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ABSTRACT

Everyone may participate in online discussions in this digital age. One of the platforms they can use is Quora. People exchanged their ideas and got information from other users on the COVID-19 vaccine controversy, which has been widely discussed since the epidemic. They can reveal (real account) or conceal (anonymous account) their identity. Then, to avoid debate between users, speakers should use politeness strategies adapted to CMC. This study aimed to identify differences in politeness between real/non-anonymous and anonymous in the comments column on Quora in discussions about the Covid-19 vaccine controversy. This research was included in the descriptive qualitative research with a pragmatic approach used to describe linguistic data related to the forms of politeness strategies found in the analysis. Then, the data were taken from netizen’s comments on the five discussions users most discussed from January 2021 to September 2022. The researcher used the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) to analyze data on the CMC (Computer-Mediated Communication) context. This study found that the most widely used politeness strategies were negative ones, followed by positive, off-record, and bald-on record politeness. However, the researcher also found that speakers used linguistic devices to convey interpersonal and affective attitudes in online communication. The tools used were abbreviations and emoticons that aimed to simulate gestures and facial expressions (Park, 2008). Further research is needed to determine politeness in CMC on different discussion platforms.
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INTRODUCTION

There are direct and indirect ways to communicate today (Murti, 2020). Direct communication is face-to-face, while indirect communication is frequently done online or on social media. It also affects the differences in language style, resulting in differences in perception, politeness, and acting between the speakers. Alibasyah (2018) said that
speakers pay less attention to their manners and faces in online communication. In an online conversation, a person also needs an identity account to join the discussion on their chosen social media platform and to communicate with other users.

There are two types of social media accounts, which are anonymous and real. A real account means users show their real identity information when interacting with other people. Conversely, Scott in Herianto (2014) says that anonymity is defined as a condition where the researcher's identity information is not present in an interaction. Anonymous account users usually appear based on the account's sensitivity and express their thoughts more freely because their identity is hidden (Rini & Manalu, 2020). However, this may lead to face threat actions (FTAs) and misunderstandings/disputes between users. To avoid misunderstandings and conflicts of this kind, speakers need to use appropriate politeness rules. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that people can use one of four ways to be polite in their conversations, which include positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on record, and off-record politeness. The study of politeness is a part of pragmatics study, which means that it looks at several rules to conduct spoken or written communication.

There were some previous studies related to this study. They were concerned about how to be polite on social media, such as research done on Instagram by Misai (2021), Ammaida (2020), Prayitno et al. (2019), Novelty et al. (2022), Kusmanto (2019), Gunawan et al. (2021), Adiandini et al. (2022), and Cahyani and Wijaya (2023). The research showed that when netizens commented on the accounts of public figures or officials, they used positive politeness strategies and commented to protect the account owner's reputation. Then, there were also studies on discussion forums like Twitter. These studies were carried out by Murti (2020), Silitonga and Pasaribu (2021), Anggario (2016), and Maros and Rosli (2017). These studies were done to find out how politicians used politeness. They found that netizens used four different types of politeness. Also, there were previous studies done on politeness in an anonymous environment by Dalton (2013), Herianto (2014), Rini and Manalu (2020) and Ranalan (2018). They revealed that the motivation for creating an anonymous account was for freedom of expression, protecting privacy, and as an opportunity for cyber stalking other Instagram users (Rini & Manalu, 2020), and showed that on anonymous discussion accounts, users more often used positive politeness strategies and sometimes there was also impoliteness strategy caused by freedom of expression (Ranalan, 2018).

From the previous studies that have been previously described, it could be concluded that most of the studies focused on the different ways people tried to be polite on social media by commenting on the accounts of public figures. The researcher found that when people commented on social media such as YouTube, Instagram, and Twitter, they tended to use positive politeness strategies. Then, there were other online discussion forums, such as KasKus, Reddit, and Quora, which still need to be explored more deeply. Therefore, this research discussed one of the social media platforms, namely Quora, which should be explored more profoundly and focused more on its users' use of politeness strategies. This study completed the previous studies above by providing new insights into politeness in online communication. The differences in topics on objects and other variables were of unique value of this study. It also filled the gap between the previous studies and this research. This study used different objects and topics, focusing on different
types of accounts and the "Covid-19 vaccine controversy", which has not been studied by previous researchers.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research used descriptive qualitative because the researcher collected the data in written utterances in words or sentences and used human instruments as the research instrument (Creswell, 2014). The researcher took this research data from netizen comments on Quora about the Covid-19 discussion and had more than ten comments from netizens. The researcher analyzed the most popular topic from the COVID-19 discussion, which included five topics in total. The first topic was "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?" (https://qr.ae/pyFH5j). The second topic was “Is it possible for someone to die after getting a COVID-19 vaccination? “ (https://qr.ae/pyFHWR), the third topic was “How safe are the different COVID-19 (coronavirus) vaccinations?” (https://qr.ae/pyFH9j), the fourth topics was “Are there any potential health risks of the COVID-19 vaccination?” (https://qr.ae/pyFHe8), and the last topic was “If vaccinated people are still catching Covid19, what is the point of 38 the vaccine?” (https://qr.ae/pyFHe0) Then, the researcher collected the data from January 2021 to September 2022. The researcher used a laptop, smartphone, books, internet sources (journals, e-books, thesis, website), and a notebook as supporting tools for data instruments.

In this research, the researcher used documentation method to collect the data and some information by any sources in the libraries such as books, documents, journal, notes, and the others. The current research employed descriptive analysis as the technique of data analysis. The researcher employed qualitative data analysis techniques because the data were obtained from netizens' comments in the Quora discussions' comments section.

To answer the first and second research questions, the researcher conducted several stages of data analysis. First, comments containing politeness were categorized and then interpreted according to Brown and Levinson's theory (1987), and compared and contrasted the data analysis with the previous studies. Then, the researcher included the collected data in the analysis to meet the categories and requirements of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategy theory. Then, the researcher presented the data for discussion. Furthermore, the researcher also looked at the linguistic devices used by users in their comments in online communication, and finally the researcher concluded the data analysis. To answer the third research question, the researcher presented the results of data analysis that had been done before answering the first and second research questions. Then, the researcher presented how to use the politeness strategy between anonymous and real accounts on each topic and strategies related to the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987).

FINDINGS

This study revealed that there were four politeness strategies in conversation: off-the-record, bald on-the-record, negative politeness, and positive politeness. The researcher then described the distinctions between the use of strategies on anonymous and real/non-anonymous accounts.
Politeness strategies used by anonymous and real accounts in the comment sections of the discussion about COVID-19 controversy

By following the politeness strategy concept of Brown and Levinson (1987), the researcher found all politeness strategies: Bald on-record: 4 comments (real) and 2 comments (anonymous); Off-record: 2 comments (real) and 6 comments (anonymous); Positive politeness: 8 comments (real) and 8 comments (anonymous); and Negative politeness: 11 comments (real) and 9 comments (anonymous) in existed data.

The way real and anonymous accounts used the politeness strategy in discussing the covid-19 vaccine controversy

In this data analysis, the data is displayed as follows: (Account type: real/anonymous) username (Discussion topic 1-5). The comment provided by real and anonymous accounts. The following topic was an example.

(Real Account) Melani Octarina (Topic 1: "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?")

IMO, it is impossible because a vaccine is created to treat a disease, not to make it worse. You can look for other research to add to your insight about the benefits of this covid-19 vaccine.

Bald-on record strategy

Bald-on record: Sympathetic advice or warnings

(Real/non-anonymous) Frederick Beutler (Topic 1: "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?")

Datum 1
No. That’s another piece of misinformation promulgated by anti-vaxxers. The mRNA vaccines, in particular, are not made by use of the virus, so there cannot be any virus to infect anyone.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987) stated that the objective of the bald-on-record strategy was to maximize the effectiveness of speech acts under the circumstances more significant than the speaker’s desire to maintain a positive self-image. It could be seen that the speaker uttered his speech directly without rambling. The speaker immediately stated that the speaker disagreed with the question, which made it seemed as if this vaccine was hazardously seen in the sentence "No. That's another piece of misinformation promulgated by anti-vaxxers."

Bald-on record: Showing disagreement

(Anonymous) Gerald Osbom (Topic 4: Are there any potential health risks of the COVID-19 vaccination?)

Datum 2
No, COVID has bad consequences.

In the sentence "COVID has bad consequences..." The speaker directly expressed the rejection of the question that made the Covid-19 vaccine appear to have a harmful effect on
the health of the human body. All the speaker's utterances revealed that the speaker disagreed with this question. A strategy that non-minimized the threat on the face of the interlocutor was seen in the sentence above. This strategy was used with the aim of efficiency, which was known among speakers. Therefore, facial improvement was optional in this strategy. Because if it was an urgent case, face repair/compensation would reduce the urgency communicated (Brown & Levinson, 1987, pp. 95-96)

**Off-record**

**Be ironic**

(Anonymous) Matt Donald (Topic 2: “Is it possible for someone to die after getting a COVID-19 vaccination?”)

*Datum 3*
Yes, if it were otherwise it would mean that the vaccination conferred immortality. Of course people also die after eating chocolate, touching paper and almost always after being born.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the off-record strategy is used by someone to criticize the other person indirectly so as not to cause FTA. It was the same as in the example data above. When the speaker wanted to try to criticize his interlocutor by saying that this vaccine was not dangerous, the speaker said an irony so that the interlocutor did not feel offended, which could be seen in the speech the speaker said that, of course, everyone would die even though just ate chocolate and touching the paper.

**Over-generalize**

(Real/non-anonymous) Brian Clark (Topic 1: "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?")

*Datum 4*
It would be a waste of time vaccinating people if vaccines gave people the virus. People do need to know that it takes 4 weeks from the first vaccine before they are safe from the virus.

In the comments above, the speaker indirectly wanted to criticize the interlocutor by saying "People do need to know that it takes 4 weeks from the first vaccine before they are safe from the virus." This was done by the speaker with the aim of minimizing possible violations due to the comments. Because in this comment, the speaker wanted to do FTA indirectly to interlocutors. Then, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), this over-generalization strategy functioned as criticism; but as a critique with the weight of tradition, which strategy was easier to see than other rule statements.

**Use Rhetorical Question**

(Real/Non-anonymous) Kenneth Taylor (Topic 5: “If vaccinated people are still catching Covid19, what is the point of the vaccine?”)

*Datum 5*
If people who own fire extinguishers can still lose their house to a fire, what's the point of fire extinguishers? If people wearing their seatbelt or motorcycle helmet can still die in a traffic accident, what's the point of those? If you can still knock a girl up even when wearing
a condom, *what's the point of birth control?* These are dumb questions. *The evidence shows that in the overwhelming majority of instances, the preventive measures saved (or prevented, in the case of birth control) lives. The existence of exceptions to the rule doesn't make the rule invalid.*

In this method, the speaker asked questions without expecting answers. The speaker wanted to enlighten the interlocutor indirectly. In the sentence, “The evidence shows that ……” the speaker desired to convey information to the other party. On the other hand, speakers could benefit in the following ways. For example, the speaker may receive praise for being tactful and non-aggressive and accept responsibility for interpretations that disfigure faces. Brown and Levinson (1987) explanation that in this strategy, the speaker can ask a question without intending to receive an answer, thereby violating the seriousness requirement in the question, namely that S wants H to provide information to them.

*Positive Politeness*

**Avoid Disagreement**

(Anonymous) Ron Lawrence (Topic 1: "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?")

**Datum 6**

They should not cause serious diseases as some vaccines in the past have done. **However, this is a new virus,** and it has been doing some unexpected things. Therefore, we will have to just wait and see.

This comment showed that the speaker avoided disagreement with the speaker’s question, which stated that the COVID-19 vaccine seemed so dangerous that it could make someone lost their life. It showed that after the first sentence, the speaker used the word "however" after a statement which seemed as if the speaker disagreed with the statement of the sender/interlocutor. The speakers used the avoid of disagreement strategy to expressed a desire to agree or appeared to agree with H, which also led to a mechanism for pretending to agree, for example, 'token' agreement (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

**Joke**

(Anonymous) JustAnotherHuman (Topic 2: “Is it possible for someone to die after getting a COVID-19 vaccination?”)

**Datum 7**

No its not possible. **When you get vaccinated for covid you are basically immortal. All knowing and all powerful too. You can see in 4 dimensions and manipulate all 4 basic forces that exist in the universe at your will…**

**Basically when you get the vaccine you become God.**

In the comment, it was evident that the speaker was attempting to respond to the sender's query with a joke. After being vaccinated, the speaker claimed, a person would become immortal, perceive four dimensions, travel to another universe, and even became God. This was because of the numerous rumors and debates surrounding the COVID-19 vaccine. The COVID-19 vaccine did not, of course, confer immortality. Speakers did this to
become acquainted with other speakers and to attempt to save the sender's face. This joke strategy could emphasize shared backgrounds or shared values/knowledge. As in the sentence above, the knowledge that a vaccine could not yet made humans.

*Notice, attend to H (his/her interests, wants, needs, and goods)*

(Anonymous) Mlwlyons (Topic 3: “How safe are the different COVID-19 (coronavirus) vaccinations?”)

Datum 8

**Thank you for the question.**
I suggest you go to http://openvaers.com and VigiAccess. They are both vaccine adverse reactions reporting systems, VAERS (USA) VigiAccess (WHO). VAERS latest reports are over 1.9 million. The Lazarus Report was a study done on the effectiveness of VAERS. The study reported that as little as 1% of all vaccine reactions were reported.

In the comment above, the speaker offered the sender/other speaker to open the link speaker has included. The link contained information about vaccine reported needed by other senders/speakers. In this strategy, the Speaker attempted to establish S’s good intentions in satisfying Speaker’s positive-face desires. Also, the outcome of this strategy demonstrated that the Speaker must pay attention to aspects of the interlocutor's condition (apparent changes, special possession, anything that appears to indicate that the interlocutor wants the Speaker to pay attention and encourage it) (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

*Use of in-group identity markers*

(Real/Non-anonymous) Nisheet (Topic 4: Are there any potential health risks of the COVID-19 vaccination?)

Datum 10

**Give us an example of any serious bad effect of the Corona Vaccine which has resulted in any damage that makes us reject it.**

In the comments above, the speaker used one of the pronouns to replace you and I, namely "us". The used of the pronoun ‘we’ denoted brotherhood, a group of people united by their knowledge of one thing. Moreover, the pronoun ‘we’ denoted a team effort and decision made by all community members. The speaker also wanted to make other speakers aware of the evidence of congenital diseases from vaccines that have not been proven, which other speakers might have overlooked.

*Assume or Assert Reciprocity*

(Anonymous) Carol Gronicus (Topic 5: “If vaccinated people are still catching Covid19, what is the point of the vaccine?”)

Datum 9

*If you are fully vaccinated and you catch COVID-19, then your symptoms will be greatly reduced. So much so that you may not have to seek medical help. If you have any doubts about that, contact the hospital of your choice and ask. If you are not vaccinated and get the*
**virus, you could well be looking forward to** spending days with a respiration tube jammed down your throat just to be able to breathe and may well end up with lung damage.

In the utterance, the speaker attempted to educate the interlocutor by asking what would happen if the interlocutor accepted or declined the COVID-19 vaccine. If the speaker accepted it, his or her symptoms from contracting this virus would be mild and would not progress to severe conditions such as lung injury. Besides, according to Brown and Levinson (1987), using this strategy means referring to reciprocal rights (or habits) of performing FTAs with each other, and speakers can soften their FTAs by eliminating aspects of debt and aspects of face-threatening speech acts such as criticism and complaints.

*Seeking agreement*

(Real/non-anonymous) Michael Kowalik (Topic 1: "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?")

*Datum 10*

*it is possible* Vaccine induced viral interference is a common phenomenon......

In the utterance, the speaker revealed that the speaker agreed with what the sender/other speaker said. The speaker also added an opinion to support the statement. The speaker said that although speaker has a limited understanding of antigens, the speaker also knew little about the benefits and risks posed by these antigens. This strategy was a strategy that aimed to find ways that allow speakers to agree with their interlocutors (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

*Intensifying interest to H*

(Real/Non-anonymous) Joy Salomon (Topic 4: Are there any potential health risks of the COVID-19 vaccination?)

*Datum 11*

*No bad side effects, but getting Covid does.* After my shot I had an afternoon arm for the rest of the day. My husband had that and was very tired and slept most of the day. We were both fine the next day. Same thing happened with the second shot. We got the Pfizer shot.

Here the speaker began to attract the attention of other speakers with the story. The speaker made up an interesting story about the experiences after the vaccine. She and her husband only had sore arms at the injection site and were tired that day, and were back to normal the next day. Then, Brown and Levinson (1987) said that the use of this strategy aimed to attract attention and created closeness/solidarity with the speaker/sender.

*Assert or presuppose S s knowledge of and concern for H ’s want*

(Real/non-anonymous) Tay Mercer (Topic 3: "How safe are the different COVID-19 (coronavirus) vaccinations?")

*Datum 12*

*I know this is something that worries a lot of people. I’m not against vaccination and I plan to go through this soon, but I want to be sure that my doctor has a quality certified drug that is effective, has no (or has few) side effects and is in any case safe for me health.*

.........
In the sentence above, the speaker used the word "I know... But...." which showed the use of offer and apology forms in this strategy. In the comments above, the speaker stated the information to the interlocutor. Also, the strategy above the speaker (S) implied knowledge about the desire and willingness of the interlocutor (H) to adapt his wishes to theirs.

**Give or ask for reasons**
Yossi Shargal (Real) (Topic 4: Are there any potential health risks of the COVID-19 vaccination?)

Datum 13

----------Did you think to ask about the potential risks for any other medicine that you may have taken? Why this obsession with this specific vaccine?

The use of this strategy aimed to ask the reasons why the speaker thought like this. Besides to asking for reasons, speakers also directed other senders/speakers to agree with their opinion that each drug and vaccine has its own risks/side effects. In the comments above, it showed that the speaker gave reasons why the speaker wanted what the speaker wanted. Then, the form of indirect suggestion in the comments above that was said by the speaker to the interlocutor who demanded rather than gave reasons was a conventional form of positive politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

**Negative Politeness**

**Question and Hedge**
(Real/non-anonymous) Sofia Lee (Topic 3: "How safe are the different COVID-19 (coronavirus) vaccinations?")

Datum 14

**In my personal view**...It leaves the body a bit lazy. Maybe I am wrong but yes that is the case.
I always believe...---------

In the comment above the speaker used Hedge "in my personal view" in the comment the used of this hedge was used to show that the speaker was not completely sure about something. It showed that the use of hedge here meant that the speaker did not want to burden the interlocutor with what the speaker said, and this was by one of the social class factors belonging to Brown and Levinson (1987), namely the degree of an imposition when committing a face-threatening act.

**Nominalize**
(Anonymous) Ronda Spear (Topic 5: “If vaccinated people are still catching Covid19, what is the point of the vaccine?”)

Datum 15

It lessens the chance of you getting a serious case of virus. It gives your immune system a heads up. It lessens the chance of people dying and being put on respirators and clogging the hospitals.
In the comments above, it showed that the speaker omitted the actor when expressing the opinion. The speaker said that this covid-19 vaccine would reduce our chances of getting serious cases of the virus. Then, the comment above also turned into a passive sentence, where the speaker was no longer the subject but becomes part of the action. Therefore, the above comments were formal. Then, the goal of the strategy was to keep the sender's/other speakers' faces so that they did not reveal FTA. This strategy emphasized subject nominalization, which made the sentence more formal. Brown and Levinson (1987) present a scale of "degrees of formality corresponding to degrees of nouniness."

**Impersonalize S and H**

(Anonymous) George Linker (Topic 1: "Will the COVID-19 vaccines cause serious COVID-19 disease?")

Datum 16
"It is one of the possibilities that most don't know exists. It is called vaccine-associated enhanced disease. It has been common in animal trials of mRNA vaccines."

The "Impersonalize S and H" strategy, which included "it" in these comments, was an example of negative politeness. The speaker used the performances instead of the pronouns "I" and "You" to prevent FTA. It explained the widespread disappearance of overt references to the subject and indirect object of the top performance verb. In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) asserted that this strategy was an additional helpful technique that could demonstrate that the speaker did not wish to annoy the other individual.

**State the FTA as the rule**

(Real/non-anonymous) Maruti hospital (Topic 3: "How safe are the different COVID-19 (coronavirus) vaccinations?")

Datum 17
There are strict protections in place to help ensure the safety of all COVID-19 vaccines. Before receiving validation from WHO and national regulatory agencies, COVID-19 vaccines must undergo rigorous testing in clinical trials to prove that they meet internationally agreed benchmarks for safety and efficacy. WHO and regulatory authorities will continuously monitor the use of COVID-19 vaccines to identify and respond to any safety issues that might arise, and through that process to assure they remain safe for use around the world.

In the comments above, the speaker showed WHO's work. WHO was responsible for monitoring the use of the COVID-19 vaccine to identify and respond to any safety issues that may arise. Besides, the speaker also said that WHO was also testing the safety of the Covid-19 vaccine before it was given to the public. Even though using this strategy, the speaker did not need to fix the face of the opponent the speaker was talking to. This was because the speaker used the politeness strategy to provide the explanation needed by the interlocutor. This strategy was one way of separating S and H from specific coercion in FTAs, and thus a way of communicating that S did not wish to violate FTAs but was forced to do so by circumstances by citing FTAs as examples of general social norms, regulations, or obligations (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Thus, the speaker employed this avoidance strategy.
Apologize

(Anonymous) Jennifer Lepa (Topic 3: "How safe are the different COVID-19 (coronavirus) vaccinations?")

Datum 18

Can't say anything for sure but according to the info that I have gained till date, the COVID-19 coronavirus vaccine is not 100% safe. Apart from many other controversies attached with it, it does not guarantee full recovery and the risk of side effects is always there. So, going for the vaccine is quite risky at these initial stages. So, try your best to go with other safety protocols like hand sanitizing and covering your face with a facemask.

The speaker intended to apologize because the speaker could not provide valid information to the sender/speaker because the speaker could not confirm whether the Covid-19 vaccine was safe or not. However, the speaker commented that the vaccine was still not 100% safe because it did not guarantee a cure for Covid-19. Besides, by using this strategy speakers also tried to improve the faces of other speakers. However, the use of this strategy was carried out because of social distance and familiarity between speakers. The purpose of social distance was the existence of a power relationship between the interlocutor and the speaker (Zyihab, 2022).

Politeness in computer-mediated-communication

In this study, the researcher found 3 data containing linguistic devices in politeness in computer-mediated communication. Here was one of the data.

(Real/non-anonymous) Pete Wilkes (Topic 2: “Is it possible for someone to die after getting a COVID-19 vaccination?”)

Datum 19

It’s a 100% certainty 😄

The speaker expressed the opinion, which in the sentence was followed by emoticons that support the opinion to make jokes for the other person speaker said. These emoticons were also used to simulate gestures and facial expressions, which were useful in CMC.

DISCUSSION

In the data that has been analyzed above, it was found that speakers use 6 bald-on record strategies. The data showed that real accounts used more bald-on records than anonymous accounts. In this discussion, the real account tried to make an effective statement to the interlocutor rather than rambling, making the meaning they conveyed less striking/accurate to the interlocutor.

The next was off record. It was found that speakers use 8 off-record strategies. The data showed that anonymous accounts used more off-record politeness strategies than anonymous accounts. Following the findings of Chang in Herianto (2014), it was that anonymity in online discussions has an environment that did not threaten the face of his opponent; therefore, the participants could take risks without losing face, and in the end, the participants felt freer to express their opinions.

In the study, the researcher also found several positive politeness in data analysis. This strategy emphasized listener satisfaction based on the positive face of the interlocutor.
In this strategy found, 16 data/comments were used by speakers. This data analysis showed that real and anonymous accounts have the same number of positive politeness strategies, which meant that these two accounts both wanted to show their sense of solidarity and shorten the distance between the speaker and the interlocutor.

The last strategy was negative politeness. The analysis showed that real accounts used more negative politeness strategies than anonymous accounts. Besides, this strategy was also found to be more than other politeness strategies. It showed that speakers in controversial discussions on Quora tend to maintain/create distance with their interlocutors so as not to offend and cause FTA. Then, the data also showed that anonymous accounts used this negative politeness strategy more frequently than any other strategy. This study’s findings were consistent with Nishimura and Yukiko’s and Hsieh in Herianto (2014) stated that negative politeness strategies were predominantly employed in an anonymous situations.

The findings of the data analysis also showed that in the used of politeness strategies, the two types of accounts also paid attention to three sociological factors (Brown & Levinson, 1987), namely three sociological factors: the relative power of the listener over the speaker, the social gap between the speaker and the listener, and the degree of an imposition when committing a face-threatening act, which of these factors aimed to make the conversation between speakers run well.

Besides, it showed that in the data analyzed above, emoticons and abbreviations were used. It was supported by the opinion of the theory of politeness in CMC explained by Nikzam (2012), who adopted Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. Nikzam (2012) stated that the speakers utilized a variety of linguistic and paralinguistic devices to convey interpersonal and affective attitudes in online communication.

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

The results showed four politeness strategies used by anonymous and real accounts in the Covid-19 vaccine controversy. The data analysis showed that real and anonymous accounts more often used the negative politeness strategy with a total of 20 data. Real accounts used this strategy more often. Besides, the factor of social distance was one of the factors that influence the users to decide to use negative politeness. The negative politeness strategy used to show that there was a distance to respect the other person is by using the "nominalize" strategy. The second strategy was positive politeness, with a total of 16 strategies. Positive politeness has the same number of findings in both types of accounts. It could be seen that the users were trying to show solidarity by using the in-group identity markers strategy.

Furthermore, the off-record strategy was used by speakers to criticize their interlocutors indirectly. Anonymous accounts more often used one of the strategies, namely, "be ironic." The last strategy was a bald-on record. In this strategy, real accounts use it more often than anonymous accounts, aiming to make sentences more effective by providing direct sentences, warnings, and advice. Also, linguistic devices were found to simulate gestured and facial expressions, which help express interpersonal and affective attitudes in politeness in online communication (Park, 2008). In this section, the researcher provided suggestions to other researchers, readers, and social media users to research politeness strategies on other discussion platforms using different theories, such as the theory of politeness by Leech or Lakoff and also used a theory of politeness in computer-
mediated communication. Then, the researcher also suggested that other researchers analyze the language function of the speech. Finally, social media users were advised to use this research as a reference for understanding the application of politeness on social media, especially for people expressing opinions to remain polite even when gave comments to someone on social media.
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