

Buzzeringuistics: Decoding Digital Propaganda through Cyberpragmatics

Arkin Haris^{1*}

UIN Raden Mas Said Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia

*) Corresponding Author

Email: arkin.haris@staff.uinsaid.ac.id

DOI: 10.18326/jopr.v8i2.696-717

Submission Track:

Received: 23-01-2026

Final Revision: 20-06-2026

Available Online: 01-07-2026

Copyright © 2026 Authors



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This study examines how political buzzer discourse on social media constructs persuasion through the interaction of speech acts, cyberpragmatic functions, and digital politeness strategies. Focusing on competing hashtag discourses IndonesiaEmas and IndonesiaCemas on X, the study adopts a descriptive qualitative approach to explore how meaning, intention, and ideological positioning are pragmatically negotiated in online political communication. The data consist of selected user-generated comments representing polarized political engagement and were analyzed using speech act theory and cyberpragmatics. The findings indicate that assertive speech acts dominate buzzer discourse by presenting evaluative judgments and ideological claims as established realities, reinforced by expressive and directive acts that mobilize emotions and encourage audience alignment. The persuasive force of these utterances is strengthened through five cyberpragmatic functions, namely contextual saturation, non-verbal compensation, cyber-aggression, high inferential load, and algorithmic relevance optimization, reflecting how digital affordances shape interpretation and intensify pragmatic effects. The study also identifies three strategic patterns in digital politeness management, namely legitimization, delegitimization, and mitigation, which construct in-group solidarity and regulate face-threatening acts in polarized discourse. The findings show that buzzer communication operates as a systematic form of performative political discourse. The study proposes

Buzzeringuistics as an integrative analytical framework that combines cyberpragmatics, speech act analysis, and critical perspectives to explain digitally mediated political persuasion.

Keywords: *Buzzeringuistics; Cyberpragmatics; Pragmatics; Speech Acts; Buzzer*

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of social media has transformed political communication into a strategic practice shaped by buzzer accounts that amplify and contest narratives, as seen in competing discourses IndonesiaEmas and IndonesiaCemas. From a pragmatic perspective, such interactions require Cyberpragmatics (Yus, 2011), which explains meaning-making under conditions of reduced cues, audience scalability, and algorithmic mediation, where interpretation relies on contextual saturation and multimodal signals. In this context, hashtags function as evaluative triggers, and multimodal elements guide interpretation, reinforcing the persuasive nature of online discourse (Yus, 2011). At the level of action, buzzer messages operate as speech acts (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1976), with illocutionary force emerging from the interaction between linguistic content and cyberpragmatics cues within platform affordances.

A key implication concerns the reconfiguration of politeness and aggression. In Cyberpragmatics, Yus (2011) conceptualizes this as Politeness on the Net, emphasizing that online interaction encompasses a wide spectrum of communicative behaviors beyond polite and impolite distinctions. Practices such as irony, sarcasm, flaming, trolling, and strategic face attacks are not communicative failures but functional resources. These practices adapt the politeness framework of Brown and Levinson (1987), in which positive and negative face remain relevant but are reshaped by anonymity, reduced social accountability, and expanded audiences. Consequently, face-threatening acts in digital political discourse are often intentional and strategically deployed.

Previous studies provide important foundations but remain fragmented. Yus (2011) foregrounds relevance and inference in online meaning-making, while

Culpeper (2011) and Dynel (2015) demonstrate the normalization of impoliteness and aggression in computer-mediated interaction. Zappavigna (2018) highlights the metapragmatic role of hashtags in organizing stance and alignment, and Graham (2015) and Masduki (2021) show that confrontational discourse enhances engagement and algorithmic visibility. In the Indonesian context, Djatmika (2016) reveals that politeness and impoliteness function strategically to negotiate power and ideology in public discourse. However, these studies rarely integrate cyberpragmatic mechanisms, speech act intentions, and digital politeness strategies within a single analytical framework (Orsini-Jones & Lee, 2018; Locher, 2013; Herring, 2013; Olshtain, 2023; Sumartono et al., 2023; Sumarlam et al., 2024; Gitu et al., 2025).

This study addresses this gap by proposing Buzzeringuistics as an integrative framework combining Cyberpragmatics (Yus, 2011), Speech Act Theory (Searle, 1976), and digital politeness strategies adapted from Brown and Levinson (1987). Focusing on buzzer discourse surrounding IndonesiaEmas and IndonesiaCemas, this study is guided by three research questions: what types of illocutionary acts are produced by buzzer accounts, how cyberpragmatic functions support these acts and render them relevant for audiences, and how competing buzzer groups strategically manage politeness and impoliteness to achieve persuasive effectiveness. By doing so, this study contributes theoretically and methodologically to pragmatics and digital discourse analysis by demonstrating how meaning, intention, and ideological positioning are constructed through digitally mediated speech acts.

Cyberpragmatics (Yus, 2011) explains meaning-making in digitally mediated communication shaped by the absence of physical co-presence, limited paralinguistic cues, audience scalability, and algorithmic mediation, which intensify inference and make meaning reliant on contextual saturation and multimodal signals. This is highly relevant to political buzzer discourse, where messages are

immediate and affective, and language functions as action through Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1976), with illocutionary force emerging from the interplay between linguistic content and cyberpragmatic cues such as hashtags, visuals, and repetition. Politeness on the Net (Yus, 2011) further shows that politeness and impoliteness extend beyond stable norms and operate strategically, adapting Brown and Levinson's (1987) face framework under conditions of anonymity and reduced accountability. In this context, buzzers, defined as coordinated or semi-coordinated actors who manipulate attention and emotion (Woolley and Howard, 2016), function as strategic pragmatic agents who amplify or contest political narratives through repetitive, emotionally charged discourse shaped by cyberpragmatic constraints and speech act intentions.

Buzzeringuistics is proposed not as an alternative pragmatic theory, but as a domain-specific analytical framework grounded in Cyberpragmatics. While Cyberpragmatics offers a broad explanatory account of online meaning-making, Buzzeringuistics operationalizes these principles for analyzing political buzzer discourse. Its focus lies on recurrent persuasive patterns, affective alignment, and strategic amplification across multiple utterances. By integrating speech act analysis, cyberpragmatic functions, and digital politeness management, Buzzeringuistics enables a systematic examination of how political persuasion is linguistically engineered in algorithm-driven environments. In this sense, it functions as an applied extension of Cyberpragmatics that provides analytical specificity for politically polarized and strategically mediated online discourse.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a descriptive qualitative research design to examine how political buzzer discourse is constructed pragmatically in social media. Descriptive qualitative research is appropriate for studies that aim to interpret meanings, intentions, and communicative practices as they naturally occur in social contexts rather than to measure variables quantitatively (Creswell, 2014). Accordingly, this

approach allows for an in-depth interpretation of how pragmatic meanings are negotiated in online political communication. The analysis is grounded in a cyberpragmatic perspective, enabling a detailed examination of how linguistic and multimodal cues interact to produce illocutionary force, relevance, and strategic politeness in digitally mediated political discourse.

The data consist of social media postings from X that contain the hashtags *IndonesiaEmas* and *IndonesiaCemas*, selected because they represent opposing ideological framings in polarized political discourse. Data were collected within a defined observation period by retrieving publicly accessible posts and replies that explicitly used these hashtags. To ensure analytical relevance, the dataset was filtered to include postings that display evaluative, persuasive, or confrontational intentions, which are commonly associated with buzzer communication in online political contexts.

The primary unit of analysis is a single posting, including its textual content and accompanying cyberpragmatic elements such as hashtags, emojis, capitalization, and visual references. However, postings are not treated as isolated pragmatic events, but as localized instances of broader networked discourse practices in which locutionary content, illocutionary intention, and cyberpragmatic cues are jointly realized. This approach positions each post as an analytical entry point into distributed and cumulative communicative processes, where meaning and pragmatic force are shaped not only by internal features but also by circulation, repetition, and algorithmic positioning. Accordingly, the analysis examines buzzer discourse as digitally mediated speech acts operating within interconnected and ideologically driven communication networks.

Data analysis follows Spradley's (1980) ethnographic analytical model, adapted for digital discourse analysis. The analysis proceeds through four stages. First, domain analysis is conducted to identify recurring communicative domains such as affirmation, criticism, warning, or mockery in political hashtag discourse.

Second, taxonomic analysis is applied to classify these domains according to cyberpragmatic functions and types of illocutionary acts. Third, componential analysis examines contrasts between #IndonesiaEmas and #IndonesiaCemas discourse, particularly in terms of politeness strategies, aggression, and relevance optimization. Finally, cultural theme analysis is used to identify overarching patterns that explain how buzzer discourse constructs ideological positioning and manages persuasion in digital political spaces. Through this analytical procedure, the study systematically links cyberpragmatic functions, speech act intentions, and digital politeness strategies, allowing for a comprehensive interpretation of political buzzer discourse on X.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Cyberpragmatic Functions in Buzzer Discourse

In this study, the term function refers to the pragmatic role performed by linguistic and non-linguistic elements in guiding interpretation, shaping relevance, and supporting illocutionary intention in digitally mediated communication. Within the framework of Cyberpragmatics (Yus, 2011), functions are not limited to grammatical or semantic roles, but encompass how utterances operate cognitively and interactionally in online environments. A function, therefore, explains *what a communicative move does* in relation to audience inference, relevance optimization, and ideological positioning.

In political buzzer discourse, functions operate at the intersection of locution, illocution, and digital affordances. Locutionary content provides the explicit textual material, while illocutionary force reflects the speaker's intended action, such as asserting, promising, judging, or urging. Cyberpragmatic functions mediate between these two levels by shaping how intentions are recognized and interpreted by audiences. Through functions such as contextual saturation, non-verbal compensation, or inferential loading, buzzer messages strategically reduce cognitive effort while maximizing persuasive impact and emotional resonance.

Importantly, cyberpragmatic functions are not neutral. They are strategically deployed to frame reality, legitimize particular ideological positions, and delegitimize opposing narratives. In this sense, functions serve as mechanisms of pragmatic control, allowing political actors to present certain interpretations as natural, urgent, or self-evident. Analyzing these functions makes it possible to uncover how buzzer discourse operates beyond surface content and reveals the underlying pragmatic strategies that sustain polarization and persuasion in social media environments.

Based on the analysis of postings containing the hashtags #IndonesiaEmas and #IndonesiaCemas, this study identifies five dominant cyberpragmatic functions that recurrently support illocutionary acts in political buzzer discourse. These functions are analytically distinguished for clarity, although in practice they often co-occur within a single posting. The five functions are Contextual Saturation, Non-Verbal Compensation, Cyber-Aggression, High Inferential Load, and Algorithmic Relevance Optimization.

Table 1. Cyberpragmatic Patterns in Buzzer Discourse

Cyberpragmatic Function	Dominant Speech Act	Linguistic and Multimodal Features	Discursive Effect
Contextual Saturation	Assertive	Evaluative declaratives, compressed narratives, generalized claims	Normalizes optimism (#IndonesiaEmas) or crisis (#IndonesiaCemas)
Non-Verbal Compensation	Expressive	Emojis, capitalization, repetition, punctuation	Intensifies affective stance and emotional alignment
Cyber-Aggression	Assertive	Labeling, evaluative judgments, exclusionary framing	Delegitimizes opposing narratives and hardens polarization

High Inferential Load	Implicit Assertive / Expressive	Irony, insinuation, rhetorical questions	Encourages audience inference and strategic ambiguity
Algorithmic Relevance Optimization	Implicit Directive	Hashtags, trending keywords, concise framing	Mobilizes alignment, reflection, or engagement

Contextual Saturation

In this study, **contextual saturation** refers to a cyberpragmatic function through which complex social, political, or economic realities are compressed into simplified and evaluative frames that appear self-evident to audiences. This function foregrounds selected aspects of reality while backgrounding alternative interpretations, thereby reducing cognitive effort and steering audience inference toward a preferred ideological stance. Rather than offering detailed argumentation, such messages present interpretations as already established or natural.

Data 1: #IndonesiaEmas

Indonesia Emas 2045 bukan sekadar mimpi, tapi arah masa depan yang sedang kita bangun bersama. #IndonesiaEmas

The locutionary content of this post frames “Indonesia Emas 2045” as an ongoing and collective national project. A complex set of political, economic, and social processes is condensed into a single forward-looking statement that presents development as both realistic and inevitable. The dominant illocutionary act performed is assertive, as the speaker states the future vision as a matter of fact rather than opinion or speculation. Through contextual saturation, the post constructs optimism and continuity as self-evident realities, thereby discouraging critical interrogation and positioning acceptance as the most natural interpretive response.

Data 2: #IndonesiaCemas

Indonesia Cemas bukan tanpa alasan. Harga naik, hidup makin sulit, dan janji tak kunjung terasa. #IndonesiaCemas

In contrast, this posting uses contextual saturation to construct national conditions as problematic and anxiety-inducing. The locutionary content compresses multiple socioeconomic issues into a concise evaluative statement that foregrounds hardship and disappointment. The dominant illocutionary act is assertive, as the speaker presents the negative evaluation of current conditions as a factual description rather than a subjective complaint. By saturating the context with crisis-oriented cues, the posting naturalizes skepticism and concern, leaving little space for alternative interpretations that might emphasize gradual improvement or structural complexity.

The findings indicate that contextual saturation functions as a shared cyberpragmatic mechanism across both discourses while supporting contrasting ideological orientations through the same type of illocutionary act. In #IndonesiaEmas, assertive acts normalize optimism and developmental continuity, whereas in #IndonesiaCemas, assertive acts normalize anxiety and dissatisfaction. In both cases, contextual saturation simplifies complex realities into cognitively efficient frames, enabling political buzzer discourse to guide audience interpretation quickly and decisively within the constraints of social media interaction.

Non-Verbal Compensation

In this study, non-verbal compensation refers to a cyberpragmatic function whereby illocutionary force is reinforced or partially substituted through non-linguistic cues such as emojis, symbols, capitalization, punctuation, and visual references. In digitally mediated communication, these elements compensate for the absence of physical co-presence and paralinguistic cues, guiding interpretation and intensifying evaluative stance. Non-verbal compensation thus enables speakers to convey emotional alignment and pragmatic intent without expanding propositional content.

Data 3: #IndonesiaEmas

Optimis menatap masa depan! ID 🇮🇩 ✨ Indonesia Emas 2045 kita wujudkan bersama! #IndonesiaEmas

The locutionary content of this posting conveys a positive orientation toward the future through a brief affirmative utterance. The presence of the national flag and sparkle emojis functions as a non-verbal reinforcement of emotional alignment, symbolizing pride, hope, and collective enthusiasm. The dominant illocutionary act in this posting is expressive, as the speaker primarily expresses optimism and confidence rather than asserting a verifiable state of affairs. Through non-verbal compensation, positive affect is foregrounded, allowing the message to mobilize emotional identification and collective sentiment without relying on factual argumentation.

Data 4: #IndonesiaCemas

Harga naik terus!!! Rakyat makin tertekan!!! 🚨 😡 #IndonesiaCemas

In contrast, this posting relies heavily on non-verbal compensation to amplify a negative emotional stance. Capitalization, repeated exclamation marks, and warning or anger emojis intensify urgency, frustration, and alarm. While the locutionary content refers to socio-economic hardship, the dominant illocutionary act is expressive, as the posting foregrounds emotional reaction and affective evaluation rather than neutral description. Non-verbal compensation here serves to heighten emotional pressure and convey distress, directing audience interpretation through affective resonance rather than propositional elaboration. The findings indicate that non-verbal compensation functions as a shared cyberpragmatic mechanism across both discourses, primarily supporting expressive illocutionary acts. In #IndonesiaEmas, expressive acts normalize optimism, enthusiasm, and collective hope. In #IndonesiaCemas, expressive acts normalize anxiety, frustration, and emotional urgency. In both cases, non-verbal compensation strengthens illocutionary force by foregrounding

affective stance, enabling political buzzer discourse to remain persuasive and salient within the brevity constraints of social media interaction.

Cyber-Aggression

In this study, cyber-aggression refers to a cyberpragmatic function through which speakers strategically deploy confrontational or delegitimizing language to attack opposing actors or narratives. Unlike purely emotional expression, cyber-aggression in political discourse often presents negative evaluations as objective judgments or common sense truths. This function deliberately violates conventional politeness norms to assert ideological dominance, polarize audiences, and strengthen in-group alignment.

Data 5: #IndonesiaEmas

Kritik itu wajar, tapi pesimisme dan nyinyir tidak akan membawa Indonesia ke mana-mana. #IndonesiaEmas

The locutionary content of this posting draws a contrast between what is framed as legitimate criticism and what is labeled as “pesimisme” and “nyinyir.” Although the utterance appears moderated, it implicitly attacks opposing voices by categorizing them as unproductive and obstructive. The dominant illocutionary act is assertive, as the speaker presents this evaluative distinction as a generally valid assessment rather than a personal feeling or directive command. Cyber-aggression operates here in a mitigated form, where negative judgment is embedded within rational framing, allowing the speaker to delegitimize dissent while maintaining an appearance of reasonableness.

Data 6: #IndonesiaCemas

Yang masih percaya janji manis ini berarti menutup mata terhadap kenyataan. #IndonesiaCemas

In contrast, this post employs cyber-aggression in a more explicit manner. The locutionary content directly targets supporters of the opposing narrative by portraying them as ignoring reality. The dominant illocutionary act is assertive, as the speaker presents this negative characterization as an objective evaluation rather than an insult driven by emotion. Through cyber-aggression, the utterance

constructs a clear in-group versus out-group distinction, positioning skepticism as rational and belief in the opposing narrative as irrational or misguided.

The findings indicate that cyber-aggression functions as a shared cyberpragmatic mechanism across both discourses while maintaining different tonal strategies. In #IndonesiaEmas, cyber-aggression is typically moderated and framed as rational evaluation, allowing assertive acts to marginalize criticism without overt hostility. In #IndonesiaCemas, cyber-aggression is more direct, using assertive acts to openly delegitimize opposing beliefs. In both cases, cyber-aggression serves to harden ideological boundaries and reduce dialogic space, demonstrating how assertive speech acts can function aggressively when combined with evaluative and exclusionary framing.

High Inferential Load

In this study, high inferential load refers to a cyberpragmatic function in which meaning is not stated explicitly but must be inferred by audiences through irony, insinuation, or rhetorical questioning. Rather than presenting direct evaluations, messages with high inferential load rely on shared background knowledge and contextual cues, requiring audiences to actively reconstruct the speaker's intended stance. This function increases cognitive involvement while allowing speakers to convey critique or endorsement indirectly, often reducing overt accountability in politically sensitive discourse.

Data 7: #IndonesiaEmas

Katanya negara ini gagal, tapi investasi terus berdatangan. #IndonesiaEmas

The locutionary content of this posting takes the form of a contrastive statement that implicitly challenges a negative narrative. By juxtaposing claims of national failure with the arrival of investment, the utterance invites the audience to infer that the pessimistic discourse is unfounded. The dominant illocutionary act is assertive, as the speaker indirectly asserts the success of current conditions without stating it explicitly. High inferential load operates by requiring audiences

to draw the intended conclusion themselves, thereby strengthening persuasion through perceived reasoning rather than direct proclamation.

Data 8: #IndonesiaCemas

Hebat ya, negara kaya tapi rakyat disuruh terus berhemat. #IndonesiaCemas

In contrast, this post employs irony to convey a critical stance. Although the locutionary content appears superficially positive through the word “hebat,” the intended meaning is negative and evaluative. The dominant illocutionary act is expressive, as the speaker conveys a stance of dissatisfaction and sarcasm rather than making a straightforward factual claim. High inferential load functions here by compelling the audience to recognize the ironic reversal, aligning them emotionally with the implied critique.

The findings indicate that high inferential load functions as a shared cyberpragmatic mechanism across both discourses, but supports different illocutionary orientations. In #IndonesiaEmas, high inferential load primarily supports implicit assertive acts, allowing speakers to affirm progress while avoiding overt confrontation. In #IndonesiaCemas, it predominantly supports expressive acts, enabling speakers to articulate criticism and discontent indirectly through irony. In both cases, high inferential load enhances persuasive subtlety by shifting part of the meaning construction process onto the audience, thereby increasing interpretive engagement while maintaining strategic ambiguity.

Algorithmic Relevance Optimization

In this study, algorithmic relevance optimization refers to a cyberpragmatic function in which linguistic choices are strategically aligned with platform affordances to maximize visibility, engagement, and circulation. This function operates through the use of hashtags, topical keywords, concise framing, and repetition that resonate with algorithmic logics of social media. Rather than focusing on semantic depth, messages relying on algorithmic relevance

optimization prioritize shareability and discoverability, ensuring that intended meanings reach broader audiences efficiently.

Data 9: #IndonesiaEmas

Indonesia Emas 2045 dimulai hari ini. Bersama kita maju. #IndonesiaEmas #IndonesiaMaju

The locutionary content of this posting is brief and declarative, emphasizing immediacy and collective movement. The strategic use of multiple aligned hashtags functions to amplify visibility and associate the message with broader trending narratives of progress and nationalism. The dominant illocutionary act is directive, as the posting subtly invites audiences to align with, support, or participate in the promoted vision without issuing an explicit command. Algorithmic relevance optimization operates here by embedding ideological endorsement within platform-friendly structures that facilitate circulation and engagement.

Data 10: #IndonesiaCemas

Rakyat harus terus bertahan, tapi sampai kapan? #IndonesiaCemas #IndonesiaGelap

In contrast, this posting combines a rhetorical question with multiple issue-based hashtags to enhance algorithmic reach. The locutionary content foregrounds uncertainty and pressure, while the hashtags link the message to broader conversations about crisis and economic hardship. The dominant illocutionary act is also directive, as the posting implicitly urges audiences to question, reflect, and potentially challenge prevailing narratives. Algorithmic relevance optimization here functions by coupling critique with searchable tags that increase visibility within contentious public debates.

The findings indicate that algorithmic relevance optimization functions as a shared cyberpragmatic mechanism across both discourses, primarily supporting implicit directive acts. In #IndonesiaEmas, this function encourages alignment and participation by embedding optimism within highly visible hashtag networks. In #IndonesiaCemas, it encourages reflection and dissent by linking critique to widely circulating issue-based tags. In both cases, algorithmic relevance

optimization demonstrates how illocutionary force can be subtly redirected toward audience action through strategic adaptation to platform algorithms, reinforcing the role of social media affordances in shaping political buzzer discourse.

Digital Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies in Buzzer Discourse

Grounded in *Politeness on the Net* (Yus, 2011) and its adaptation of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory, this section examines how competing buzzer camps strategically manage digital politeness and impoliteness to achieve persuasive effectiveness. In online political discourse, politeness norms are not merely upheld or violated, but selectively calibrated in response to anonymity, reduced social accountability, and audience scalability. The findings reveal three dominant strategies through which politeness and impoliteness function as instrumental pragmatic resources rather than moral or interpersonal obligations.

Table 2. Digital Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies in Buzzer Discourse

Strategy	Politeness Orientation	Cyberpragmatic Support	Persuasive Function
Legitimization	Polite alignment	Contextual saturation, emojis	Builds authority and trust
Delegitimization	Strategic impoliteness	Cyber-aggression, saturation	Undermines opposing narratives
Mitigation	Managed impoliteness	High inferential load	Preserves face while criticizing

Legitimization

The first strategy is legitimization, predominantly employed in #IndonesiaEmas discourse. This strategy relies on digital politeness, particularly positive politeness, to construct legitimacy, credibility, and moral authority. Speakers emphasize shared goals, collective identity, and optimism, thereby aligning themselves with the audience and reinforcing the acceptability of dominant narratives. Assertive and expressive acts are strategically softened, while impoliteness is minimized or framed implicitly.

This strategy reflects an adaptive form of politeness where face is preserved not for interpersonal harmony, but to enhance persuasion and trust. Persuasive effectiveness is achieved by normalizing support and portraying ideological alignment as reasonable, inclusive, and socially endorsed.

Delegitimization

The second strategy is delegitimization, which is more salient in #IndonesiaCemas discourse. This strategy foregrounds strategic impoliteness, where threats to positive face are deliberately employed to undermine opposing narratives and actors. Rather than maintaining harmony, speakers present criticism, confrontation, and negative evaluation as justified and necessary.

This strategy represents a conscious relaxation of politeness constraints enabled by anonymity and distance. Assertive acts dominate, presenting negative judgments as objective realities rather than personal attacks. Persuasive effectiveness is achieved by intensifying polarization, clarifying in-group boundaries, and mobilizing audiences who already share skeptical orientations.

Mitigation

The third strategy is mitigation observed in both #IndonesiaEmas and #IndonesiaCemas. This strategy involves the management of face risk through indirectness, irony, and insinuation, allowing speakers to convey evaluative meanings without explicit confrontation. Rather than eliminating impoliteness, mitigation softens or disguises it, enabling criticism or endorsement to be communicated in a less accountable and more inferential manner. Expressive and implicit assertive acts are supported by high inferential load, requiring audiences to actively reconstruct the intended stance.

Mitigation reflects a calculated reduction of face-threatening force rather than its absence. Politeness is selectively maintained, while impoliteness is strategically moderated. Persuasive effectiveness is achieved by engaging cognitively active

audiences, reinforcing in-group cohesion, and preserving plausible deniability in ideologically sensitive exchanges.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that digital politeness and impoliteness are strategically calibrated rather than normatively fixed in political buzzer discourse. #IndonesiaEmas primarily employs legitimization through polite alignment, while #IndonesiaCemas relies more heavily on delegitimization through strategic impoliteness. Both camps also utilize mitigation to balance persuasion, visibility, and face management. Online politeness is adaptive and functional, illustrating how persuasive effectiveness in social media is achieved through the deliberate orchestration of politeness and impoliteness under cyberpragmatic constraints.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that persuasive effectiveness in political buzzer discourse surrounding #IndonesiaEmas and #IndonesiaCemas is achieved not through deliberative argumentation, but through the strategic interaction of dominant speech acts, cyberpragmatic functions, and adaptive politeness management. Across the dataset, assertive speech acts emerge as the most dominant illocutionary form, particularly in contextual saturation, cyber-aggression, and algorithmic relevance optimization. In both discourses, assertives function to present evaluative positions as established realities rather than contestable opinions, with #IndonesiaEmas normalizing optimism, continuity, and legitimacy, and #IndonesiaCemas normalizing crisis, dissatisfaction, and skepticism. This dominance confirms Austin's (1962) view of language as action and supports Searle's (1976) claim that assertives are central to ideological positioning because they assert authority over representations of social reality.

Expressive speech acts are most salient in non-verbal compensation and high inferential load, where affective stance, irony, and sarcasm become central to persuasion. These expressives mobilize emotional alignment and in-group

cohesion, demonstrating that digital political persuasion relies heavily on affect rather than propositional reasoning. Directive acts appear primarily in algorithmic relevance optimization, where calls for alignment or reflection are implied rather than explicitly stated, reinforcing the indirect and inferential nature of persuasion in social media environments.

The five cyberpragmatic functions identified in this study operate as mechanisms that shape and amplify illocutionary force under digital constraints. Contextual saturation enables assertive acts to function ideologically by compressing complex realities into simplified and self-evident frames, directly supporting Yus's (2011) argument that online communication prioritizes relevance and cognitive economy. Non-verbal compensation reinforces expressive acts through emojis, symbols, and punctuation, compensating for the absence of physical co-presence, while cyber-aggression demonstrates how assertive acts become face-threatening when combined with evaluative and exclusionary framing. High inferential load further highlights the inferential demands of online discourse, as speakers rely on irony and insinuation to shift interpretive responsibility onto audiences, and algorithmic relevance optimization illustrates how platform affordances transform illocutionary intent into widely circulating, implicitly directive messages.

In this study, persuasion is conceptualized as a pragmatic action rather than a directly measurable audience effect. The analysis does not establish causal links between buzzer discourse and belief change or mobilization, but examines how persuasion is discursively constructed through patterned illocutionary strategies and cyberpragmatic affordances oriented toward influencing interpretation, alignment, and engagement. Speech acts, cyberpragmatic functions, and politeness strategies are treated as interrelated configurations that enable persuasive intent within algorithm-driven environments, creating conditions for perlocutionary uptake without measuring audience responses.

From the perspective of Politeness on the Net, these patterns show that politeness and impoliteness function as strategic resources rather than stable norms. Consistent with Brown and Levinson (1987), face remains relevant but is reshaped by anonymity, reduced accountability, and audience scalability. The legitimization strategy in IndonesiaEmas discourse relies on positive politeness to construct authority, supporting Yus (2011), while delegitimization in IndonesiaCemas employs strategic impoliteness to threaten positive face, aligning with Culpeper (2011) and Dynel (2015). Mitigation across both camps further shows how speakers manage face risk through indirectness and ambiguity. While these patterns are analyzed as functional, this does not imply normative endorsement, but highlights how symbolic hostility becomes routinized and may undermine deliberative norms.

Taken together, these findings extend existing theories by showing that speech acts, cyberpragmatic functions, and politeness strategies operate as an integrated system. While Austin (1962) and Searle (1976) explain illocutionary intention, Cyberpragmatics accounts for its digital mediation, and Politeness on the Net explains adaptive face management. This integration substantiates Buzzeringuistics as an operational framework for analyzing coordinated political persuasion, affective mobilization, and algorithmic amplification in social media discourse.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that political buzzer discourse on social media operates as a form of strategic cyberpragmatic action in which persuasion is achieved through the coordinated use of speech acts, cyberpragmatic functions, and adaptive politeness management. Focusing on the competing hashtags #IndonesiaEmas and #IndonesiaCemas, the analysis shows that assertive speech acts dominate ideological positioning by presenting evaluative stances as established realities, while expressive and implicit directive acts support affective

alignment and audience engagement. These illocutionary patterns are systematically amplified by five cyberpragmatic functions, namely contextual saturation, non-verbal compensation, cyber-aggression, high inferential load, and algorithmic relevance optimization, each of which reflects the cognitive and technological constraints of digitally mediated communication.

The findings further confirm that digital politeness and impoliteness are not fixed norms but instrumental resources calibrated to achieve persuasive effectiveness. Drawing on Politeness on the Net and the adaptation of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, the study identifies three dominant strategies: legitimization through polite alignment, delegitimization through strategic impoliteness, and mitigation through managed indirectness. Together, these strategies illustrate how face management in online political discourse is reshaped by anonymity, reduced accountability, and audience scalability.

Theoretically, this study contributes to pragmatics and digital discourse analysis by integrating Speech Act Theory, Cyberpragmatics, and online politeness into a unified analytical framework termed *Buzzeringuistics*. Methodologically, it demonstrates the value of qualitative cyberpragmatic analysis for uncovering the mechanisms through which ideology, affect, and persuasion are jointly constructed in social media. Future research may extend this framework to other political contexts, platforms, or multilingual settings to further explore the evolving dynamics of digital persuasion and polarization.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Djatmika. (2016). *Kesantunan berbahasa dalam wacana publik*. Surakarta, Indonesia: UNS Press.
- Dynel, M. (2015). The landscape of impoliteness research. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 11(2), 329–354. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2015-0013>
- Gitu, S., Basweti, N., & Atoh, F. (2025). Understanding impolite utterances on Facebook in Kenya: A cyberpragmatic approach. *Hungarian Journal of African Studies (Afrika Tanulmányok)*, 19(1), 23–41.
- Graham, T. (2015). Everyday political talk in the internet-based public sphere. In S. Coleman & D. Freelon (Eds.), *Handbook of digital politics* (pp. 247–263). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Herring, S. C. (2013). Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, reconfigured, and emergent. In D. Tannen & A. M. Trester (Eds.), *Discourse 2.0: Language and new media* (pp. 1–25). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Locher, M. A. (2013). Review of Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated communication in context (F. Yus). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 47(1), 128–130.
- Masduki (2021)**. *Media Control in the Digital Politics of Indonesia*. *Media and Communication*, 9(4), 52–61.
- Olshtain, E. (2023). Cyberpragmatics: Complaints and the collective perspective. Retrieved from ScienceDirect.
- Orsini-Jones, M., & Lee, F. (2018). Cyberpragmatics. In M. Orsini-Jones & F. Lee (Eds.), *Intercultural communicative competence for global citizenship* (pp. 25–37). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837>

- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sumarlam, S., Djatmika, D., Widiana, Y., & Budiyo, S. (2024). Persuasive speech act strategies of online fashion sellers in live e-commerce: A cyberpragmatics approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(11), 3385–3393. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1411.07>
- Sumartono, S., Ariyati, Y., Puryanto, P., & Setiawan, Y. L. (2023). *Netizens Become Political Buzzers as an Act of Retribution*. *Migration Letters*, 21(21), 745–755.
- Woolley, S. C., & Howard, P. N. (2016). Political communication, computational propaganda, and autonomous agents. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 4882–4890.
- Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-mediated communication in context*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Zappavigna, M. (2018). *Searchable talk: Hashtags and social media metadiscourse*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.