

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

1.1 Conclusions

This chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the research described in the previous chapter.

- To address the first research question, the researcher identified four types of impolite utterances used by both haters and supporters of presidential candidates on the @suaraanies Instagram comment section: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness.

Haters: Positive impoliteness was the most dominant strategy used by haters, occurring 35 times, followed by negative impoliteness (27 times). Sarcasm or mock impoliteness and bald on record impoliteness were the least common, each occurring 8 times.

Supporters: Negative impoliteness was the most dominant strategy used by supporters, occurring 43 times, followed by positive impoliteness (11 times). Sarcasm or mock impoliteness occurred 9 times, and bald on record impoliteness was the least common, occurring only 3 times.

- To address the second research question, the researcher concluded that Haters: Twelve realizations of impoliteness were identified, with Condescend/Scorn/Ridicule being the most common (17 occurrences), followed by Insults (12 occurrences) and Inappropriate Identity Markers (11 occurrences). Taboo words were the least frequent (1 occurrence).

Supporters: Eleven realizations of impoliteness were used, with Insults being the most common (20 occurrences), followed by Condescend/Scorn/Ridicule (10 occurrences) and Inappropriate Identity Markers (9 occurrences). Seeking disagreement was the least frequent (1 occurrence), and taboo words were not used at all.

- To address the third research question, the researcher concluded that **Haters** often resort to impolite language primarily to vent negative emotions, with 29 occurrences demonstrating a strong emotional drive behind their behavior. They frequently utilize impolite language to express displeasure with situations or individuals (14 occurrences). While direct mockery is employed, it is the least common motivation (7 occurrences), suggesting that it is not a primary driver for their impolite behavior.

In contrast, **supporters** most commonly used impolite language to clarify their viewpoints, with 17 occurrences indicating a desire to emphasize or explain their positions. Mocking someone is also frequent among supporters (15 occurrences), highlighting a potential tendency towards derision.

However, expressing opposition through impolite language is the least common reason for supporters (2 occurrences), suggesting that they rarely use impoliteness to explicitly disagree.

1.2 Suggestions

Based on the conclusions presented above, researchers have offered several suggestions for further research. These recommendations are as follows:

1. This research serves as a valuable resource for students seeking to understand the types of impoliteness strategies on social media. It provides clear

explanations and insightful examples of how these strategies are applied in real-world situations, offering a solid foundation for further research and analysis.

2. This research provides a foundation for further research exploring the multifaceted nature of impoliteness strategies across various social media platforms and discourse types. Expanding the study's scope could significantly contribute to the development of cyberpragmatics as a robust theoretical framework for analyzing internet-mediated communication.
3. The research highlights the need for Dedicated Lessons on Digital Communication such as IT classes. The lessons should cover the basics of polite language and the impact of digital communication. Therefore, educators can effectively improve students' communication skills and reduce impolite utterances. This not only fosters a more respectful and positive online environment but also prepares students to navigate digital interactions responsibly and thoughtfully, benefiting both individuals and society as a whole.