

DISAGREEMENT STRATEGIES IN ONLINE COMMUNICATION: A CASE STUDY OF THE JAVANESE COMMUNITY IN YOGYAKARTA

¹*Dona Aji Karunia Putra, ²Alek, ³Muhammad Zainal Muttaqien

¹Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, Jl. Ir H. Juanda No.95, Tangerang Selatan, Indonesia

²English Language Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah, Jl. Ir H. Juanda No.95, Kota Tangerang Selatan, Indonesia

³Department of English Education, Faculty of Cultures and Languages, UIN Raden Mas Said, Jl. Pandawa, Dusun IV, Pucangan, Sukoharjo, Central Java, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author Email: dona.aji@uinjkt.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: February 2025 Revised: May 2025 Accepted: September 2025 Published: October 2025	<i>Each language community has a unique disagreement strategy in online communication that reflects its cultural values and communication norms. Disagreement can be expressed differently depending on the medium used. In face-to-face communication, disagreement tends to be expressed indirectly and with mitigation. In online communication, disagreement tends to be expressed explicitly and without mitigation. This study describes the strategies for expressing disagreement in the Info Cegatan Jogja Group and the factors that cause the emergence of various disagreement strategies in the group. The study used a descriptive qualitative method to analyze sentences expressing disagreement in posts from the ICJ Facebook Group. The data sources were message walls and comment fields. The study identified four types of disagreement strategies: one-speech strategy, two-speech strategies, three-speech strategies, and four-speech strategies. Verbal communication is the primary strategy employed to express disagreement among ICJ members. The study found that most disagreements are classified as strong, based on the level of confrontation. Various disagreement strategies were identified, which can be attributed to factors such as social media dynamics, posting topics, gender dynamics, and cultural influences. Understanding strategies for managing disagreements and cultural norms surrounding it is essential for successful communication.</i>
Keywords Disagreement; Javanese community; Online communication; Sociopragmatic;	
How to cite: Putra, D.A.K., Alek, A., & Muttaqien, M.Z. (2025). Disagreement Strategies in Online Communication: A Case Study of the Javanese Community in Yogyakarta. <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 13(4), 2067-2078. Doi: https://doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v13i4.14713	

INTRODUCTION

In online discourse, individuals often encounter various communicative scenarios, including disagreements. According to Putra et al. (2022), expressions of disagreement can be categorized as negative from both semantic and pragmatic perspectives. Semantically, disagreement may negate preceding utterances explicitly or implicitly through denial, contradiction, skepticism, satire, belittlement, or contempt. From a pragmatic viewpoint, such expressions are face-threatening acts that may endanger the interlocutor's social image. Linguistic markers such as negations, contradictory conjunctions, conflicting facts or opinions, and opposing meanings are typically used to convey disagreement Putra et al. (2022). These expressions involve a speaker denying or challenging another's opinion—for example, responding to proposition A with proposition not A, and vice versa. The intensity and politeness of disagreement depend on several social factors, including distance and power relations. Speakers with closer social ties tend to use more polite strategies, while those in distant or

hierarchical relationships may express disagreement more directly or cautiously. Formal settings also demand more restrained and courteous disagreement strategies compared to informal ones. In the digital realm, particularly in computer-mediated communication, disagreement tends to prioritize face-saving and politeness due to the nature of online interaction, which often lacks non-verbal cues.

The expression of disagreement is a nuanced linguistic phenomenon that manifests across varied speech contexts and adopts diverse forms. On social media platforms, disagreement strategies are shaped by communicative media, discussion topics, gender, and cultural norms (Locher, 2004a; Kakava, 2002). As Locher & Graham (2021) note, digital interactions introduce layers of complexity in expressing disagreement, requiring a heightened reliance on linguistic politeness and mitigation strategies. Kadar & House (2020) emphasize the importance of indirectness in maintaining social harmony, particularly in intercultural online communication. Placencia & Lower (2021) describe such disagreements as part of “relational work,” where speakers negotiate intent, identity, and rapport through discursive choices. Chen & Rau (2023) further assert that the use of politeness strategies online is influenced by audience perception and platform features, such as anonymity, synchronicity, and message permanence. Moreover, Vasquez (2022) finds that humor, sarcasm, and satire often serve as softening mechanisms in digital disagreement, reducing potential face threats. Haugh & Chang (2019) reinforce this by proposing that disagreements in online communication involve interactional pragmatics—where meaning and social relations are co-constructed through subtle alignment and stance-taking rather than overt confrontation.

The study analyzes instances of disagreement within the *Info Cegatan Jogja* Facebook group, a platform utilized by the Javanese community to discuss prevalent social issues in Yogyakarta and its environs. The comments within the group reflect the socio-cultural values of Yogyakarta. A sociopragmatic approach is employed to examine language usage variations across different social contexts, classes, genders, and linguistic cultures (Leech, 1983) (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005) (Gumperz, 2015). The article utilizes sociopragmatic theory to examine disagreement strategies in the *Info Cegatan Jogja* Facebook Group, with a particular emphasis on social factors such as gender and speech culture. This study suggests that expressions of disagreement within a group are a significant sociopragmatic phenomenon to investigate. (Angouri & Tseliga, 2010) endorse this notion, observing that computer-mediated communication frequently employs non-traditional language elements to convey emotions. (Mulkay, 1985) notes that written disagreements are typically more explicit than verbal ones, suggesting that disagreement expressed through social media has unique characteristics.

Previous studies have examined disagreement in online communication, particularly in forums and synchronous chats (Baym, 1996) (Langlotz & Locher, 2012) (Baek et al., 2012) (Shum & Lee, 2013) (Stromer-Galley et al., 2015). However, there is a lack of research specifically focusing on disagreement within social media platforms such as Facebook. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by examining the dynamics of disagreement among group members on Facebook. Additionally, this study aims to complement existing research by exploring aspects that have received less attention. After conducting a comprehensive literature review, this study will describe the different methods used to express disagreement within the *Info Cegatan Jogja* Facebook group and explain the factors that contribute to the emergence of these strategies. Based on this background, the research aims to answer the following questions: “What are the strategies used to express disagreement in the online Javanese community of Yogyakarta?” “What factors contribute to the diversity of disagreement strategies within the Yogyakarta Javanese community Facebook group?”

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study investigates the methods used by Indonesian speakers with a Javanese first language background to express disagreement in social media interactions. The research falls under the field of pragmatic studies and focuses on the strategies employed for expressing disagreement. A qualitative approach was used for the research, which involves analyzing the meaning that individuals or groups attribute to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2010). The purpose of this study was to examine the reasons and methods behind a social phenomenon. A qualitative approach with a descriptive method was utilized to clarify the strategies and factors that impact the selection of disagreement strategies in communication on Facebook social media.

Participants

The study participants were selected from the ICJ Facebook group and primarily resided in Yogyakarta and its surrounding areas. They had diverse professional backgrounds, including students, employees, traders, and police officers, among others. Additionally, the participants varied in terms of their political views, ages, education, and social status, and were not previously acquainted. Five participants were selected as post senders using purposive sampling. The selection criteria were based on the level of post-controversy and the frequency of responses. One hundred controversial comments expressing disagreement were selected for each post. Only comments relevant to the content of the post were included as data.

Data and Data Sources

This study analyzed sentences from messages and comments that express disagreement on the ICJ Facebook group. The data source is messages and information uploaded to the ICJ group message wall, along with comments from ICJ group members, over a one year period. Researchers selected messages displayed over a one-year period and then selected the five messages that received the most responses. The research data sources consist of five posts with the initials KD, WG, AA, AG, and RD. A sample of 500 comments from 500 different accounts was used in this study. The 500 comments represent the total number of samples taken from the five selected posts used a purposive sampling technique. Data collection was limited to a one year period so that it was sufficient to obtain representative data. The ICJ Facebook message wall feature contains two types of comments: (1) ICJ Group member comments on posts displayed on the ICJ Group Facebook message wall and (2) ICJ Group member comments on comments from other ICJ Group members. This study analyzes ICJ members' comments on posts displayed on the Facebook message wall of the ICJ group.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The study utilized three methods for data collection: documentation, observation, and note-taking. Documentation involved capturing posts and comments from the ICJ Facebook group message wall that contained disagreements, using the screenshot technique. The selected posts and comments were then reviewed by the researcher in order to extract the relevant data. After reviewing the data sources, the researcher recorded the selected data. The study involved transcribing posts and comments that expressed disagreement, and then categorizing the disagreement comments based on the strategies used. (Moleong, 2017) outlines a four-step data analysis process: applying theory, classification, finding, and drawing conclusions. Once the data is collected, the expressions of speech acts of disagreement should be sorted based on their complexity and intensity. The intensity of disagreement was analyzed using (Rees-Miller, 2000) (García, 1989) disagreement scale theory with some modifications. The next phase involved analyzing the factors contributing to the emergence of different disagreement strategies on social media. This will be done using the theory of the relationship between language use or speech acts, topics of conversation, and gender. The data analysis was concluded by

establishing a correlation between the results of the current and previous studies and drawing general conclusions.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Disagreement Strategies Based on Complexity

Table 1

Frequency of Disagreement Strategy Variations Based on Complexity					
Post Sender	Topic	Disagreement Strategy Variations			
		one strategy	two strategies	three strategies	four strategies
KD	Parkir di jalan umum (Parking on public roads)	76	14	8	2
WG	Tarif parkir mahal (Expensive parking rates)	77	18	4	0
AA	Kemacetan di Yogyakarta (Traffic jams in Yogyakarta)	88	7	4	0
AG	Merokok di dekat anak (Smoking near children)	51	3	2	0
RD	Menongkrong di warkop (Hanging out at the coffee shop)	74	20	8	0

The data analysis indicates that members of the ICJ group frequently employ particular speech strategies to express disagreement in their posts. For instance, KD's posts often receive conflicting opinions, irony, and criticism, with 76 out of 100 comments utilizing a single speech strategy. The text suggests that KD's views on parking issues are frequently challenged by other members through direct contradiction. The text discusses the issue of improper parking and expresses dissatisfaction through narratives and arguments. The following is an example of disagreement on KD posts illustrating the form of conflicting opinions.

(1) *Ini bukan masalah wong Jogja atau bukan ini masalah inti yaitu parkir tidak pada tempatnya dan mobil ada goresan entah tergores secara sengaja atau tidak belum pasti....* (This is not a problem for Jogjaneese or not, but the main problem is that parking is not in the right place and it is not certain whether the scratches on KD's car were intentional or not.) (ADS-Facebook, ICJ, 2018).

In example (1), ADS disagrees with KD's opinion using conflicting opinions. ADS believes that an unknown person scratched KD's car because it was parked in the wrong place, not because KD came from Jogja or not. ADS also notes that there is no certainty whether the car was scratched intentionally or not. ADS disagreed with KD's attitude of blaming others and seeking justification for parking his car on public roads for a long time. The text follows conventional academic structure and maintains a formal register with clear, objective language and precise word choice.

According to WG's posts, 77 out of 100 comments used a single speech strategy, primarily consisting of irony and conflicting opinions. Members often respond to WG's insinuations about high parking fees with ironic remarks aimed at satirizing or belittling their viewpoints. An example of disagreeing with a strategy in the form of irony towards WG's posts is shown below.

(2) *Motor e didol dinggo tuku lahan parkir dewe.* (Just sell the motorbike to buy your own parking space) (FR-Facebook, ICJ, 2018).

In example (2), FR disagrees with WG's opinion, expressing it implicitly through irony. The grammar, spelling, and punctuation are correct, and the text is free from bias and filler words. FR suggested that WG sell his motorbike and buy his own parking space, which he

ultimately did. The speech implies an allusion to WG's opinion that the parking fee of IDR 5,000 is expensive. The satire is a form of FR's implicit disagreement with WG's posts.

AA's posts generated 88 out of 100 comments using a single speech strategy, with irony and orders prevailing. Members commonly use irony to criticize AA's understanding of traffic conditions in Yogyakarta, using satire to mock or insult their perspectives. An example of disagreeing with a strategy in the form of irony towards AA's post is shown below.

(3) *Apalagi kalau jam 2 subuh jalanan lancar sama adem* (especially if it's 2 in the morning, the traffic is smooth and the air is cold) (DK-Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In example (3), the utterance appears to agree with AA's post stating that Yogyakarta traffic is not congested. However, the implicature of the utterance is the opposite of the literal meaning. DK wants to state that AA's statement is true, but only in the morning. In other words, DK is implying that traffic in Yogyakarta is congested throughout the day except for early morning. This suggests that DK disagrees with AA's post, using irony to express their disagreement.

AG's posts, on the other hand, mainly consisted of conflicting opinions and sarcasm, eliciting 51 out of 56 comments. Members often disagree with AG's criticism of smoking near children by presenting opposing viewpoints. An example of disagreement of one strategy in the form of opposing opinions on AG's post is presented in example (4).

(4) *Kalo tempatnya luas rapopo* (if the place is wide it's okay) (AT-Facebook, ICJ, 2018).

In example (4), AT expresses disagreement with AG's opinion through conflicting viewpoints. AT argues that smoking near children is acceptable only in large areas. The opinion implies that cigarette smoke from parents will not harm children's health due to the large area. This is a counterargument to AG's statement that parents who smoke near children can endanger their health.

RD's posts received 100 comments, with 74 containing conflicting opinions, criticism, and irony. Members frequently challenge RD's perspectives on teenage behavior in coffee shops by presenting alternative viewpoints, engaging in direct criticism, or using irony to mock or criticize their viewpoints. An example of disagreement of one strategy in the form of opposing opinions on RD's post is shown below.

(5) *Seng salah wong tuane dudu warunge. warunge golek duet* (the fault of the parents, not the seller. The seller is just selling) (NPe-Facebook, ICJ, 2018).

In example (5), Npe disagrees with RD's opinion, which is conveyed through conflicting opinions. NPE believes that it is the parents who should be responsible for disciplining their children and ensuring they do not stay out late at coffee shops. This is in opposition to RD's suggestion that coffee shop owners should take action to reprimand or send the teenagers home. NPE argues that the responsibility for the teenagers who hang out at the coffee shop until late at night lies with their parents, rather than the coffee shop owners.

The data highlight the diverse strategies employed by ICJ members to express disagreement, emphasizing the importance of narrative and argumentation in challenging differing viewpoints within the group.

Disagreement Strategies Based on Intensity

Table 2
Frequency of Disagreement Variation Based on Intensity

Post Sender	Topic	Disagreement Strategies Based on Intensity		
		Strong Disagreement	Moderate Disagreement	Soft Disagreement
KD	Parkir di jalan umum	83	36	17

	(Parking on public roads)			
WG	Tarif parkir mahal (Expensive parking rates)	77	29	24
AA	Kemacetan di Yogyakarta (Traffic jams in Yogyakarta)	80	38	8
AG	Merokok di dekat anak (Smoking near children)	37	16	10
RD	Menongkrong di warkop (Hanging out at the coffee shop)	56	56	12

The analysis provides insights into the strategies employed by members of the ICJ group to express disagreement in various posts by KD, WG, AA, AG, and RD. These strategies vary in intensity, ranging from strong to soft disagreement, and are manifested through different forms such as criticism, orders, irony, and sarcasm.

For KD's posts, strong disagreement is prevalent, primarily conveyed through criticism, orders, and irony. Members often express discontent with KD's viewpoints on parking issues, using direct criticism and commands to convey their dissent. An examples of strong disagreement in the form of criticism of KD post is shown below.

(6) *Parkir neng dalan kok seolah2 dadi bener ki tek kpye kui, ada sebab ada akibat* (park the car on the side of the road as if to be the right thing. How can be like that? there is a cause there is an effect) (BYR-Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In example (6), BYR disagrees with KD's opinion using critical language. BYR presents a cause and effect relationship by stating that parking a car on a public road is not the right thing to do, conveying a negative assessment of KD. BYR criticizes KD's attitude of justifying his wrong behavior, namely parking the car on the side of a public road for an extended period. Therefore, in this context, BYR expresses disagreement with KD's attitude.

Similarly, WG's posts evoke strong disagreement, with irony and criticism being prominent. Members frequently challenge WG's insinuations, resorting to ironic remarks and criticism to oppose their perspectives. An example of harsh disagreement in the form of irony towards a WG post is presented below.

(7) *Nek mbayar 5000 kabotan diparkirke neng kebon mawon ..gratis bos..* (if you mind paying 5000, just park your car in the fields...it's free boss..) (RES-Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In example (7), RES recommends that WG park his motorbike in the fields where parking is free, in response to WG's complaint about the Rp. 5000 parking fee at Kridosono stadium. It is important to avoid using satire, which insults and demeans the target, and to maintain a balanced and objective tone. The text uses irony to convey disagreement, which is categorized as strong disagreement due to its confrontational nature.

AA's posts also attract strong disagreement, mainly expressed through irony and orders. Members often express disagreement with AA's understanding of traffic conditions, using irony and commands to emphasize their point. An example of strong disagreement in the form of irony towards AA's post is presented below.

(8) *Situ mah enak jadi sopir ambulan* (You don't get stuck in traffic because you are an ambulance driver) (MM-Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In example (8), MM explicitly stated that AA did not encounter a traffic jam because he was driving an ambulance, which receives priority from other road users and thus does not get stuck in traffic. The speaker implies disagreement with AA's statement that Yogyakarta traffic is smooth. The speaker uses satire to express their disagreement, which can be insulting or condescending and threaten AA's reputation. Therefore, MM's use of irony to express disagreement is considered strong.

AG's posts also generate strong disagreement, with sarcasm and criticism being the dominant tone. Members frequently use sarcasm and criticism to oppose AG's viewpoints, especially regarding smoking near children. An example of harsh disagreement in the form of sarcasm towards AG's post is presented below.

(9) *Tak slomot purun* (do you want me to burn) (Wrd-Facebook, ICJ, 2018).

In example (9), Wrd's comment implies criticism of AG's attitude towards parents who smoke near their children. The use of the word 'slomot' marks the comment as sarcastic. The sarcasm implies that Wrd disagrees with AG's criticism of someone who smokes near their child and shares it on social media. This disagreement is classified as strong.

Lastly, RD's posts elicit strong disagreement, conveyed mainly through orders and criticism. ICJ members often disagree with RD's perspectives on teenage behavior, expressing their dissent through commands and criticism. An example of violent disagreement in the form of an order against RD's post is shown below.

(10) *Mbok ngurusi awake dewe to* (you better take care of yourself) (PP-Facebook, ICJ, 2018)

In example (10), PP disagrees with RD's opinion by giving an order to take care of himself. This implies that PP does not agree with RD's habit of interfering in other people's affairs or privacy. The speech can be categorized as a strong disagreement due to the directness of the order and its potential to threaten RD's reputation. The statement has the potential to harm reputations due to the social distance between PP and RD, who are not acquainted. Therefore, it is necessary to rephrase the statement in a more polite and respectful manner.

In summary, strong disagreement is the predominant form of expression among ICJ members in all the posts analyzed. This suggests a tendency towards assertive opposition and criticism when confronted with viewpoints that are perceived as problematic or disagreeable. However, it is important to note the diversity of strategies employed, which reflects the nuanced nature of disagreement within the group.

Discussion

The Influence of Socialmedia on the Diversity of Disagreement Strategies

Disagreement is expressed differently across various media platforms. This study demonstrates that within the ICJ Facebook Group, comments expressing disagreement towards certain posts are notably concise and direct. This conciseness aligns with the informal nature of Facebook communication, where brevity is favored. The findings are consistent with (Olojede et al., 2018) research, which highlights syntactic deviation and the use of logograms on Facebook. (Benamara et al., 2018) observed that online comments are often brief and accompanied by non-linguistic cues. This preference for directness is similar to (Nor & Hashim, 2011) observation that oral disagreements tend to be convoluted, in contrast to the straightforward approach online.

Furthermore, ICJ Group members express disagreement with notable intensity, which can be attributed to the anonymity factor inherent in online communication. Anonymity in online communication can lead to confrontational expressions of disagreement, as noted by (Davis, 1999), (Hill & Hughes, 1998), and (Anonymous, 1998). (Angouri & Locher, 2012) highlights the importance of avoiding personal attacks in face-to-face disagreements, which contrasts with the boldness encouraged by online anonymity. This statement agrees with (Mulkay, 1985) claim, as cited by (Baym, 1996), that written disagreements often take a more explicit and harsh form, facilitated by the ease of expressing dissent in writing compared to speaking.

In conclusion, the expression of disagreement in the ICJ Facebook Group reflects a preference for directness and assertiveness. The preference for informal language and anonymity on the platform is a contributing factor. These findings demonstrate the nuanced

dynamics of disagreement across different communication mediums, which are influenced by both the characteristics of the medium and social norms.

The Influence of Post Topics on the Diversity of Disagreement Strategies

The research investigates the impact of topics on the expression of disagreement on social media platforms, specifically Facebook. It focuses on the ICJ Facebook Group and analyzes the different disagreement strategies and levels of intensity used in response to various themes. The results reveal that posts covering specific themes elicit a range of disagreement strategies, although one strategy is predominantly used per post.

For instance, KD's posts regarding the dangers of parking vehicles in random or public places elicited conflicting opinions from group members. This demonstrates the use of expressive discourse to express disagreement. Similarly, WG's posts about the costly motorbike parking at Kridosono Stadium received ironic responses, reflecting criticism conveyed through irony. AA's posts about traffic congestion in Yogyakarta often received ironic responses, serving as a rebuttal to public perceptions. AG's posts about smoking near children typically received conflicting opinions, reflecting criticism of such behavior. RD's posts on negative adolescent behavior predominantly received responses that blended order and criticism.

Additionally, the intensity of disagreement varied across different post topics. Discussions about traffic congestion in Yogyakarta, high parking fees, and parking on public roads can often lead to disagreements due to conflicting values, opinions, and perceptions among members. For instance, AA's post on traffic congestion in Yogyakarta received a strong disagreement response because it challenged public perceptions. Similarly, WG's post on expensive parking rates was met with strong disagreement due to the criticism conveyed through irony. Discussions about parking on public roads received strong disagreement responses due to complaints about negative incidents based on personal experiences.

These findings are consistent with (Locher, 2004b) research, which emphasizes the significant contribution of discussion topics to the emergence of disagreement in interactions. Additionally, (Schiffrin, 1984) highlights the role of conversation topics in fostering disagreement, which supports the empirical observations made in this study. (Rees-Miller, 2000) supports these findings by stating that disagreement intensifies when it threatens personal identities, values, beliefs, or privacy. Therefore, posts in the ICJ Facebook Group that challenge public values or intrude on personal privacy tend to provoke strong disagreement responses.

In conclusion, the topic of posts in the ICJ Facebook Group significantly influences the diversity of disagreement strategies employed and the intensity of disagreement expressed. These findings emphasize the complex relationship between post topics, disagreement strategies, and intensity levels within online discourse communities.

The Influence of Gender on Diversity in Disagreement Strategies

The analysis reveals that gender plays a significant role in the patterns of disagreement strategies within the ICJ Facebook Group, highlighting differences in participation and expression between male and female members. Specifically, male members tend to provide more disagreement comments, particularly towards posts by KD, WG, AA, AG, and RD. This observation indicates that female members may have less interest in the topics discussed in these posts, which is consistent with (Ning et al., 2010) findings on divergent topic preferences between men and women.

Furthermore, male ICJ members tend to use more complex disagreement strategies compared to their female counterparts, which challenges the stereotype that women communicate more complexly. This statement contradicts (Oppermann & Weber, 1997) previous research, which suggested that men tend to communicate more simply and linearly. The prevalence of strong disagreement expressions and confrontational approaches among male members on social media reflects broader gendered communication patterns. (Tannen,

1990) and (Sutton, 1994) note men's tendency towards aggressive tactics, while (Maltz & Borker, 1982) highlight their competition-oriented communication style. Conversely, individuals may employ different communication strategies based on their gender. According to (Holmes, 2013), women often use cooperative and community-focused strategies, emphasizing relationship-building and politeness.

(Guiller & Durndell, 2006) found that women's posts are more likely to contain agreement, while men's posts tend to feature challenges and disagreement. Additionally, (Wenjing, 2012) suggests that women prioritize language elegance in their communication. These observations emphasize the complex relationship between gender, communication styles, and social dynamics in online communities, such as the ICJ Facebook Group.

In conclusion, gender differences have a significant impact on the use of disagreement strategies within the ICJ Facebook Group, with male members displaying more confrontational approaches and complexity in their expressions. These findings challenge stereotypes about gendered communication patterns and demonstrate the ways in which gender influences online interaction dynamics.

The Influence of Cultural Factors on the Diversity of Disagreement Strategies

The diversity of strategies for disagreement in the ICJ Facebook Group is influenced by cultural factors, particularly the communication culture in Javanese society. This interaction is complex and influenced by various theoretical perspectives and empirical observations. Language and culture are intertwined, with each society exhibiting unique speech acts that reflect cultural values (Wierzbicka, 2003). Similarly, (Wierzbicka, 1990) emphasizes the diversity in communication styles across societies, which are shaped by cultural norms and priorities. The analysis of disagreement strategies within the ICJ Facebook Group reveals variations in speech acts, with disagreement often expressed through one or two strategies. This phenomenon suggests a nuanced approach to disagreement among members, which may be attributed to the Javanese cultural background, where direct confrontation is often avoided. (Suwarno, 2013) noted that Javanese individuals tend to use silent communication strategies more frequently. (Gunarwan, 2004) also highlighted the prevalence of indirect speech acts, such as prohibition conveyed through innuendos, among Javanese people.

These findings emphasize the distinctive speaking culture in Javanese society, characterized by a tendency to avoid direct confrontation and employ indirect communication methods. This passage supports Wierzbicka's claim that cultural values greatly impact communication styles. (Saville-Troike, 1984) also stresses the connection between language structure and content with cultural beliefs, values, and needs, underscoring the complex interplay between language and culture.

It can be summed up that the diverse strategies for disagreement observed in the ICJ Facebook Group with a Javanese cultural background indicate the unique communication culture within Javanese society. This phenomenon emphasizes the significant impact of cultural values on communication patterns, highlighting the necessity for a nuanced understanding of cultural contexts in interpreting communication behaviors.

CONCLUSION

This research provides valuable insights into the complexities of disagreement strategies employed within the ICJ Facebook Group. The analysis shows that group members use four distinct types of disagreement strategies: single speech strategy, two speech strategies, three speech strategies, and four speech strategies. The dominant approach is the single speech strategy. The group mainly expresses strong disagreement, indicating a prevalence of confrontational interactions. This variation in disagreement strategies can be attributed to several factors, including social media dynamics, posting topics, gender dynamics, and cultural influences.

The informal communication norms of social media facilitate concise disagreement strategies that predominantly employ the single-speech strategy. The lack of face-to-face communication on social media platforms such as Facebook may contribute to the confrontational tone of disagreements. In addition, the content of posts can influence the frequency and intensity of disagreements. Posts that challenge commonly held beliefs or values often lead to strong disagreements, especially when they relate to personal or professional identities. Gender dynamics play a role in shaping disagreement strategies on social media, with male members tending to use more complex and confrontational approaches. In addition, cultural factors, such as the distinct speaking culture of Javanese society, influence the diversity of disagreement strategies. Javanese communication norms may contribute to an indirect expression of disagreement, which is consistent with Wierzbicka's observations on cultural differences in speech patterns. Future research could explore the intersectionality of these factors and their impact on online interaction dynamics. Educators should include lessons on effective disagreement strategies and cultural sensitivity in language and communication curricula. By promoting a deeper understanding of these dynamics, individuals can navigate online interactions more effectively and foster respectful dialogue within diverse communities.

These findings have practical implications for educators and language learners, emphasizing the importance of teaching and learning effective strategies for disagreement. Educators should incorporate lessons on negative speech acts and sociocultural norms into language curricula to equip learners with the necessary skills to navigate disagreements politely and effectively in both online and offline contexts. Language learners must acquire not only linguistic competence but also sociocultural competence to navigate diverse communication situations effectively. Understanding strategies for managing disagreements and cultural norms surrounding it is essential for successful communication. Therefore, it is crucial to incorporate insights from these areas.

REFERENCES

- Angouri, J., & Locher, M. A. (2012). Theorising disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Angouri, J., & Tseliga, T. (2010). "You Have No Idea What You are Talking About!" From e-disagreement to e-impoliteness in two online fora. *degruyter.com*.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2010.004>
- Anonymous. (1998). To reveal or not to reveal: A theoretical model of anonymous communication. *Communication Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1998.tb00226.x>
- Baek, Y. M., Wojcieszak, M., & ... (2012). Online versus face-to-face deliberation: Who? Why? What? With what effects? *New Media & ...* <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444811413191>
- Baym, N. K. (1996). Agreements and disagreements in a computer-mediated discussion. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi2904_2
- Benamara, F., Inkpen, D., & Taboada, M. (2018). Introduction to the special issue on language in social media: exploiting discourse and other contextual information. *Computational Linguistics*.
- Chen, Y., & Rau, P. L. P. (2023). Politeness in Online Communication: The Role of Platform Design in Social Media Interaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 140.
- Creswell, J. W. (2010). Research design pendekatan kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan mixed. *Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar*.
- Davis, R. (1999). *The web of politics: The Internet's impact on the American political system*. *books.google.com*.

- García, C. (1989). Disagreeing and requesting by Americans and Venezuelans. *Linguistics and Education*.
- Guiller, J., & Durndell, A. (2006). "I totally agree with you": gender interactions in educational online discussion groups. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2006.00184.x>
- Gumperz, J. J. (2015). Interactional Sociolinguistics A Personal Perspective. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118584194.ch14>
- Gunarwan, A. (2004). Pragmatik, kebudayaan, dan pengajaran bahasa. *Dalam Seminar Nasional Semantik III. Surakarta*
- Haugh, M., & Chang, W. (2019). *Face in Interaction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, K. A., & Hughes, J. E. (1998). *Cyberpolitics: Citizen activism in the age of the Internet*. dl.acm.org. <https://doi.org/10.5555/551242>
- Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men and politeness*. books.google.com.
- Kadar, D. Z., & House, J. (2020). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kakava, C. (2002). Opposition in Modern Greek discourse: cultural and contextual constraints. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(10–11), 1537–1568. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00075-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00075-9)
- Langlotz, A., & Locher, M. A. (2012). Ways of communicating emotional stance in online disagreements. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics (2016)*. Oxford University Press.
- Locher, M. A. (2004a). *Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreement in Oral Communication*. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Locher, M. A. (2004b). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. books.google.com.
- Locher, M. A., & Graham, S. L. (2021). Impoliteness and Emotion in Digital Communication. In J. et al. Culpeper (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp. 429–452). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. *A Cultural Approach to Interpersonal*
- Moleong, L. J. (2017). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, cetakan ke-36, Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.
- Mulkay, M. (1985). Agreement and disagreement in conversations and letters. *Text-Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1985.5.3.201>
- Ning, H., Dai, X., & Zhang, F. (2010). On gender difference in English language and its causes. *Asian Social Science*.
- Nor, S. M., & Hashim, A. (2011). Disagreement strategies of Malaysian speakers of English in radio discourse. *12th APRU Doctoral Students Conference*.
- Olojede, A. M., Ebim, M. A., & Abioye, A. T. (2018). Language use on social media: A study of facebook interactions by yaba college of technology undergraduates. *International Journal of*
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Leech, N. L. (2005). On becoming a pragmatic researcher: The importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. *International Journal of Social* <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570500402447>
- Oppermann, K., & Weber, E. (1997). Frauensprache--Männersprache: die verschiedenen Kommunikationsstile von Männern und Frauen. (No Title).
- Placencia, M. E., & Lower, A. (2021). Relational Work in Facebook Comment Threads: Managing (Dis)agreement in Public Debate. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 177, 52–65.

- Putra, D. A. K., Suhandano, S., & Sulistyowati, S. (2022). Expressions of disagreement in the info cegatan jogja facebook group. *LiNGUA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 17(1), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.18860/ling.v17i1.13736>
- Rees-Miller, J. (2000). Power, severity, and context in disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *TESOL Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586690>
- Schiffrin, D. (1984). Jewish argument as sociability. *Language in Society*.
- Shum, W., & Lee, C. (2013). (Im) politeness and disagreement in two Hong Kong Internet discussion forums. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Stromer-Galley, J., Bryant, L., & ... (2015). Context and medium matter: Expressing disagreements online and face-to-face in political deliberations. *Journal of Deliberative* <https://doi.org/10.16997/jdd.218>
- Sutton, L. A. (1994). Using Usenet: Gender, power, and silence in electronic discourse. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics*
- Suwarno. (2013). Strategi Bertutur dalam Budaya Jawa dan Batak. *International Seminar on Linguistics*.
- Tannen, D. (1990). You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men. *Conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Vasquez, C. (2022). *Language Humor and Identity in Social Media Discourse*. Routledge.
- Wenjing, X. (2012). Study on gender differences in English. *Lecture Notes in Information*
- Wierzbicka, A. (1990). Cross-cultural pragmatics and different values. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.13.1.03wie>
- Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. degruyter.com. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110220964.bm>