act of mock impoliteness.

(4) What message is she giving her daughter

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as an unmotivated mock impoliteness. Speakers do not understand that what has been said can lead to misunderstandings caused by inadvertently understanding different contexts. Even though that person may give a sense of empathy, it could be possible to make the comment as a comment that satirizes Farrah. Therefore, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the commentary column is to criticize Farrah Abraham. The criticism given by the speaker could have made Farrah hurt by her decision. Such comments cannot be shared on social media to criticize others.

(5) Lord she looks like 40 something

In this comment, seen from the aims and objectives, it is included in the unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand if what he is doing is an act of impoliteness. As a result, it will lead to a misunderstanding caused by a different understanding of the context. Moreover, what is involved is the issue of age. Actions like this are an act of unmotivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in this commentary is to criticize Farrah Abraham. The speaker says that Farrah Abraham's face looks like 40 years old even though Farrah Abraham is still very young. This includes mock impoliteness because the speaker tries to criticize using an impolite statement.

(6) The plastic surgery she has had is terrible

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. In this comment, the speaker shows that his speech is a mock impoliteness which is done intentionally. The speaker intentionally said something satirical and could hurt Farrah Abraham's feelings if she knew.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in this commentary is to criticize Farrah Abraham. In the comment, the speaker criticized that after undergoing plastic surgery, Farrah Abraham's face became scary. Maybe according to him, before carrying out plastic surgery Farrah Abraham looked beautiful. But giving criticism like that is an act that is impolite to do.

(7) Don't watch this in the middle of the night

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as an unmotivated mock impoliteness. In this comment the speaker does not understand if his speech is an act that includes impoliteness. The meaning of these comments may seem a little confusing which will eventually make people misunderstand. The comment may refer to a horror video, but Farrah Abraham's video is not a horror video. Therefore, the comment is included in the unmotivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Farrah Abraham's video. The speaker intends to warn that the video of the show should not be viewed at night. Even though the video is a video interview of Farrah Abraham, not a horror video. Comments like this can make people misunderstand that the video being shown is a horror video.

The next video is titled "Kourtney Kardashian & Travis Barker Married in Italy, Wedding Dress Stuns". This video was broadcast on May 25, 2022 which is about 6 minutes 52 seconds long. This video tells of the wedding between Kourtney Kardashian and Travis Barker which was held in Italy with luxury and Kourtney Kardashian who wore a very surprising dress. This video garnered some public attention so that they also participated in commenting after watching the video. However, there are some comments that fall into mock impoliteness comments. There are some comments made that belong to mock impoliteness. Some of these comments are as follows.

(1) Not a fan of short wedding dress

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. In this comment the speaker does not understand that his comment is considered to be intended to carry out an act of impoliteness in an unintentional way. The speaker does not understand that his comments can be satirical to Kourtney Kardashian.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean. The speaker of the comment intends to belittle the state of the wedding dress worn by

Kourtney Kardashian. The speaker seemed to say that the dress she was wearing by Kourtney Kardashian did not match her body shape. Therefore the act includes mock impoliteness used to demean Kourtney Kardashian's short dress.

(2) Kourtney looks pregnant!!!!

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. Speakers do not understand that what is written in the comments column includes impolite actions. Comments written by speakers can cause misunderstandings which can be caused by understanding different contexts. The word pregnant in the commentary can be positive or negative. Because the culture there is pregnant before marriage is a natural thing. However, we do not know what the speaker actually meant. It could be meant to indent to something negative.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to criticize Kourtney Kardashian. Speakers criticize Kourtney Kardashian by saying that she looks like she is pregnant. I don't know if I'm really happy with Kourtney being pregnant or annoyed with Kourtney's fat belly so it looks like she's pregnant. Therefore, the comment is included in the mock impoliteness strategy to criticize.

(3) He looks so nasty with all those tattoos

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. The speaker intentionally says something that is considered an act of impoliteness. The speaker said something sarcastic to Travis Barker and could have hurt Travis Barker's feelings. Disrespectful words like

those in the comments are not good for posting on social media. Therefore, it is included in motivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to humiliate Travis Barker. The speaker disrespectfully insulted Travis Barker by saying he looked disgusting with his tattoo. Speakers insult the tattoos on Travis Barker's body. Comments like this are rude to say. It's okay to dislike a tattoo on Travis Barker but not to say it's disgusting.

(4) Especially when the legs are kinda short and stumpy.

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. In this comment the speaker does not understand that his comment is considered to be intended to carry out an act of impoliteness in an unintentional way. The speaker does not understand that his comments can be satirical to Kourtney Kardashian.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean. The speaker of the comment intends to belittle the state of the wedding dress worn by Kourtney Kardashian. The speaker seemed to say that the dress she was wearing by Kourtney Kardashian did not match her body shape. Therefore the act includes mock impoliteness used to demean Kourtney Kardashian's short dress.

(5) Nasty

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. speakers intentionally say things that are not polite and are considered as mock impoliteness. The comments were directed at

Kourtney Kardashian and Travis Barker for their appearance at the wedding. Speakers are not supposed to say that to comment on the video post. Because it was done intentionally and impolitely, the comment was included in motivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to humiliate Kourtney Kardashian's dress and Travis Barker's tattoss. the speaker insults both of them by using the word nasty which causes the sentence to be included in mock impoliteness. It's clear that nasty is an impolite word to use when commenting on something. Therefore this comment can be included in the mock impoliteness which is used to humiliate.

The next video is titled "Kim Kardashian Hits the Streets in Italy for Gelato Ahead of Kourtney's Wedding". This video airs on May 23, 2022 which is about 45 seconds long. The video shows Kim Kardashian walking in Italy with Gelato in her hand at Kourtney's wedding. This video captured the attention of several publics so that many watched it and there were also some who left comments in the comments column. However, from these comments there are some comments that are classified as mock impoliteness. Some of these comments are as follows.

(1) You can hear people laughing out louds as they should.

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that his comments are included in the mock impoliteness. Such comments can lead to misunderstandings caused by understanding different contexts. However, these

comments are classified as mock impoliteness because they are satirical to someone.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Kardashian. Speakers belittled Kardashian's actions by saying that it was as if someone was laughing at her as she casually walked over with gelato on Kourtney's wedding day. The speaker shows mock impoliteness by demeaning it. Therefore, the action is classified as mock impoliteness.

(2) Her body looks a lot different than it did last year.

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that his comments are included in the mock impoliteness. Such comments can lead to misunderstandings caused by understanding different contexts. However, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness because they are satirical to someone.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Kardashian. The speaker condescended by saying that his body looks different from last year. Actions like this are included in mock impoliteness because they compare someone's physique which is meant to be satirical. Therefore, the action is classified as mock impoliteness.

(3) They laughing at that diaper but she got.

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that his

comments are included in the mock impoliteness. Such comments can lead to misunderstandings caused by understanding different contexts. However, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness because they are satirical to someone.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Kardashian. Speakers belittled Kardashian's actions by saying that it was as if someone was laughing at her as she casually walked over with gelato on Kourtney's wedding day. The speaker shows mock impoliteness by demeaning it. Therefore, the action is classified as mock impoliteness.

(4) Rich people these days

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that his comments are included in the mock impoliteness. Such comments can lead to misunderstandings caused by understanding different contexts. However, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness because they are satirical to someone.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Kardashian. The speaker looked down on him by acting as if he didn't care about Kourtney's wedding. The speaker tries to show the impoliteness by demeaning her. Therefore, the action is classified as mock impoliteness.

(5) Almost shipped like an Ant.. not a cool outfit it looks odd.

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that his comments are included in the mock impoliteness. Such comments can lead to misunderstandings caused by understanding different contexts. However, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness because they are satirical to someone.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Kardashian. The speaker condescended by saying that his body looks different from last year. Actions like this are included in mock impoliteness because they compare someone's physique which is meant to be satirical. Therefore, the action is classified as mock impoliteness.

(6) She can't eat anything.

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as unmotivated mock impoliteness. The speaker does not understand that his comments are included in the mock impoliteness. Such comments can lead to misunderstandings caused by understanding different contexts. However, these comments are classified as mock impoliteness because they are satirical to someone.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to demean Kardashian. The speaker tried to demean him by saying that he couldn't eat anything. This is because Kardashian is acting as if she is tough to face Kourtney's

marriage but she can't eat anything. The speaker performs an act of mock impoliteness that intends to demean to ridicule Kardashian.

(7) Plastic surgery works!

Judging from the aims and objectives of the comment, it is classified as motivated mock impoliteness. The speaker is considered to have committed an act of impoliteness, namely by saying that the plastic surgery he did was successful so that it changed his body shape. Comments like this are considered intentionally to corner Kardashian for her actions. However, it is still classified as motivated mock impoliteness.

The mock impoliteness strategy used in the comments was to humiliate Kardashian. Speakers are trying to insult the plastic surgery done by Kardashian to change her body shape. The speaker performs an act of mock impoliteness by insulting her. Actions like this are classified as mock impoliteness.

D. Discussion

The results of data analysis obtained by researchers using qualitative research methods to answer the formulation of the problem put forward in the formulation of the problem. The first problem formulation is used to see what types of mock impoliteness are used when commenting on youtube. The second problem formulation is to answer how the mock impoliteness is used when commenting on youtube.

From the analysis of comments on TMZ video posts, there are several sentences that fall into the mock impoliteness category. These sentences include

insulting, humiliating, and criticizing the perpetrator in the TMZ video. Some people don't even realize that maybe they have committed an act of mock impoliteness in their speech or have fallen victim to mock impoliteness. In this research study, some sentences that are often used in comments are harsh words, taboo words, and curses that are commonly spoken.

This study has similarities to the research conducted by Adonis D. Rivera (2021) which aims to investigate the mock impoliteness strategies used by millennial groups based on the Culpeper (1996). The similarity in these studies is examining mock impoliteness on social media. However, there are also several previous studies that produced different studies but still discussed mock impoliteness. This study reveals that the type of mock impoliteness strategy that is often used by millennial FB users is the type of criticism, threats, and also ridicule. In addition, the factors that influence millennial FB users to express mock impoliteness are emotions, lack of awareness, too much intimacy with friends. Meanwhile, in current research, the most frequently used strategy for mock impoliteness is satirical strategy. Youtube users or youtube viewers on TMZ shows often give satirical videos they watch and they also often use unmotivated mock impoliteness.

Based on the results of the analysis conducted by the researcher, it can be concluded that according to Culpeper (1996) the act of mock impoliteness in the comments column in the TMZ video post found 36 comments classified as mock impoliteness. Which consists of 21 unmotivated mock impoliteness and 15 motivated mock impoliteness. Furthermore, it was found that there were 36

comments, each of which was used to demean, humiliate, and criticize TMZ videos.

Based on this research, it is known that the act of mock impoliteness unmotivated in the TMZ comment column is the most common. This is due to the act of mock impoliteness whose purpose is to insinuate someone by using soft words but can also really hurt the feelings of someone who is the victim. Most of the comments on TMZ video posts are comments that are meant to be satirical. The perpetrator who gave the comment did not understand that what he had written in the comment column was an act of disrespect. The comments are inadvertently meant to provide satire. In the end it will lead to misunderstandings because of the different understanding of the context. While the act of motivated mock impoliteness is used a little because most of the satire is not done directly and intentionally. Perpetrators of motivated mock impoliteness are considered to have intended to do dishonest acts of impoliteness. The result is that the sentence uttered is not a complete satire.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

From several TMZ videos that have been analyzed, the researcher found several comments from the video that were classified as mock impoliteness. From these comments, the researcher also examines the comments that are classified into motivated mock impoliteness and unmotivated mock impoliteness. The researcher also did not forget to describe how the mock impoliteness in the comments was used. Of the 5 strategies strategy theory of Culpeper (1996) to describe the form of impoliteness used in youtube comments, only 3 strategies are used most often. From the analysis of some videos the researcher found 21 unmotivated mock impoliteness and 15 motivated mock impoliteness in the comments. Furthermore, in terms of use mock impoliteness strategy the researcher found 15 comments that are used to demean, 10 comments that are used to humiliate, and 11 comments that are used to criticize.

B. Suggestion

For future researchers, it is recommended to use data sources that are more varied, for example by comparing two data sources in order to get the results vary as well. Furthermore, it is recommended that the next researcher investigates more deeply on the topic of politeness, especially Culpeper's theory. Researcher can then examine the sub-strategy of politeness in order to get good research results more varied and in-depth.

REFERENCES

Alkady, H. A. (2020). Impoliteness, Mock-Impoliteness and Underpoliteness Strategies in Abla Fahita's TV Show. *journals.ekb.eg*, 301-326.

Alqarni, M. (2021). Mock Impoliteness in Saudi Arabia: Strategies of Evil Cursing. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 52-74.

Dewing, M. (. (2012). Social media: An introduction. *Dewing, M. (2010). Social media: An introduction (Vol. 1). Ottawa: Library of Parliament.*, 1-3.

Ermida, I. (2017). "Get the snip – and a job!"Disagreement, impoliteness and conflicting identities on the Internet. *A Journal of English Linguistics* , 205-247.

Goddard, C. (2006). "Li your game, Martina!" – Deadpan jocular irony and the ethnopragmatics of Australian. *academia.edu*, 65-97.

Harared, N., & Nurani, S. (2020). Sarcasm : Mock Politeness In The Big Bang Theory. *English and Literature Journal*, 186-199.

Haugh, M., & Bousfield, D. (2012). Mock impoliteness, jocular mockery and jocular abuse in Australian and British English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1099-1114.

Ida, S. A. (2020). Impoliteness Strategies of Whatsapp Group Speech Community related to Local Government Policy in Handling Covid-19 Virus. *Web of Conferences*, 6.

Liu, S. (2021). The conventionalization of mock impoliteness in Roast! *13th meeting of the international Symposium on (Im)Politeness and 7th meeting of the biannual iMean (interaction and meaning)*, 24-26.

Magnifico, C., & Defrancq, B. (2016). Impoliteness in interpreting: A question of gender? *Translation & Interpreting*, 26-45.

McKinnon, S., & Prieto, P. (2014). The role of prosody and gesture in the perception of mock impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 185-219.

Nainggolan, E. F. (2021). An Analysis Of Impoliteness Strategies In Commentary Hate Speech Uttered By Netizen's On Donald Trump's Presidential Election Campaign Speech In The United State 2020 On Youtube. *English Education*, 45-67.

Lumban Toruan, N. (2020). analysis of impoliteness strategies in commentary hate speech on jokowi's speech about covid-19 pandemic as found in youtube. *English Education*, 56-78.

Nurkamto, J., & Marmanto, S. (2018). Politeness and Impoliteness in Directives: A Study on the Students-Lecturers Interaction. *Atlantis Press*, 30.

Taylor, C. (2015). Mock Politeness in English and Italian: A Corpus-Assisted Study of the Metalanguage of Sarcasm and Irony. *ProQuest Dissertations*, 67-89.

Taylor, C. (2016). Mock politeness and culture: Perceptions and practice in UK and Italian data. *Intercultural Pragmatic*, 463-498.

Taylor, C. (2016). Mock Politeness in English and Italian. *John Benjamins Publishing Company*, 235-315.

Wang, J., & Taylor, C. (2019). The conventionalisation of mock politeness in Chinese and British online forums. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 270-286.

Xu, C., & Gu, W. (2020). Prosodic Characteristics of Genuine and Mock (Im)polite Mandarin Utterances. *Interspeech*, (pp. 4153-4157).

Yin, M., & Zhou, H. (2019, December). A Research on Mock Politeness——A Case Study of the Legend of Zhen Huan. In *5th Annual International Conference on Social Science and Contemporary Humanity Development (SSCHD 2019)* (pp. 705-711). Atlantis Press.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Amelia Azzarista was born in Mojokerto on June 17, 2000. She graduated from MA Salafiyah Syafi'iyah Mojokerto in 2018. During her study at Senior High School, she actively participated in English Club as the vice chairman. She also joined several science olympics and got several achievements in this martial. She started her higher education in 2018 at the Department of English Literature UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang and finished in 2022. During her study she joined Hai'ah Tahfidz Al-Qur'an (HTQ) and get multiple scholarships. In her semester break, she attended English Course in Pare Kediri and did part time job as English tutor.

.