



Impoliteness Strategies in Facebook Comments on Religious-driven Sermons against the LGBTQ+ Community: A Pragmatic Analysis

Trisana Jyn Q. Tomas¹, Mary Rose D. Rival², Rechel B. Lapaz³, Mecca S. Seguran⁴, Mark Aaron A. Dacalanio⁵

St. Mary's College of Bansalan, Inc.

markdacalanio@smcbi.edu.ph⁵

Article History:

First Received:
21/07/2025

Final Revision:
18/11/2025

Available online:
31/12/2025

Abstract. This research aims to identify common impoliteness strategies employed by Facebook users in their comments on religious-driven sermons against the LGBTQ+ community. The researchers gathered 50 impolite comments and analyzed based on the Impoliteness theory by Jonathan Culpeper (1996). The data were gathered from Facebook comments and underwent descriptive qualitative analysis wherein each comment is given a description and analyzed as to how they are being used and interpreted. In terms of impoliteness triggers, it involved the following: insults, pointed criticism, unpalatable questions, dismissals, silencers, threats, context-driven impoliteness, and convention-driven impoliteness. Meanwhile, in terms of the impoliteness strategies used, it involved the following: bald-on record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness while withhold impoliteness. The analysis revealed that impoliteness strategies or utterances in the religious context are the terms that are used to destroy the image, criticize, and express strong disagreement with the addressee. The findings suggest that Facebook users have to be aware of their words to foster respect in online contexts.

Keywords: *impoliteness, Facebook, religious-driven sermons, LGBTQ+ community, pragmatic analysis*

<http://jos.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/jes>

INTRODUCTION

Religious discrimination towards the members of the LGBTQ+ community has been a dominant issue in today's generation, often provoked within the context of sermons and religious beliefs. These sermons usually contradict LGBTQ+ beliefs and individuals, seeing them as sinful or immoral, which can contribute to an unfavorable environment for religious people. According to McCarthy and Nair (2018), LGBTQ+ groups and religion continue to be both a source of potential inclusion and exclusion in the community. Balancing religious freedom and LGBTQ+ rights is a long-standing tension and an increasingly pressing concern (Eskridge & Wilson, 2018). Thus, the use of religion as a justification to discriminate against the LGBTQ+ community reinforces social biases and challenges to acceptance and equality. These biases can negatively influence the well-being as well as the mental health of the individuals who belong to the LGBTQ+ community. Religiously-driven discrimination has been an issue to full acceptance within many religious groups despite having LGBTQ+ rights advocacies. Social media is a platform where LGBTQ+ individuals and the community can express themselves and defend their rights.

In British Columbia, LGBTQ+ individuals are identified as abnormal, shameful, and sinful in their conservative Christian community (Block, 2021). The rigid adherence to religious beliefs and teachings can create a hostile environment for LGBTQ+ individuals, leading to feelings of rejection and alienation. Vegter and Haider-Markel (2020), within the American view, religious context significantly affects the attitudes towards LGBTQ+ people, particularly their rights and positions within religious communities. In Chicago, negative messages associated with religion significantly affected the mental health and depression of many LGBTQ+ persons due to homophobia or transphobia, resulting in a decrease in their participation in religion (Pauken, 2020). Muslim LGBTQs in Turkey faced discrimination from both Muslim and non-religious groups, which affected their expression and identity development (Kumpasoglu et al., 2022). Furthermore, Muslim LGBTQs in Indonesia are facing challenges living in a homophobic and heterosexist society. They believe that being gay or bisexual is sinful, impure, and wrong due to the religious and sexual norms in Indonesia (Khoir, 2020).

In Australia, LGBTQ+ individuals utilize social media for individuality, connectivity, and welfare support. There are a large number of LGBTQ+ individuals who engage in Facebook groups to connect with their fellows. Facebook was considered a crucial support for the mental health of an individual to prevent them from having suicidal temptations. Social media is a room where LGBTQ+ individuals relate and support each other, which contributes to and comforts them from isolation and discrimination (Berger et al., 2021). As stated by Devito et al. (2021), LGBTQ+ individuals in the United States use social media to express themselves to find comfort in their welfare, and build connections with other people. However, the desire to express themselves is not solely to expose themselves; they also tend to protect their identity from any discrimination, isolation, and oppression from social media, specifically on Facebook.

In the Philippine context, LGBTQ+ Filipinos in Manila continue to experience a variety of abuse, discrimination, and harassment due to society's conservative religious beliefs. These experiences are evident anywhere, including churches, schools, workplaces, and communities (Dagle, 2022). According to Libiran et al.

(2024), Filipinos in Bulacan are well-known for their religious characteristics, rendering hope and support for their fellow citizens. Hence, this characteristic somehow resulted in contradiction, as a few church teachings hold and control LGBTQ+ members, stereotyping them as immoral individuals.

Filipino LGBTQ+ members use social media to be themselves, to gain support, and to be authentic. The drive to “be themselves” is a way for them to protect their well-being from online harm (Fernandez, 2021). Through social media platforms like Facebook, LGBTQ+ individuals can express themselves without fear of discrimination, finding comfort and freedom (Taylor et al., 2020).

The research problem exists in both international and national settings, particularly in the context of impoliteness on social media, specifically Facebook. However, the researchers have not found any published research in the local setting, which is why the study is necessary. This study is responsive to UN SDG 16: Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions, as the findings may be used to promote peace and inclusivity for all, ensuring that justice is accessible to everyone.

This study is based on Culpeper’s (1996) Impoliteness theory. Culpeper (2005) defines impoliteness as a negative attitude toward specific behaviors in specific contexts, sustained by expectations, desires, and beliefs about social organization, including how one person's or group's identities are mediated by others in interaction. Five impoliteness strategies have been identified: bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness. First, bald on record impoliteness, the FTA (face-threatening act) is carried out in a straightforward, transparent, and concise manner, where preserving reputation or minimizing embarrassment is not a concern. Second, positive impoliteness is the strategy that aims to damage the addressee’s positive face wants, which include being appreciated or approved of, activities such as ignore the other, exclude the other from an activity, being disinterested, unconcerned, being unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, use obscure or sensitive language, seek disagreement, use taboo words, call the other names. Third is negative impoliteness, which employs tactics to harm the recipient's desire to avoid forcing or disturbance. Fourth, sarcasm or mock politeness is used with politeness strategies that are insincere or untrue. Fifth, withhold politeness, which is the expected politeness, but is left out for some reason.

This study will also utilize impoliteness triggers by Culpeper (1996), categorized into two: conventionalized and non-conventionalized. Non-conventionalized impoliteness refers to meanings classified by their implicatures, often referred to as implicational impoliteness. Conventionalized impoliteness pertains to identifying the meaning of words according to how they are used or depending on the context in which the speaker relates. Conventionalized impoliteness is categorized as insults, pointed criticism/complaints, unpalatable questions, presuppositions, condescension, message enforcers, dismissals, silencers, threats, and negative repressions. Non-conventionalized are categorized into three: context-driven, form-driven, and convention-driven. Context-driven characteristics arise when unnoticed activities are not aligned with the context intended, much like impressing oneself on someone while neglecting the entity's facial significance. The form-driven is also identified as implication/referential politeness that embodies behaviors such as insinuation, innuendo, casting aspersions, sarcastic comments or remarks. Lastly,

the convention-driven method involves sarcasm, teasing, or harsh/bitter jokes/humor, implying sarcasm or fake politeness. Ultimately, examples from each type of impoliteness trigger can be seen in impolite remarks.

This research addresses the impoliteness strategies found in Facebook comments through the use of pragmatic lens. The researchers were motivated to conduct this study by the impoliteness strategies observed in social media, specifically on Facebook. This study examined the way people give impolite comments to show disagreement, hostility, or prejudice in online religious discourses, particularly religious-driven sermons towards the LGBTQ+ community.

This study is relevant to Facebook users and everyone who uses social media. Social media users, specifically Facebook users, have the most significant role in this study. Social media users should understand how impoliteness is used as a tool in impolite behavior, leading to discrimination and disrespect in online discourses. This study aligns with the UN's SDG 5 Gender Equality and SDG 16 Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions. By presenting the impolite features, social media users will be more careful in expressing themselves online to avoid committing offensive remarks and behavior.

RESEARCH METHOD

Researchers utilized descriptive qualitative design utilizing pragmatic analysis. Researchers use descriptive qualitative methods to create an understanding of complicated experiences in natural settings. Pragmatic analysis deals with understanding language, emphasizing how language is utilized in real-life applications to obtain a specific target and relay meaning. Social, cultural, and situational factors that affect communication are included in examining the context of the language used. It also analyzes how the communicator understands and responds to the message, considering the different communication features, such as tone, gesture, and language context. This approach plays a pivotal role in understanding the meaning of language in various contexts (Insyirah, 2021).

The study analyzed 50 impolite comments about a woman expressing disgust at members of the LGBTQ+ community, drawn from a publicly available Facebook post. This sample size allows for a manageable yet representative qualitative analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Inclusion criteria required impolite and vulgar comments in a Facebook post showing a person from a religious organization slamming members of the LGBTQ+ community. Exclusion criteria excluded edited posts and shared post of the same video. Afterward, certain procedures were followed. Firstly, comments were analyzed according to the strategies of impoliteness employed. Secondly, impoliteness strategies were analyzed to determine the impoliteness strategies and triggers used. Thirdly, the collected data were arranged accordingly. The researchers guaranteed that the statements were analyzed numerous times to gather information and that impolite features are discovered and emphasized.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on the pragmatic analysis conducted, impoliteness strategies, as well as the conventionalized and non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers were observed. The impoliteness strategies include the following: bald-on record

impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. On the other hand, impoliteness triggers, such as conventionalized impoliteness triggers include the following: insult, pointed criticism, unpalatable question, condescension, message enforcers, dismissal, silencers, threats, and negative expressives. The non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers including the following: context-driven impoliteness and convention-driven impoliteness as discussed below:

Table 1. Impoliteness Triggers used in Religious-driven Sermons against the LGBTQ+ Community

Impoliteness Triggers	Impoliteness Formulae	Utterances
Conventionalized Impoliteness Triggers	Insults	Homophobic bitch [IC: NC1] That girl is so stupid.
	Pointed Criticism	[IC: NC5] You're humiliating girl [IC:NC16] You're not that convincing you need more acting workshop [IC: NC45]
	Unpalatable Questions	Who are you to judge? [IC: NC29] How much did she sip?
	Message Enforcers	[IC: NC39] Hang yourself girl [IC: NC3]
	Dismissals	That's enough, surrender now. [IC: NC25] You're not supposed to judge, who you are by the way? [IC:NC27]
	Silencers	Shut up! [IC: NC8]
	Threats	Come here in front of me 'cause I will pierce your private part

		[IC: NC2]
		If I see you in hell, I will surely grab your tongue
Non- Conventionalized Impoliteness Trigger	Context-driven Impoliteness	[IC: NC12] There’s nothing wrong in preaching but make sure you are doing it correctly. Based on this case, it seems that you were not taught properly on how to relay and preach the words of God. Pretending holy but your action seems not.
	Convention-driven Impoliteness	[IC: NC37] There’s always a gentle way to share the gospel. But, why do the people at her back seems having a problem?
		[IC: NC31]

Insult. This conventionalized impoliteness trigger is disrespectful and hurtful, which results in social harm. This includes words or statements that refer to negative meanings towards a person. Moreover, this can occur in different forms, such as personalized negative vocatives, personalized negative assertions, and personalized third-person negative references, as shown in the following statement:

Homophobic bitch
[IC: NC1]

That girl is so stupid.
[IC: NC5]

In the first statement above, the addresser used personalized negative assertions, “homophobic bitch” where the impolite effect can be seen in the utterance. When we say homophobic, it pertains to the discrimination towards some conservative-religious people who label a strong hatred or prejudice towards the LGBTQ+ community. Using the term *homophobic* is a way of shaming or belittling the complexity of a person. The commenter labels the addressee as homophobic because of how the person downgrades the existence of the LGBTQ+ community through her religious sermons. On the other hand, the word “bitch” can be seen as an offensive word for a woman who is considered to be promiscuous. When we call someone bitch, we are stereotyping them as a woman who is unpleasant and somehow less respected than men. The addresser calls the addressee a bitch because the addressee’s action is somewhat unpleasant and irritable. It is unpleasant since the person speaking is from a religious organization, but the words coming from her mouth are words that only homophobic people use. Undoubtedly, the terms used in the comments are highly and undeniably insulting.

Secondly, the phrase “That girl is so stupid” shows personalized negative assertions. The phrase labels the person based on the perceived lack of intelligence or awareness towards the LGBTQ+ community. Thus, the phrase used in the comment is insulting and will surely stain the person’s reputation. The statement “That girl is so stupid” is used to insult the person giving the sermon, which means that she lacks intelligence or sufficient understanding of the LGBTQ+ community. The addresser tends to dismiss the addressee’s worth by labeling her as ‘stupid’ or having no sufficient knowledge to argue at all.

According to Rousseau and Baele (2021), insults are used as a strategy to upset conversation and contribute to how people see themselves. In the context of religion, the study of McCormick and Krieger (2020) indicates that LGBTQ+ members are often mocked as sinful individuals, and in this study, the person giving the sermon uses the sacred scriptures to insult or slam the LGBTQ+ members. The study of Dynel (2021) shows that in social media, insult is frequently used to discriminate against the LGBTQ+ community, leading to disrespect and hurting the addressers.

Pointed Criticism. This is a criticism or comment referring to a specific flaw or issue. This includes complaints, articulation of dissatisfaction, expression of fault, weakness, and disadvantages. That is why it suggests the inadequacy of the target. This can be seen in the utterance below:

You’re humiliating girl
[IC: NC16]

You’re not that convincing you need more acting
workshop
[IC: NC45]

In the first statement above, it is evident that the commenter is judging the addressee. Since she is from a religious organization, it is expected that she will express words that convey hope, love, compassion, or respect at the very least. But the actions of the woman in the video showed otherwise; she was screaming and bashing the members of the queer community. When we call someone humiliating, we intend to judge their action as embarrassing and ridiculous. In the statement “You’re humiliating girl”, the commenter directly addresses the addressee as a person who caused embarrassment or shame to herself or implies that the commenter intentionally tries to make the addressee feel embarrassed or distressed about her actions. This indeed foretells that the criticism is visible from the statement.

Secondly, the utterance, “You’re not that convincing,” implies that the arguments or explanations presented by the person giving the religious sermon are not strong enough to persuade the audience. It is openly foreseen that the addressee is trying to convince, manipulate, or perform poorly, which is unqualified for such an act, or is believed to be superficial. Additionally, the phrase “you need more acting workshops” means that the addresser is not that convinced by the addressee’s point on how she talks or acts; therefore, the addressee needs to do more acting

workshops, which in this case shows criticisms in the way the person giving the sermon is expressing herself. This constitutes a pointed criticism of how someone is dissatisfied with the person's speech.

This impoliteness trigger consists of strong disagreement and expressing falsified statements that intend to attack the addressee in any form of face attack. Banat et al. (2024) emphasize that in social media, pointed criticism uses straightforward and clear dissatisfaction or judgment, often rude, without softening the language used. Furthermore, in the context of religion, McCutcheon (2023) highlights pointed criticism as a direct expression of critique and disapproval based on religious norms, where some actions are considered unethical and sinful towards the divine law.

Unpalatable Questions. This impoliteness trigger tends to express that something is falsified and unacceptable, and thus becomes the root of forming an impolite question. In this statement, the sentence was made in the form of questioning, but not directly asking for a clear and direct answer. This statement clearly emphasizes that the complainant wants the receiver to feel discomfort and guilt about what he/she has done. In the study, the following utterances show the use of unpalatable questions:

Who are you to judge?
[IC: NC29]

How much did she sip?
[IC: NC39]

In the first statement, the addresser asked the unpalatable question "Who are you to judge?" this is in question form, but rather than asking for an answer, the commenter implies that the addressee should not judge the LGBTQ+ community as being immoral. The commenter expresses that the person giving the religious sermon should not impose her belief on all. Additionally, this statement did not ask for a direct answer to the addresser's question, but rather made the speaker feel guilty and reflect on his own. This implies that the addressee's arguments are unacceptable. Therefore, it negatively affects the addressee and the reputation of the addressee's religion as being someone who is quick to judge people by their gender expression.

In the second utterance, with the use of an unpalatable question, "how much did she sip?", they did not necessarily ask for a definite response but refer to the number of drugs the speaker took for uttering such nonsense statements that are inappropriate and disrespectful. In the Philippines, or Mindanao specifically, there is this statement "unsa kadaghana iyang nasuyop?" [how much did that person take] or "naka suyop ka?" [have you taken drugs] which is often addressed to a person who is taking drugs. This utterance "how much did she sip?" is highly impolite, particularly in Mindanao, because it implies that the person is using drugs or behaves like a drug addict by the way she behaves screaming and judging the LGBTQ+ community through the sermons. The person giving a sermon against the LGBTQ+ was questioned by the commenter "how much did she sip?" because the

addressee was not in the right behavior, uttering nonsense ideology, and shouting as if not in her right mind or state.

This type of impoliteness trigger is used as statements that show something is unacceptable; thus, the speaker strongly disagrees with it. In the context of social media, the use of this impoliteness trigger can be seen in discussions and debates. For instance, a person may ask the other side to question the validity of their argument, thus the person being asked may feel doubtful and guilty about his/her stance. According to Ismail and Shanmuganathan (2019), online interactors usually use unpalatable questions in the online world to express disagreement towards someone in an indirect manner. This is also found in the study of Dacalanio et al. (2024), where unpalatable questions challenge the addressee without overtly placing blame and utilizing ambiguity to express disappointment or frustration in a way that is often hard to encounter.

Dismissals. This conventionalized impoliteness trigger is intended to stop someone or instruct them to cease their actions. Furthermore, this trigger is frequently used when rejecting or disregarding someone, indicating that it is no longer important or needed. This impoliteness trigger is seen in the utterance below:

That's enough, surrender now.
[IC: NC25]

You're not supposed to judge, who you are by the way?
[IC:NC27]

The statement "that's enough" indicates that the commenter wants the woman in the video to stop her speech. The utterance "that's enough" is a way of rejecting or disregarding the person's actions or speech. The commenter finds the woman or the addressee to be someone who utters nonsense ideologies that are irrelevant and unimportant; thus, there is a need to stop the speech. Additionally, the statement "surrender now" is a clear example of a dismissive statement that is an impolite trigger to just give up. This utterance aims to shut down and disregard the addressee's worth by believing that no amount of explanation can change the minds of the commenter regarding the LGBTQ+ community, and that the person giving the sermon cannot persuade the audience into hating the LGBTQ+ community.

In the second phrase, "You're not supposed to judge, who you are by the way?" implies the idea that as humans, we are all imperfect, and that we cannot judge people by the way they express or identify themselves even as members of the LGBTQ+. It also suggests that we should not judge other people in this world. Instead of judging someone, we should strive to support and help each other in a good way. This is considered impolite since the statement is phrased as a question, not meant to be answered, but rather meant to shut down whoever is speaking.

This impoliteness trigger, according to Culpeper (2011) aims to exclude the recipient from a conversation. In the study of Acheampong and Kwarteng (2021), dismissals are a frequently used approach for Ghanaians to show their disapproval or complaints. Moreover, Karithi (2020) found that dismissals were used by

candidates during the 2007 and 2013 Kenyan presidential elections to stop their addressees from responding to their discourse.

Silencers. This type of conventionalized impoliteness trigger is used to shut down, prevent them from speaking, or invalidate their input. These are often used to assert dominance or control and can be perceived as rude, aggressive, or disrespectful between the people involved. The conventionalized impoliteness trigger can be seen in the utterance below:

Shut up!
[IC: NC8]

In the statement above, the phrase “shut up” is a clear example of a silencer, which means to silence someone immediately, and its use can expand tension or conflict in a conversation. “Shut up” is a direct command to stop speaking or shut down the addressee’s supposed nonsense speech. The comment aims to silence the person giving the religious sermon to prevent her from continuing her nonsensical speech against the LGBTQ+ community. Thus, it is also used in moments of frustration, anger, or annoyance and is considered impolite or disrespectful. Overall, the utterance “shut up” is seen as rude, disrespectful, and impolite.

The study by Karithi (2020) found that a presidential candidate used the utterance “shut up” to silence his opponent; thus, this aggressive command was deemed to be impolite and disrespectful. Furthermore, it was found in the study of Acheampong and Kwarteng (2021) that the utterances “shut up” and “stop crying” are used to forcefully silence a speaker, which is a form of dismissing someone. Moreover, in the context of social media, silencers oppress LGBTQ+ views by using algorithmic biases, bullying, and reporting abuse. Some users report the social media content of LGBTQ+ members to get their accounts shadow-banned or even suspended. Some group pages on social media often indulge in online bullying to discriminate against LGBTQ+ members and to silence them (Jakob, 2024). Furthermore, in the context of religion, silencers are used to terminate LGBTQ+ voices by using the religious doctrine to exclude the LGBTQ+ community from participating in religious activities (Altahmazi, 2024).

Threats. This conventionalized impoliteness trigger can be viewed as a potential risk that requires analysis to prevent negative outcomes. This trigger aims to harm and threaten the receiver, causing him/her to feel unsafe due to the words uttered by someone because of actions done. The conventionalized impoliteness trigger can be seen in the utterances below:

Come here in front of me ‘cause I will pierce your private part.
[IC: NC2]

If I see you in hell, I will surely grab your tongue.
[IC: NC12]

In the first statement above, “come here in front of me,” the addresser meant to challenge the addressee to come in front of the addresser. On the other hand, the statement “I will pierce your private part” implies the potential risk that the addressee might face, which will probably cause negative outcomes. The utterance clearly shows a serious threat, sexual assault, and violence towards the person giving the sermon. “I will pierce your private part” explicitly threatens physical harm to the addressee’s private part, which leads to pain or serious injury. In contrast, the threat of piercing someone’s private parts is impolite and is a form of sexual assault, which is a serious crime. Overall, the utterance intimidates and instills fear in the addressee.

Secondly, the statement “If I see you in hell, I will surely grab your tongue” indicates a warning to the addressee about how the addresser will attack her. The utterance shows a threatening and disturbing act towards the addressee. Grabbing someone’s tongue can inflict harm or pain, and the statement creates a sense of potential danger and difficulty. On the other hand, the context of hell is a representation of danger, a place of suffering, and an environment that is full of violence. Overall, the utterance “If I see you in hell, I will surely grab your tongue” is a threat and a sign of extreme disrespect.

Ghani (2018) stated that threat is an impoliteness trigger as a way to intimidate the addresser, either through physical violence or verbal warnings. Ghani further highlights that the use of threat is prevalent in Online animosity in the study: *Impoliteness Strategies and Triggers of Hostility in A Social Networking Site in Brunei*. Moreover, according to Andersson (2024), in a religious setting, threats may affect either spiritual or physical aspects towards LGBTQ+ members. In this instance, the addressee may cause fear towards the addresser by articulating hell as a place for LGBTQ+ members due to their supposed sinful beliefs and choices. In serious cases, religious advocates even support laws that prohibit one’s sexual conversion and same-sex marriage.

Non-conventionalized Impoliteness Trigger. The study of Sperber and Willson (1986) and Culpepper (2011) revealed that words and statements play a great role in communication, depending on the context in which it is being used. This type of impoliteness trigger depends on the listener’s belief and cultural norms and understanding rather than the meaning meant to imply. Words or statements can be interpreted as impolite depending on how they are perceived by the addresser. Therefore, these statements can influence a wider range of listeners’ mental aspect rather than the word itself. Furthermore, Hassan (2019) claimed that some factors change how words are interpreted by someone. Thus, these factors can modify the meaning and purpose of words in social, cultural, and linguistic aspects by understanding the trigger of non-conventionalized impoliteness.

Context-driven Impoliteness. The characteristic of this impoliteness happens when unnoticed activities are not aligned with the context supposed to be targeted, just like impressing oneself on someone while neglecting the facial significance of the entity. The non-conventionalized impoliteness trigger can be seen in the utterance below:

There's nothing wrong in preaching but make sure you are doing it correctly. Based on this case, it seems that you were not taught properly on how to relay and preach the words of God. Pretending holy but your action seems not.
[IC: NC37]

The statement above is considered context-driven impoliteness because of the attack on someone's religious practice and entity, which violates the social norms of religious discourse. This kind of attack on someone's belief is highly inappropriate in various religious communities. Thus, the phrase is highly impolite and interpreted as context-driven impoliteness, particularly in a religious context where practice and faith are held sacred. The statement "*It seems that you were not taught properly on how to relay and preach the words of God*" clearly emphasizes that the addresser is against how the woman in the video delivered the word of God. It is supposed to be in a proper way, but the person giving the sermon delivered it in a very offensive manner by screaming and shouting. Secondly, the statement "Pretending holy but your actions seem not" clearly shows an incongruence between actions and words done by the person giving the sermon. This statement emphasizes the mismatch of the characteristics displayed by the addressee and what is expected of her in a religious context. Lastly, the overall statement displays a misalignment of the addressee's words and actions in a religious context.

One particular instance wherein disrespect for LGBTQ+ members differs based on the setting to which it is conveyed is the Pragmatic analysis of religious speech on social media platforms by Altahmazi (2022). In contrast to more varied or public contexts wherein religious or faith-based judgements are usually expressed in gentler language to promote acceptance among the public, his study emphasizes how religious criticisms develop into more explicit and aggressive situations where animosity towards LGBTQ+ members is generally acceptable. Moreover, Stone's (2017) study highlights how a platform's norms and audiences influence the degree of impoliteness in religious discourse. According to their research, individuals in religious groups usually employ language that is clear and exclusive, as opposed to those participating in larger and public discourse often modify their vocabulary to express their disagreement in a manner that seems more acceptable to society by using persuasive or implicit arguments. Furthermore, Chimunya and Igwebuike (2021) stated that religious criticism of LGBTQ+ individuals on social media becomes worse during periods of increased socio-political discourse. This indicates that religious individuals often change their choice of words and level of impoliteness, wherein it varies depending on a certain situational context, like political events, court cases on LGBTQ+ rights, or a change in public opinions, which causes them to use more violent and offensive language in response to perceived opposition to their beliefs.

Convention-driven Impoliteness. This impoliteness includes sarcasm and harsh or bitter jokes that go beyond mock politeness. This happens when the different parts of behavior differ semantically and, additionally, when the behavior

implied is not aligned with the intended context, leading to misunderstandings. The non-conventionalized impoliteness trigger can be seen in the utterance below:

There's always a gentle way to share the gospel,
but it seems like her colleagues are ashamed of her.
[IC: NC31]

The phrase, “there’s always a gentle way to share the gospel, but it seems like her colleagues are ashamed of her,” exemplifies convention-driven impoliteness. The line “There’s always a gentle way to share the gospel” employs a seemingly polite approach that suggests ways to share the gospel with kindness and respect. However, the line “but it seems like her colleagues are ashamed of her” is a sentiment that creates a misalignment, turning the message into an impolite remark. This implies that other members of the religious group represented by the person giving the sermon to the audience do not totally agree with the way the message is being presented. This is somewhat sarcastic because the first part of the statement is quite fine and nice, but the second part of the statement seeks to damage the addressee by insinuating that other members of their group are not entirely on her side. The overall statement suggested an idea that can have contrasting perceptions between the proper way of sharing religious beliefs and the perceived attitude of an individual’s colleagues.

The pragmatic analysis of religious-driven discourse in social media platforms by Carvalho et al. (2024) discovered how, as opposed to outright judgment, faith-based inspired criticisms towards LGBTQ+ members on online platforms, particularly on YouTube, acquired popularity by using moral justifications. The result of their study suggests that the addressers in social media arguments often incorporate the scripture as their reference in questioning the rights and beliefs of LGBTQ+ individuals. Although it is not directly antagonistic, it can nevertheless lead to rhetorical argument. Additionally, the study of Hudhayri (2021) presents instances of how religious beliefs can be utilized in expressing contradiction to LGBTQ+ individuals, while still claiming a sense of ethical prerogative. The findings of their study show how certain religious beliefs, even though it is framed within biblical scriptures and religious teaching, can still serve as judgment and marginalization. Furthermore, Mejia and Ngo (2024) found that those who used faith-based arguments to argue against LGBTQ+ concerns usually gathered more attention compared to those who employed overtly antagonistic language. According to their findings, users are more inclined to get involved in social media content that is presented as moral instructions rather than overt racism, which implies that religious traditional discourse, even if it is implicitly insulting, still has a significant societal impact.

Table 2 Impoliteness Strategies used Based on the Impoliteness Triggers used in Religious-driven Sermons against LGBTQ+ Community

Impoliteness Strategies	Impoliteness Triggers	Impoliteness Formulae
Bald-on Record Impoliteness	Conventionalized	Insult
		Pointed criticism
Negative Impoliteness	Conventionalized	Unpalatable question
		Silencers
		Threats
		Dismissals
Positive Impoliteness	Conventionalized	Unpalatable Questions
Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	Conventionalized	Unpalatable Questions
		Pointed criticism
	Non-Conventionalized	Convention-driven impoliteness
Withhold Politeness	Conventionalized	Unpalatable Question
	Non-Conventionalized	Context-driven Impoliteness

As shown in Table 2, impoliteness triggers were classified according to their strategies, which involved the following: bald-on-record impoliteness, negative impoliteness, positive impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withhold politeness. Firstly, the bald-on-record impoliteness strategy involved the use of conventionalized impoliteness triggers: insults, pointed criticisms, and non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers. Secondly, the negative impoliteness strategy involved the use of conventionalized impoliteness triggers such as unpalatable questions, silencers, threats, and dismissals. Thirdly, the positive impoliteness strategy involved the use of the conventionalized impoliteness triggers, such as dismissals, negative expressives, and fighting words, and the non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, namely form-driven impoliteness. Then, the sarcasm or mock politeness strategy involved the use of non-conventionalized impoliteness triggers, namely, convention-driven impoliteness. Lastly, the withhold politeness strategy involved the use of unpalatable questions and context-driven impoliteness.

Bald-on record impoliteness. This impoliteness strategy is done when the FTA (face-threatening act) is carried out in a straightforward, transparent, and concise manner in situations where preserving reputation or minimizing embarrassment is not a concern. This strategy expresses rudeness or impoliteness assertions. This is also a form of impoliteness where someone uses rudeness, but it uses a message that

is intended to be explicit. This can be observed in conventionalized impoliteness such as insults and pointed criticisms.

This impoliteness strategy is found in the study of Banguis et. al. (2023), where online users utilized bald-on-record impoliteness to express complaints regarding blended learning in the Philippines during the pandemic. Putra (2024) emphasized the usage of unfiltered criticism towards members of LGBTQ+, where religious figures intentionally use straightforward and frank language when discussing LGBTQ+ issues in order for them to establish theological positions as well as clearly define what is appropriate behavior towards LGBTQ+ members. Similar to this, Jantunen and Kytola (2022) discovered that in various religious contexts, the use of bald-on-record impoliteness is an effective strategy for mobilizing organizations and enhancing group identity by evoking intense emotional feelings towards perceived departures from societal norms. Moreover, according to Stefanita and Buf (2021), users of online platforms often choose direct and unfiltered criticisms when talking about LGBTQ+ rights due to their freedom of speech and anonymity.

Negative Impoliteness. This impoliteness strategy uses tactics intended to harm the recipient's desire to avoid forcing or disturbance. Negative impoliteness can be a tactic to intentionally hurt someone's feelings and make them feel inferior to others. This can be observed in the forms of conventionalized impoliteness, unpalatable questions, condescension, silencers, threats, and dismissals. The impoliteness triggers used are an outline of the negative impoliteness strategy. It involves strategies like negative facial threats, humiliation or harassment, insults, and belittling.

This impoliteness strategy is defined by Saragih and Murni (2021) as the opposite of positive impoliteness; this strategy clearly shows how a person dislikes someone without being sneaky. The study of Ambarita (2024) highlights that religious debate towards LGBTQ+ individuals is common, where several addressers utilize negative impoliteness by humiliating and attacking the addressee, which often leads to heated arguments. Moreover, in the context of social media, particularly on Instagram, the study of Afriana and Mubarak (2024) discovered that individuals were also spotted using the negative impoliteness strategy, where addressers often incorporate disparaging language and uphold commands to assert superiority over others who have a contrasting view.

Positive Impoliteness. This strategy aims to damage the addressee's positive face wants, which include being appreciated or approved of, activities such as ignoring the other, excluding the other from an activity, being disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, using obscure or sensitive language, seeking disagreement, using taboo words, or calling the other names. This can be observed in the forms of conventionalized impoliteness message enforcers, unpalatable questions, and negative expressives. With regard to non-conventionalized impoliteness, it can be seen in form-driven impoliteness.

Saragih and Murni (2021) define this impoliteness strategy as a clever way to show someone you hate them without being excessively rude to them. This strategy involves using insincere compliments and actions like fake smiles; it also allows people to express their hatred without causing direct offense. According to the study

of O'Toole (2024), religious satire on social media frequently incorporates the positive impoliteness strategy, wherein the addresser utilizes name-calling and sarcasm against LGBTQ+ individuals, causing them to become polarized. Moreover, Bakshi (2024) stated that faith-based arguments or comments are full of positive impoliteness that involves excluding, neglecting, and ignoring others, such as the usage of positive impoliteness strategy in social media, may cause harm to LGBTQ+ members and could polarize them.

Sarcasm or mock politeness. This impoliteness strategy uses overly courteous language or gestures in a context where genuine politeness would not be appropriate. Sarcasm is a form of expression where someone says something in a tone or manner that implies the opposite of what they actually mean, often with the intent to criticize or belittle someone. Mock politeness, also known as “banter,” involves the use of impolite language in a playful, non-threatening manner. This form of impoliteness is often intended to be humorous rather than hurtful, allowing people to make fun of each other without causing offense. This can be observed in the forms of conventionalized impoliteness message enforcers, presuppositions, unpalatable questions, and pointed criticism. In terms of non-conventionalized impoliteness, convention-driven impoliteness is considered as sarcasm or mock politeness, which involves saying something polite that is obviously insincere to infer meaning that is critical.

This impoliteness strategy is used in situations where the response is clearly insincere according to Ghani (2018). The use of sarcasm or a mock politeness strategy is often employed against LGBTQ+ individuals. In the context of social media, the study of Rubio (2024) found that in online platforms, addressers frequently used sarcastic language to discreetly correct bias against the group and question current social norms. Similarly, Fadila and Wijayanto (2024) discovered how sarcasm or mock politeness towards LGBTQ+ members is often employed in online interactions to argue opposing points of view, which perpetuates never-ending pattern of polarizing ideology in the online world.

Withhold politeness. This impoliteness is a speech strategy wherein an addressee intentionally neglects to use appropriate words that are expected in a given situation. This can be done by expressing anger, defending against perceived threats, or asserting dominance. It also happened to insult or offend someone, or perhaps a passive-aggressive method of showing dissatisfaction or disagreement. Withhold politeness brings a negative impact on someone. It can damage strong relationships, cause hurtful feelings, and create disagreement. Also, using polite language can help reduce conflict in certain situations. It can help to clarify intentions that will help avoid misinterpretation. This impoliteness strategy can be observed in the forms of conventionalized impoliteness, unpalatable questions, and non-conventionalized impoliteness, context-driven impoliteness.

This impoliteness strategy is a subtle yet impactful strategy. This happens when the addressee intentionally withholds an act of politeness that is commonly expected in a situation. This withholding of politeness can be an effective strategy to bring displeasure to string disapproval relying on the relationship between the addresser and addressee (Ghani, 2018). Additionally, Berkman et al. (2024) found

that the avoidance of showing emotional connection, understanding, and failing to observe what is expected of politeness in a discourse implies that LGBTQ+ members are not expected to be part of their religious group. Moreover, in the context of social media, the study of Pahor de Maiti et al. (2024) discovered that the withhold impoliteness strategy is also evident in social media platforms where famous personalities or influencers fail to read or reply to the comments made by LGBTQ+ individuals, displaying their hidden disapproval or lack of support.

CONCLUSION

The utterances revealed that comments posted on Facebook about a religious-driven sermon, described as impolite, are being used to damage the addressee's image, mock, criticize, and strongly express opposition to the addressee's point. The impoliteness triggers found were insults, threats, negative expressions, message enforcers, silencers, pointed criticisms, unpalatable questions, dismissals, context-driven impoliteness, and presuppositions.

The most common impoliteness strategy employed by Facebook users in posting their comments is negative impoliteness. Facebook users commenting on religious sermons that criticize the LGBTQ+ community frequently use a range of impoliteness triggers in the negative impoliteness spectrum. This impoliteness strategy involves the addresser being offensive and rude in conveying their views and opinions, which can cause harmful consequences to those subjected to impolite remarks.

In this study, the researchers exhibit the significance of understanding linguistic diversity and their impact on individuals. In the context of religion, there is no problem with preaching about what the scripture or a religion says. Teaching students to accept their beliefs, disregard biases, and consider an individual's status can be achieved through specific standard techniques. In this way, students can learn to appreciate individual differences in terms of religious beliefs and views, and build respect among individuals, avoiding words and statements that are impolite and offensive. Students must be considerate enough to deal with their differences in terms of culture, social norms, language, and beliefs in order for them not to be harmed.

The basis of this study is limited to 50 impolite Facebook comments; future research may draw on linguistic corpora from other social media platforms, such as Reddit, X, and Instagram. They may also do follow-up interviews with both parties concerned as participants.

REFERENCES

- Acheampong, D. O., & Kwarteng, M. (2021). A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in selected Ghanaian social interactions. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(3), 32-40.
<https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.3.5>
- Afiana, A., & Mubarak, Z. H. (2024). IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES USED BY NETIZENS TOWARDS TASYI ATHASYIA ON INSTAGRAM. *IdeBahasa*, 6(1), 81-

93. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.idebahasa.or.id/index.php/Idebahasa/article/view/172>
- Altahmazi, T. H. M. (2022). Impoliteness in Twitter diplomacy: offence giving and taking in Middle East diplomatic crises. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 18(2), 281-310. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2019-0032>
- Altahmazi, T. H. (2024). Humorous but hateful: Linguistic impoliteness and visual dysphemism in anti-Muslim memes. *Internet Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00106.alt>
- Ambarita, R. (2024, December). Characteristics of Impoliteness Formulas in Political Comments on Social Media: A Qualitative Study. In *PROCEEDINGS OF THE 5TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING (ICON-ELT 2024)* (p. 50). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-333-7_5
- Andersson, M. (2024). Multimodal expression of impoliteness in YouTube reaction videos to transgender activism. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 58, 100760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2024.100760>
- Bakshi, P. (2024). Language, religion, and workplace discrimination: intersectional microaggressions in India. *Asian Ethnicity*, 25(2), 185-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2023.2255542>
- Banat, S., Al-Natour, M. M., Almahasees, Z., & Al-Omari, N. M. A. (2024). A pragmatic analysis of negative politeness strategies employed by Jordanian professors. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2), 7212-7222. Retrieved from https://pjlss.edu.pk/pdf_files/2024_2/7212-7222.pdf
- Banguis, J., Divino, P. F., Jay O. Syting, C., & Maintang, K. C. . (2023). Students' E-complaints on the Promises and Pitfalls of Blended Learning: A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 3(2), 205-221. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v3i2.225>
- Berger, M. N., Taba, M., Marino, J. L., Lim, M. S., Cooper, S. C., Lewis, L., ... & Skinner, S. R. (2021). Corrigendum to: social media's role in support networks among LGBTQ adolescents: a qualitative study. *Sexual health*, 18(5), 444-444. https://doi.org/10.1071/SH21110_CO
- Berkman, C., Stein, G. L., Javier, N. M., O'Mahony, S., Maingi, S., & Godfrey, D. (2024). Disrespectful and inadequate palliative care to transgender persons. *Palliative & Supportive Care*, 22(1), 3-9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478951523001104>
- Betti, Mohammed Jasim. (2021a). Theoretical and Applied Linguistics. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347943117_Theoretical_and_Applied_Linguistics
- Block, K. (2021). *LGBTQ+ experiences in Conservative Christian communities* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00084298221128883>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256089360_Successful_Qualitative_Research_A_Practical_Guide_for_Beginners
- Carvalho, P., Caled, D., Silva, C., Batista, F., & Ribeiro, R. (2024). The expression of hate speech against Afro-descendant, Roma, and LGBTQ+ communities in

- YouTube comments. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 12(2), 171-206. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00085.car>.
- Chimuanya, L., & Igwebuike, E. E. (2021). Legitimizing falsehood in social media: A discourse analysis of political fake news. *Discourse and Communication*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481320961659>
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/JonathanCulpeper/publication/2224979>
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. Retrieved from <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35/html>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/31340781/SILEBR_2012_003-libre.pdf?1392310849=&response-content-disposition
- Culpeper, J. (2016). Impoliteness strategies. *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society*, 421-445. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6_16
- Dacalanio, M. A. A., Cani, S. M., Osiba, G. T., & Syting, C. J. O. (2024). Impoliteness Triggers and Strategies in Students' Complaints: A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 4(1), 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i1.308>
- Dardano, P. (2022). How to be impolite in ancient Greek: silencers and dismissals in Greek comedy. *Veleia*, (39), 65-83. <https://doi.org/10.1387/veleia.22300>
- DeVito, M. A., Walker, A. M., & Fernandez, J. R. (2021). Values (mis) alignment: Exploring tensions between platform and LGBTQ+ community design values. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(CSCW1), 1-27. Retrieved from <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3449162>
- Dynel, M. (2021). Desperately seeking intentions: Genuine and jocular insults on social media. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 179, 26-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.017>
- Eskridge, W. N., Jr, & Wilson, R. F. (Eds.). (2018). Religious freedom, LGBT rights, and the prospects for common ground. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316999752>
- Fadilah, I., & Wijayanto, A. (2024). Sarcasm in Social Media: A Study of Comments on Sam Smith's Instagram Posts. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 10(1), 92-104. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i1.3077>
- Fernandez, J. R. (2021, October). "Being Yourself" Online: Supporting Authenticity for LGBTQ+ Social Media Users. In *Companion Publication of the 2021 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (pp. 249-252). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3462204.3481786>
- Ghani, N. A. A. A. (2018). Online animosity: Impoliteness strategies and triggers of hostility in a social networking site in Brunei. *Southeast Asia: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 18, 71-84. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nurul-Akmal-A-Abdul-Ghani/publication/331371455 Online Animosity Impoliteness Strategies>

- Hassan, B. E. A. (2019). Impolite viewer responses in Arabic political TV talk shows on YouTube. *Pragmatics*, 29(4), 521-544. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.18025.has>
- Hudhayri, K. (2021). Linguistic harassment against arab lgbs on cyberspace. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v11n4p58>
- INSYIRAH, L. (2021). DEFINING PRAGMATICS Retrieved from <https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/66106966/DEFINING PRAGMATIC>
- Ismail, I. N., & Shanmuganathan, T. (2019). Face threats in threads: Assessing the responses to Impoliteness in Facebook comments on 1MDB. 3L, *Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 25(4). <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2020-2001-08>
- Jakob, J. C. (2024). An Analyzing Impoliteness Strategies Used in Facebook. Available at SSRN 4728587. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4728587>
- Jantunen, J. H., & Kytölä, S. (2022). Online discourses of 'homosexuality' and religion: The discussion relating to Islam in Finland. *Journal of Language and Sexuality*, 11(1), 31-56. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jls.20011.jan>
- Kariithi, F. (2020). Aspects of Impoliteness during 2007 and 2013 Presidential Campaigns in Kenya. Retrieved from <https://www.ajssmt.com/Papers/230924.pdf>
- Khoir, A. B. (2020). LGBT, Muslim, and heterosexism: The experiences of muslim gay in Indonesia. *Wawasan: Jurnal Ilmiah Agama dan Sosial Budaya*, 5(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jw.v5i1.8067>
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092>
- Kumpasoğlu, G. B., Hasdemir, D., & Canel-Çınarbaş, D. (2022). Between two worlds: Turkish religious LGBTs relationships with islam and coping strategies. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 13(2), 302-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2020.1772354>
- Libiran, T. J. D., Cepeda, R. L. C., Ramos, C. K. M., Alano, J. C. O., & Guballa, M. J. S. (2024). Understanding the Challenges Faced by Filipino LGBTQ+ Individuals with Strong Religious Ties. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(1), 2520-2547. <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2024.801186>
- Lincoln, Y. (1980). Guba. E.(1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage. Lincoln Naturalistic Inquiry 1985.
- McCarthy, J., & das Nair, R. (2018). Levels and layers of invisibility: Exploring the intersections of ethnicity, culture and religion in the lives of older LGBT people. In *Older lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans people* (pp. 75-92). Routledge. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315628462->
- McCormick, M., & Krieger, M. (2020). Religion and bullying: Perspectives from sexual and gender minority youth (SGMY) in Michigan. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 32(2), 191-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720.2020.1728460>

- McCutcheon, R. T. (2023). Critics not caretakers: Redescribing the public study of religion. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003383307>
- Mejia, G. E. A., & Ngo, C. G. A. (2024). Profanity in Social Media: An Analysis of Pragmatic Functions and Politeness Maxims Violation. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 4(1), 92-117. <https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i1.315>
- O'Toole, O. (2024). (Im) politeness as a strategy in the discursive construction of in-group solidarity in discussions about love, sex and relationships on Incels. *is. Półrocznik Językoznawczy Tertium*, 9(1), 29-55. <https://doi.org/10.7592/Tertium.2024.9.1.282>
- Pahor de Maiti, K., Franza, J., & Fišer, D. (2023). Haters in the spotlight: gender and socially unacceptable Facebook comments. *Internet Pragmatics*, 6(2), 173-196. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00093.pah>
- Pauken, T. J. (2020). *Variation in Clergy Attitudes Toward Subgroups of the LGBTQ+ Community*. Adler University. Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/openview/4de6ae4c9483ee12a53a0096c2f057db/1?cbl=51922&diss=y&pq-origsite=gscholar>
- Permana, L. B., Suwandi, S., & Setiawan, B. (2021). Students' impoliteness strategy during online learning in covid-19 pandemic. *International journal of multicultural and multireligious understanding*, 8(12), 87-94. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i12.3184>
- Putra, A. N. (2024). Impoliteness Strategies Found in Netizen Comment on Sam Smith Tweets (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Andalas). Retrieved from <http://scholar.unand.ac.id/464229/>
- Rabab'ah, G., & Alali, N. (2020). Impoliteness in reader comments on the Al-Jazeera channel news website. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 16(1), 1-43. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2017-0028>
- Rousseau, E., & Baele, S. J. (2021). "Filthy Lapdogs," "Jerks," and "Hitler": Making Sense of Insults in International Relations. *International Studies Review*, 23(3), 532-555. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viaa047>
- Saragih, A., & Murni, S. M. (2021, November). Language Impoliteness Strategies Used by Headmaster with Reference to the Level of Education in School Area. In 6th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL 2021) (pp. 484-488). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211110.128>
- Saz Rubio, M. M. D. (2024). 'You are not empowered, you have neither character nor pride'. *Journal of language aggression and conflict*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.00109.del>
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition* (Vol. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Daniel-Hirst/publication/230260420_review_of_Sperber_and_Wilson_1986_Relevance_Communication_and_Cognition
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2020). Expanding approaches for research: Understanding and using trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of developmental education*, 44(1), 26-28. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/45381095>

- Ștefăniță, O., & Buf, D. M. (2021). Hate speech in social media and its effects on the LGBT community: A review of the current research. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 23(1), 47-55. <https://doi.org/10.21018/rjcpr.2021.1.322>
- Stone, A. L. (2017). Gender panics about transgender children in religious right discourse. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 15(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2017.1395305>
- Taylor, K., Coulombe, S., Coleman, T. A., Cameron, R., Davis, C., Wilson, C. L., ... Travers, R. (2020). Social support, discrimination, and Self-Esteem in LGBTQ + high school and Post-Secondary students. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 19(3), 350–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2020.1812465>
- Vegter, A., & Haider-Markel, D. P. (2020). The Special Role of Religion in LGBT-Related Attitudes. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1254>