

EXPRESSIONS OF DISAGREEMENT IN THE *INFO CEGATAN JOGJA* FACEBOOK GROUP

Dona Aji Karunia Putra^[1], *Suhandano*^[2], *Sulistyowati*^[3]

^[1]dona.aji@uinjkt.ac.id, ^[2]suhandano@ugm.ac.id, ^[3]lies_sulistyowati@ugm.ac.id
^[1, 2, 3] Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia,

Abstract: Disagreement is a difference of opinion expressed differently based on the media used. Based on this phenomenon, it is interesting to define an expression of disagreement and the types of discourse that trigger it on Facebook, which tends to be accessible and not distant. Analyzing these two things is interesting and important as something new in pragmatic studies. This study aims to define the expression of disagreement and describe the types of messages that get a lot of disagreement responses in the ICJ Facebook group. The current research utilized a qualitative approach with a descriptive method. The data in this study are messages and comments that contain disagreement in the ICJ Facebook group. Data collection was carried out using documentation, observation, and note-taking techniques. The data analysis technique utilizes semantic and pragmatic perspectives. The results showed that the expression of disagreement could be defined as a negative expression expressed verbally as a reaction when the speaker opposes or denies the opponent's proposition or vice versa in a communication context. Posts or messages that get a lot of disagreement responses have the following characteristics, 1) the topics discussed relate to the disclosure of social problems from a personal point of view, 2) aim to assess social phenomena or as social criticism, 3) type of expressive and persuasive discourse.

Keywords: pragmatics, disagreement, discourse analysis, Facebook

INTRODUCTION

In the communication process, it is not uncommon for the speaker and the interlocutor to have different views. These differences of opinion are usually manifested in the form of expressions of disagreement (Sifianou, 2012). In connection with this phenomenon, this study will examine the expression of disagreement in online communication in the Info Cegatan Jogja Facebook group. The Facebook group becomes the data source because it has some uniqueness compared to other Facebook groups, such as the group has more than one million members; groups are dominated by members from the Javanese culture and language of Yogyakarta and its surroundings with diverse social backgrounds, and the group is an effective means to convey or discuss various social issues that occur in Yogyakarta. Thus, the ICJ Facebook group has

many linguistic issues, especially the issue of pragmatics. The following is an example of the uniqueness of posts and comments that show the phenomenon of disagreement in the ICJ Facebook group.

AA's Post

AA : *"Saya sering lihat postingan di ICJ bahwa jogja kota macet. Saya yakin itu gak benar. Selama jalan-jalan di Jogja ga ada yang macet, mau kemana-mana lancar, lingkungan bersih dan kulinernya enak tenan. Jogja memang istimewa"* (I often see posts on ICJ that Yogyakarta is a traffic jam. I'm sure that's not true. During a tour in Yogyakarta, there are no traffic jams, wherever you want to go smoothly, the environment is clean and the cuisine is really delicious. Yogyakarta is special.) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Group Member Comments

- (1) JB : *"Kok rodo ngapusi yo"* (Sounds like a bit of a lie huh)
(2) SPJ : *"Who koe rung tahu mlebu parkirane malioboro nk malem minggu yo"*
(Oh, you've never entered the Malioboro parking lot on a Saturday night, have you?)

Quantitative data on the ICJ Facebook group message wall shows that 2,024 members of the ICJ group responded to AA's posts. In example (1), JB's account expresses disagreement with AA's post. The disagreement is expressed by a sarcasm strategy which implies JB's denial of the truth of AA's proposition. The linguistic aspect used to express disagreement in the form of sarcasm is the phrase "rodo ngapusi." In example (2), SPJ expressed disagreement with AA. The expression of disagreement is expressed by a rhetorical question strategy which implies SPJ's opposition to AA's proposition. With a rhetorical question strategy, SPJ wants to show facts that contradict the facts contained in AA's proposition. Based on the data examples above, the expression of disagreement in the ICJ Facebook group is an essential and interesting pragmatic phenomenon to study.

Various studies showing the characteristics of expressing disagreement in computer-mediated interactions (online) have been carried out by several researchers. Mulkey (1985) discussed the influence of communication media on agreement and disagreement in 80 written letters from scientific discussions. Shum & Lee (2013) investigated two Hong Kong internet discussion forums based on the disagreement strategy of the interlocutor's forum. Angouri & Tseliga (2010) examined disagreement in computer-mediated communication. In addition, several disapproving studies have also been carried out by Baym (1996), Langlotz & Locher (2012), Galley, Bryant, & Bimber (2015), etc. Some of these studies have not discussed the disagreements on Facebook group communication. However, some studies have not discussed the definition of disagreement from the perspective of online communication and the types of discourse that trigger the emergence of disagreement in online communication. Thus, this research is essential to fill the gap and complement the results of previous studies.

After conducting a literature review, the researchers set two objectives for this study. The first one is to define expressions of disagreement within the scope of online interactions on Facebook. This definition is an attempt to test or develop several definitions of disagreement that have been set by Wierzbicka (1987), Rees-Miller (2000), Edstrom (2004), and Sifianou (2012), which state that disagreement leads to the expression of conflicting views between the speaker and the interlocutor in specific contexts. In other words, disagreement is a negative assessment or denial of the previous proposition. The definition of disagreement is determined through direct or face-to-face communication data, while this study uses data from online communication. In addition, to obtain a comprehensive definition of the expression of disagreement in online communication, the researcher uses the politeness theory framework of Brown & Levinson (1987) and Leech (1993). Referring to Locher's opinion (2004), the topics discussed can also contribute significantly to the emergence of disagreements in interactions. Empirically, one might presume that a less controversial topic will generate mild disagreement. Based on this theory, it is interesting to be able to analyze topics that are part of the types of discourse that can trigger disagreements in the ICJ Facebook group.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted by utilizing a qualitative approach. First, a qualitative approach with a descriptive method is used to determine the definition of the expression of disagreement and describe the messages that get many disagreement responses on social media. The object of this research is the Info Cegatan Jogja Facebook group. Researchers chose the ICJ Facebook group as the object of research because the ICJ Facebook group could present a variety of factual information directly from the source. In addition, the group members were very responsive in responding to posted information or issues, and the language used in the group was varied and concise; the information and interactions within the group created social awareness.

This study's data are the sentences in messages and comments that contain disagreement in the ICJ Facebook group. The data sources in this study were messages or information uploaded on the ICJ group wall along with comments from ICJ group members from January to December 2018. First, the researcher selected the messages displayed from January to December 2018. After that, the researcher selected four messages that received many general responses from the ICJ group members using the purposive sampling technique. Data collection is limited during the period January to December 2018 because, during this period, it is sufficient to obtain representative data.

Data collection in this study was carried out using three techniques: documentation, observation, and note-taking. Several stages are done after the data are collected. The first stage is to select messages that members primarily respond to and then followed by defining disagreement using indicators which include (1) the use of negation, (2) the use of contradictory conjunctions, (3) the use of facts or figures conflicting opinions, (4) the use of meaningful words, phrases, clauses or related meanings with the meaning of 'deny.' In addition, Searle's speech act theory and Brown and Levinson's and Leech's theory of politeness is also used as a definition framework. The next one is to analyze disagreements in group members' comments on messages. Then, the last stage is to classify messages based on their types using discourse theory, Hymes' (1974) discourse context, and Kinneavy's (1971) discourse type.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Lingual Indicators of Disagreement

Disagreement is an expression that often appears in interaction and communication between speakers and interlocutors in various communication contexts. Therefore, an indicator and condition parameters are needed to determine a verbal expression as a disagreement. In this section, the researchers analyze four data from conversations in the ICJ Facebook group to determine some lingual aspects that can be indicators of a disagreement and determine the parameters of the condition of a disagreement. The

analysis of the four data is described as follows.

Message posted

AA: *"Saya sering lihat postingan di ICJ bahwa jogja kota macet. Saya yakin itu gak benar. Selama jalan-jalan di Jogja ga ada yang macet, mau kemana-mana lancar, lingkungan bersih dan kulinernya enak tenan. Jogja memang istimewa."* (I often see posts on ICJ that Jogja is a traffic jam. I'm sure that's not true. During a tour in Jogja, there are no traffic jams, wherever you want to go smoothly, the environment is clean and the cuisine is really delicious. Yogyakarta is special) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Comments

Data 1

BD: *"Jam 4 sore cobo lewat **jl, taman siswa** monggo nek pingin ngrasakne **macet mas**"* (At 4 pm try passing through the taman siswa road, please if you want to feel the traffic jam, bro) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In data 1, there is disagreement expressed by BD towards AA's messages. BD expresses his disagreement with AA's proposition using contradictory facts, namely by pointing out that at 4 pm, Taman Siswa road was jammed. The contradictory facts used by BD are packaged in the form of imperative sentences. Thus, in data 1, disagreement is semantically expressed as a conflict between BD's and AA's views. The contradiction is conveyed indirectly, namely in the form of imperative sentences, by utilizing contradictory facts.

Data 2

SA: *"Iya Jogja jalan lancar kalo hari kerja biasa, **tapi** kalo **hari sabtu minggu hari libur** jalan-jalan utama banyak yang macet karena banyak wisatawan"* (Yes, that's right, Jogja runs smoothly on a normal weekday, but on Saturday-Sunday, holidays, many main roads are jammed because of many tourists.) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In data 2, there is disagreement expressed by SA towards AA's messages. SA expresses disagreement with AA's proposition using a partial agreement strategy by utilizing contradictory conjunctions and contradicting facts. The opposite conjunction used to express disagreement is "tetapi" (but). Contrasting conjunctions tetapi (but) are used in parts of sentences that show facts that contradict the proposition AA. For example, the opposite fact is used by SA to show that on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, the main

roads in Yogyakarta are jammed. Thus, it can be stated that in data 2, semantically, disagreement is expressed as a conflict between SA's and AA's views. The opposition is conveyed indirectly with a partial agreement strategy in the form of declarative sentences by utilizing contradictory facts.

Data 3

Xn: "*Mbok raup sik mas ben sadar*" (Wash your face first bro, so you'll wake up) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In data 3, Xn expresses disagreement with AA's proposition by utilizing the semantic aspect, namely sarcasm. The lexical aspect that marks sarcasm is the word "ben sadar" (so you'll wake up). The sarcasm is used to express Xn's denial of the truth of proposition AA. The denial of Xn is expressed by underestimating proposition AA. The sarcasm conveyed by Xn implies that the traffic in Yogyakarta is jammed. So, AA's proposition, which states that traffic in Yogyakarta is smooth, is incorrect or does not match reality. Thus, the use of the phrases "raup sik" (wash your face first) and "ben sadar" (so you'll wake up) is a verbal form that is used as a form of denial to show disagreement indirectly.

Data 4

CI: "*Ketok urung apal dalam jogja... Ketok urung suwi nang jogja... Ketok nek Cuma golek sensasi*" (It's like not memorizing the streets in Jogja. It's like haven't lived in Yogyakarta for a long time. It's like only looking for sensation) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In data 4, CI expresses disagreement with AA's proposition by utilizing the linguistic aspect, namely the "undo" (not yet) negation. In the data, the negation "unless" (yet) is used as a form of expression denying the truth of AA's proposition which states that traffic in Yogyakarta is not jammed. In addition to negation, CI also uses sarcasm as a form of denial of AA's proposition. The lexical aspect that marks sarcasm is the use of the clause "Just looking for sensation" (It's like only looking for sensation). The sarcasm is used to express CI's denial of the truth of the proposition AA. The denial of CI is expressed by reproaching the proposition of AA. The sarcasm conveyed by CI implies that the traffic in Yogyakarta is jammed. So, AA's proposition that traffic in Yogyakarta is smooth is considered a sensation to get public attention.

Based on the analysis of the four data above, the expression of disagreement is always marked by one of several linguistic features. One of them is negation. The primary function of negation is to deny the statement of the interlocutor or speaker, which the speaker considers wrong (Givon, 1979, p.29). In Indonesian, negative constituents include (a) bound morphemes, such as a-, non-, tuna- and others; (b) free morphemes, namely *tidak*, *bukan*, (no, not) and their various variants, and (c) free morphemes which in addition to expressing negation also state other things, namely *jangan*, *tanpa*, and *belum* (do not, without, and yet) (Sudaryono, 1993, p.4). The next feature is contradictory conjunctions. Besides negation in a compound sentence, disagreement is also indicated by the presence of contradictory conjunctions. A contradictory relationship occurs when there are two ideas or propositions that show the opposite or contrast. Contrasting conjunctions commonly used in Indonesian compound sentences are, coordinating compound *tetapi*, *sedangkan*, and subordinating compound *meskipun*, *walaupun*, and *biarpun*. The third feature is conflicting facts or opinions. The contradicting facts and opinions in a proposition can be used as an indicator of disagreement because a proposition can be said to be contrary to the previous proposition if there are contradictory facts or opinions. Another feature is in the form of words, phrases, or clauses that are meaningful or relate to the meaning of 'deny.' In this indicator, the researcher uses words, phrases, or clauses that have meanings related to the meaning of negation, which means 'denying' as an indicator to determine an expression of disagreement. Givon (1984, p.322) states that denial denies truth, factuality, and presuppositions stated by the interlocutor or the speaker himself.

Conditions of Disagreement

Disagreement is an expression that shows the existence of opposing opinions or views between the speaker and the interlocutor. A disagreement can occur under certain conditions. Based on the results of the analysis of the four data above, disagreement can occur in a communication process when:

- (a) The speaker opposes the opinion of the interlocutor

(b) The speaker denies the opinion of the interlocutor.

Condition (a) is when the speaker conveys a proposition that directly or indirectly shows a contradiction (contradictory) to the opponent's proposition. In this condition, the propositions of the speaker and the interlocutor contain opposite (contradictory) meanings. Direct contradiction is usually marked by declarative sentences with linguistic markers in the form of negations or contradicting conjunctions. Indirect contradiction is usually manifested by declarative, imperative, or interrogative sentences using opposing facts or opinions. Condition (b) is when the speaker conveys a proposition that directly or indirectly shows a denial of the interlocutor's opinion. In this condition, the speaker does not believe in the truth or accuracy of the interlocutor's opinion. Direct denial is usually manifested in an interrogative form, while indirect denial can be realized in declarative propositions, which contain the meaning of 'doubt, insinuate, and reproach.'

Definition of Expression of Disagreement

After getting answers about the indicators and conditions of disagreement in the communication process, in this section, the researcher will present an analysis to determine a proportional definition of the expression of disagreement in online media. Finally, the description of the two terms or conditions will be applied to several examples, and their analysis is as follows.

Message posted:

AA: *"Saya sering lihat postingan di ICJ bahwa jogja kota macet. Saya yakin itu gak benar. Selama jalan-jalan di Jogja ga ada yang macet, mau kemana-mana lancar, lingkungan bersih dan kulinernya enak tenan. Jogja memang istimewa."* (I often see posts on ICJ that Yogyakarta is a traffic jam. I'm sure that's not true. During a tour in Yogyakarta, there are no traffic jams, wherever you want to go smoothly, the environment is clean and the cuisine is really delicious. Yogyakarta is special.) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Context:

AA's account posted a message on the ICJ Facebook group message wall on September 14, 2018. The message contained AA's opinion on traffic, environmental, and culinary conditions in Yogyakarta. This opinion is

reinforced by AA's experience while in Yogyakarta. However, the thing that became the emphasis in sending the message was AA's denial of traffic jams in Yogyakarta. This denial sparked various comments from members of the ICJ group.

Comments:

Data 5

KS: *"Mas sampeyan ki piye to.. wkwkwk. Nek jalan2 e wisata malam mulai jam 11 malam sampai jam 6 pagi yaiyalah.."* (emotikon tertawa). (Bro, why do you think like that...hahaha (laugh). If you go on a night tour starting at 11 pm to 6 am, it will definitely not be jammed) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Analysis:

In data 5, the interlocutor responds to the speaker's proposition with two strategies, namely rhetorical questions and irony. In data 5, the interlocutor tries to deny the speaker's proposition which states that traffic in Yogyakarta is smooth by conveying a proposition that is wrapped in irony, namely *"Mas sampeyan ki piye to..wkwkwk."* ("Bro, why do you think like that...hahaha (laugh)). The speech is a form of rhetorical question accompanied by a laughing expression in the form of a laughing sound onomatopoeia *"wkwkwk"* which serves to denounce the speaker's opinion (AA account). *"If you go on a night tour starting at 11 pm to 6 am, it will definitely not be jammed"* In this speech the interlocutor uses the form of irony as an allusion to the speaker's opinion (AA account). The implicature contained in the satire is that the interlocutor wants to state that if the trip is carried out in the morning and evening, there will be traffic jams, but if the trip is carried out at night from 11 pm to 6 am there will be no traffic jams. It can be concluded that the comments submitted by the KS account are disagreements expressed in the form of rhetorical and ironic questions. Rhetorical questions are used to criticize the speaker's opinion (AA's account), while irony is used to insinuate and convey contradicting facts regarding traffic conditions in Yogyakarta.

Data 6

Comment

GM: *"Paling TS e ngimpi"* (Maybe the sender of the message is dreaming) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Analysis

In data 6, the interlocutor expresses his disagreement with the speaker's proposition

by utilizing the semantic aspect, namely cynicism. The lexical aspect that marks cynicism is the word “*ngimpi*” (dreaming). The lexical aspect is used to express the denial or distrust of the interlocutor (GM account) of the truth or accuracy of the opinion of the AA account. The mental attitude of disbelief that the GM account has is conveyed by disparaging the opinion of the AA account.

The implied intention is that the interlocutor wants to state that, in reality, the traffic in Yogyakarta is jammed. So the speaker's opinion that traffic in Yogyakarta is smooth is not correct or does not match reality (a dream). Therefore, it concludes that the comments submitted by the GM account are disagreements conveyed by denying the accuracy of AA's opinion. Semantically, the denial is conveyed indirectly through cynicism by utilizing the lexical feature of “*ngimpi*” (dreaming), which is intended to belittle.

Data 7

Comment

Kent: “*Menurut sy macetnya Yogya masih batas toleransi dan hanya jam2 tertentu aja, atau saat liburan panjang, drpd dulunya sy tgl di Jakarta yg macetnya luar biasa bs berjam2 bahkan antrean panjang. Di Yogya msh byk jalur tikus / alternatif jalannya bs dibilang semuanya supermulus.*” (In my opinion, traffic jams in Yogyakarta are still within tolerance limits and only for certain hours or during long holidays, compared to when I lived in Jakarta the traffic was extremely jammed, it could take hours and even long queues. In Yogyakarta there are still many shortcut or alternatively the path can be said to be all super smooth.) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018).

Analysis

In data 7, the interlocutor responds to the speaker's proposition in two sentences. In the first sentence, the interlocutor conveys his personal experience, comparing traffic conditions in Yogyakarta and Jakarta. In the first sentence, the interlocutor stated that the traffic jams in Yogyakarta were still within the tolerance limit and only for specific hours or during long holidays than I used to live in Jakarta, where the traffic jams were extraordinary for hours and even longer queues. The implication in the speech is that the interlocutor judges that Yogyakarta is not jammed like Jakarta. In the second sentence, the interlocutor tries to respond by stating the facts found in Yogyakarta. For example, there

are still many rat paths or alternative paths, and practically all are super smooth. The implication in the second speech is that the interlocutor states that Yogyakarta is not jammed because many alternative roads are smooth. In general, the interlocutor's response, in both the first and second speech, does not imply a denial of the proposition's truth from the speaker.

Data 8

Comment

ArAr: “*Macet e kalau pas musim liburan aja. Itu pun Cuma di beberapa titik gak semua titik macet kok*” (Traffic congestion only occurs during the holiday season. Even then, only at some points, not all traffic jams.) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Analysis

In data 8, the interlocutor responds to the speaker's proposition in two sentences. In the first sentence, the interlocutor conveys that the traffic conditions in Yogyakarta are jammed only during holidays. The implication in the speech is that the interlocutor thinks that Yogyakarta is not always in a traffic jam. In the second sentence, the interlocutor tries to respond by stating that not all road points in Yogyakarta are jammed. The second speech implies that the interlocutor states that not all roads in Yogyakarta are jammed. In general, the interlocutor's response, in both the first and second speech, does not imply a denial of the proposition's truth to the speaker.

Based on the examples of data one to four above, several states can be stated. First, data 5 and 6 belong to expressions of disagreement because the utterances in the two data imply the denial of the interlocutor of the truth of the speaker's proposition. Second, data 7 and 8 are not expressions of disagreement because the two data do not imply a denial of the speaker's proposition to the truth of the speaker's proposition.

Based on a lengthy description of the indicators and the process of defining disagreement, the researcher can state that the expression of disagreement is negatively expressed verbally as a reaction when the speaker opposes or denies the proposition of the interlocutor, or vice versa, in a communication context. For example, when the speaker conveys a meaningful proposition A, the interlocutor responds with a meaningful proposition, not A, and vice versa.

The expression of disagreement can be called a negative expression when viewed from a semantic and pragmatic perspective. From a semantic perspective, disagreement is called negative because it negates the meaning of the previous utterance, either explicitly or implicitly. The negation of meaning tends to lead to meaning features that express denial, contradiction, skepticism, satire, belittlement, and even contempt. From a pragmatic perspective, disagreement can be called a negative expression because it can potentially threaten the face of the interlocutor. It is in line with the opinion of Brown & Levinson (1987, p.103) that in a communication process, speakers can save the positive face of the interlocutor by agreeing and "claiming similarities." Leech (1983) states that polite speech or saving the face of the interlocutor must meet the following principles "(a) Minimize disagreements between self and others, and (b) Maximize agreement between self and others" (Leech, 1983, p. 132).

Types of Messages Triggers Disagreement

This chapter will discuss the types of posts that get a lot of disagreement responses on social media (ICJ's Facebook group). First, the researcher selected the messages displayed from January to December 2018. After that, the researchers selected five messages that received a lot of responses in general from members of the ICJ group using a purposive sampling technique. From the five messages that have been selected, 100 comments will be taken from each group member to see the number of disagreement responses that accompany the messages. Finally, to identify the types or characteristics of messages that received many disagreement responses, the researcher will analyze several aspects of messages sent on ICJ's Facebook message wall, namely the analysis of objectives, topics, and types of messages.

1. Messages posted by KD account (Facebook ICJ, January 2018)



Transcription

"Nuwun jalure Om, wonten unek2 sekedik, oleh2 saking Yogya. Kebetulan parkir agak jauh dari rumah istri di daerah pengok Pjka Jln. Bimo Kunting. Kejadian tanggal 1 Januari 2018 pas malem terakhir di Yogya. Aku ki yo wong asli Yogya, ngomahku Jl. Mataram Cokrodirjan. Parkir mobil ga iso di rumah istri yo pancen gak ono garasi omah, dadi parkir pinggir jalan, tapi memang kebanyakan daerah situ mobil do di parkir di pinggir jalan, embuh ngopo mobil yg lain gak ono goresan kok nggon ku ono goresan, smoga pelakunya menyadari nek suatu saat deweke duwe mobil di berlakukan hal yg sama opo yo ra muntap... Matur nuwun sakderenge om... Salam SAG"

for some reason the other car has no scratches but mine has scratches. I hope the perpetrator of the vandalism realizes that if one day he owns a car and the same thing applies, will he not be angry? Thank you in advance. Regards SAG (Salam Aspal Gronjal is friendly greeting used by ICJ members)

Number of Response Statistics

Quantitative data on the ICJ Facebook group message wall shows that 1,774 members of the ICJ group responded to the messages from the KD account. From a population of 1,774 comments, a sample of 100 comments was taken. Based on the results of statistical calculations on the comments in the sample, there are 100 responses to disagreement and 0 responses to non-disagreement. Based on these statistics, the majority of ICJ members (the people of Yogyakarta and its surroundings) have the perception that whatever the reason, parking the car on the side of the road for a long time is wrong.

Message Purpose

The purpose that the KD account owner wants to convey through his message is to complain about car damage due to parking his car on the side of a public road for a long time. In addition, through this message, the account owner would like to ask for moral support from ICJ members that the bad incident that happened to the account owner was not the result of the account owner's actions but purely because of an unknown person's fad.

Message Topic

The topic in the KD account message is about the risk of parking vehicles in any place or on public roads for a long time. Specifically, the topic leads to ethical issues in parking vehicles. This topic has become a polemic in urban communities because many car owners do not have a garage to park their cars.

Message Type

The researcher uses Kinneavy's (1971) discourse type theory in the message type section. In his theory, Kinneavy divides the types of discourse based on the purpose of constructing a discourse. For example, the message sent by the KD account on ICJ's Facebook wall is classified as an expressive discourse. It can be seen from the purpose in

the message sent by the KD account, namely the KD account trying to convey complaints and disappointments to readers (ICJ members), why only KD account cars were scratched by unknown people when parked on the side of the road.

2. Messages posted by the WG account (Facebook ICJ, August 2018)



Transcription

"...Kridosono. Muraah beuud...ngga nyangka. Pagi ini, 27 Agustus 2018 jam 06.55" Di samping pesan, terdapat foto yang berisi informasi " parkir sepeda motor Stadion Kridosono Rp. 5000"(At the Kridosono Stadium Parking. Very cheap....didn't expect it. This morning, August 27, 2018 at 06.55) Beside the message, there is a photo containing the information "the motorcycle parking fee at Kridosono Stadium is 5000 rupiah"

Number of Response Statistics

Quantitative data on the message wall of the ICJ Facebook group shows that 1,199 members of the ICJ group responded to messages from the WG account. Therefore, from the comment population of 1,199 comments, a sample of 100 comments was obtained. Furthermore, from the total disagreement responses of 100 comments,

there were 100 disagreement responses and 0 non-disagreement responses. Based on these statistical results, most ICJ members (the people of Yogyakarta and its surroundings) have the perception that the motorbike parking fee of 5000 rupiah is not expensive and is comparable to the vehicle safety aspect obtained.

Message Purpose

The purpose that the WG account wants to convey through its message is to convey criticism of the high price for motorbike parking at the Kridosono Stadium. The WG account critiqued this problem in the form of irony. It can be seen in the following quote “...Kridosono. Muraah beuud...ngga nyangka. Pagi ini, 27 Agustus 2018 jam 06.55” Di samping pesan, terdapat foto yang berisi informasi “parkir sepeda motor Stadion Kridosono Rp. 5000” (At the Kridosono Stadium Parking. Very cheap.... didn't expect it. This morning, August 27, 2018, at 06.55) Besides the message, there is a photo containing the information "the motorcycle parking fee at Kridosono Stadium is 5000 rupiah"

Message Topic

The topic in the message sent to the WG account is the high price for motorbike parking at the Kridosono Stadium. Specifically, the topic leads to the issue of parking rates. This topic has become a polemic in the community because many parking managers do not comply with the rules regarding the official parking rates that the local government has set. The problem of parking rates for motorized vehicles has been regulated in Yogyakarta local regulations No. 5 of 2012 concerning public service levies, especially regarding motor vehicle parking rates. In the regulation, it is stated that the motorcycle parking fee is 2,000.00 rupiah.

Message Type

Based on Kinneavy's theory of discourse types (1971), messages sent by the WG account on ICJ's Facebook wall are classified as expressive discourse. It can be seen from the purpose contained in the message sent by the WG account that it seeks to express criticism openly in the public sphere. The criticism was related to the high price for

motorbike parking at the Kridosono Stadium. It can be seen in the following quote “...Kridosono. Muraah beuud...ngga nyangka. Pagi ini, 27 Agustus 2018 jam 06.55” Di samping pesan, terdapat foto yang berisi informasi “parkir sepeda motor Stadion Kridosono Rp. 5000” (At the Kridosono Stadium Parking. Very cheap.... didn't expect it. This morning, August 27, 2018, at 06.55) Besides the message, there is a photo containing the information "the motorcycle parking fee at Kridosono Stadium is 5000 rupiah"

3. Messages posted by AA account (Facebook ICJ, September 2018)



Transcription

“Saya sering lihat postingan di ICJ bahwa jogja kota macet. Saya yakin itu gak benar. Selama jalan-jalan di Jogja ga ada yang macet, mau kemana-mana lancar, lingkungan bersih dan kulinernya enak tenan. Jogja memang istimewa.” (I often see posts

on ICJ that Jogja is a traffic jam. I'm sure that's not true. During a tour in Jogja, there are no traffic jams, wherever you want to go smoothly, the environment is clean and the cuisine is really delicious. Yogyakarta is special) (Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

Number of Response Statistics

Quantitative data on the ICJ Facebook group message wall shows that 2,024 members of the ICJ group responded to AA account messages. From the comment population of 2,024 comments, a sample of 100 comments was taken. Based on the results of statistical calculations on the comments in the sample, the following details are obtained, from a total of 100 disagreement responses, there are 100 disagreement responses and 0 non-disagreement responses. Based on these statistical results, most ICJ members (the people of Yogyakarta and its surroundings) perceive that roads in the Yogyakarta area are congested.

Message Purpose

The purpose that the AA account owner wants to convey through his message is to convey his disagreement that traffic in the Yogyakarta area is said to be jammed. Through these messages, the account owner wants to deny or deny the news of road traffic jams in the Yogyakarta area. Messages sent by AA's account containing disagreements about traffic jams in Yogyakarta received many negative responses from most ICJ members. It is because ICJ members have the perception that traffic conditions in Yogyakarta are primarily congested.

Message Topic

The topic contained in the AA account message is traffic jams in Yogyakarta. Specifically, the topic leads to the problem of traffic jams. The topic of traffic congestion has become a polemic in urban communities, especially in the context is Yogyakarta.

Message Type

The researcher uses Kinneavy's (1971) discourse type theory in the discourse type section. In his theory, Kinneavy divides the types of discourse based on the purpose of constructing a discourse. For example, messages sent by the AA account on ICJ's

Facebook wall are classified as expressive discourse. It can be seen from the message sent by the AA account that seeks to convey disagreement about road traffic in Yogyakarta, which is often reported to be jammed. Based on Kinneavy's theory (1971), messages sent by the AA account can be classified as expressive discourse types because the discourse aims to express the thoughts, feelings, or beliefs of the encoder in the form of the speaker's disagreement with the news and communal perceptions of traffic jams in Yogyakarta.

4. Messages posted by AG account (Facebook ICJ, November 2018)



Transcription

"Lur aku arep cerito. Aku mau ki weruh bapak-bapak karo anake karo bojone jajan ayam goreng ning Jl. Bantul. Bapak mau bal bul bal bul udud ngleciss ning ngarepe anake kiro-kiro umur 2 tahunan. Aku ki pingin ngelokke tapi kk wedi. Aku dudu opo-opone. Mesakke anake lha anake keno kebule udud terus e. Aku mung pingin ngomong

nggo sedulur-sedulur ICJ. Sing podho duwe anak cilik, nek udud ojo ning cerake anak e yo lur, diampet disik le udud nek isi ono cah cilik. nek keno opo-opo sing repot ora wurung oyo sing tuo sing nanggung" (Brother ICJ, I want to tell you a story. Earlier I saw men with their children and wives eating fried chicken on Bantul road. The father smoked casually and emitted a lot of smoke in front of his two-year-old son. I wanted to rebuke but didn't dare. I'm not his acquaintance. I feel sorry for the child because he was continuously exposed to his father's cigarette smoke. I just want to convey this to the ICJ brothers and sisters. For ICJ brothers who have small children, don't go near your children if you smoke. Instead, the desire to smoke is first restrained if small children are near you. If something happens to a child, the parents are bothered and suffer the consequences).

Number of Response Statistics

Quantitative data on the ICJ Facebook group message wall shows that 1,404 members of the ICJ group responded to AG account messages. From the comment population of 1,404 comments, a sample of 100 comments was taken. The following details were obtained based on the results of statistical calculations on the comments in the sample. From a total of 100 disapproving responses, there were 56 disagreement responses and 44 non-disagreement responses. Based on these statistical results, most ICJ members (Yogyakarta and surrounding communities) perceive that parents smoking in front of their children is a personal problem, so the AG account does not need to intervene and make a fuss about it in the ICJ group.

Message Purpose

The purpose that the AG account owner wants to convey through his message is to convey criticism about smoking behavior near children. Based on the data above, the AG account would like to express criticism that parents should not do smoking in front of children because cigarette smoke can harm children's health. In addition to criticism, the AG account also conveys suggestions that are manifested in the form of a ban. In this quote, the AG account wants to advise the public that the parents who smoke are expected to stay away from their children or refrain from smoking when they are near their children. The message received a lot of negative

responses from most ICJ members. ICJ members have the perception that criticism of the AG account published in the ICJ Facebook group includes meddling in the affairs of others.

Message Topic

The topic contained in the AG account messages is the ethics of smoking near children. Specifically, the topic refers to the negative impact of smoking on children. The negative impact of smoking near children has become a polemic in society. In connection with this problem, Sugihartono and Nurjazuli (2012) stated that children whose parents smoke can experience higher coughs, colds, sore throats, and lung diseases. In addition, toddlers who live at home with family members who smoke have a 5.743 times greater risk of suffering from pneumonia compared to toddlers who live at home with family members who do not smoke. From the results of this research, smoking near children in the long term can harm children's health. Although the opinion or suggestion of the AG account follows some research results and scientific evidence regarding the harmful effects of cigarette smoke on children, many ICJ members disagree with AG's suggestion. Furthermore, many ICJ members assume that AG's opinions or suggestions include interfering with the privacy of others.

Message Type

The message sent by the AG account on ICJ's Facebook wall is classified as a persuasive discourse. It can be seen from the purpose in the message sent by the AG account, namely the AG account seeks to influence and make readers (ICJ members) take action, namely not smoking near children. In the message fragment, the AG account has seen an adverse event that harms the child's health, namely a father smoking near his child. Furthermore, the AG account attempted to convey its opinion on the adverse event to ICJ members. The message ends with a suggestion from the AG account to smokers (ICJ members) not to smoke near children. Based on Kinneavy's theory (1971), messages sent by the AG account can be classified as persuasive discourse types because the discourse aims to influence and make readers (ICJ members) take action.

5. Messages posted by RD account(Facebook ICJ, March 2019)



Transcription

“Bapak/Ibu, mas/mbak, pemilik coffee shop, warung burjo, kafe, siapapun, kalau liat ada anak di bawah umur belum pulang di atas jam 8 malam, baiknya tegur mereka, suruh mereka pulang. Miris deh, akhir-akhir ini sering liat ABG-ABG laki-laki dan perempuan nongkrong-nongkrong ndak kenal waktu. Bahkan jam sholatpun dilanggar, mereka asyik aja cekikikan (bercanda). Ditegurya mas atau mbak, bapak atau ibu kalau lihat yang beginian. Suruh pulang. Pembiaran untuk hal-halseperti itu membuka peluang untuk maksiat yang lebih serius. Bang Haji Rhoma Irama juga bilang jangan begadang kalau ga ada perlunya. Sekian. Terimakasih.” (Mr or Mrs, Bro or Sis, owners of coffee shops, green bean porridge stalls, cafes, anyone, if you see teenagers still hanging out after eight o'clock at night, you should reprimand them and tell them to go home. Be concerned, lately you have often seen teenagers, both boys and girls hanging out without knowing the time. In fact, they ignore the time of worship. They have fun joking. If

you see this, please reprimand them and tell them to go home. Ignoring such things opens up opportunities for more serious immorality. Bang Haji Rhoma Irama also said that don't stay up late if there's no need. That's it. Thank you).

Number of Response Statistics

Quantitative data on the ICJ Facebook group message wall shows that 1,671 members of the ICJ group responded to messages from the RD account. From a population of 1,671 comments, the researcher will take a sample of 100 comments. Based on the results of statistical calculations on the comments in the sample, the following details are obtained, from a total sample of 100 comments, there are 100 responses of disagreement. These messages received many disagreement responses from ICJ members, which amounted to 100% of the total sample response. Based on these statistical results, most ICJ members have a perception that the behavior of teenagers hanging out in coffee shops or cafes for a long time is a parent's business or a matter of family privacy. Thus, it is inappropriate for intervention and publication in public spaces (ICJ group).

Message Purpose

The purpose that the RD account owner wants to convey through his messages is to influence readers (ICJ members) to take action in the form of advising or sending teenagers home to hang out at the coffee shop or cafes. The message is manifested in two forms, namely suggestions and criticisms. The RD account suggested that the public should be proactive in reprimanding teenagers who spend a lot of time hanging out in coffee shops or cafes. In addition to suggestions, RD's account also criticizes the phenomenon of the negative behavior of teenagers who spend a lot of time hanging out in coffee shops, or cafes can lead to immoral actions. Messages sent by the RD account that aims to influence and make readers (ICJ members) take action related to adolescent behavior have received a lot of disagreement responses. ICJ members perceive that RD account messages interfere with other people's affairs.

Message Topic

The topic of discussion in the RD account message is juvenile delinquency

(hanging out). Specifically, the topic refers to the negative behavior of teenagers in the form of hanging out at coffee shops or cafes for a long time. The topic of juvenile delinquency (hanging out) has become a polemic in society. Juvenile delinquency in the study of social problems can be categorized into deviant behavior. The behavior of hanging out in a coffee shop or cafe can be called negative because it spends time on things that are not useful, such as chatting without a clear purpose, playing games without knowing the time, smoking, etc. It is feared that the various actions accompanying these hanging-out activities will lead to unlawful acts, such as planning a brawl, taking drugs, and planning other criminal acts. Although the opinions or suggestions of RD's account are in accordance with the theory of adolescent psychology, many ICJ members disagree with RD's criticisms and suggestions. Many ICJ members assume that RD's criticism or suggestions include interfering with the privacy of others.

Message Type

Based on Kinneavy's (1971) discourse type theory, messages sent by the RD account on ICJ's Facebook wall are classified as persuasive discourse. It can be seen from the purpose contained in the messages sent by the RD account, namely to influence and make readers (ICJ members) take action related to the behavior of teenagers who spend a lot of time hanging out at coffee shops or cafes. In the message, it appears that the RD account uses a form of a directive to advise the community (ICJ members) to care and be willing to reprimand the teenagers who hang out at the coffee shops until late at night because neglecting this situation will lead to more serious immoral actions.

Discussion

This research has succeeded in providing something new compared to several studies of disagreement in online communication, such as those that have been carried out (Baym, 1996; Wojcieszak & Delli Carpini, 2012; Langlotz & Locher, 2012; Shum & Lee, 2013; Galley, Bryant, & Bimber, 2015). Several novelties were found in analyzing disagreements in online media, namely identifying the linguistic aspects of disagreement markers, setting the conditions for disagreement, determining the definition of

disagreement, and identifying the types of posts that trigger disagreement on Facebook. First, the use of linguistic aspects such as (1) negation, (2) contradictory conjunctions, (3) contradicting facts or opinions, and (4) the use of meaningful words, phrases, or clauses related to meanings with the meaning of 'deny' can be an indicator of disagreement. Second, the conditions for the occurrence of disagreement: (a) the speaker opposes the opinion of the interlocutor, and (b) the speaker denies the interlocutor's opinion. Third, the expression of disagreement can be defined as a negative expression (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Leech, 1983) expressed verbally as a reaction when the speaker opposes or denies the proposition of the interlocutor or vice versa in a communication context. Fourth, the conditions and definitions of disagreement have developed slightly compared to those done by Sifianou (2012), Wierzbicka (1987), Edstrom (2004), Rees-Miller (2000), Sornig (1977), and Pomerantz (1984). Fourth, the results of the analysis of posts or messages in the ICJ Facebook group showed that posts or messages that received a lot of disapproving responses from members of the ICJ group had the following characteristics, 1) the topics discussed were related to the disclosure of social problems from a personal point of view, 2) aims to assess social phenomena or as social criticism, 3) expressive and persuasive discourse types.

Based on the definition of the expression of disagreement above, there are two types of disagreement, namely disagreement in the form of opposition and denial. The utilization of the two types of disagreement is based on the type of post or message being responded to. Based on the analysis results, the type of disagreement in the form of conflict will tend to appear when responding to posts or messages in the form of opinions or criticisms that are argumentative-persuasive and built on facts or personal experience. Disagreements in the form of conflicts often appear in posts (KD, WG, AG, RD). Disagreement in denial tends to arise when responding to posts or messages in the form of argumentative-informative opinions expressed using data and facts. Disagreement in the form of denial tends to appear on AA's posts.

Based on the results of an analysis of the types of posts or messages that can trigger a lot of disagreement, it appears that Indonesian netizens, especially netizens in Yogyakarta and its surroundings, do not like the type of posts or messages that contain negative opinions,

criticisms, or assessments of a problem relating to a person's privacy or public interest. This phenomenon can be seen in the response of ICJ group members' disagreement with RD's account posts criticizing teenagers' habits of spending time hanging out in the coffee shop. In addition, netizens also tend to respond negatively to posts or messages with opposing opinions, criticisms, or judgments about the public interest. For example, it can be seen in the post on KD's account, which seeks to seek moral support and criticizes the perpetrator who scratched his car when parking for a long time on a public road. Most netizens do not agree with KD's post because KD is considered looking for justification for his mistake (parking the car on a public road for a long time).

Based on the description of the research results above, it can be stated that theoretically, the results of this study can be a reference in the field of pragmatic analysis in online communication. In particular, the research results provide a theoretical contribution to the study of disagreement speech acts in online communication. Practically, the results of this study can be a guide for netizens so that netizens can avoid posting negative opinions, criticisms, or judgments that offend someone's privacy or relate to public interests or norms. Both of these are sensitive matters and can trigger a lot of disagreement responses on social media.

CONCLUSION

It turns out that the phenomenon of disagreement, which has only been defined as a contentious proposition between the speaker and the interlocutor, can be expanded through the results of this study. This study finds that disagreement can occur when (a) the speaker opposes the other person's

opinion; (b) the speaker denies the interlocutor's opinion. Thus, the disagreement that arises in response to the previous proposition can also be a denial. The emergence of the type of disagreement, both opposition, and denial, is influenced by the type of the triggering proposition.

The results of this study also provide a new perspective in looking at the phenomenon of disagreement, which has only been seen from one pragmatic theory, namely speech acts. The results of this study indicate that it is not enough just to use speech acts. This study uncovered the phenomenon of a disagreement using four linguistic aspects. They are negation, contradictory conjunctions, opposing opinions or facts, and the use of linguistic forms that have meaning or meanings related to 'deny.' Regarding the analysis of the types of posts that trigger disagreement, understanding the cultural context or communal mindset also plays an important role. It is caused by the tendency of posts that trigger disagreement related to social issues and criticism that intersects with individual privacy or public perception.

This study has several limitations, mainly since the data source is limited to one Facebook group and a few posts, so it cannot provide a comprehensive description of disagreements on social media. However, based on the aspects that have been studied through this research, further research can be carried out to reveal netizen strategies in more detail in conveying disagreement on Facebook. In addition, further research also needs to be done to answer why netizens use particular strategies in expressing their disagreement on Facebook.

REFERENCES

- Ali, Shamim, "Authority Relations and Pragmatic Strategies in Disagreement between ESL Learners" *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, Volume 1, Issue.3, December 2014.
- Angouri, Jo & Miriam A. Locher. (2012). "Theorising Disagreement." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (2012) 1549-1553.
- Arévalo, Carmen Maíz. (2014). "Expressing Disagreement in English as a Lingua Franca: Whose Pragmatic Rules?" *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2014; 11(2): 199 – 224.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University

Press.

- Baryadi, Pratomo. (2002). *Dasar-dasar Analisis Wacana dalam Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka gandaSuli.
- Barbulet, Gabriel. (2013). "Social Media- A pragmatic Approach: Contexts & Implicatures." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 83 (2013) 422 – 426.
- Baruah, Trisha Dowerah. (2012). "Effectiveness of Social Media as a Tool of Communication and its Potential for Technology Enabled Connections: A micro-Level Study." *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Volume 2, Issue 5, May 2012.
- Baym, Nancy K. (1996). "Agreements and Disagreements in a Computer-Mediated Discussion" *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, Vol. 29, 315-346.
- Boyd, D., & Ellison, N. (2007). "Social Network Site: Definition, History, and Scholarship." *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*. 13 (1), 14-18.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, D. and Harman, G. (1972). *Semantics and Natural Language*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Djajasudarma, Fatimah. (1994). *Wacana Pemahaman dan Hubungan Antarunsur*. Bandung: PT Eresco.
- Edstrom, Anne. (2004). "Expressions of Disagreement by Venezuelans in Conversation: Reconsidering the Influence of Culture." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (2004) 1499–1518.
- Finegan, E. and Besnier, N. (1989). *Language: Its Structure and Use*. San Diego etc.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Garcia, Carmen. (1989). "Disagreeing and Requesting by Americans and Venezuelans." *Journal Linguistics and Education* 1, 299-322 (1989).
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. (2001). "Arguing about the Future: on Indirect Disagreements in Conversations." *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (2001) 1881-1900.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Griffiths, Patrick. 2006. *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Herring, Susan. (1994). "Gender Differences in Computer-Mediated Communication: Bringing Familiar Baggage to the New Frontier." American Library Association Annual Convention, Miami, June 27, 1994.
- Hobbs, Pamela. (2003). "The medium is the Message: Politeness Strategies in Men's and Women's Voice Mail Messages." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (2003) 243–262.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men, and Politeness*. London: Longman.

- Horn, Laurence. dan Gregory Ward. (2006). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Horn, Laurence dan Istvan Kecskes. (2013). "Pragmatics, Discourse and Cognition." In Anderson Stephen R. Jacques Moeschler and Fabienne Reboul (eds.) *The Language-Cognition Interface*. Geneva-Paris: LibrairieDroz: 353-375.
- Kietzmann, Jan H. et. all. (2011). "Social media? Get serious! Understanding the Functional Building Blocks of Social Media. *Business Horizons* (2011) 54, 241—251.
- Kinneavy, J. L. (1971). *The Theory of Discourse*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice.Hall.
- Koczogh, Helga Vanda. (2012). "The Role of Gender in Verbal Disagreement: A Study of Disagreement Strategies Employed by Hungarian Undergraduate Students." *Versita* (2012).
- Koczogh, Helga. (2013). "Scrutinizing the Concept of (Verbal) Disagreement" *Argumentum* 9 (2013), 211-222.
- Kushartanti, UntungYuwono, dan Multamia RMT Lauder. (2007). *Pesona Bahasa: Langkah Awal MemahamiLinguistik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Lakoff, R. (1993). The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and classroom discourse. *Multilingua*8.
- Langlotz, Andreas & Miriam A. Locher. (2012). "Ways of Communicating Emotional Stance in Online Disagreements." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (2012) 1591-1606.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1993). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Mey, J.L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Massachusetts: Best-set Typesetter Ltd.
- Miller, Jannie Rees. (2000). "Power, Severity, and Context in Disagreement." *Journal of Pragmatics* 32 (2000) 1087-1111.
- Moeliono, Anton M. (1988). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Muntigl, Peter & William Turnbull. (1998). "Conversational Structure and Facework in Arguing." *Journal of Pragmatics* 29 (1998) 225-256.
- Nadar, I Dewa Putu Wijana, Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo, Sthephanus Djawanai. (2005). "Penolakandalambahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Inggris" *Humaniora* Vol. 17 No. 2 2005.
- Nadar, F.X. (2009). *Pragmatik&PenelitianPragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Grahallmu.
- Netz, Hadar. (2014). "Disagreement Patterns in Gifted Classes." *Journal of Pragmatics* 61 (2014) 142--160.
- Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Shum, Winnie, Cynthia Lee. (2013). "(Im)politeness and Disagreement in Two Hong Kong Internet Discussion Forums." *Journal of Pragmatics* 50 (2013) 52--83.
- Sifianou, Maria. (2012). "Disagreements, Face and Politeness." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44 (2012) 1554–1564.

- Sudaryono. (1993). *Negasi dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Suatu Tinjauan Sintaksis dan Semantik*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Sugihartono dan Nurjazuli. (2012). "Analisis Faktor Risiko Kejadian Pneumonia pada Balita di Wilayah Kerja Puskesmas Sidorejo Kota Pagar Alam." *Jurnal Kesehatan Lingkungan Indonesia*. Vol 11. No 1. April 2012.
- Tarigan, Henry Guntur. (1987). *Pengajaran Wacana*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Weinberg, Martin S., et. al. (1981). *The Solution of Social Problems*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English speech act verbs: A semantic dictionary*. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Valenzuela, Sebastián, Namsu Park, and Kerk F. Kee. "Lessons from Facebook: The Effect of Social Network Sites on College Students' Social Capital." *International Symposium on Online Journalism* Austin, Texas, April 4-5, 2008.
- Yule, George. (2014). *Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

