Discursive-Integrative Politeness Meanings in Digital Spaces: A Third-Wave Pragmatic Analysis of Face-Threatening Acts in Online Communication

R. Kunjana Rahardi*
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Yuliana Setyaningsih
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Roni Sulistiyono
Ahmad Dahlan University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Seli Tria Febriani
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract—This study investigates the discursive-integrative meanings of politeness in online communication by applying a third-wave pragmatics framework, with a particular focus on the management of face-threatening acts (FTAs). Employing discourse analysis, the research explores how participants in digital interactions strategically manage FTAs, not only through linguistic and contextual strategies but also by navigating sociocultural norms that emerge within specific online communities. The findings reveal eight distinct pragmatic meanings associated with acts of politeness in these contexts: (1) negative politeness aimed at avoiding direct confrontation, (2) negative politeness involving dismissive humor, (3) positive politeness intended to prevent prolonged conflict, (4) positive politeness used to assert credibility, (5) negative politeness employed to assert authority, (6) negative politeness expressed through emotional outbursts, (7) negative politeness manifested in direct criticism, and (8) negative politeness signaling relational closeness. These findings underscore the dynamic and context-sensitive nature of politeness in online environments. By emphasizing the discursive and integrative dimensions of pragmatic behavior, this study extends the theoretical scope of third-wave pragmatics and contributes to a more nuanced understanding of how individuals navigate FTAs in digital communication. The research offers critical insights into the evolving norms of politeness in virtual discourse and highlights the complex interplay between language, identity, and social interaction in mediated settings.

Index Terms—discursive-integrative politeness, online communication, face-threatening acts, third-wave pragmatics

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, the domain of human communication has witnessed a paradigmatic shift, catalyzed by the exponential growth of digital communication technologies. Online media have not only diversified the channels through which individuals interact but have also reconfigured the pragmatic dimensions of interpersonal discourse (Jaszczolt, 2018). From a linguistic pragmatics perspective, this transformation necessitates a re-examination of how meaning is negotiated, social roles are enacted, and relational work is accomplished in technologically mediated contexts. One of the most salient implications of this shift pertains to the evolving conceptualization and realization of politeness. Traditionally viewed through the lens of face management, politeness has been central to mitigating potential threats to interlocutors' self-image and preserving social harmony in interaction (Haugh, 2018; O'Driscoll, 2011).

However, in digital environments—where interactions are often asynchronous, multimodal, and partially disembodied—the enactment of politeness cannot be fully understood through conventional frameworks rooted in face-to-face communication. The absence of immediate contextual cues such as intonation, gesture, and eye contact requires interlocutors to rely more heavily on linguistic and paralinguistic resources to index stance, emotion, and social intent. Moreover, the communicative affordances of digital media fundamentally alter the contextual parameters that underpin pragmatic interpretation. Politeness, in this sense, becomes a fluid and adaptive practice, co-constructed by users in response to platform-specific norms, audience design, and intercultural variability (Arundale, 2013). Scholars in digital

---

* Corresponding Author.

pragmatics have thus emphasized the need to expand the analytical lens to include emerging phenomena such as politeness through performative memes, strategic ambiguity in online conflict mitigation, and meta-pragmatic commentary in thread-based interactions. Therefore, in contemporary digital discourse, politeness must be theorized not as a static set of universal strategies, but as a dynamic and context-sensitive practice shaped by technological, sociocultural, and discursive factors. This reconceptualization challenges the boundaries of traditional politeness theory and opens new avenues for interdisciplinary inquiry at the intersection of linguistic pragmatics and digital communication studies (Barton & lee, 2013; Wang & Tucker, 2016).

The classical politeness framework, particularly as articulated by Brown and Levinson, has long been regarded as a seminal contribution to the field of linguistic pragmatics. Anchored in the notion of "face" derived from Goffman, their theory conceptualizes politeness as a set of strategic moves that interlocutors employ to mitigate face-threatening acts within interaction. Central to this model are the universalist assumptions that posit the existence of two fundamental types of face—positive and negative—and the speaker's rational capacity to select from a predefined range of politeness strategies based on assessments of power, distance, and imposition (Levinson, 2013). This approach has been widely adopted and applied across languages and cultures, thereby cementing its status as a dominant paradigm within early politeness research. Nevertheless, the Brown and Levinson model has also been subject to substantial critique, particularly from scholars advocating for more context-sensitive and socially embedded accounts of language use. Among the most significant criticisms are its individualistic and cognitive bias, its detachment from power dynamics and broader social structures, and its reliance on a rationalist calculus that often underrepresents the complexity and variability of real-world interaction (Cummings, 2013). Furthermore, the model's claim to universality has been challenged by empirical studies demonstrating that politeness is culturally contingent, locally realized, and often co-constructed rather than pre-selected or strategically deployed in a vacuum. These critiques have catalyzed a shift in the field toward alternative theoretical orientations that privilege emergent, interactional, and ideological dimensions of politeness.

In response, the field has witnessed the rise of what is now referred to as the "third wave" of politeness research, which builds on and significantly departs from both the classical and postmodern critiques. Third-wave politeness theorists conceptualize politeness not as an a priori property of utterances or speaker intentions, but as a discursively co-constructed phenomenon that emerges through interaction. This approach is grounded in a relational view of communication, whereby politeness is understood as one dimension of "relational work" the broader process through which social relationships are continuously negotiated, contested, and redefined through language (O'Driscoll, 2011; Topic, 2020). Central to this paradigm is an emphasis on the contextual embeddedness of politeness: it is shaped by institutional settings, cultural norms, historical discourse practices, and the interlocutors' identities and orientations.

Additionally, third-wave politeness research foregrounds the role of evaluative practices and meta-pragmatic awareness in politeness perception, arguing that what counts as polite or impolite is not intrinsic to particular forms or strategies, but is the outcome of socially situated interpretations and judgments. This theoretical shift aligns closely with broader movements in pragmatics toward interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, and discursive psychology, thereby enabling a more nuanced and empirically grounded account of politeness as a lived, contested, and ideologically loaded practice (Li & Wang, 2016; Terkourafi & Bezuidenhout, 2021). In sum, the evolution from classical to third-wave politeness theories marks a crucial theoretical reorientation in pragmatics—from strategic, speaker-centered models to ward interactional, context-sensitive, and socially reflexive frameworks. This reorientation not only addresses the limitations of earlier models but also opens up new avenues for investigating politeness in diverse communicative ecologies, including digital, institutional, and intercultural contexts (Rahardi, 2022; Rahardi & Budhiono, 2024).

In this view, politeness is not a property of discrete linguistic forms nor solely a product of speaker intention, but rather arises dynamically within the unfolding structure of discourse. Politeness is treated as a contingent accomplishment that participants negotiate through their interpretive alignments, meta-pragmatic evaluations, and strategic responses to contextually salient norms. This shift reflects a broader move in pragmatics toward relational, discursive, and ethnographically informed approaches that foreground how meaning is collaboratively shaped in situated communicative practices. A central contribution of this third-wave orientation is its attention to what may be termed discursive-integrative politeness strategies—that is, the embedding of politeness within larger rhetorical, ideological, and relational structures that extend beyond the sentence or turn level (Haugh, 2015; Haugh, 2006). These strategies involve thematic continuity, identity positioning, narrative framing, and the management of intertextual resources across genres and modalities.

Rather than viewing politeness as local and bounded, third-wave approaches recognize that it often functions across temporal and textual scales, contributing to the ongoing construction of social roles, group belonging, and moral positioning. Such discursive-integrative practices may include, for example, aligning oneself with communal values, mitigating disalignment through humor or irony, or enacting solidarity via culturally salient speech registers. Despite a marked increase in scholarly attention to politeness in digital contexts, much of the existing literature remains theoretically tethered to the assumptions of first- and second-wave politeness models (Haugh, 2018; Haugh, 2006). Predominantly, these studies adopt a form-function approach, privileging the identification and classification of surface-level politeness markers or the strategic deployment of conventionalized speech acts. While such analyses offer valuable insights into the linguistic encoding of politeness, they often fall short of accounting for the interactional complexity and sociopragmatic fluidity characteristic of digital communication. In particular, the nuanced ways in which politeness operates discursively and integratively remain underexplored, especially through the lens of third-wave pragmatics (Li & Wang, 2016).

This gap is not merely methodological but epistemological: it constrains our understanding of politeness as a contextually situated, socially consequential, and morally evaluable practice. Digital media environments, with their unique affordances—such as multimodal expression, algorithmic amplification, temporal asynchronicity, and networked publics—require a reconceptualization of politeness as more than just mitigation of face threats. Rather, they invite us to examine how politeness is enacted, interpreted, and contested in relation to the shifting parameters of visibility, virality, and value within platformed interaction. Without such reconceptualization, politeness risks being reduced to a static inventory of forms, stripped of its discursive, ideological, and relational force (Franch & Conejos, 2003). To address this critical gap, the present study investigates the pragmatic workings of discursive-integrative politeness in digital media, with a particular focus on how users deploy such strategies to navigate, negotiate, and mitigate face-threatening acts in complex communicative ecologies. Anchored in the third-wave pragmatics paradigm, this study views politeness as an emergent and reflexive process of relational work—a form of pragmatic action that is dynamically constituted through the interplay of linguistic choice, sequential positioning, multimodal signaling, and contextual interpretation.

These research questions are as follows: What are the types of strategies employed by speakers to manage face-threatening acts and what role do identity, stance, and social relations play in shaping the meaning and interpretation of politeness in digital interactions? The research objectives are to describe the types of strategies employed by speakers to manage face-threatening acts and what role do identity, stance, and social relations play in shaping the meaning and interpretation of politeness in digital interactions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The theory of politeness developed by Brown and Levinson remains one of the most influential frameworks in the study of social interaction. At its core, the model posits that politeness strategies function as mechanisms for mitigating face-threatening acts, thus protecting the face of participants in an interaction. Brown and Levinson's model is predicated on the assumption that politeness is primarily an individual endeavor, with speakers choosing specific strategies to preserve their own and others' social identities, usually in the context of conflicting social demands or potential threats to one's face. In this view, strategies such as mitigation, hedging, and indirectness are tools used to reduce social friction and maintain harmonious relations (Kulka, 2003; Myers, 1989).

However, despite its foundational status in pragmatics, Brown and Levinson's model has faced considerable scrutiny for its individualistic and normative assumptions. Scholars like Eelen and Watts have highlighted the limitations of the framework, particularly its emphasis on universal, context-independent strategies for face management. One of the primary critiques revolves around its reductionist view of politeness, which assumes that individuals operate as rational agents who, in a largely neutral, face-to-face interaction, engage in the negotiation of face according to a fixed set of strategies (Haugh, 2018; Silva et al., 2020). This simplification overlooks the complex, dynamic, and relational nature of politeness, particularly in real-world contexts where communication is shaped by social structures, cultural values, and power asymmetries.

As noted by Eelen, politeness is not a universal, cross-cultural phenomenon but rather a socially constructed practice that varies widely across different social settings, cultures, and historical periods. The Brown and Levinson model's universalism therefore fails to account for the diversity of politeness norms that exist in various communities, both geographically and socially. For example, strategies that may be deemed polite in one cultural context could be seen as impolite or overly deferential in another. This is especially important in contemporary communication, where multiculturalism and transnationalism complicate the application of a one-size-fits-all model of politeness. The emphasis on individual agency in Brown and Levinson's model also neglects the influence of collective social dynamics and power relations, both of which profoundly shape the enactment of politeness in discourse (Zienkowski, 2014; Blitvich & Sifianou, 2019). Politeness, as a socially situated phenomenon, must be analyzed not only at the individual level but also in terms of its role in maintaining or challenging existing power structures, such as those related to gender, class, or authority.

Moreover, theoretical critiques of the model often point to its narrow focus on verbal communication and its disregard for non-verbal cues that play an essential role in face-to-face interactions. As scholars in the field of nonverbal communication have demonstrated, features such as gestures, posture, gaze, and intonation are vital in conveying politeness and mitigating FTAs. These non-verbal elements help to shape the meaning and interpretation of polite acts, facilitating or hindering the successful management of face needs (Wharton, 2009; Zuckerman et al., 1981). By omitting the multimodal aspects of communication, Brown and Levinson's model overlooks how politeness is constructed through the integration of verbal and non-verbal resources, particularly in contexts where face-to-face interaction is mediated or absent.

In light of these criticisms, recent advancements in pragmatics have sought to address the gaps in Brown and Levinson's model by adopting more context-sensitive and relational approaches to politeness. A third-wave pragmatics perspective, for example, reconceptualizes politeness as a socially negotiated and contextually situated process. This framework emphasizes the interactive co-construction of meaning, where politeness emerges not solely from individual strategic choices but from ongoing, mutually negotiated social interactions that unfold across time, space, and modality (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018; Bezemer, 2021). Furthermore, digital communication has brought new complexities to the study of politeness, as online spaces often involve asynchronous interaction, anonymity, and multimodal resources, which require a rethinking of how politeness functions in the digital age.

Ultimately, while Brown and Levinson's model has undoubtedly shaped the field of politeness research, it is essential to recognize its limitations in accounting for the relational, cultural, and multimodal nature of politeness. The move toward a more discursive-integrative approach offers a more holistic and flexible framework for understanding how politeness is not simply an individual strategy for face management but a dynamic and socially negotiated phenomenon that adapts to the changing needs and conditions of communication (Tekourafi & Bezuidenhout, 2021).

In response to the limitations of Brown and Levinson's framework, third-wave pragmatics has emerged as a significant paradigm shift in the study of politeness, offering a contextually sensitive, socially embedded, and relationally oriented approach to understanding how politeness functions in discourse. This approach marks a departure from earlier models by rejecting the notion that politeness can be reduced to a fixed repertoire of strategies designed to avoid face-threatening acts (Chiappini, 2003; Oatey & Ruhi, 2007). Instead, third-wave pragmatics positions politeness as a dynamic and collaborative process that emerges through the co-construction of meaning between interlocutors during interaction. This shift is a significant theoretical advancement, as it allows for a more nuanced understanding of how politeness is negotiated in real-time, across different social contexts, and in relation to the identities, stances, and power dynamics of the participants involved.

Central to this paradigm is the view that politeness is not simply a means of mitigating conflict or preserving face in the traditional sense, but a socially situated phenomenon that is continually shaped and reshaped by the unfolding interaction. In third-wave pragmatics, politeness is conceptualized as an ongoing process of negotiation wherein interlocutors continually adjust their language, behaviors, and stances in response to the evolving dynamics of social relationships and cultural expectations (Rahardi, 2019; Ramírez, 2020). This interactive construction of politeness challenges the notion of politeness as an individual, strategic undertaking and instead highlights the relational and cooperative dimensions of communicative behavior.

Moreover, third-wave pragmatics places a strong emphasis on the social contexts within which politeness is enacted, arguing that politeness is inherently embedded in the larger sociocultural and institutional contexts in which discourse occurs. Rather than assuming that politeness is universally governed by a static set of principles, this perspective underscores that politeness is always contingent upon the specific social and cultural contexts, as well as the asymmetries of power and status between the participants. Politeness, therefore, becomes a negotiated resource through which speakers not only manage face but also address issues of power, solidarity, and moral order in interaction (Franch & Conejos, 2003; Leech, 2007).

Importantly, the relational nature of politeness in third-wave pragmatics means that it cannot be understood solely through the lens of face management. While face preservation remains a key concern, the scope of politeness in this framework expands beyond individual strategies to encompass a broader set of social actions and interactional goals. This includes the management of interpersonal relationships, the performance of social identities, and the enactment of collective norms and values within a given community (Widdowson, 1998; Mungmachon, 2012). The interactive and relational dynamics of politeness are thus viewed as a central site for the performance and negotiation of social roles and group membership, and not merely a technique for averting confrontation or potential social conflict.

This reconceptualization of politeness as a socially situated and relationally negotiated practice is especially relevant in the context of digital communication. In online environments, the negotiation of politeness is often further complicated by factors such as anonymity, visibility, and asynchronous interaction, as well as the affordances of multimodal (Bezemer & Jewitt, 2018; Stockl, 2019). These features challenge traditional conceptions of politeness, emphasizing the need for a discursive-integrative approach that accounts for the multilayered nature of social interaction in the digital age. Here, the co-construction of meaning occurs not only through verbal exchanges but also through visual, textual, and digital cues that reflect the complex ways in which speakers negotiate their social identities, emotional stances, and relationships in these mediated spaces.

Thus, third-wave pragmatics offers a more holistic framework for understanding politeness as a contextually contingent, socially negotiated, and interactionally situated phenomenon. This approach is essential for capturing the multidimensional nature of politeness in contemporary communication, particularly in online settings, where traditional face-to-face strategies may be less applicable or evolve into new forms of digital interaction (Wang & Tucker, 2016; Van Eck, 2006).

With the advent of online media, communication has undergone a profound transformation, as digital platforms now serve as dynamic and interactive spaces where users engage in multifaceted forms of discourse. These platforms offer a rich array of communicative modalities, including text, images, videos, and other multimodal resources, which interact to construct meaning in increasingly complex ways. In this context, politeness strategies are no longer confined to linguistic expressions. Instead, they have evolved into multimodal practices that integrate visual, textual, and gestural cues, reflecting the hybrid nature of online communication. Such strategies now extend beyond simple speech acts, encompassing a broader communicative framework where politeness is dynamically constructed through multiple channels, including but not limited to emojis, gifs, and video content (Swidler, 1986; Sykes & Cohen, 2018; Mulyana, 2021).

While the study of politeness in digital contexts has gained significant momentum in recent years, much of the existing literature remains focused on surface-level politeness markers or isolated instances of speech acts, such as greetings, requests, and apologies. These studies often fail to consider the broader discursive processes that underpin online

interactions. In particular, they tend to overlook how politeness is integrated into the flow of communication, often focusing only on individual strategies or one-off acts without situating them within the larger social context in which they occur. Moreover, the predominant reliance on classical models of politeness, such as those put forth by Brown and Levinson, continues to dominate the field. These models, however, offer limited insight into the nuanced ways that politeness is socially negotiated, especially in multimodal and asynchronous online environments (Hombach & Thom, 2019; Rowsell, 2013).

This reliance on outdated paradigms overlooks the potential for a more context-sensitive approach to politeness, which can account for the interactive, fluid, and negotiated nature of online discourse. Third-wave pragmatics offers a promising alternative by reconceptualizing politeness not as a fixed set of strategies for mitigating face-threatening acts, but as a collaborative, dynamic process that is co-constructed through social interaction. Third-wave pragmatics places emphasis on how politeness practices are shaped by the social relationships, identities, and power dynamics between interlocutors, highlighting the contextual and socially embedded nature of politeness (Unger, 2011; Sperber & Wilson, 2012). These frameworks provide a richer lens through which to explore how individuals in online spaces not only use politeness to manage FTAs but also continuously negotiate social roles, group memberships, and identity positions.

This gap in existing research presents a compelling opportunity for further investigation. By applying the third-wave pragmatics approach, future research can explore how discursive-integrative politeness functions in complex digital contexts. Specifically, it can examine how individuals strategically navigate FTAs in these multimodal, multifaceted, and rapidly evolving online spaces (Rahardi et al., 2023, 2024). The increasing use of social media, instant messaging, and video-based communication further complicates the study of politeness, demanding a more holistic understanding of how language, identity, and social norms interact in the digital age. Thus, this line of inquiry not only challenges existing paradigms of politeness but also contributes to a broader understanding of how digital interaction reshapes communicative practices, highlighting the need for theoretical innovations that reflect the increasingly complex nature of politeness in the online world.

Despite increasing attention to politeness in online communication, much of the research still adheres to first- and second-wave paradigms that treat politeness as a set of individual strategies or static features of speech. These studies fail to account for the social negotiation of politeness in real-time, digitally mediated communication. Furthermore, there is a lack of empirical research that applies third-wave pragmatics to explore how discursive-integrative politeness operates in digital media to navigate face-threatening acts (Li & Wang, 2016; Haugh, 2003). This research aims to fill this gap by investigating how politeness strategies are employed discursively in online interactions to mitigate FTAs and how these strategies are influenced by social, cultural, and identity-related factors.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative descriptive approach, specifically using pragmatic discourse analysis as the primary method of data analysis. This approach is particularly suited for exploring how meaning is constructed in social interactions and allows for an in-depth examination of how politeness is negotiated in online discourse (Johnson, 2001; Harper, 2011). By focusing on the dynamic and situated nature of politeness, this methodology aligns with the goals of third-wave pragmatics, which emphasizes the contextual, social, and interactive dimensions of communication.

Data for this study will be collected from the comment sections of posts on the popular online platform. The comments selected will be those that reflect interactive discourse involving negotiations of politeness, identity, and face-management in response to posted content (Smith et al., 2011; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Data Collection Procedure are as follows: (1) Data Identification: The first step involves selecting the appropriate timeframe and posts that are likely to generate interactive discourse involving users' opinions and responses; (2) Data Collection: The researcher will systematically collect comments from selected posts, focusing on those that contain clear instances of politeness strategies or face-threatening acts; (3) Data Selection: Only comments that are relevant to the research focus will be selected for analysis. This ensures the data set is focused and manageable.

The collected data will be analyzed through pragmatic discourse analysis. The steps of analysis will include: (1) Identifying Politeness Strategies: Politeness strategies will be identified in the data by examining how speakers mitigate FTAs and maintain face during interactions. This includes identifying direct linguistic strategies as well as multimodal strategies; (2) Contextual Analysis: A careful analysis of the social, cultural, and interactional context in which the politeness strategies are employed will be conducted. This includes examining the relationship between participants, their social identities, and how these factors influence the use of politeness strategies; (3) Interpretative Analysis: The final step will involve interpreting how politeness is co-constructed in digital interactions. This will include examining the relational functions of politeness strategies and how they help interlocutors avoid or mitigate FTAs in ways that are sensitive to the dynamic and contextual nature of online media (Bown, 2009; Krippendorff, 2010).

Finally, to ensure the reliability and validity of the analysis, several strategies will be employed: (1) The study will cross-check findings from different data sources and analytical methods to ensure consistency and robustness; (2) Feedback from a sample of participants will be solicited to ensure that the interpretations of the data are accurate and reflective of the participants' intentions (Dong, 2018).

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research has produced five types of politeness and the pragmatic meanings carried by these types of politeness. The five findings of this research are briefly mentioned below: (1) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of avoiding direct confrontation, (2) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of involving dismissive humor, (3) Positive politeness with the pragmatic meaning of avoiding prolonged conflict, (4) Positive politeness with the pragmatic meaning of credibility assertion, (5) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of asserting authority, (6) negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of emotional outburst, (7) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of delivering direct criticism, (8) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of expressing relational closeness. This section outlines the research findings and offers a critical discussion of the ways in which politeness meanings are discursively and integratively realized in online communication.

A. Negative Politeness With the Pragmatic Meaning of Avoiding Direct Confrontation

Data 1

Data source:
https://www.instagram.com/p/DHimxZHNxQ5/?img_index=1&igsh=MXY3eGx2Y2t1ZHI3NA==

The speech in question originates from an Instagram post by the account suaradotcom, which features a statement by Arif Maulana, the Deputy Chair of Advocacy at YLBHI. In the post, Maulana voices serious concern over the recurrence of terror experienced by Tempo, marked most recently by the delivery of six mutilated rat carcasses to its editorial office—an act that follows a prior incident involving the sending of a pig's head. These acts of intimidation are suspected to be linked to Tempo's investigative reporting on the TNI Bill, a topic currently under intense public scrutiny. In response, YLBHI has called on law enforcement to swiftly investigate the matter and to guarantee the safety of Tempo's journalists. They emphasize the importance of determining whether this intimidation is connected to Tempo's journalistic activities, particularly given the pattern of such incidents occurring after the publication of sensitive investigative reports.

TABLE 1
NEGATIVE POLITENESS WITH THE PRAGMATIC MEANING OF AVOIDING DIRECT CONFRONTATION

Data Code	Form of Politeness	Markers & Meanings of Language Politeness	Using Mitigation & Formality	Avoiding Direct Confrontation	Delivering Criticism Diplomatically
Data 1	Negative Politeness	Markers of politeness	"YLBHI sees that"	"The repeated terror received by Tempo is a serious threat to the journalist profession."	"A serious threat to the journalist profession."
		Pragmatic meaning of language politeness	Use neutral and objective expressions to maintain the formality and credibility of the statement.	It does not directly accuse of criticize a particular party, but expresses concerns in a diplomatic way.	Criticism of the terror against Tempo was delivered as a rational statement, not as an aggressive accusation.

The statement delivered by YLBHI, as featured in the Instagram post by suaradotcom, exemplifies the use of negative politeness strategies as conceptualized by Brown and Levinson. This politeness strategy is reflected in the use of mitigating expressions aimed at minimizing imposition and avoiding direct confrontation. For instance, the phrase "seeing that" functions as a cautious preamble to critique, softening the delivery and signaling deference to the interlocutor. Furthermore, the assertion that "the repeated terror experienced by Tempo constitutes a serious threat to the journalism profession" employs formal, measured language, thereby reinforcing the credibility of the message while refraining from overtly targeting specific actors. The lexical choices made in the statement indicate that the critique is grounded in rational analysis rather than emotional reaction. Through the application of negative politeness, YLBHI is able to express disapproval of the intimidation faced by Tempo while maintaining an indirect stance, thus framing the issue as a broader concern for press freedom. This strategic use of language not only underscores YLBHI's role as an advocacy organization committed to journalist protection, but also enhances the persuasive appeal of the statement by projecting professionalism and neutrality—qualities likely to elicit a more responsive stance from state authorities such as the police.

B. Negative Politeness With the Pragmatic Meaning of Involving Dismissive Humor

Data 2

Data source:
https://www.instagram.com/reel/DHfgyUcCdDP/?igsh=MWl6NWgxZGUyNXhmOQ==

The speech referenced originates from a post on the official Instagram account of KompasTV, which features a statement by Hasan Nasbi, Head of the Presidential Communications Office. In this post, Nasbi addresses questions posed by journalists concerning the recent acts of intimidation directed at Tempo journalists—most notably, the delivery of a pig's head to the media outlet's editorial office. This act, following a previous incident involving the sending of a dead rat, is widely regarded as a serious threat to press freedom. In response to these concerns, Nasbi made a lighthearted remark, stating, "Just cook it, if it's a pig's head, just cook it," during a casual media interaction at the Presidential Palace Complex in Central Jakarta on Friday, March 21, 2025. The threatening package, reportedly addressed to "Cica," a journalist and host of Tempo's Bocor Alus program, was sent by an unknown individual. While Nasbi later affirmed that the government does not impose restrictions on journalistic activity, he also noted that the government's role is limited to correcting misinformation or inaccuracies in media reporting.

TABLE 2
NEGATIVE POLITENESS WITH THE PRAGMATIC MEANING OF DISMISSIVE HUMOR

Data code	Form of politeness	Markers & Meanings of Language Politeness	Non-formal Expressions and
Data 2	Positive Politeness	Politeness marker	"Just cook it, if it's a pig's head, just cook it."
		Pragmatic meaning of language politeness	Presenting humor in response to journalists' questions. However, in a broader context, this statement could be seen as trivializing the serious issue of press freedom and threats to journalists.

The statement "It's already cooked, if it's a pig's head, just cook it." exemplifies a positive politeness strategy, as defined by Brown and Levinson, where the speaker employs humor to foster familiarity and reduce potential tension in communication. However, within a broader context, this remark has the potential to provoke controversy, particularly as it was made in response to a sensitive issue—the threat to press freedom linked to the intimidation experienced by Tempo journalists. The use of informal language and humor to address serious matters may inadvertently suggest a lack of sensitivity to the gravity of the situation, especially when it concerns the safety of journalists and the protection of press freedom. Furthermore, humor in political discourse is often used as a tool to deflect or minimize attention on difficult or uncomfortable topics. In this case, Hasan Nasbi's comment could be interpreted as an attempt to downplay the significance of the threats faced by the press without offering a substantive response or solution. While positive politeness strategies aim to maintain harmonious relations with interlocutors, their application can backfire in certain situations, such as this one, where the humor might be perceived as dismissive or indicative of a lack of seriousness regarding critical issues. Consequently, the use of humor in official communications, particularly in political contexts involving public safety and sensitive matters, must be approached with greater caution to prevent misunderstandings or the cultivation of negative perceptions.

C. Positive Politeness With the Pragmatic Meaning of Avoiding Prolonged Conflict

Data 3

Data source:
https://www.instagram.com/reel/DG2AFRNzQ1j/?igsh=ZW41NzI5Ynk5dWJy

The statement in question originates from a post on the Instagram account mediagossip.kuy, which features a quote from Nissa Sabyan during an interview with reporters. In the interview, Nissa Sabyan was asked about the label of "pelakor" (homewrecker) that has been associated with her, a label that persists to this day. This term emerged because her current husband was previously married to another woman before divorcing and subsequently marrying Nissa. In response to the question, Nissa Sabyan remarked, "Whether you like it or not, that's a risk," and further explained that she was simply moving forward with her life in the face of these circumstances. This statement reflects an attitude of acceptance and a desire to avoid further prolonging the public debate surrounding the controversy involving her.

TABLE 3
POSITIVE POLITENESS WITH THE PRAGMATIC MEANING OF AVOIDING PROLONGED CONFLICT

Data Code	Form of Politeness	Markers & Meanings of Language Politeness	Expressing acceptance and avoiding
Data **3**	Positive Politeness	Markers of politeness	"Whether you want it or not is a risk."
		Pragmatic meaning of language politeness	Avoiding further conflict and not prolonging the debate by indicating that he/she will not argue or defend himself/herself further.

The statement "Hau tak mau itu peluang" (willing or unwilling, it's a risk) uttered by Nissa Sabyan exemplifies a negative politeness strategy, as defined by Brown and Levinson. The negative politeness in this utterance is demonstrated through the use of language that avoids direct confrontation, reflecting a resigned acceptance of the situation. By framing the consequences she faced as an inherent part of the risks involved, Nissa does not engage in a defensive argument or attempt to justify herself, but instead chooses to accept the label imposed upon her without extending the debate. This approach reflects a communication strategy that seeks to maintain a respectful distance from the interlocutor, avoiding the provocation of further discussion or emotional responses. Furthermore, this utterance illustrates how individuals can strategically use language to circumvent conflict in contentious circumstances. Rather than adopting a defensive stance or assigning blame, Nissa opts for a neutral response that minimizes the potential for further contention. This can also be seen as an attempt to manage her public image, maintaining control over the narrative while avoiding overt signs of discomfort. In pragmatic terms, such a strategy is often employed by public figures dealing with controversy, enabling them to stabilize their image and prevent the escalation of a larger public dispute.

D. Positive Politeness With the Pragmatic Meaning of Credibility Assertion

Data 4

Data source:
https://www.instagram.com/p/DHlGPv9zgXL/?igsh=MWttano1Z2VuZW9pNQ==

The statement in question originates from a post on the Instagram account idntimes, which features a quote from Rosan Roeslani, the Head of the Danantara Executive Agency, regarding the announcement of the complete organizational structure of the Daya Anagata Nusantara (Danantara) Investment Management Agency (BPI) on Monday, March 24, 2025. During a press conference held at Graha CIMB Niaga in South Jakarta, Rosan emphasized that no names had been "deposited" in the selection of Danantara's management. He specifically noted that even President Prabowo Subianto had not submitted any nominations. When reporters inquired about the possibility of political influence, Rosan firmly responded, "We do not entertain any form of deposits. Even the President did not submit any names." He further clarified that no individuals from political parties were included in the Danantara management, as all selected candidates had been chosen based on professional assessments conducted by three global headhunting firms. This statement was intended to assure the public that the selection process for Danantara officials was conducted in a transparent and independent manner, free from political interference.

TABLE 4
POSITIVE POLITENESS WITH THE PRAGMATIC MEANING OF CREDIBILITY ASSERTION

Data Code	Form of Politeness	Marker & Meanings of Language Politeness	Assertion Phrases
Data **4**	Positive Politeness	Politeness marker	"Even Mr. President doesn't give any names".
		Pragmatic meaning of language politeness	Inviting the audience to agree and believe that there is no entrustment in the appointment of Danantara officials. By mentioning the President as an example, the speaker emphasizes the credibility of the decisions made.

The utterance "Wong Bapak Presiden saja tidak ada tibpan nama" reflects a positive politeness strategy as outlined by Brown and Levinson. This strategy is employed to foster a sense of rapport with the audience and to encourage alignment with the speaker's message. The use of the term "wong", which carries an informal tone, signifies an attempt by the speaker to establish familiarity and solidarity with the listener. Additionally, referencing "Mr. President" as an example enhances the credibility of the statement and serves as a persuasive tactic, making it easier for the audience to accept the argument being presented. From a pragmatic perspective, this statement seeks to reassure the public that the process of selecting Danantara management was conducted in a professional manner, free from political influence. By emphasizing that even the President did not submit any names, the speaker aims to dispel any concerns about potential conflicts of interest in the organizational structure. Moreover, this statement works to bolster the image of transparency and independence of the institution in question. Through the use of a positive politeness strategy, the speaker endeavors to build trust by employing inclusive language that resonates with the public. The casual, locally nuanced style of communication helps cultivate a closer relationship between the speaker and the audience, thus enhancing the effectiveness of the message in achieving its communicative objectives.

E. Negative Politeness With the Pragmatic Meaning of Asserting Authority

Data 5

Data source:
https://www.instagram.com/p/DHSUY5LSXFC/?igsh=MTY2eXpnYTRmNmJheQ==

The statement in question is sourced from an Instagram post by idntimes, which features a comment by Bahlil Lahadalia, the General Chairperson of the Golkar Party, regarding rumors about Finance Minister Sri Mulyani's potential resignation from the Red and White Cabinet. Speaking at the Golkar Party DPP Office in Jakarta on Sunday, March 16, 2025, Bahlil Lahadalia emphasized that changes in the ministerial composition of the cabinet are solely within the prerogative of President Prabowo Subianto. When questioned by reporters about the possibility of a cabinet reshuffle or Sri Mulyani's resignation, Bahlil refrained from further comment, asserting: "Let's not always think that it exceeds the president's authority. It's not allowed because ministerial affairs are absolute matters, the president's prerogative." Additionally, he reminded ministers in the Red and White Cabinet not to overstep their authority, particularly with regard to cabinet appointments. The limited meeting held by President Prabowo in Hambalang that same day, according to Bahlil, focused solely on downstreaming policy and did not address the issue of a cabinet reshuffle. This statement serves to reiterate that the president alone has the authority to determine the composition of the cabinet, and there is no external influence in this process.

TABLE 5
NEGATIVE POLITENESS WITH THE PRAGMATIC MEANING OF ASSERTING AUTHORITY

Data Code	Form of Politeness	Markers & Meanings of Language Politeness	Maintaining the Hierarchy of Power
Data **5**	Negative Politeness	Politeness marker	"The minister is an absolute matter, the prerogative of the president."
		Pragmatic meaning of language politeness	Avoid violating the limits of the President's authority. By emphasizing that this decision is the President's prerogative, the speaker emphasizes respect for authority and avoids appearing to interfere.

The statement "The minister is an absolute matter, the president's prerogative" exemplifies the use of negative politeness as defined by Brown and Levinson. This approach is employed to uphold the established power hierarchy by asserting that decisions regarding the appointment of ministers fall solely within the President's jurisdiction, thus preventing any external interference. The terms "absolute" and "prerogative" serve to underscore the exclusivity of this decision, emphasizing that it is beyond dispute or challenge. In the context of political discourse, this negative politeness strategy operates to acknowledge and respect the President's authority, while simultaneously avoiding any ambiguity or public speculation concerning the involvement of other parties in cabinet formation. Furthermore, the statement acts as a means to maintain clear boundaries between the roles and responsibilities of different governmental entities, ensuring that no one exceeds their designated authority. Therefore, this utterance not only affirms the speaker's neutral position regarding potential ministerial changes but also functions as a clarifying remark intended to mitigate public controversy and reduce unnecessary polemics.

V. Conclusion

This study has systematically identified and categorized five distinct politeness strategies, each embodying specific pragmatic functions. The findings which contribute to the broader discourse on linguistic politeness are concisely delineated in the subsequent items: (1) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of avoiding direct confrontation, (2) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of involving dismissive humor, (3) Positive politeness with the pragmatic meaning of avoiding prolonged conflict, (4) Positive politeness with the pragmatic meaning of credibility assertion, (5) Negative politeness with the pragmatic meaning of asserting authority. Nevertheless, this study encounters methodological constraints, particularly regarding the limited availability of established theoretical frameworks within third-wave pragmatics that adopt a discursive-integrative approach. This constraint inevitably influences the scope and granularity of pragmatic meaning analysis, which constitutes the study's primary focus. Future research should address these gaps to advance the field. We encourage scholars with shared interests in discursive-integrative politeness to pursue complementary investigations, thereby facilitating a more comprehensive understanding of this phenomenon. Such efforts would significantly enhance pragmatic pedagogy across tertiary education levels.

Acknowledgements

References

[1] Arundale, R. B. (2013). Face as a research focus in interpersonal pragmatics: Relational and emic perspectives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *58*(108-120). doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.05.013.
[2] Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and politeness: New (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(10-11), 1453-1469. doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00173-X.
[3] Barton, D., & Lee, C. (2013). *Language Online: Investigating Digital Texts and Practices* (1st ed.). Routledge. doi.org/10.4324/9780203552308.
[4] Bezemer, J. (2021). Multimodality: A guide for linguists. Manuscript to appear in L. Litosseliti (ed.), *Research Methods in Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum. doi.org/10.5040/9781350043466.ch-012.
[5] Bezemer, J., & Jewitt, C. (2018). Multimodality: A guide for linguists. *Research Methods in Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
[6] Blitvich, P. G. C., & Sifianou, M. (2019). Im/politeness and discursive pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *145*, 91-101. doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.03.015.
[7] Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics*, *11*(2), 131-146. doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5.
[8] Bou-Franch, P., & Garcés-Conejos, P. (2003). Teaching linguistic politeness: A methodological proposal. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *41*(1), 1-22. doi.org/10.1515/iral.2003.001.
[9] Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27-40. doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027.
[10] Cummings, L. (2013). *Pragmatics: A multidisciplinary perspective* (1st ed.). Routledge. doi.org/10.4324/9781315045580.
[11] Dong, G. Z. (2018). Improvement validity of modern Chinese reading teaching based on pragmatics. *Kuram Ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, *18*(6), 3354-3360. doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.6.240.
[12] Harper, D. (2011). Choosing a Qualitative Research Method. In *Qualitative Research Methods in Mental Health and Psychotherapy: A Guide for Students and Practitioners*. Thompson. doi.org/10.1002/9781119973249.ch7.
[13] Haugh, M. (2003). Japanese and Non-Japanese Perceptions of Japanese Communication. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, *5*(1), 156-177.
[14] Haugh, M. (2006). Emic Perspectives on the Positive-Negative Politeness Distinction. *Culture, Language and Representation*, *3*(October). http://hdl.handle.net/10072/13702
[15] Haugh, M. (2008). Intention in pragmatics. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *5*(2), 99–110. doi.org/10.1515/ip.2008.006.
[16] Haugh, M. (2015). Impoliteness and taking offence in initial interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *86*, 36-42. doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.018.

[17] Haugh, M. (2018). Disentangling face, facework and im/politeness. *Pragmática Sociocultural / Sociocultural Pragmatics*, *1*(1). doi.org/10.1515/soprag-2012-0005.
[18] Jaszczolt, K. M. (2018). Pragmatics and philosophy: In search of a paradigm. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *15*(2). doi.org/10.1515/ip-2018-0002.
[19] Johnson, E. (2001). *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press. doi.org/10.1177/00754240122005503.
[20] Krippendorff, K. (2010). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (2nd ed.). Organ Research Methods. SAGE Publications, Inc.
[21] Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research Language Behaviour Culture*, *3*(2). doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.009.
[22] Levinson, S. C. (2013). Recursion in Pragmatics. *Language* (Baltim), *89*(1), 149-162. doi.org/10.1353/lan.2013.0005.
[23] Li, H., & Wang, M. (2016). Culpeper, Jonathan & Haugh, Michael: Pragmatics and the English language. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *13*(4), 595-601. doi.org/10.1515/ip-2016-0026.
[24] Mulyana, N. (2021). Politeness Strategies on Instagram: A Cyberpragmatics Perspective. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik dan Sastra* (SEMNALISA), *6*, 561-565.
[25] Mungmachon, M. R. (2012). Knowledge and Local Wisdom: Community Treasure. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *2*(13), 174–181. doi.org/10.5194/nhess-15-1785-2015.
[26] Murray, N. (2009). Pragmatics, awareness raising, and the cooperative principle. *ELT Journal*, *64*(3), 293-301. doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp056.
[27] Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 1-31. doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.1.1.
[28] O'Driscoll, J. (2011). Face, communication and social interaction (Francesca Bargiela-Chiappini & Michael Haugh, Eds.). *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, *7*(1), 153-157. doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2011.008.
[29] Onwuegbuzie, A., & Leech, N. (2005). On becoming a pragmatic researcher: The importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory & Practice*, *8*(5), 375–387. doi.org/10.1080/13645570500402447.
[30] Rahardi, R. K. (2019). Integrating Social, Societal, Cultural, and Situational Context to Develop Pragmatics Course Learning Materials: Preliminary Study. *Jurnal Gramatika: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, *5*(2), 169-178. http://dx.doi.org/10.22202/jg.2019.v5i2.3572
[31] Rahardi, R. K. (2022). Triadicities of Indonesian Phatic Functions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *12*(12), 2641–2650. doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1212.22.
[32] Rahardi, R. K. (2024). *Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar dalam Bidang Ilmu Bahasa, Teroka Paradigma Linguistik, Perspektif Studi Linguistik, dan Konteks Siberteks dalam Cyberpragmatics* [Inauguration Speech for Professor in the Field of Linguistics, "Exploring Linguistic Paradigms, Linguistic Study Perspectives, and Cybertext Contexts in Cyberpragmatics]. Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta.
[33] Rahardi, R. K., & Budhiono, R. H. (2024). Information Layers of Ostentive Communication of Hoaxes in the Perspective of Relevance Theory of Sperber & Wilson. *Suar Betang*, *19*(2), 207–218. doi.org/10.26499/sorbet v19i2.23484.
[34] Rahardi, R. K., Rahmat, W., & Kurniawan, Y. (2023). Pseudo-Directive Speech Act in the Javanese Language: Culture-Specific Pragmatic Perspective. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *66*, 1–12. doi.org/10.1044/2023_JSLHR-23-00223.
[35] Rahardi, R. K., Setyaningsih, Y., Rahmat, W., & Lateh, N. H. M. (2024). A Stylistic Pragmatics Perspective on Metaphors of Emotive Words in Anak Bajang Menggiring Angin. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(8), 2417–2425. doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1408.14.
[36] Ramírez, A. (2020). The case for Culturally and Linguistically Relevant Pedagogy: Bilingual Reading to learn for Spanish-Speaking immigrant mothers. *System*, *95*, 102379. doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102379.
[37] Rowsell, J. (2013). *Working with multimodality: Rethinking literacy in a digital age*. Routledge. doi.org/10.4324/9780203071953.
[38] Sachs-Hombach, K., & Thon, J. N. (2019). Introduction: Multimodal media. *Poetics Today*, *40*(2), 183–187. doi.org/10.1215/03335372-7298494.
[39] Silva, V. M., Holler, J., Ozyurek, A., & Roberts, S. G. (2020). Multimodality and the origin of a novel communication system in face-to-face interaction. *R Soc Open Sci*, *7*(1), 182056. doi.org/10.1098/rsos.182056.
[40] Smith, J., Bekker, H., & Cheater, F. (2011). Theoretical versus pragmatic design in qualitative research. *Nurse Research*, *18*(2), 39-5. doi.org/10.7748/nr2011.01.18.2.39.c8283.
[41] Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2012). Pragmatics, modularity and mindreading. *Meaning and Relevance*, *(17)*, 3-23. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139028370.016.
[42] Spencer-Oatey, H., & Ruhi, Ş. (2007). Identity, face and (im)politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 635-786. doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.12.003.
[43] Stöckl, H. (2019). Linguistic multimodality - multimodal linguistics: A state-of-the-art sketch. *Multimodality: Disciplinary Thoughts and the Challenge of Diversity*. De Gruyter. doi.org/10.1515/9783110608694-002.
[44] Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies. *American Sociological Review*, *51*(2), 273-286. doi.org/10.2307/2095521.
[45] Sykes, J. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics: Explicit and comprehensive. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(2 Special Issue), 381-402. doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.9.
[46] Terkourafi, M., & Bezuidenhout, A. (2021). Special issue: (Im)politeness, humour, and the role of intentions: Essays presented to Michael Haugh: Guest editors' introduction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *179*(1), 1-3. doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.05.015.
[47] Topić, M. (2020). Fluffy PR and 'comms girls': banter, social interactions and the office culture in public relations in England. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *29*(5), 1321-1336. doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-09-2020-2423.
[48] Unger, C. (2012). Cognitive Pragmatics. The Mental Processes of Communication. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(3), 332-334. doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.12.001.

[49] Van Eck, R. (2006). Digital Game-Based Learning: It's Not Just the Digital Natives Who Are Restless. *Educause Review*, *41*(2), 16-30. doi.org/10.1145/950566.950596.

[50] Wang, V., & Tucker, J. V. (2016). Phatic systems in digital society. *Technology in Society*, *46*, 140-148. doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2016.06.002.

[51] Wharton, T. (2009). *Pragmatics and non-verbal communication*. Cambridge University Press. doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511635649.

[52] Widdowson, H. G. (1998). Communication and community: The pragmatics of ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, *17*, 3-14. doi.org/10.1016/s0889-4906(97)00028-8.

[53] Zienkowski, J. (2014). *Discursive pragmatics.* John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi.org/10.1075/hoph.8.01zie.

[54] Zuckerman, M., Depaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1981). Verbal and nonverbal communication of deception. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *14*, 1-59. doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60369-X.

R. Kunjana Rahardi, M.Hum., is a linguist and pragmatics expert who earned his doctorate from Gadjah Mada University in 1999 and became a professor of linguistics at Sanata Dharma University in 2023. His expertise includes pragmatics, cyberpragmatics, sociolinguistics, politeness strategies, and digital communication. He also explores multimodality, cybertextuality, and ecolinguistics in the digital age. His influential book *Pragmatics: Politeness Strategies in Indonesian Imperatives* analyzes the interplay between language, social norms, and politeness. Later works such as *The Phenomenon of Impoliteness*, *Introduction to Pragmatics*, and *Sociolinguistic Studies* expand on these themes and examine language variation in multilingual societies. He has authored over 40 academic books and published more than 70 journal articles. Recent notable publications include "Unraveling the Psychological Impact of Spatial Cybertext Environments" (*AILA Review*), "The Role of Multimodal Visual Cybertext Context" (*Linguistik Indonesia*), and "A Stylistic Pragmatics Perspective on Metaphors" (*TPLS*). His research also addresses everyday humor in digital spaces, as seen in "Javanese Silly Gags on Social Media" (*Arbitrer*). Prof. Kunjana is recognized as a key figure in modern Indonesian linguistics, combining theory, empirical research, and contextual analysis to address the evolving challenges of language and communication in contemporary society.

Yuliana Setyaningsih, M.Pd., is a permanent lecturer at Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta. She earned her doctoral degree in Indonesian Language Education from the Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, in 2008. Since 2009, she has taught Indonesian Phonology, and her teaching experience in this field is reflected in the book *Fonologi Bahasa Indonesia: Mengkaji Tata Bunyi dalam Perspektif Edukasi*, co-authored with her colleague specializing in linguistics, giving the work a distinctive educational and linguistic perspective. Her published works include edited volumes such as *Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajaran dalam Teropong Kekiniannya* (2013) and *Butir-butir Gagasan Sastra dan Pengajarannya* (2013), as well as authored titles like *Menulis Artikel Jurnal: Panduan Mencipta Karya Ilmiah Bermutu dengan Pengembangan Argumentasi Berperspektif Stephen Toulmin* (2018) and *Morfologi Kontekstual Berbasis Multimodalitas untuk Mahasiswa Program Sarjana Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia* (2022, with Jasmine Belinda Budijanto).

Roni Sulistiyono, M.Pd., is a permanent lecturer and the Head of the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Program (PBSI) at Ahmad Dahlan University (UAD), Yogyakarta. He was reappointed as program head for the 2023–2026 term, reflecting strong trust in his leadership and dedication to academic development. Under his guidance, the PBSI program actively works on curriculum innovation to align with contemporary needs and the job market, including a new curriculum planned for implementation in 2025. Beyond internal improvements, he also initiates strategic collaborations, such as with the Indonesian Language for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) association, APPBIPA DIY Branch, to broaden student perspectives in language teaching. He once provided material on Differentiation in Learning Indonesian Language and Literature to students and lecturers who are members of the PBSI LPTK PTMA association. Known for his innovative and communicative approach, Roni consistently strives to elevate the quality of Indonesian language and literature education. Through various initiatives and strategic partnerships, he is committed to positioning PBSI UAD as a leading and competitive program both nationally and internationally.

Seli Tria Febriani was born on February 5, 2004, in Singkut District, Sarolangun Regency, Jambi Province. She began her formal education at SD Negeri 61 Bukit Murau and graduated in 2016. She then continued her studies at SMP Negeri 5 Sarolangun, graduating in 2019, followed by vocational education at SMK Negeri 9 Sarolangun, from which she graduated in 2022. Currently, she is pursuing a degree in Indonesian Language and Literature at Sanata Dharma University.